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## Executive Summary

The 2007 Harvard Faculty Climate Survey examines issues related to overall satisfaction with the University, as well as satisfaction with 6 substantive areas including: atmosphere, workload, mentoring, tenure, hiring and retention and life outside Harvard. The main results for each are summarized below. More detailed summaries are provided following the executive summary.

The overall response rate for the Harvard Faculty Climate Survey is 75\%. The response rates for all Schools and all demographic groupings are also consistently high, and the respondent characteristics match very closely those of the overall population.

In this report we analyze demographic differences (e.g., gender, ethnicity, citizenship and age) among the faculty at Harvard. The body of the report focuses on differences for which there are large, discernible patterns in the data, such as gender and rank. ${ }^{1}$ Since some demographic groups are small in size, we might not be able to discern trends in the survey data for these groups, even if they exist. The Office of the Senior Vice Provost for Faculty Development and Diversity is in the process of conducting a qualitative study of tenure-track minority faculty, and other small demographic groups, to understand issues that may uniquely affect them.

## Satisfaction

Overall, $85 \%$ of the faculty are at least "somewhat satisfied" with being faculty members at Harvard, and $80 \%$ are at least "somewhat satisfied" with their Schools. Tenure-track faculty are less satisfied than tenured faculty with Harvard and their individual Schools. Non-ladder faculty are also less satisfied than tenured faulty with Harvard, but are more satisfied than tenure-track faculty with their Schools. Women, meanwhile, are less satisfied than men with Harvard and their individual Schools.

For tenured faculty, the strongest predictor of overall University satisfaction is the extent to which they find their department to be a good fit for them. For tenure-track faculty, it is adequate overall mentoring. Finally for non-ladder faculty, the strongest predictor of University satisfaction is the stress of finding a tenure-track position.

Of the 17 issues in the survey related to compensation and benefits, teaching, facilities, resources, and services, the faculty are most satisfied with the quality of the students. The tenured faculty are least satisfied with administrative support for grants and special research facilities, while the tenure-track and non-ladder faculty are least satisfied with the availability of nearby parking. For these 17 issues, there is only one significant difference between men and women, namely women are less satisfied with teaching resources.

## Atmosphere

Over two-thirds of the faculty agree to some extent that their departments are a good fit for them with women agreeing less strongly than men. For the 9 specific aspects of departmental

[^0]atmosphere (e.g., collegiality and collaboration), ladder women view 8 of these issues less positively than ladder men. Moreover, tenure-track faculty view all 9 issues less positively than tenured faculty. In most cases, the effects of gender and rank are additive, whereby tenure-track women have the least positive view of departmental atmosphere. Non-ladder faculty view 3 aspects of departmental atmosphere less positively than ladder faculty, namely respect from colleagues, opportunities for extra-departmental collaboration and having a voice in departmental decision-making. As in the case of ladder faculty, non-ladder women view their department's atmosphere less positively than men along a number of dimensions.

## Workload

The average number of hours the faculty report working per week is 62 hours for tenured faculty, 60 hours for tenure-track faculty and 53 for non-ladder faculty. Although the difference between tenured and tenure-track faculty is small, it persists even when accounting for other demographics and aspects of family life (e.g., children and spousal/domestic partner employment status). Tenured faculty serve on more committees than tenure-track faculty, with tenured women serving on the most. Not surprisingly, tenured women consider service expectations to be higher than tenured men and tenure-track faculty regardless of gender. All faculty groups except tenured men report that expectations for research are significantly too high, while nonladder faculty report that expectations for teaching and service to the University are significantly too low. Finally, the one issue that presents the greatest stress for all faculty ranks is time for scholarly work.

## Mentoring

Nearly two-thirds of the tenured faculty, but only $40 \%$ of the tenure-track faculty and $31 \%$ of the non-ladder faculty consider their departments to be effective in mentoring. Tenure-track faculty are more likely to have informal mentors than formal mentors. Nearly all tenure-track faculty with informal mentors find this mentoring helpful, whereas only two-thirds of those who have formal mentors consider this experience helpful. Mentoring regarding teaching is the one area that the most tenure-track and non-ladder faculty agree is adequate. Meanwhile, a majority of the tenure-track faculty find mentoring in the following areas to be "inadequate" or "barely adequate," namely securing funds for research, distributing time among work-related activities, advising student research assistants, negotiating office politics, running a lab or research group, and work-life balance. Slightly less than a majority of the tenure-track faculty find mentoring regarding the requirements for promotion and tenure and publishing scholarly work to be "inadequate" or "barely adequate." Moreover, approximately $60 \%$ of the non-ladder faculty find mentoring to be "inadequate" or "barely adequate" regarding negotiating office politics, work-life balance and one's career.

## Tenure

Approximately one-third of the tenure-track faculty compared to two-thirds of the tenured faculty consider the criteria for tenure and the feedback junior faculty receive about their tenure prospects to be clear. Women find both of these issues to be less clear than men. Nonetheless, effective mentoring is associated with a clearer understanding of the tenure criteria for tenure-
track faculty. Both tenured and tenure-track faculty report that research is overvalued in the tenure process, while teaching and service are undervalued. However, tenure-track women report that research is more overvalued than tenure-track men, and tenured women report that teaching, service and student evaluations are more undervalued than tenured men. Tenure-track men and women both consider student evaluations to be undervalued. Finally, almost three-quarters of the tenure-track faculty, who have had their tenure clock stopped for personal reasons, report that their departments were supportive of this process.

## Hiring and Retention

About $20 \%$ of the tenured faculty, including both men and women, report that they are "somewhat" or "very likely" to leave Harvard in the next 3 years. The main reasons they have considered leaving Harvard are to increase their time to do research and to find a more supportive work environment. Almost half of the tenure-track faculty report being "somewhat" or "very" likely to leave Harvard in this time-with $56 \%$ of tenure-track women and $40 \%$ of tenure-track men of this opinion. The main reasons tenure-track faculty have considered leaving Harvard are to improve their prospects for tenure and to find a more supportive work environment. Meanwhile, the main reasons non-ladder faculty have considered leaving Harvard are to move to a tenure-track position and to enhance their career in other ways. Finally, there are no gender differences in the percentages of tenured and tenure-track faculty respondents who seek or receive outside job offers.

## Life Outside Harvard

Approximately one-third of the faculty agree that caregiving and/or other domestic responsibilities have had a negative impact on their careers. However, almost half of tenuretrack faculty and nearly half of women feel this way compared to only about a quarter of tenured faculty and a quarter of men. More women than men find managing household responsibilities, childcare, dependent care, reproductive decisions and issues, and their own health to be extensive sources of stress. Lastly, slightly more women than men report having to miss an important work-related meeting or commitment (either in part or in full) at least once a month due to caregiving and/or other domestic responsibilities.

Almost one third (31\%) of the ladder faculty have spouses that currently work in academia - as faculty members, post-doctoral fellows/research associates, or graduate students. Forty-nine percent of these faculty report that their spouses work at Harvard, while the remaining are at other institutions. Of the faculty with spouses at other institutions, over half (51\%) report that they are in commuting relationships (i.e., commuting more than an hour to work or living in separate communities more than an hour apart). Seventy-eight percent of the faculty in commuting relationships report that their spouses had problems finding appropriate jobs locally and only $6 \%$ received help from their School finding their spouses local employment.

Methodology

## Methodology

In this section of the report, we describe all technical issues related to the survey, such as the process through which the survey was designed, the estimation techniques used to analyze the data, and the standards we apply in reporting the results.

## Survey Instrument Design

The Office of Institutional Research designed the survey instrument in collaboration with faculty at Harvard as well as faculty and institutional researchers at Harvard's peer institutions (e.g., Stanford, MIT, and Yale). The collaboration with peer institutions occurred through the Association of American Universities Data Exchange (AAUDE). Consequently, the survey instrument contains a number of common questions that our peer institutions have already included or will include in future surveys of their faculty such that results of Harvard's survey can eventually be compared to the results from these other institutions.

Two university committees, the Advisory Group on Metrics and Analysis (AGMA) and the University Committee on Faculty Development and Diversity, reviewed and revised multiple drafts of the survey instrument. The members of these committees are as follows:

Advisory Group for Metrics and Analysis (AGMA): Sunshine Hillygus (FAS), Caroline Hoxby (FAS), Lawrence Katz (FAS), Donna Spiegelman (HSPH) and Alan Zaslavsky (HMS).

University Committee on Faculty Development and Diversity: Ann Braude (HDS), Catherine Claypoole (HLS) Janice Hammond (HBS), Daphne Layton (HGSE), Ellice Lieberman (HMS), Jane Mansbridge (KSG), Lisa Martin (FAS), Toshiko Mori (GSD) and Deborah Prothrow-Stith (HSPH)

## Statistical Analysis

The analysis relies on descriptive statistics, graphical analysis and regression analysis. For the questions with three to five response categories we assume that our ordered scales represent cardinal rather than (only) ordinal information and therefore have interpretable means. ${ }^{2}$ Our multivariate estimation techniques include both ordinary least squares (OLS) regressions and logistic regressions. OLS has the advantage that it is numerically easy to implement -- the numerical estimation procedure cannot get stuck at a local optimum -- and the OLS coefficients are directly interpretable. On the other hand, logistic regressions have the advantage that they have a completely rigorous statistical foundation for asymptotic analyses (i.e. when sample sizes are "large"). For questions with only two response categories we only use logistic regressions

[^1](since OLS is a poor approximation in this limiting case). For questions with three to five response categories - most of these questions have five response categories - we use OLS regressions. All results of the logistic analysis for two-category questions and of the OLS analysis for three-to-five-category questions are reported in the Appendix to each section. The authors of the report would be happy to report additional logistic or OLS analyses for any individual questions if such analysis is of interest to a reader. We provide predicted probabilities in the text to describe demographic differences found in the logistic regressions. These are calculated by holding all other demographic variables in the model, not relevant to the comparison being made, constant at the population mean.

For the regression analysis, we analyze each question using a baseline specification. The baseline specification includes variables for rank, gender, ethnicity, citizenship, age and School. This allows us to test the hypothesis that survey respondents in different demographic groups (i.e., a male respondent compared to a female respondent) have similar responses to the survey questions.

Rank is comprised of three indicator variables representing tenured, tenure-track and non-ladder faculty. Tenured faculty are always the reference category. Ethnicity is comprised of 7 indicator variables (i.e., white, black, Asian/Pacific Islander, Hispanic, American Indian/Alaskan Native, and unknown). White is always the reference category. While we include indicator variables for all ethnic groups in our analyses, we do not report the results of ethnic groups that do not meet our reporting criteria of five faculty members in each demographic group (see below). As a result, we do not report the results of faculty of American Indian/Alaskan Native descent, or faculty of unknown ethnicity.

In several cases, we hypothesize that variables other than those included in our baseline specification, or interactions between different variables, are associated with the faculty's survey responses. Thus, wherever appropriate we also include additional specifications introducing interaction terms, as well as other variables that are potentially related to the question at hand. We examine gender and rank interactions when there is a statistically significant difference in responses to a particular question between men and women (i.e., a gender gap) to determine if the effect of gender is driven by women in a particular rank. Using these interaction terms, we also examine whether or not any rank effects are confounded by gender effects and vice versa.

For all model specifications, we first analyze the data at the University level in order to understand satisfaction levels of the faculty as a whole throughout the University. This report focuses on a "global" University perspective for a number of reasons. First, analyzing the faculty as a whole provides the President, Provost and Senior Vice Provost for Faculty Development and Diversity, as well as the broader community, an overview of the issues that are common to most of the faculty at Harvard and may therefore suggest important issues on which to focus policy decisions. Second, analyzing the data at the University level provides a benchmark according to which the individual Schools at Harvard can compare their results. Third, we are interested in understanding demographic differences in survey responses. Since many demographic groups are small at Harvard, we might not observe statistically significant demographic effects (or consistent patterns in responses) among all groups if we only analyzed the data at the School level.

Although this report focuses on faculty at the University level, the baseline specification does include School fixed effects, accounting for any possible effects that may be attributable to one's School. Further, in all regressions, we use robust standard errors to adjust for heteroskedasticity in the data.

As an additional robustness check, we restrict the regressions to each School for many of the primary issues. This allows us to analyze demographic differences in survey responses within each School and provides the Deans with useful information about their individual Schools. However, it is important to note that the size of the faculty within a number of Schools is quite small (e.g. GSD, GSE, HDS and HLS) and the number of respondents for certain questions is even smaller. In these Schools, we are unlikely, therefore, to detect statistically significant effects, even though demographic differences may exist. In the School-specific analyses, we again use robust standard errors to adjust for heteroskedasticity. As mentioned previously, in this report we only report the over-arching question(s) in each section at the School level. We will report all questions at the School level in follow-up analyses.

We do not weight our analysis because our sample population closely mirrors that of the actual population, making weighting unnecessary.

Our faculty advisory group (AGMA) has reviewed this report.

## Significance Testing

Conclusions about the statistical significance of the results presented herein are based on a standard 95 percent confidence interval. This level of significance indicates that there is a 5 percent chance of a "false positive," meaning that we are detecting a difference in the population that may not really exist.

For determining the significance of the interaction effects, we rely on post-estimation F-tests for the baseline models that include the relevant interaction terms. We test a number of hypotheses that examine the relationship between women and men in the same rank, women across ranks and men across ranks. These comparisons include the following:

## Gender differences within Rank:

(1) tenured men versus tenured women,
(2) tenure-track men versus tenure-track women, and
(3) non-ladder men versus non-ladder women.

## Rank Differences within Gender:

(4) tenured men versus tenured-track men,
(5) tenured men versus non-ladder men,
(6) tenure-track men versus non-ladder men,
(7) tenured women versus tenure-track women,
(8) tenured women versus non-ladder women, and
(9) tenure-track women versus non-ladder women.

## Reporting Criteria

We do not provide information on demographic groups that contain fewer than five faculty members. We include these groups in the analysis, but do not report their results in order to protect the anonymity of our respondents.

Although we find a handful of ethnic-based differences in survey responses, we do not find clear trends in the data. This may be a result of Harvard having a small number of ethnic minorities currently employed as faculty at the University. As a result, a plausible difference in say satisfaction between different ethnic groups might not be discernable even if one exists. (Formally, plausible differences would generally not be statistically significant at a conventional level of confidence.) Due to this lack of discernable ethnic-based trends, we focus the report on other demographics for which we could find large, discernable patterns, such as gender and rank. However, summary statistics for each question are provided by ethnicity, as sample size permits, in the Ethnicity Appendix. Also, the University Committee on Faculty Development and Diversity is in the process of conducting an ethnographic study of minorities to further investigate if there are trends that were not discernable through this survey.

## DEMOGRAPHICS

- RESPONSE RATE
- ChARACTERISTICS OF THE SAMPLE POPULATION


## Response Rate

The overall response rate for the Harvard Faculty Climate Survey is 75\%. Additionally, response rates from all Schools and demographic groupings are consistently high, and the characteristics of the respondents very closely match those of the overall population.

Faculty at all of Harvard's Schools were invited to participate in the survey if they were appointed to Harvard as a faculty member on or before September 1, 2005. Visiting faculty and faculty who switched from the ladder to the non-ladder (and vice versa) after this date were not eligible to participate.

Figure D1 provides demographic information (e.g., rank, gender, ethnicity, citizenship and age) for the 1,863 faculty who were invited to participate in the survey, as well as the 1,400 who responded. ${ }^{3}$

Figure D1: Response Rates and Distribution of Respondents and Faculty

|  |  | Number of <br> Respondents | Response <br> Rate | \% of <br> Respondents ${ }^{\mathbf{4}}$ | \% of <br> Population $^{\mathbf{5}}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Rank $^{6}$ | Tenured Faculty | 697 | $77 \%$ | $50 \%$ | $49 \%$ |
|  | Tenure-Track Faculty | 357 | $77 \%$ | $26 \%$ | $25 \%$ |
|  | Non-Ladder Faculty | 345 | $70 \%$ | $25 \%$ | $26 \%$ |
| Gender | Women | 414 | $78 \%$ | $30 \%$ | $29 \%$ |
|  | Men | 986 | $74 \%$ | $70 \%$ | $71 \%$ |
|  | American Indian/ |  |  |  |  |
|  | Alaskan Native Faculty | 3 | $100 \%$ | $<1 \%$ | $<1 \%$ |
|  | Asian Faculty | 123 | $69 \%$ | $9 \%$ | $10 \%$ |
|  | Black Faculty | 41 | $73 \%$ | $3 \%$ | $3 \%$ |
|  | Hispanic Faculty | 32 | $74 \%$ | $2 \%$ | $2 \%$ |
|  | Unknown Ethnicity | 4 | $67 \%$ | $<1 \%$ | $<1 \%$ |
|  | White Faculty | 1,197 | $76 \%$ | $86 \%$ | $85 \%$ |
| Citizenship | US Citizen | 1,286 | $76 \%$ | $92 \%$ | $91 \%$ |
|  | International | 114 | $68 \%$ | $8 \%$ | $9 \%$ |
|  | Less than 35 | 116 | $73 \%$ | $8 \%$ | $9 \%$ |
|  | $35-44$ | 383 | $75 \%$ | $27 \%$ | $27 \%$ |
|  | $45-54$ | 366 | $79 \%$ | $26 \%$ | $25 \%$ |
|  | $55-64$ | 357 | $73 \%$ | $26 \%$ | $26 \%$ |
|  | $65+$ | 178 | $73 \%$ | $13 \%$ | $13 \%$ |
| Total |  | 1,400 | $75 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $100 \%$ |

[^2]Almost every demographic grouping has a response rate of 70\% or higher, with the exception of Asian faculty, faculty of unknown ethnicity and international faculty. Even within these three groups, though, more than two-thirds of the faculty participated in the survey.

Moreover, the demographic characteristics of the faculty who responded to the survey very closely mirror those of the overall population. As shown in the last two columns of Figure D1, within each demographic grouping, the composition of the respondent population is no more than 1 percentage point different from that of the actual population. Furthermore, none of these differences are statistically significant. ${ }^{7}$

Across the Schools, the response rate varies, ranging from 66\% (GSD) to 88\% (HDS). However, the distribution of the sample population (i.e., the respondents) across each of the Schools closely matches that of the actual population. Specifically, the difference between the sample and the actual population for each of the Schools is never off by more than 1 percentage point. (See Table D1 in the Demographics Appendix.)

## Characteristics of the Sample Population

In this subsection we describe in greater detail the distribution of the respondent population within each demographic group and across the Schools. ${ }^{8}$

## Schools

Figure D2 shows the distribution of the faculty respondents by School. ${ }^{9}$ Every School at Harvard is represented in the survey in approximate proportion to their size within the University as a whole.

[^3]Figure D2: Distribution of Faculty by School


Accordingly, almost half (47\%) of the faculty respondents are within FAS. Together, HBS and HMS/HSDM make up almost another quarter (24\%) of the respondents while the other 6 Schools at Harvard make up the remaining $30 \%$.

## Rank

Faculty respondents are classified as "tenured," "tenure-track" or "non-ladder." ${ }^{10}$ The distribution of faculty by rank is shown in Figure D1. Similar to the faculty as a whole, $50 \%$ of the faculty respondents are tenured, $26 \%$ are tenure-track and $25 \%$ are non-ladder. The distribution of rank varies by School. At HLS, for example, a majority ( $89 \%$ ) of the faculty respondents are tenured, whereas at KSG a majority (52\%) of the faculty respondents are nonladder. (See Table D2 in the Demographics Appendix for School-specific rank information.)

## Gender

Similar to the faculty as a whole, slightly more than two-thirds (70\%) of the faculty respondents are men, while slightly less than one-third (30\%) are women. This distribution of men and women varies by faculty rank as illustrated in Figure D3 below.

[^4]Figure D3: Distribution of Faculty Respondents, by Rank and Gender


As this graph illustrates, almost $80 \%$ of the tenured faculty respondents are men. The distribution of men and women among the tenure-track faculty respondents, as well as the nonladder faculty respondents, is a little more even. Relative to the male population, a larger proportion of the female population are tenure-track faculty( $23 \%$ of men vs. $32 \%$ of women). Because this is evident within the faculty as whole, not just within our sample, we explore gender differences within rank in many of the statistical analyses that follow.

The gender composition of each of the Schools varies notably as well. Of all of the Schools, women make up the smallest percentage of the faculty respondents at GSD, HBS and HLS where they comprise less than a quarter. In contrast, women comprise almost half of the faculty respondents at GSE and HDS (49\% and 41\%, respectively). (See Table D3 in the Demographics Appendix.)

## Ethnicity

Figure D1, as shown previously, also depicts the ethnic composition of the faculty across the University. Faculty respondents are classified as American Indian/Alaskan native, Asian/Pacific Islander, black, Hispanic, white or as having an unknown ethnicity. Within each of the Schools, the faculty respondents' ethnic composition is quite similar to that of the University as a whole. At all Schools, for example, $80 \%$ or more of the faculty are white. (See Table D4 in the Demographics Appendix.)

## Citizenship

Faculty respondents are classified as US citizens/permanent residents or nonresident aliens (international). Ninety-two percent of the faculty respondents are US citizens and $8 \%$ are international, as shown previously in Figure D1. Across the Schools, the proportion of international faculty respondents ranges from $0 \%$ at HLS to $12 \%$ at GSD. (See Table D5 in the Demographics Appendix.)

In Figure D4, below, we examine ethnicity by citizenship. As the graph illustrates, the percentage of minority faculty respondents is higher among international faculty respondents than among faculty respondents who are US citizens. White faculty respondents, however, comprise the largest ethnicity within both citizenship groups. Asians make up the largest proportion of the minority faculty among both international faculty respondents and US citizen faculty respondents. They comprise almost a quarter (22\%) of the international faculty population, compared with only $8 \%$ of the US citizens.

Figure D4: Distribution of Faculty Respondents, by Citizenship and Ethnicity


## Age

Information on the age of the faculty respondents' is based on birth date and is calculated as of January 1, 2007 (the approximate time of deployment of the survey). The average faculty respondent at Harvard is 50 years old (S.D. $=11.75$ ). Of all of the Schools, HBS has the youngest faculty -- where the average faculty member is 46 years old. HLS, GSE and HDS have the oldest faculty. At each of these three Schools, the average age is 55 . (See Table D6 in the Demographics Appendix for age distributions by School.)

Similar to the faculty as a whole, average ages of the faculty respondents' differ considerably by rank. The average tenured faculty respondent at Harvard is 56 years old (S.D.=9.65). Tenuretrack faculty respondents, meanwhile, are 17 years younger than tenured faculty on average. Their average age is 39 (S.D. $=6.19$ ). Non-Ladder faculty respondents are also on average younger than tenured faculty, but they are older than tenure-track faculty. The average age of the non-ladder faculty is 51 years old (S.D.=10.91).

## Faculty Climate Survey | Demographics

To further disaggregate faculty's age, Figure D5 depicts the distribution of the faculty among 5 different age categories by rank.

Figure D5. Distribution of Faculty by Rank and Age


As is evident in the graph, the ages of the tenured and non-ladder faculty respondents are fairly normally distributed. The distribution of age among the tenure-track faculty respondents, however, is right-skewed -- $60 \%$ of the tenure-track faculty are between 35 and 44 years old, $85 \%$ are under the age of 45 .

## Demographics Appendix

Table D1: School-Level Response Rates and Distribution of Respondents and Faculty

| School | Number of <br> Respondents | Response <br> Rate | $\%$ of <br> Respondents | $\%$ of <br> Population |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| FAS (Faculty of Arts and Sciences) | 653 | $73 \%$ | $47 \%$ | $48 \%$ |
| GSD (Graduate School of Design) | 51 | $66 \%$ | $4 \%$ | $4 \%$ |
| GSE (Graduate School of Education) | 41 | $78 \%$ | $3 \%$ | $3 \%$ |
| HBS (Harvard Business School) | 171 | $86 \%$ | $12 \%$ | $11 \%$ |
| HDS (Harvard Divinity School) | 29 | $88 \%$ | $2 \%$ | $2 \%$ |
| HLS (Harvard Law School) | 57 | $72 \%$ | $4 \%$ | $4 \%$ |
| HMS/HSDM (Harvard Medical School/ | 165 | $71 \%$ | $12 \%$ | $12 \%$ |
| Harvard School of Dental Medicine) | 97 | $75 \%$ | $7 \%$ | $7 \%$ |
| KSG (Kennedy School of Government) | 136 | $78 \%$ | $10 \%$ | $9 \%$ |
| SPH (School of Public Health) | 1,400 | $75 \%$ | $100 \%$ | $100 \%$ |
| Total |  |  |  |  |

## Faculty Climate Survey | Demographics Appendix

Table D2: School-Level Distribution of Faculty by Rank

| Rank | Tenured |  | Tenure-Track |  | Non-Ladder |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\mathbf{N}$ | $\mathbf{\%}$ | $\mathbf{N}$ | $\mathbf{\%}$ | $\mathbf{N}$ | $\mathbf{\%}$ |
| FAS | 354 | $54 \%$ | 131 | $20 \%$ | 167 | $26 \%$ |
| GSD | 15 | $29 \%$ | 16 | $31 \%$ | 20 | $39 \%$ |
| GSE | 19 | $46 \%$ | 8 | $20 \%$ | 14 | $34 \%$ |
| HBS | 68 | $40 \%$ | 74 | $43 \%$ | 29 | $17 \%$ |
| HDS | 18 | $62 \%$ | 5 | $17 \%$ | 6 | $21 \%$ |
| HLS | 51 | $89 \%$ | 3 | $5 \%$ | 3 | $5 \%$ |
| HMS/HSDM | 87 | $53 \%$ | 50 | $30 \%$ | 28 | $17 \%$ |
| KSG | 30 | $31 \%$ | 17 | $18 \%$ | 50 | $52 \%$ |
| SPH | 55 | $40 \%$ | 53 | $39 \%$ | 28 | $21 \%$ |
| Total | 697 | $50 \%$ | 357 | $26 \%$ | 345 | $25 \%$ |

Faculty Climate Survey | Demographics Appendix

Table D3: School-Level Distribution of Faculty by Gender

| Gender | Female |  | Male |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\mathbf{N}$ | $\mathbf{\%}$ | $\mathbf{N}$ | $\mathbf{\%}$ |
|  | 206 | $32 \%$ | 447 | $68 \%$ |
| GSD | 11 | $22 \%$ | 40 | $78 \%$ |
| GSE | 20 | $49 \%$ | 21 | $51 \%$ |
| HBS | 41 | $24 \%$ | 130 | $76 \%$ |
| HDS | 12 | $41 \%$ | 17 | $59 \%$ |
| HLS | 11 | $19 \%$ | 46 | $81 \%$ |
| HMS/HSDM | 44 | $27 \%$ | 121 | $73 \%$ |
| KSG | 27 | $28 \%$ | 70 | $72 \%$ |
| SPH | 42 | $31 \%$ | 94 | $69 \%$ |
| Total | 414 | $30 \%$ | 986 | $70 \%$ |

Table D4: School-Level Distribution of Faculty by Ethnicity

|  | American <br> Indian/Alaskan <br> Native |  | Asian |  | Black |  | Hispanic |  | White |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Ethnicity ${ }^{\mathbf{1 1}}$ | $\mathbf{N}$ | $\mathbf{\%}$ | $\mathbf{N}$ | $\%$ | $\mathbf{N}$ | $\%$ | $\mathbf{N}$ | $\%$ | $\mathbf{N}$ |
|  | 2 | $<1 \%$ | 53 | $8 \%$ | 17 | $3 \%$ | 9 | $1 \%$ | 569 | $87 \%$ |
| GSD | 0 | $0 \%$ | 2 | $4 \%$ | 0 | $0 \%$ | 4 | $8 \%$ | 45 | $88 \%$ |
| GSE | 0 | $0 \%$ | 1 | $2 \%$ | 5 | $12 \%$ | 1 | $2 \%$ | 34 | $83 \%$ |
| HBS | 0 | $0 \%$ | 23 | $13 \%$ | 4 | $2 \%$ | 7 | $4 \%$ | 137 | $80 \%$ |
| HDS | 0 | $0 \%$ | 0 | $0 \%$ | 2 | $7 \%$ | 0 | $0 \%$ | 27 | $93 \%$ |
| HLS | 1 | $2 \%$ | 1 | $2 \%$ | 3 | $5 \%$ | 1 | $2 \%$ | 51 | $89 \%$ |
| HMS/HSDM | 0 | $0 \%$ | 17 | $10 \%$ | 3 | $2 \%$ | 4 | $2 \%$ | 141 | $85 \%$ |
| KSG | 0 | $0 \%$ | 5 | $5 \%$ | 5 | $5 \%$ | 4 | $4 \%$ | 83 | $86 \%$ |
| SPH | 0 | $0 \%$ | 21 | $15 \%$ | 2 | $1 \%$ | 2 | $1 \%$ | 110 | $81 \%$ |
| Total | 3 | $<1 \%$ | 123 | $9 \%$ | 41 | $3 \%$ | 32 | $2 \%$ | 1197 | $86 \%$ |

[^5]Table D5: School-Level Distribution of Faculty by Citizenship

| Citizenship | US Citizen |  | International |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\mathbf{N}$ | $\mathbf{\%}$ | $\mathbf{N}$ | $\mathbf{\%}$ |
| FAS | 592 | $91 \%$ | 61 | $9 \%$ |
| GSD | 45 | $88 \%$ | 6 | $12 \%$ |
| GSE | 40 | $98 \%$ | 1 | $2 \%$ |
| HBS | 157 | $92 \%$ | 14 | $8 \%$ |
| HDS | 28 | $97 \%$ | 1 | $3 \%$ |
| HLS | 57 | $100 \%$ | 0 | $0 \%$ |
| HMS/HSDM | 151 | $92 \%$ | 14 | $8 \%$ |
| KSG | 90 | $93 \%$ | 7 | $7 \%$ |
| SPH | 126 | $93 \%$ | 10 | $7 \%$ |
| Total | 1286 | $92 \%$ | 114 | $8 \%$ |

Table D6: School-Level Distribution of Faculty by Age

| Age | $\begin{gathered} \text { Less than } \\ 35 \\ \hline \hline \end{gathered}$ |  | 35-44 |  | 45-54 |  | 55-64 |  | 65+ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% | N | \% |
| FAS | 67 | 10\% | 184 | 28\% | 161 | 25\% | 152 | 23\% | 89 | 14\% |
| GSD | 0 | 0\% | 14 | 27\% | 18 | 35\% | 14 | 27\% | 5 | 10\% |
| GSE | 3 | 7\% | 2 | 5\% | 9 | 22\% | 25 | 61\% | 2 | 5\% |
| HBS | 25 | 15\% | 60 | 35\% | 43 | 25\% | 30 | 18\% | 13 | 8\% |
| HDS | 0 | 0\% | 7 | 24\% | 7 | 24\% | 8 | 28\% | 7 | 24\% |
| HLS | 5 | 9\% | 6 | 11\% | 18 | 32\% | 13 | 23\% | 15 | 26\% |
| HMS/HSDM | 7 | 4\% | 48 | 29\% | 54 | 33\% | 37 | 22\% | 19 | 12\% |
| KSG | 4 | 4\% | 20 | 21\% | 21 | 22\% | 36 | 37\% | 16 | 16\% |
| SPH | 5 | 4\% | 42 | 31\% | 35 | 26\% | 42 | 31\% | 12 | 9\% |
| Total | 116 | 8\% | 383 | 27\% | 366 | 26\% | 357 | 26\% | 178 | 13\% |

## SATISFACTION

- SATISFACTION WITH HARVARD UnIVERSITY
- UndERSTANDING UNIVERSITY SATISFACTION
- SATISFACTION WITH COMPENSATION, BENEFITS, TEACHING, FAcIlities, Resources and Services


## Summary

The Satisfaction section of the survey explores the extent to which faculty are content with different aspects of their lives at Harvard. The first part of this section presents the faculty's overall satisfaction with being faculty members at Harvard as well as with their Schools. The second section examines which issues from the survey best explain the faculty's overall satisfaction with Harvard. The final section discusses the faculty's satisfaction with their compensation, benefits, and resources.

## Satisfaction with Harvard University and One's Individual School

Overall, $85 \%$ of the faculty are at least "somewhat satisfied" being faculty members at Harvard ( $89 \%$ of tenured faculty, $79 \%$ of tenure-track faculty and $85 \%$ of non-ladder faculty). School satisfaction is highly correlated with University satisfaction. Accordingly, $80 \%$ of the faculty are at least "somewhat satisfied" with their School ( $83 \%$ of tenured faculty, $74 \%$ of tenure-track faculty and $80 \%$ of non-ladder faculty).

Taking into account rank, gender, ethnicity, citizenship, age and School, the mean differences between tenured and tenure-track faculty regarding University satisfaction and School satisfaction are statistically significant. Likewise, non-ladder faculty are significantly less satisfied, on average, than tenured faculty with the University, while significantly more satisfied than tenure-track faculty with their Schools. Finally, women are significantly less satisfied, on average, than men with both the University and their Schools.

## Understanding University Satisfaction

In order to understand the issues that drive University satisfaction, we examine the relationship between different aspects of the faculty's daily experiences and their satisfaction with Harvard. The strongest predictors of University satisfaction are:

- good fit with one's department for tenured faculty
- adequate overall mentoring for tenure-track faculty
- stress of finding a tenure-track position for non-ladder faculty.


## Satisfaction with Compensation, Benefits, Teaching, Facilities, Resources and Services

Two-thirds (67\%) of the faculty report being at least "somewhat satisfied" with their monetary compensation (mean=3.73). Taking into account rank, gender, ethnicity, citizenship, age and School, there are no significant gender differences in satisfaction with monetary compensation. However, tenured faculty are significantly more satisfied with their monetary compensation than tenure-track faculty and both ranks are significantly more satisfied than non-ladder faculty.

Meanwhile, $77 \%$ of the faculty are at least "somewhat satisfied" with their employee benefits and almost half ( $46 \%$ ) indicate they are "very satisfied" with them (mean=4.06). The faculty are less satisfied with the benefits available to their spouses or domestic partners, with only $62 \%$ of the faculty at least "somewhat satisfied" with them (mean=3.79). There are no significant gender
differences in satisfaction with employee or spouse/domestic partner benefits. However, nonladder faculty are significantly more satisfied with both types of benefits than tenured faculty and more satisfied with employee benefits than tenure-track faculty. Tenured faculty are also more satisfied than tenure-track faculty with employee benefits.

There are 14 other issues related to teaching, facilities and resources that the faculty were asked to evaluate. The issue all faculty, regardless of rank, are most satisfied with is the quality of students. For the remaining 13 issues, faculty within each rank range between ambivalent and very satisfied on average. There are a handful of significant rank-based differences in satisfaction with these issues. Most notably, tenure-track faculty are less satisfied than tenured faculty with the availability of nearby parking. There is only one significant gender-based difference, namely women are less satisfied than men with teaching resources.

## Satisfaction with Harvard University

On the whole, the faculty are more than "somewhat satisfied" being faculty members at Harvard University (mean = 4.16). ${ }^{12}$ Accordingly, $43 \%$ of the faculty indicate that they are "somewhat satisfied" being faculty members at Harvard and $42 \%$ indicate that they are "very satisfied."

The extent to which the faculty are satisfied with Harvard overall differs by gender and rank. In particular, tenured faculty report greater satisfaction than faculty in other ranks and men report greater satisfaction than women. In order to illustrate these differences, Figure S1 provides descriptive statistics of the faculty's responses by rank and gender to the following question: "Overall, how satisfied are you being a faculty member at Harvard University?",13

Figure S1: Satisfaction with Being a Faculty Member at Harvard University

|  |  |  | \% of Respondents | Satisfaction |  |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Number of <br> Respondents | Reporting <br> Somewhat or <br> Very Satisfied | Mean | Standard <br> Deviation |
| Rank | Tenured Faculty | 625 | $89 \%$ | 4.31 | 0.93 |
|  | Tenure-Track Faculty | 344 | $79 \%$ | 3.93 | 1.01 |
|  | Non-Ladder Faculty | 323 | $85 \%$ | 4.11 | 0.92 |
| Gender | Women | 386 | $77 \%$ | 3.90 | 1.09 |
|  | Men | 907 | $89 \%$ | 4.27 | 0.88 |

(1 = very dissatisfied $2=$ somewhat dissatisfied $3=$ neither satisfied nor dissatisfied $4=$ somewhat satisfied $5=$ very satisfied)

[^6]Using the baseline specification (i.e., rank, gender, ethnicity, citizenship, age and School), we test for demographic differences and find the following statistically significant rank- and genderbased results (see Table S1 in the Satisfaction Appendix for all significant results): ${ }^{14}$

- Rank: Relative to tenured faculty, tenure-track faculty and non-ladder faculty are less satisfied being faculty members at Harvard ( 0.29 and 0.14 point differences, respectively).
- Gender: Relative to men, women are less satisfied being faculty members at Harvard (0.28 point difference).

To better understand these gender and rank gaps, we examine the relationship between the two. Figure S2 illustrates the mean satisfaction being a faculty member at Harvard by gender and rank.

Figure S2: Mean Satisfaction with Being a Faculty Member at Harvard University by Gender and Rank

( $1=$ very dissatisfied $2=$ somewhat dissatisfied $3=$ neither satisfied nor dissatisfied $4=$ somewhat satisfied $5=$ very satisfied)
The figure above shows that across all ranks, the mean for women is lower than it is for men, with tenure-track women reporting the lowest mean of all. The largest difference in satisfaction between men and women of the same rank is between non-ladder men and women ( 0.42 point difference).

To test for statistically significant gender differences within rank and rank differences within gender, we add interaction terms for rank and gender to the baseline specification and apply postestimation F-tests. We find the following statistically significant results (see Table S1 in the Satisfaction Appendix for all significant results): ${ }^{15}$

- Gender differences within each rank:
o Relative to tenure-track men, tenure-track women are less satisfied being faculty members at Harvard.

[^7]o Relative to non-ladder men, non-ladder women are less satisfied being faculty members at Harvard.

- Rank differences within gender:
o Relative to tenured women, tenure-track and non-ladder women are less satisfied being faculty members at Harvard.
o Relative to tenured men, tenure-track men are less satisfied being faculty members at Harvard.

The extent to which the faculty are satisfied with Harvard varies across Schools and may, in part, be a function of them. To understand this relationship, Figure S3 depicts the faculty's mean level of satisfaction with being faculty members at Harvard for each individual School. (Note that this is different than satisfaction with one's School, which is addressed later in this section.) As this graph illustrates, faculty at HLS report the highest mean level of satisfaction with Harvard while faculty at HDS report the lowest level of satisfaction.

Figure S3: Mean Satisfaction with Being a Faculty Member at Harvard University by School

(1=very dissatisfied $2=$ somewhat dissatisfied $3=$ neither satisfied nor dissatisfied $4=$ somewhat satisfied $5=v e r y ~ s a t i s f i e d) ~$
Differences in the demographic composition of each of the Schools may help explain why the faculty in some Schools are less satisfied being faculty members at Harvard than in others. To explore this possibility, the next two graphs illustrate the faculty's mean level of satisfaction with Harvard at each School by gender and rank. (See Table S2 in the Satisfaction Appendix for the standard deviations.)

Figure S4: Mean Satisfaction with Being a Faculty Member at Harvard University for each School by Gender

( $1=$ very dissatisfied $2=$ somewhat dissatisfied $3=$ neither satisfied nor dissatisfied $4=$ somewhat satisfied $5=$ very satisfied)
As figure S4 illustrates, at most Schools the mean for women is lower than it is for men. Applying the baseline specification to each School, we find that the differences between men and women are statistically significant at GSE (1.16 point difference) and HBS ( 0.65 point difference). (See Table S3 in the Satisfaction Appendix for all significant results.)

The mean satisfaction with Harvard at each School is demonstrated by rank in Figure S5 below. (See Table S2 in the Satisfaction Appendix for the standard deviations.)

Figure S5: Mean Satisfaction with Being a Faculty Member at Harvard University for each School by Rank

(1=very dissatisfied $2=$ somewhat dissatisfied $3=$ neither satisfied nor dissatisfied $4=$ somewhat satisfied $5=$ very satisfied) *The means for tenure-track and non-ladder faculty at HLS are not reported because there are fewer than five faculty members within each group.

Figure S5 indicates that the mean for tenure-track faculty is lower than it is for tenured faculty at all Schools except at HDS. In contrast, non-ladder faculty trends vary widely by School. This is not surprising, however, since non-ladder faculty are a diverse group both within and across Schools.

Applying the baseline specification to each School, we find the following statistically significant rank-based results (see Table S3 in the Satisfaction Appendix for all significant results):

- Tenure-track faculty are less satisfied being faculty members at Harvard than tenured faculty at KSG ( 0.91 point difference) and SPH ( 0.55 point difference).
- Non-ladder faculty are less satisfied being faculty members at Harvard than tenured faculty at FAS ( 0.32 point difference), but more satisfied at HBS ( 0.35 point difference).
- Non-ladder faculty are more satisfied being faculty members at Harvard than tenure-track faculty at KSG ( 0.75 point difference), HBS ( 0.67 point difference) and GSE (1.02 point difference).


## School Satisfaction

Faculty are not only members of the University as a whole, but also members of particular Schools. Therefore, the survey also asks the faculty: "Overall, how satisfied are you with your particular School at Harvard?" In response, $80 \%$ of the faculty report they are either "very" or "somewhat" satisfied with their School and on average are "somewhat satisfied" (mean=3.98). This is significantly lower than the faculty’s mean satisfaction with Harvard (4.16), suggesting
that faculty are less satisfied with their School than with the University as a whole. ${ }^{16}$ However, satisfaction with one’s School and satisfaction with Harvard are significantly correlated (Pearson's r = 0.75).

Demographic trends in School satisfaction echo those for University satisfaction. Once again, tenured faculty report greater satisfaction than faculty in other ranks and men report greater satisfaction than women. To illustrate these differences, Figure S6 provides descriptive statistics of School satisfaction by rank and gender.

Figure S6: Satisfaction with School by Rank and Gender

|  |  | Number of Respondents | $\%$ of <br> Respondents Reporting Somewhat or Very Satisfied | Satisfaction |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Mean |  | Standard <br> Deviation |
| Rank | Tenured Faculty |  | 624 | 83\% | 4.08 | 1.11 |
|  | Tenure-Track Faculty | 344 | 74\% | 3.78 | 1.12 |
|  | Non-Ladder Faculty | 323 | 80\% | 4.00 | 1.00 |
| Gender | Women | 387 | 71\% | 3.70 | 1.19 |
|  | Men | 905 | 84\% | 4.10 | 1.02 |

(1=very dissatisfied $2=$ somewhat dissatisfied $3=$ neither satisfied nor dissatisfied $4=$ somewhat satisfied $5=$ very satisfied)
Regardless of rank or gender, the faculty are less satisfied with their individual Schools than with the University as a whole. ${ }^{17}$ However, as we saw with University satisfaction, most faculty are close to "somewhat satisfied" with their Schools.

Using the baseline specification, we find the following statistically significant rank- and genderbased differences (see Table S1 in the Satisfaction Appendix for all significant results): ${ }^{18}$

- Rank: Relative to tenure-track faculty, tenured faculty and non-ladder faculty are more satisfied being faculty members at their Schools ( 0.23 and 0.22 point differences, respectively).
- Gender: Relative to men, women are less satisfied being faculty members at Harvard ( 0.35 point difference).

See Section S4 of the Satisfaction Appendix for an analysis of School satisfaction within each School.

[^8]
## Understanding University Satisfaction

Many different aspects of the faculty's work environment may influence their overall level of satisfaction with Harvard. Therefore, in order to better understand the issues driving faculty satisfaction, we identify the best predictors of overall satisfaction with Harvard from the survey for tenured, tenure-track and non-ladder faculty. The best predictor is defined as the variable that has the largest effect on satisfaction in terms of magnitude according to its standardized coefficient and is also statistically significant.

To do this, we add variables individually to the baseline specification predicting satisfaction with Harvard from each section of the survey identified below. (See Table S6 in the Satisfaction Appendix for the list of variables used.) ${ }^{19}$ We then identify which question from each section is the best predictor of satisfaction with Harvard. ${ }^{20}$ Each faculty rank (i.e., tenured, tenure-track and non-ladder faculty) is analyzed separately because there are important issues that pertain to certain faculty groups and not others.

For all three faculty ranks, we analyze issues from the following 4 sections:
(1) Atmosphere (e.g., respect from colleagues and students, camaraderie and collegiality, and voice in governance decisions)
(2) Workload (e.g., hours spent working per week, committee work, expectations regarding teaching, research and service, and sources of academic stress)
(3) Life Outside Harvard (e.g., work-life balance)
(4) Satisfaction (e.g., satisfaction with staff, resources and facilities)

For tenure-track faculty (only), we also investigate the importance of issues from the following 2 sections:
(5) Mentoring (e.g., the effectiveness of mentoring for junior faculty)
(6) Tenure (e.g., the clarity and content of the tenure criteria and one's tenure prospects)

For non-ladder faculty (only), we also investigate the importance of issues from the following 2 sections:
(5) Mentoring (e.g., the effectiveness of mentoring)
(7) Renewal of Contract/Review (e.g., the clarity and content of the contract renewal process and recognition for work contributions). ${ }^{21}$

Figure S7 identifies the variables that are the best predictors of satisfaction with Harvard from each section for tenured, tenure-track and non-ladder faculty.

[^9]Figure S7: Best Predictors of Satisfaction with Harvard by Section and Rank

| Section | Tenured Faculty | Tenure-Track Faculty | Non-Ladder Faculty |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Atmosphere | Good fit with one’s department | Good fit with one's department | Collaboration with faculty in one's primary department |
| Workload | Stress of department or campus politics | Stress of department or campus politics | Stress of finding a tenuretrack position |
| Life Outside Harvard | Agreement with domestic responsibilities having a negative impact on one's career | No significant predictors of satisfaction with Harvard | No significant predictors of satisfaction with Harvard |
| Satisfaction ${ }^{22}$ | Satisfaction with monetary compensation | Satisfaction with physical infrastructure | Satisfaction with monetary compensation |
| Mentoring |  | Adequate overall mentoring | Adequate overall mentoring |
| Tenure |  | Clarity of tenure criteria |  |
| Renewal of Contract/ Review |  |  | Extent research/scholarly work is valued in the contract renewal process at one's School |

To identify which issue presented in Figure S7 is the strongest overall predictor of University satisfaction, we add all of them together to our baseline specification of satisfaction with Harvard for each faculty group. We note which factors remain significant when included together in the baseline specification, herein defined as the expanded model. (See Tables S7, S8, and S9 in the Satisfaction Appendix.)

For tenured faculty, the best predictor of satisfaction with Harvard is good fit with one's department. However, all factors listed for tenured faculty are statistically significant predictors of satisfaction with Harvard in the expanded model.

For tenure-track faculty, the best predictor of satisfaction with Harvard is adequate mentoring overall. However, all factors listed for tenure-track faculty, except satisfaction with infrastructure, are statistically significant predictors of satisfaction with Harvard in the expanded model.

Finally, for non-ladder faculty, the best predictor of satisfaction with Harvard is the stress of finding a tenure-track position. ${ }^{23}$

[^10]
## Satisfaction with Compensation, Benefits, Teaching, Facilities, Resources and Services

In addition to asking the faculty about their satisfaction with Harvard and their individual Schools, the survey asks the faculty about their satisfaction with 17 different issues related to compensation and benefits, teaching, facilities and resources. They are as follows:
(1) Monetary compensation ${ }^{24}$
(2) Employee benefits
(3) Spouse/domestic partner benefits
(4) Clerical and administrative staff
(5) Technical and research staff ${ }^{25}$
(6) Computing support staff
(7) Administrative support for grants ${ }^{26}$
(8) Availability of nearby parking
(9) Classroom and meeting space
(10) Office space
(11) Lab or research space ${ }^{27}$
(12) Special research facilities ${ }^{28}$
(13) Research equipment ${ }^{29}$
(14) Physical infrastructure
(15) Quality of graduate/professional students (Ladder faculty) or quality of students (Non-Ladder faculty) ${ }^{30}$
(16) Access to teaching assistants ${ }^{31}$
(17) Teaching resources

The one issue all faculty, regardless of rank, are most satisfied with is the quality of students. ${ }^{32}$ Ninety-two percent of tenured faculty and $85 \%$ of tenure-track faculty are "somewhat" or "very" satisfied with the quality of graduate and professional students, while $96 \%$ of non-ladder faculty are "somewhat" or "very" satisfied with the quality of students.

[^11]However, the extent to which faculty are satisfied with the remaining issues on the survey varies widely. A large percentage of the faculty (i.e., at least $80 \%$ ) are either "somewhat" or "very" satisfied with a number of issues though. Tenured faculty (83\%) and tenure-track faculty (84\%) are "somewhat" or "very" satisfied with their office space, while non-ladder faculty are "somewhat" or "very" satisfied with their employee benefits (84\%) and teaching resources (80\%).

There is no single issue with which all faculty are "least satisfied." Tenure-track and non-ladder faculty are least satisfied with the availability of nearby parking ( $43 \%$ "somewhat" or "very" satisfied), while tenured faculty are least satisfied with administrative support for grants and special research facilities (both 57\% "somewhat" or "very" satisfied). (See Tables S10, S11, and S12 in the Satisfaction Appendix for additional summary statistics.)

Applying the baseline specification to each issue, we find the following statistically significant rank- and gender-based results (see Tables S13 and S14 in the Satisfaction Appendix for all significant results):

- Rank:
o Relative to tenured faculty, tenure-track faculty are less satisfied with monetary compensation ( 0.26 point difference), employee benefits ( 0.24 point difference) and the availability of nearby parking ( 0.54 point difference).
o Relative to tenured faculty, non-ladder faculty are less satisfied with their monetary compensation ( 0.48 point difference), the availability of nearby parking ( 0.69 point difference) and office space ( 0.47 point difference), but more satisfied with employee benefits ( 0.17 point difference), spouse/domestic partner benefits ( 0.22 point difference), technical and research staff ( 0.23 point difference) and computing support staff ( 0.34 point difference).
o Relative to tenure-track faculty, non-ladder faculty are less satisfied with monetary compensation ( 0.22 point difference), office space ( 0.62 point difference) and classroom and meeting space ( 0.21 point difference), but more satisfied with employee benefits ( 0.42 point differences), computing support staff ( 0.42 point difference) and technical and research staff ( 0.29 point difference).
- Gender: Relative to men, women are less satisfied with teaching resources (0.17 point difference).


## SATISFACTION Appendix

## Faculty Climate Survey | Satisfaction Appendix

Table S1: Satisfaction with Harvard and with One's School (All Faculty)

| Dependent Variable: | Satisfaction with Harvard |  | Satisfaction with School |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Regressor | Baseline | (1) | Baseline | (1) |
| Female | -0.28** | -0.19 | -0.35** | -0.30* |
|  | (0.06) | (0.10) | (0.07) | (0.12) |
| Asian/Pacific Islander | -0.08 | -0.08 | -0.07 | -0.07 |
|  | (0.10) | (0.10) | (0.11) | (0.11) |
| Black | 0.02 | 0.02 | 0.09 | 0.09 |
|  | (0.15) | (0.15) | (0.18) | (0.18) |
| Hispanic | 0.17 | 0.18 | 0.05 | 0.06 |
|  | (0.14) | (0.14) | (0.20) | (0.20) |
| American Indian/ |  |  |  |  |
| Alaskan Native ${ }^{\dagger}$ | . | . | . | . |
| Unknown ${ }^{\dagger}$ | . | . | . | . |
| Tenure-Track |  |  |  |  |
|  | -0.29** | -0.25** | -0.23* | -0.22* |
|  | (0.08) | (0.09) | (0.09) | (0.10) |
| Non-Ladder | -0.14* | -0.09 | -0.01 | 0.03 |
|  | (0.07) | (0.07) | (0.08) | (0.08) |
| International | 0.26** | 0.26** | 0.25* | 0.25* |
|  | (0.10) | (0.10) | (0.11) | (0.11) |
| Age | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
|  | (0.00) | (0.00) | (0.00) | (0.00) |
| School <br> (8 dummy variables) | Controlled for but not reported | Controlled for but not reported | Controlled for but not reported | Controlled for but not reported |
| Female*Tenure-Track |  | -0.13 |  | -0.05 |
|  |  | (0.15) |  | (0.17) |
| Female*Non-Ladder |  | -0.17 |  | -0.11 |
|  |  | (0.15) |  | (0.17) |
| Constant | 4.11** | 4.09** | 4.09** | 4.08** |
|  | (0.16) | (0.16) | (0.19) | (0.19) |
| Observations | 1292 | 1292 | 1291 | 1291 |
| R-squared | 0.082 | 0.084 | 0.076 | 0.077 |
| Robust standard errors <br> * significant at 5\%; ** <br> ${ }^{\dagger}$ Results for this demog | eses <br> t at $1 \%$ |  |  | han 5 faculty |

Table S2: Mean Satisfaction with Harvard by Gender and Rank for Each School

|  | Gender |  | Rank |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Women | Men | Tenured Faculty | Tenure-Track Faculty | Non-Ladder Faculty |
| $\mathrm{HLS}^{\dagger}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \hline 4.64 \\ (0.92) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4.62 \\ (0.63) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \hline 4.66 \\ (0.71) \end{gathered}$ | . | . |
| HBS | $\begin{gathered} 3.83 \\ (1.32) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4.53 \\ (0.67) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4.42 \\ (0.85) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4.13 \\ (1.06) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4.79 \\ (0.42) \end{gathered}$ |
| KSG | $\begin{gathered} 4.16 \\ (0.85) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4.35 \\ (0.85) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4.52 \\ (0.95) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3.76 \\ (0.90) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4.35 \\ (0.70) \end{gathered}$ |
| GSD | $\begin{gathered} 4.20 \\ (0.42) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4.21 \\ (0.81) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4.31 \\ (0.85) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3.94 \\ (0.77) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4.37 \\ (0.60) \end{gathered}$ |
| FAS | $\begin{gathered} 3.95 \\ (1.02) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4.24 \\ (0.91) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4.32 \\ (0.91) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3.98 \\ (0.93) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3.93 \\ (1.03) \end{gathered}$ |
| HMS/HSDM | $\begin{gathered} 3.95 \\ (1.01) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4.21 \\ (0.95) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4.24 \\ (1.00) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4.02 \\ (0.97) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4.04 \\ (0.85) \end{gathered}$ |
| GSE | $\begin{gathered} 3.56 \\ (1.10) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4.53 \\ (0.51) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4.06 \\ (0.93) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3.88 \\ (1.25) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4.15 \\ (0.90) \end{gathered}$ |
| SPH | $\begin{gathered} 3.59 \\ (1.30) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3.95 \\ (0.93) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4.17 \\ (0.90) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3.46 \\ (1.20) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3.92 \\ (0.91) \end{gathered}$ |
| HDS | $\begin{gathered} 3.45 \\ (1.21) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4.00 \\ (1.18) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3.53 \\ (1.36) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4.20 \\ (0.45) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4.00 \\ (1.22) \end{gathered}$ |

Standard deviations are in parentheses.
${ }^{\dagger}$ The means for tenure-track and non-ladder faculty at HLS are not reported because there are fewer than 5 faculty members within each group.

Table S3: Overall Satisfaction with Harvard by School (All Faculty)

| Dependent Variable: Satisfaction with Harvard |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Regressor | FAS Baseline | GSD <br> Baseline | HDS Baseline | GSE Baseline | KSG <br> Baseline | HBS <br> Baseline | HLS <br> Baseline | $\begin{aligned} & \text { HMS/HSDM } \\ & \text { Baseline } \end{aligned}$ | SPH <br> Baseline |
| Female | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \hline-0.17 \\ & (0.09) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \hline-0.02 \\ (0.19) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \hline-0.51 \\ (0.66) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline-1.16^{* *} \\ (0.29) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline-0.14 \\ (0.19) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline-0.65 * * \\ (0.21) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.09 \\ (0.27) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline-0.13 \\ & (0.18) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline-0.30 \\ & (0.23) \end{aligned}$ |
| Asian/Pacific Islander ${ }^{\dagger}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.00 \\ (0.14) \end{gathered}$ | . | . |  | $\begin{gathered} -0.27 \\ (0.80) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & -0.08 \\ & (0.21) \end{aligned}$ | . | $\begin{gathered} -0.14 \\ (0.29) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.22 \\ (0.35) \end{gathered}$ |
| Black ${ }^{\dagger}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.10 \\ (0.23) \end{gathered}$ | . | . |  | $\begin{gathered} 0.40 \\ (0.23) \end{gathered}$ | (0.21) | . | (0.29) | (0.35) |
| Hispanic ${ }^{\dagger}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.16 \\ (0.26) \end{gathered}$ | . | . | . | (0.23) | $\begin{gathered} 0.32 \\ (0.25) \end{gathered}$ | . | . | $\stackrel{.}{ }$ |
| American <br> Indian/Alaskan <br> Native ${ }^{\dagger}$ | . | . | . | . | . | . | . | . | . |
| Unknown ${ }^{\dagger}$ |  | . | . | . | . | . | . | . | $\cdot$ |
| International ${ }^{\dagger}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.27 \\ (0.14) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.26 \\ (0.27) \end{gathered}$ | . | . | $\begin{gathered} -0.00 \\ (0.37) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.48 \\ (0.28) \end{gathered}$ | . | $\begin{gathered} 0.70^{* *} \\ (0.23) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.03 \\ (0.45) \end{gathered}$ |
| Tenure-Track ${ }^{\dagger}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.22 \\ (0.13) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.33 \\ (0.47) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.76 \\ (0.80) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -1.16 \\ (0.64) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.91^{* *} \\ (0.31) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.32 \\ (0.20) \end{gathered}$ | . | $\begin{gathered} -0.19 \\ (0.23) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.55^{*} \\ (0.28) \end{gathered}$ |
| Non-Ladder ${ }^{\dagger}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.32^{* *} \\ (0.11) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.06 \\ (0.34) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.80 \\ (0.74) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.14 \\ (0.39) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & -0.15 \\ & (0.20) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.35^{*} \\ & (0.16) \end{aligned}$ | . | $\begin{gathered} -0.20 \\ (0.25) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.18 \\ (0.23) \end{gathered}$ |
| Age | $\begin{gathered} 0.01 \\ (0.00) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.00 \\ (0.01) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.01 \\ (0.03) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & -0.06 * \\ & (0.03) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & -0.01 \\ & (0.01) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.01 \\ (0.01) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.01 \\ (0.01) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.01 \\ (0.01) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.00 \\ (0.01) \end{gathered}$ |
| Constant | $\begin{gathered} 4.05^{* *} \\ (0.24) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4.01^{* *} \\ (0.95) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3.36 \\ (1.87) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 8.30^{* *} \\ & (1.82) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 5.06 * * \\ & (0.51) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4.80^{* *} \\ (0.54) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4.12^{* *} \\ (0.66) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3.82^{* *} \\ (0.54) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4.10^{* *} \\ (0.60) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| Observations | 589 | 48 | 25 | 37 | 94 | 164 | 50 | 156 | 129 |
| R-squared | 0.056 | 0.086 | 0.171 | 0.508 | 0.136 | 0.180 | 0.184 | 0.072 | 0.128 |

Robust standard errors in parentheses.

* significant at 5\%; ** significant at $1 \%$
${ }^{\dagger}$ Results for this demographic group are controlled for in every model but not reported for those with less than 5 faculty.


## Section S4: Satisfaction with School by School

Having analyzed School satisfaction at the University level in the chapter, we analyze it within each of the Schools. In this regard, Figure S4a depicts average School satisfaction for each of the 9 Schools that comprise Harvard University.

Figure S4a: Mean Satisfaction with One’s School, by School

( $1=$ very dissatisfied $2=$ somewhat dissatisfied $3=$ neither satisfied nor dissatisfied $4=$ somewhat satisfied $5=$ very satisfied)
As in the case of overall satisfaction with Harvard, School satisfaction is highest at HLS and lowest at HDS. This again may be driven, however, by differences in the demographic composition of each School. To explore this possibility, Figure S4b illustrates the faculty's mean level of satisfaction with their individual Schools by gender. (See Table S4d for the standard deviations.)

Figure S4b: Mean Satisfaction with One’s School by School and Gender

(1=very dissatisfied $2=$ somewhat dissatisfied $3=$ neither satisfied nor dissatisfied $4=$ somewhat satisfied $5=$ very satisfied $)$
In the graph above, mean satisfaction for women is lower than for men at all of the Schools. Applying the baseline specification to each School, we find that women are significantly less satisfied with their School than men at GSD ( 0.74 point difference), HBS ( 0.93 point difference), and HMS/HSDM ( 0.54 point difference). (See Table S5 in this appendix for all significant results.)

In contrast the mean School satisfaction is shown by rank in Figure S4c below. (See Table S4d for the standard deviations.)

Figure S4c: Mean Satisfaction with One’s School by School and Rank
$\square$ Tenured $\square$ Tenure-Track $\square$ Non-Ladder

(1=very dissatisfied $2=$ somewhat dissatisfied $3=$ neither satisfied nor dissatisfied 4=somewhat satisfied $5=$ very satisfied)
*The means for tenure-track and non-ladder faculty at HLS are not reported because there are fewer than five faculty members within each group.

Figure S4c shows that the mean for tenured-track faculty is also lower than tenured faculty at every School except HDS and GSE As seen with University satisfaction, however, non-ladder faculty trends again vary widely by School.

Applying the baseline specification to each School, we find the following statistically significant rank-based results (see Table S5 in this appendix for all significant results):

- Tenure-track faculty are more satisfied with their School than tenured faculty at HDS (2.07 point difference), but less satisfied at SPH ( 0.71 point difference).
- Non-ladder faculty are less satisfied with their School than tenured faculty at FAS (0.26 point difference), but more satisfied at HBS ( 0.45 point difference).
- Non-ladder faculty are more satisfied with their School than tenure-track faculty at HBS ( 0.82 point difference) and SPH ( 0.86 point difference).

Figure S4d below provides the standard deviations in satisfaction with one’s School, along with means as seen above by gender and rank for each School.

Figure S4d: Mean Satisfaction with One's School by School and Rank

|  | Gender |  |  | Rank |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Women | Men | Tenured <br> Faculty | Tenure-Track <br> Faculty | Non-Ladder <br> Faculty |
| HLS $^{\dagger}$ | 3.91 | 4.44 | 4.32 | . | . |
| HBS | $(1.70)$ | $(0.85)$ | $(1.16)$ | . | . |
|  | 3.51 | 4.48 | 4.34 | 3.92 | 4.82 |
| KSG | $(1.52)$ | $(0.75)$ | $(0.95)$ | $(1.25)$ | $(0.39)$ |
|  | 4.00 | 4.13 | 4.21 | 3.47 | 4.25 |
| HMS/HSDM | $(0.91)$ | $(1.07)$ | $(1.11)$ | $(1.07)$ | $(0.89)$ |
|  | 3.59 | 4.16 | 4.06 | 3.98 | 3.93 |
| FAS | $(1.22)$ | $(0.99)$ | $(1.11)$ | $(1.13)$ | $(0.92)$ |
|  | 3.84 | 4.08 | 4.12 | 3.92 | 3.85 |
| GSE | $(1.03)$ | $(1.01)$ | $(1.02)$ | $(0.96)$ | $(1.06)$ |
|  | 3.67 | 3.95 | 3.63 | 4.00 | 3.92 |
| GSD | $(1.28)$ | $(1.03)$ | $(1.26)$ | $(1.31)$ | $(0.95)$ |
|  | 3.20 | 3.84 | 3.92 | 3.50 | 3.74 |
| SPH | $(1.03)$ | $(1.00)$ | $(1.19)$ | $(0.97)$ | $(0.99)$ |
|  | 3.49 | 3.64 | 3.79 | 3.25 | 3.88 |
| HDS | $(1.25)$ | $(1.17)$ | $(1.23)$ | $(1.20)$ | $(0.93)$ |
|  | 2.82 | 3.36 | 2.80 | 3.60 | 3.60 |
|  | $(1.47)$ | $(1.45)$ | $(1.57)$ | $(0.89)$ | $(1.52)$ |

[^12]Table S5: Satisfaction with School by School (All Faculty)

| Dependent Var Satisfaction | ble: <br> School |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Regressor | FAS <br> Baseline | GSD <br> Baseline | HDS <br> Baseline | GSE <br> Baseline | KSG <br> Baseline | HBS <br> Baseline | HLS Baseline | HMS/HSDM <br> Baseline | SPH <br> Baseline |
| Female | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \hline-0.18 \\ & (0.09) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \hline-0.74^{*} \\ (0.34) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \hline-0.05 \\ & (0.68) \end{aligned}$ | -0.78 | $\begin{gathered} \hline-0.10 \\ (0.23) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline-0.93^{* *} \\ (0.24) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline-0.55 \\ & (0.57) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \hline-0.54^{*} \\ & (0.22) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline-0.15 \\ (0.23) \end{gathered}$ |
| Asian/Pacific Islander ${ }^{\dagger}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.06 \\ (0.14) \end{gathered}$ | . | . | . | $\begin{gathered} -0.13 \\ (0.78) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.03 \\ (0.24) \end{gathered}$ | . | $\begin{gathered} -0.28 \\ (0.31) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.39 \\ (0.35) \end{gathered}$ |
| Black ${ }^{\dagger}{ }_{\text {Hispanic }}{ }^{\dagger}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.15 \\ (0.26) \\ 0.18 \\ (0.23) \end{gathered}$ | $\cdots \cdot$ | $\cdots$ | . | $\begin{gathered} 0.74^{* *} \\ (0.13) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & -0.01 \\ & (0.47) \end{aligned}$ | $\cdots$ | $\cdots \cdot$ | $\cdots$ |
| American <br> Indian/Alaskan <br> Native ${ }^{\dagger}$ | (0.23) | . | . | . | . | (0.47) | . | . | . |
| Unknown ${ }^{\dagger}$ | . | . | . | . | $\stackrel{ }{ }$ | . | . | . | . |
| International ${ }^{\dagger}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.21 \\ (0.15) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.60^{*} \\ & (0.24) \end{aligned}$ | . | . | $\begin{gathered} -0.04 \\ (0.49) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.68^{*} \\ & (0.29) \end{aligned}$ | $\stackrel{.}{ }$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.68^{* *} \\ (0.20) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.02 \\ (0.45) \end{gathered}$ |
| Tenure-Track ${ }^{\dagger}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.24 \\ (0.14) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.28 \\ (0.60) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2.07^{*} \\ & (0.96) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.43 \\ (0.98) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.71 \\ (0.39) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.37 \\ (0.25) \end{gathered}$ | . | $\begin{gathered} 0.04 \\ (0.26) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.71^{*} \\ (0.32) \end{gathered}$ |
| Non-Ladder ${ }^{\dagger}$ | $\begin{aligned} & -0.26^{*} \\ & (0.12) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.04 \\ (0.45) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1.31 \\ (0.81) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.32 \\ (0.47) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.03 \\ (0.25) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.45 * * \\ (0.16) \end{gathered}$ | $\stackrel{.}{.}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.04 \\ (0.29) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.15 \\ (0.25) \end{gathered}$ |
| Age | $\begin{aligned} & -0.00 \\ & (0.00) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & -0.01 \\ & (0.02) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.06 \\ (0.04) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.04 \\ (0.04) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.00 \\ (0.01) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.00 \\ (0.01) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.00 \\ (0.01) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.01 \\ (0.01) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & -0.02 \\ & (0.01) \end{aligned}$ |
| Constant | $\begin{gathered} 4.25^{* *} \\ (0.27) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4.08^{* *} \\ (1.35) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} -0.79 \\ (2.38) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} 6.56 * * \\ (2.30) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4.18^{* *} \\ (0.66) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4.61^{* *} \\ (0.59) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4.22^{* *} \\ (0.96) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3.72^{* *} \\ (0.58) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4.92^{* *} \\ (0.71) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| Observations | 587 | 48 | 25 | 37 | 94 | 164 | 50 | 157 | 129 |
| R-squared | 0.027 | 0.180 | 0.323 | 0.438 | 0.113 | 0.240 | 0.118 | 0.096 | 0.110 |

Robust standard errors are in parentheses.

* significant at 5\%; ** significant at $1 \%$
${ }^{\dagger}$ Results for this demographic group are controlled for in every model but not reported for those with less than 5 faculty.


## Faculty Climate Survey | Satisfaction Appendix

## Table S6: List of variables from each section of the report analyzed for impact on satisfaction with Harvard



## Faculty Climate Survey | Satisfaction Appendix

| Renewal of Contract/ Review (continued) |
| :--- |
| Primary role in department/School is teaching |
| Primary role in department/School is other |
| Responded to posting for current position |
| Satisfaction with current title |
| Department has an established renewal of contract process |
| Value placed on research/scholarly work in renewal of contract process at School |
| Value placed on service in the renewal of contract process at School |
| Value placed on teaching contributions in the renewal of contract process at School |
| Life Outside Harvard |
| Agreement: My domestic responsibilities have had a negative impact on my career (All Faculty) |
| Currently caring for or managing care of an aging/ill parent, spouse or other relative (All Faculty) |
| Has at least 1 child (All Faculty) |
| Has taken advantage of teaching relief (All Faculty) |
| Has a spouse/domestic partner (All Faculty) |
| Has had to miss a meeting more than once a month due to domestic responsibilities (All Faculty) |
| In a commuting relationship (All Faculty) |
| School helped spouse/domestic partner find employment locally (All Faculty) |
| Spouse had trouble finding a job in the local area (All Faculty) |
| Stress of childcare (All Faculty) |
| Stress of cost of living (All Faculty) |
| Stress of dependent care (All Faculty) |
| Stress of managing household responsibilities (All Faculty) |
| Stress of reproductive decisions/issues (All Faculty) |
| Stress of your health (All Faculty) |
| Use Harvard-affiliated childcare (All Faculty) |
| Was with spouse before becoming employed at Harvard (All Faculty) |
| Mentoring (Tenure-Track and Non-Ladder Faculty Only) |
| Adequacy of mentoring on negotiating office politics (Tenure-Track Faculty) |
| Adequacy of mentoring on teaching (Tenure-Track Faculty) |
| Adequacy of mentoring on work-life balance (Tenure-Track Faculty) |
| Adequacy of mentoring overall (Tenure-Track Faculty) |
| Adequacy of mentoring on advising student research assistants (Tenure-Track Faculty) |
| Adequacy of mentoring on distribution of time among work-related activities (Tenure-Track Faculty) |
| Adequacy of mentoring on publishing scholarly work (Tenure-Track Faculty) |
| Adequacy of mentoring on requirements for promotion and tenure (Tenure-Track Faculty) |
| Adequacy of mentoring on running a lab or research group (Tenure-Track Faculty) |
| Adequacy of mentoring on securing funds for research (Tenure-Track Faculty) |
| Effectiveness of department at mentoring its junior faculty (Tenure-Track Faculty) |
| Had a formal mentor (Tenure-Track Faculty) |
| Had an informal mentor (Tenure-Track Faculty) |
| Had both an informal and formal mentor (Tenure-Track Faculty) |
| Had neither an informal or formal mentor (Tenure-Track Faculty) |
| Had a formal mentor only (Tenure-Track Faculty) |
| Had an informal mentor only (Tenure-Track Faculty) |

## Faculty Climate Survey | Satisfaction Appendix



## Faculty Climate Survey | Satisfaction Appendix

| Workload (continued) |
| :--- |
| Stress of scholarly productivity (All Faculty) |
| Stress of securing funding for research (All Faculty) |
| Stress of teaching responsibilities (All Faculty) |
| Stress of time for scholarly work (All Faculty) |
| Stress of timing of School-wide or Harvard-wide meetings and functions (All Faculty) |
| Stress of timing of department meetings and functions (All Faculty) |
| Stress of department or campus politics (All Faculty) |
| Stress of review/promotion process (Ladder Faculty) |
| Stress of finding a tenure-track position (Non-Ladder Faculty) |
| Stress of review of employment contract (Non-Ladder Faculty) |

Table S7: Predicting Satisfaction with Harvard (Tenured Faculty)

| Dependent Variable: Satisfaction with Harvard |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Regressor | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) |
| Female | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \hline-0.08 \\ & (0.09) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline-0.12 \\ (0.10) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline-0.10 \\ (0.11) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline-0.20^{*} \\ (0.10) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \hline-0.09 \\ (0.09) \end{gathered}$ |
| Asian/Pacific Islander | $\begin{gathered} -0.14 \\ (0.17) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.04 \\ (0.19) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & -0.13 \\ & (0.21) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.01 \\ (0.17) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.14 \\ (0.18) \end{gathered}$ |
| Black | $\begin{gathered} -0.13 \\ (0.22) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.10 \\ (0.34) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.32 \\ (0.39) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.10 \\ (0.28) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.19 \\ (0.26) \end{gathered}$ |
| Hispanic | $\begin{gathered} 0.08 \\ (0.16) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.10 \\ (0.19) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.00 \\ (0.20) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.08 \\ (0.16) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.02 \\ (0.19) \end{gathered}$ |
| American Indian/ Alaskan Native ${ }^{\dagger}$ | ) | (0.19) | (0.20) | (0.16) | (0.19) |
| Unknown ${ }^{\dagger}$ | . | . | . | . | . |
| International | $\begin{gathered} 0.12 \\ (0.23) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.09 \\ (0.26) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.00 \\ (0.27) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} . \dot{16} \\ (0.20) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.01 \\ (0.21) \end{gathered}$ |
| Age | $\begin{aligned} & 0.01^{* *} \\ & (0.00) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.00 \\ (0.00) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.00 \\ (0.00) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.01^{*} \\ & (0.00) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.01 \\ (0.00) \end{gathered}$ |
| School (8 dummy variables) Good Fit | Controlled for but not reported 0.28** (0.04) | Controlled for but not reported | Controlled for but not reported | Controlled for but not reported | Controlled for but not reported 0.26** (0.04) |
| Stress of Dept. or Campus Politics |  | $\begin{gathered} -0.24^{* *} \\ (0.05) \end{gathered}$ |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & -0.11^{*} \\ & (0.05) \end{aligned}$ |
| Domestic Resp. Had Negative Impact on Career |  |  | $\begin{gathered} -0.12^{* *} \\ (0.03) \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} -0.06^{*} \\ (0.03) \end{gathered}$ |
| Satisfaction with <br> Monetary <br> Compensation |  |  |  | $\begin{gathered} 0.24^{* *} \\ (0.04) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.18 * * \\ (0.04) \end{gathered}$ |
| Constant | $\begin{gathered} 2.66 * * \\ (0.26) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4.57 * * \\ (0.25) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4.40^{* *} \\ (0.25) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2.92 * * \\ (0.26) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2.69 * * \\ (0.33) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| Observations R-squared | $\begin{gathered} 601 \\ 0.205 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 581 \\ 0.097 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 523 \\ 0.096 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 619 \\ 0.152 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 510 \\ 0.330 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |

Robust standard errors in parentheses

* significant at 5\%; ** significant at $1 \%$
${ }^{\dagger}$ This demographic group is controlled for in every model but its results are not reported because it contains less than 5 faculty.

Table S8: Predicting Satisfaction with Harvard (Tenure-Track Faculty)

| Dependent Variable: <br> Satisfaction with Harvard |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Regressor | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | (6) |
| Female | $\begin{gathered} -0.15 \\ (0.10) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline-0.25^{*} \\ & (0.11) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline-0.36 * * \\ (0.12) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.16 \\ (0.11) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline-0.32^{* *} \\ (0.12) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.07 \\ (0.10) \end{gathered}$ |
| Asian/Pacific Islander | $\begin{gathered} -0.19 \\ (0.16) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.21 \\ (0.18) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.16 \\ (0.18) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.21 \\ (0.17) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.08 \\ (0.16) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.22 \\ (0.16) \end{gathered}$ |
| Black | $\begin{gathered} -0.03 \\ (0.19) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.31^{* *} \\ (0.12) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.03 \\ (0.10) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.09 \\ (0.13) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.15 \\ (0.12) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.01 \\ (0.14) \end{gathered}$ |
| Hispanic | $\begin{gathered} 0.24 \\ (0.18) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.53 * * \\ (0.18) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.45^{*} \\ & (0.20) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.50^{*} \\ & (0.23) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.53 * * \\ (0.18) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.53^{*} \\ & (0.21) \end{aligned}$ |
| American <br> Indian/Alaskan <br> Native ${ }^{\dagger}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Unknown ${ }^{\dagger}$ | . | . | . | . | . | . |
| International | $\begin{gathered} 0.01 \\ (0.14) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.04 \\ (0.15) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.12 \\ (0.14) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.03 \\ (0.14) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.04 \\ (0.14) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.07 \\ (0.13) \end{gathered}$ |
| Age | $\begin{aligned} & -0.02^{*} \\ & (0.01) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & -0.03^{*} \\ & (0.01) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.04^{* *} \\ (0.01) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & -0.02^{*} \\ & (0.01) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.04^{* *} \\ (0.01) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.03^{* *} \\ (0.01) \end{gathered}$ |
| School (8 dummy variables) Good Fit | Controlled for but not reported 0.42** (0.04) | Controlled for but not reported | Controlled for but not reported | Controlled for but not reported | Controlled for but not reported | Controlled for but not reported 0.18** (0.05) |
| Stress of Dept. or Campus |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Politics |  | $\begin{gathered} -0.49 * * \\ (0.07) \end{gathered}$ |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & -0.15^{*} \\ & (0.08) \end{aligned}$ |
| Satisfaction <br> with Physical |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Infrastructure |  |  | $\begin{gathered} 0.23 * * \\ (0.06) \end{gathered}$ |  |  | $\begin{gathered} 0.09 \\ (0.06) \end{gathered}$ |
| Mentoring | Adequate |  |  |  |  |  |
| Overall |  |  |  | $\begin{gathered} 0.45 * * \\ (0.04) \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} 0.24^{* *} \\ (0.05) \end{gathered}$ |
| Clarity of Tenure Criteria |  |  |  |  | $\begin{gathered} 0.27 * * \\ (0.04) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.12 * * \\ (0.04) \end{gathered}$ |
| Constant | $\begin{gathered} 3.38^{* *} \\ (0.41) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 5.87 * * \\ (0.41) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4.66 * * \\ (0.47) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3.68^{* *} \\ (0.42) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4.93 * * \\ (0.41) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3.30 * * \\ (0.48) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| Observations | 314 | 313 | 323 | 302 | 303 | 267 |
| R-squared | 0.378 | 0.263 | 0.203 | 0.376 | 0.294 | 0.505 |

Robust standard errors in parentheses

* significant at 5\%; ** significant at $1 \%$
${ }^{\dagger}$ This demographic group is controlled for in every model but its results are not reported because it contains less than 5 faculty.

Table S9: Predicting Satisfaction with Harvard (Non-Ladder Faculty)

| Dependent Variable: <br> Satisfaction with Harvard |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Regressor | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | (6) |
| Female | $\begin{gathered} \hline-0.19 \\ (0.12) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline-0.13 \\ (0.14) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline-0.35 * * \\ (0.11) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline-0.12 \\ (0.12) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline-0.33 \\ (0.25) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline-0.57 \\ (0.31) \end{gathered}$ |
| Asian/Pacific Islander | $\begin{gathered} 0.00 \\ (0.20) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.55^{*} \\ & (0.27) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.14 \\ (0.18) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.14 \\ (0.22) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & -0.20 \\ & (0.45) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.91 \\ (0.47) \end{gathered}$ |
| Black | $\begin{gathered} -0.22 \\ (0.25) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.12 \\ (0.24) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & -0.17 \\ & (0.22) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.53 \\ (0.29) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.45 \\ (0.30) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.00 \\ (0.00) \end{gathered}$ |
| Hispanic | $\begin{gathered} 0.04 \\ (0.24) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.77 \\ (0.47) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.10 \\ (0.35) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.42 \\ (0.34) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.59 \\ (0.42) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.00 \\ (0.00) \end{gathered}$ |
| American Indian/ <br> Alaskan Native ${ }^{\dagger}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Unknown ${ }^{\dagger}$ | . | . | . | . | . | . |
| International | $\begin{gathered} 0.25 \\ (0.15) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.45^{*} \\ & (0.21) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.33^{*} \\ & (0.16) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.33^{*} \\ & (0.16) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.68^{*} \\ & (0.33) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.51 \\ (0.35) \end{gathered}$ |
| Age | $\begin{gathered} 0.01 \\ (0.01) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.00 \\ (0.01) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.00 \\ (0.01) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.01 \\ (0.01) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.01 \\ (0.01) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & -0.02 \\ & (0.02) \end{aligned}$ |
| School (8 dummy variables) Collaboration Inside | Controlled for but not reported 0.27** (0.05) | Controlled for but not reported | Controlled for but not reported | Controlled for but not reported | Controlled for but not reported | Controlled for but not reported 0.27** (0.08) |
| Stress of Finding a Tenure-Track Position |  | $\begin{gathered} -0.41^{* *} \\ (0.09) \end{gathered}$ |  |  |  | $\begin{gathered} -0.36 \\ (0.24) \end{gathered}$ |
| Monetary |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Compensation |  |  | $\begin{gathered} 0.19 * * \\ (0.05) \end{gathered}$ |  |  | $\begin{gathered} 0.08 \\ (0.12) \end{gathered}$ |
| Adequate Mentoring Overall |  |  |  | $\begin{gathered} 0.23^{* *} \\ (0.05) \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} 0.28 * * \\ (0.08) \end{gathered}$ |
| Extent Research/ Scholarly Work is Valued |  |  |  |  | $\begin{gathered} 0.59 * * \\ (0.18) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.01 \\ (0.18) \end{gathered}$ |
| Constant | $\begin{gathered} 2.60^{* *} \\ (0.34) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4.59 * * \\ (0.34) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3.34^{* *} \\ (0.29) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2.78 * * \\ (0.36) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.82^{*} \\ & (0.83) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3.52 * * \\ (0.99) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| Observations | 268 | 181 | 315 | 249 | 87 | 47 |
| R-squared | 0.272 | 0.274 | 0.186 | 0.236 | 0.461 | 0.760 |
| Robust standard errors in parentheses <br> * significant at 5\%; ** significant at $1 \%$ <br> ${ }^{\dagger}$ This demographic group is controlled for in every model but its results are not reported because it contains less than 5 faculty. |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Table S10: Summary Statistics for Satisfaction with Compensation, Benefits, Facilities and Resources (Tenured Faculty)

|  | Number of Respondents | \% of <br> Respondents Reporting Somewhat or Very Satisfied | Satisfaction |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Mean | Standard <br> Deviation |
| Quality of students, graduate/ professional students ${ }^{\dagger}$ | 595 | 92\% | 4.52 | 0.82 |
| Office space | 660 | 83\% | 4.29 | 1.10 |
| Access to teaching assistants ${ }^{\ddagger}$ | 546 | 78\% | 4.08 | 1.14 |
| Employee benefits | 658 | 78\% | 4.09 | 1.14 |
| Teaching resources | 633 | 77\% | 4.09 | 1.03 |
| Monetary compensation | 663 | 74\% | 3.92 | 1.20 |
| Technical and research staff ${ }^{\ddagger}$ | 531 | 73\% | 3.98 | 1.11 |
| Lab or research space ${ }^{+}$ | 319 | 72\% | 3.87 | 1.27 |
| Clerical and administrative staff | 663 | 71\% | 3.84 | 1.26 |
| Classroom and meeting space | 658 | 71\% | 3.83 | 1.24 |
| Availability of nearby parking | 521 | 70\% | 3.97 | 1.29 |
| Physical infrastructure | 614 | 69\% | 3.88 | 1.09 |
| Research equipment ${ }^{+}$ | 303 | 65\% | 3.70 | 1.15 |
| Computing support staff | 646 | 64\% | 3.68 | 1.28 |
| Spousal/domestic partner benefits | 491 | 64\% | 3.86 | 1.12 |
| Special research facilities ${ }^{+}$ | 260 | 57\% | 3.56 | 1.28 |
| Administrative support for grants ${ }^{+}$ | 474 | 57\% | 3.54 | 1.32 |

${ }^{\dagger}$ Faculty at HBS were asked to rate their satisfaction with the quality of MBA students and the quality of doctoral students. Their responses to these questions were not included in this analysis. Faculty at HLS were asked to rate their satisfaction with the quality of students (as opposed to the quality of graduate and professional students).
Their responses to this question are included with the faculty from other Schools in this analysis.
${ }^{\ddagger}$ Faculty at HLS were not asked this question.
${ }^{+}$Faculty at HBS and HLS were not asked this question.

Table S11: Summary Statistics for Satisfaction with Compensation, Benefits, Facilities and Resources (Tenure-Track Faculty)

|  | Number of Respondents | \% of <br> Respondents Reporting Somewhat or Very Satisfied | Satisfaction |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Mean | Standard Deviation |
| Quality of students, graduate/ professional students ${ }^{\dagger}$ | 272 | 85\% | 4.28 | 0.93 |
| Office space | 348 | 84\% | 4.33 | 1.05 |
| Teaching resources | 333 | 75\% | 4.02 | 1.07 |
| Classroom and meeting space | 351 | 74\% | 4.03 | 1.14 |
| Technical and research staff ${ }^{\ddagger}$ | 318 | 69\% | 3.86 | 1.19 |
| Physical infrastructure | 332 | 69\% | 3.98 | 1.17 |
| Employee benefits | 348 | 68\% | 3.81 | 1.15 |
| Access to teaching assistants ${ }^{\ddagger}$ | 280 | 67\% | 3.75 | 1.29 |
| Monetary compensation | 351 | 64\% | 3.65 | 1.25 |
| Clerical and administrative staff | 350 | 64\% | 3.67 | 1.31 |
| Lab or research space ${ }^{+}$ | 149 | 60\% | 3.56 | 1.37 |
| Research equipment ${ }^{+}$ | 173 | 59\% | 3.64 | 1.22 |
| Computing support staff | 347 | 56\% | 3.42 | 1.37 |
| Administrative support for grants ${ }^{+}$ | 262 | 54\% | 3.39 | 1.38 |
| Spousal/domestic partner benefits | 257 | 53\% | 3.54 | 1.24 |
| Special research facilities ${ }^{+}$ | 141 | 51\% | 3.40 | 1.26 |
| Availability of nearby parking | 262 | 43\% | 3.04 | 1.61 |

${ }^{\dagger}$ Faculty at HBS were asked to rate their satisfaction with the quality of MBA students and the quality of doctoral students. Their responses to these questions were not included in this analysis. Faculty at HLS were asked to rate their satisfaction with the quality of students (as opposed to the quality of graduate and professional students). Their responses to this question are included with the faculty from other Schools in this analysis.
${ }^{\ddagger}$ Faculty at HLS were not asked this question.
${ }^{+}$Faculty at HBS and HLS were not asked this question.

Table S12: Summary Statistics for Satisfaction with Compensation, Benefits, Facilities and Resources (Non-Ladder Faculty)

|  | Number of Respondents | \% of <br> Respondents Reporting Somewhat or Very Satisfied | Satisfaction |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Mean | Standard <br> Deviation |
| Quality of students ${ }^{\dagger}$ | 295 | 96\% | 4.65 | 0.69 |
| Employee benefits | 318 | 84\% | 4.25 | 1.00 |
| Teaching resources | 309 | 80\% | 4.16 | 0.98 |
| Access to teaching assistants ${ }^{\ddagger}$ | 226 | 77\% | 4.08 | 1.04 |
| Computing support staff | 309 | 74\% | 3.92 | 1.16 |
| Technical and research staff ${ }^{\ddagger}$ | 268 | 74\% | 4.11 | 1.08 |
| Spousal/domestic partner benefits | 195 | 69\% | 3.98 | 1.10 |
| Physical infrastructure | 281 | 69\% | 3.92 | 1.10 |
| Clerical and administrative staff | 329 | 67\% | 3.86 | 1.21 |
| Office space | 321 | 67\% | 3.73 | 1.38 |
| Classroom and meeting space | 326 | 66\% | 3.70 | 1.32 |
| Lab or research space ${ }^{+}$ | 98 | 58\% | 3.73 | 1.16 |
| Monetary compensation | 327 | 58\% | 3.41 | 1.22 |
| Research equipment ${ }^{+}$ | 102 | 58\% | 3.73 | 1.10 |
| Special research facilities ${ }^{+}$ | 90 | 56\% | 3.69 | 1.12 |
| Administrative support for grants ${ }^{+}$ | 205 | 54\% | 3.43 | 1.26 |
| Availability of nearby parking | 250 | 43\% | 3.02 | 1.57 |

${ }^{\dagger}$ Faculty at HBS were asked to rate their satisfaction with the quality of MBA students and the quality of doctoral students. Their responses to these questions were not included in this analysis.
${ }^{\ddagger}$ Faculty at HLS were not asked this question.
${ }^{+}$Faculty at HBS and HLS were not asked this question.

Table S13: Satisfaction with Particular Issues (All Faculty Except Where Stated Below)
$\left.\begin{array}{lc|c|c|c|c|c|c}\hline \text { Dependent Variable: } & \begin{array}{c}\text { Monetary } \\ \text { Compensation }\end{array} & \begin{array}{c}\text { Employee } \\ \text { Benefits }\end{array} & \begin{array}{c}\text { Spouse/ } \\ \text { Domestic } \\ \text { Partner Benefit }\end{array} & \begin{array}{c}\text { Quality of Graduate/ } \\ \text { Professional } \\ \text { Students }\end{array} & \begin{array}{c}\text { Quality of } \\ \text { Students }\end{array} & \begin{array}{c}\text { Access to } \\ \text { Teaching } \\ \text { Assistants }\end{array} & \begin{array}{c}\text { Teaching } \\ \text { Resources }\end{array} \\ \hline & \text { Baseline } & \text { Baseline } & \text { Baseline } & \text { Baseline } & \text { Baseline } & \text { Baseline } & \text { Baseline } \\ \text { Administrative } \\ \text { Staff }\end{array}\right]$ Baseline

Robust standard errors in parentheses

* significant at 5\%; ** significant at $1 \%$
${ }^{\dagger}$ This demographic group is controlled for in every model but its results are not reported because it contains less than 5 faculty.

Table S14: Satisfaction with Particular Issues Continued ( $\underline{\text { All Faculty) }}$

| Dependent Variable: | Technical and Research Staff | Computing Support Staff | Administrative Support for Grants | Availability of Nearby Parking | Classroom and Meeting Space | Office Space | Lab or Research Space | Special <br> Research <br> Facilities | Research <br> Equipment | Physical Infrastructure |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Regressor | Baseline | Baseline | Baseline | Baseline | Baseline | Baseline | Baseline | Baseline | Baseline | Baseline |
| Female | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \hline-0.08 \\ & (0.08) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \hline-0.05 \\ & (0.08) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline-0.14 \\ & (0.10) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline-0.04 \\ (0.10) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \hline-0.02 \\ & (0.08) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0.03 \\ (0.07) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline-0.03 \\ & (0.13) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline-0.08 \\ & (0.14) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline-0.11 \\ (0.12) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.03 \\ (0.07) \end{gathered}$ |
| Asian/Pacific Islander | $\begin{gathered} -0.09 \\ (0.11) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.19 \\ (0.13) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.20 \\ (0.15) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.04 \\ (0.15) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.03 \\ (0.11) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.01 \\ (0.11) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.09 \\ (0.17) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.14 \\ (0.17) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.14 \\ (0.13) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.10 \\ (0.10) \end{gathered}$ |
| Black | $\begin{gathered} 0.29 \\ (0.17) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.28 \\ (0.20) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.10 \\ (0.22) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & -0.22 \\ & (0.25) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.19 \\ (0.19) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.04 \\ (0.16) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.18 \\ (0.30) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.71^{*} \\ & (0.28) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.39 \\ (0.26) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.37 * \\ & (0.15) \end{aligned}$ |
| Hispanic | $\begin{gathered} -0.44 \\ (0.28) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & -0.56^{*} \\ & (0.24) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.48 \\ (0.31) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.31 \\ (0.27) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.06 \\ (0.22) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & -0.33 \\ & (0.23) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.29 \\ (0.57) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.65 \\ (0.57) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.17 \\ (0.40) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & -0.14 \\ & (0.23) \end{aligned}$ |
| American Indian/ Alaskan Native ${ }^{\dagger}$ | (0.28) |  | (0.31) |  | (0.22) |  |  | (0.57) | (0.0) | (0.23) |
| Unknown ${ }^{\dagger}$ | . | . | . | . | . |  |  | . | . | $\cdot$ |
| Tenure-Track | $\begin{gathered} -0.06 \\ (0.11) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.08 \\ (0.12) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.13 \\ (0.14) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.54^{* *} \\ (0.13) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.19 \\ (0.10) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.15 \\ (0.09) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.10 \\ (0.16) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.10 \\ (0.18) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.13 \\ (0.14) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} . \\ 0.15 \\ (0.09) \end{gathered}$ |
| Non-Ladder | $\begin{gathered} 0.23^{* *} \\ (0.09) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.34^{* *} \\ (0.09) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.02 \\ (0.12) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.69 * * \\ (0.11) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.02 \\ (0.09) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.47^{* *} \\ (0.09) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.00 \\ (0.15) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.17 \\ (0.16) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.03 \\ (0.14) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.14 \\ (0.08) \end{gathered}$ |
| International | $\begin{gathered} 0.08 \\ (0.13) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.47 * * \\ (0.12) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.19 \\ (0.15) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.36 \\ (0.19) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.15 \\ (0.13) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.03 \\ (0.12) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.22 \\ (0.21) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.19 \\ (0.22) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.20 \\ (0.17) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.01 \\ (0.13) \end{gathered}$ |
| Age | $\begin{gathered} 0.00 \\ (0.00) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.01^{* *} \\ & (0.00) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.00 \\ (0.01) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.02^{* *} \\ (0.00) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.01 \\ (0.00) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.01^{*} \\ & (0.00) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.01 \\ (0.01) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.00 \\ (0.01) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.00 \\ (0.01) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.01 \\ (0.00) \end{gathered}$ |
| School (8 dummy variables) Constant | Controlled for but not reported 3.73** (0.23) | Controlled for but not reported 2.79** (0.24) | Controlled for but not reported 3.34** (0.30) | $\begin{gathered} \text { Controlled } \\ \text { for but not } \\ \text { reported } \\ 2.60^{* *} \\ (0.28) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Controlled for but not reported 3.42** (0.21) | Controlled for but not reported 3.77** (0.21) | Controlled for but not reported 3.49** (0.35) | Controlled for but not reported 3.56** (0.40) | Controlled for but not reported 3.94** (0.32) | Controlled for but not reported 3.52** (0.19) |
| Observations | 1117 | 1302 | 941 | 1033 | 1335 | 1329 | 566 | 491 | 578 | 1227 |
| R-squared | 0.053 | 0.074 | 0.069 | 0.247 | 0.129 | 0.097 | 0.092 | 0.061 | 0.039 | 0.156 |

Robust standard errors in parentheses

* significant at $5 \%$; ** significant at $1 \%$
${ }^{\dagger}$ This demographic group is controlled for in every model but its results are not reported because it contains less than 5 faculty.


## ATMOSPHERE

- Good FIT
- ASPECTS OF DEPARTMENTAL ATMOSPHERE (LADDER FACULTY)
- Aspects of Departmental Atmosphere (NON-LADDER FACULTY)


## Summary

The Atmosphere section of the survey explores the extent to which faculty find their colleagues to be collegial, collaborative and respectful of their work. Together these factors help to explain whether faculty feel comfortable working in their departments, or, in general, find that their departments are a "good fit" for them. ${ }^{33}$ Seventy percent of the faculty agree to some extent with the statement: "My department is a good fit for me." However, women in all three ranks find their departments to be less of a good fit than their male counterparts. Moreover, tenuretrack women feel that their departments are less of a good fit for them than tenured women.

In addition to overall "good fit," the survey examines 3 different aspects of departmental atmosphere, including: (1) respect from colleagues and students, (2) collaboration and camaraderie, and (3) voice in governance decisions. These 3 categories consist of 9 issues for the ladder faculty and 12 for the non-ladder faculty.

## Aspects of Departmental Atmosphere (Ladder Faculty)

Among the ladder faculty, women have significantly lower assessments than men for 8 of the 9 issues (excluding "good fit"), taking into account rank, gender, ethnicity, citizenship, age and School. These 8 issues are as follows:
(1) Research/scholarship valued by colleagues
(2) Comfort in raising personal responsibilities when scheduling department obligations
(3) Opportunities to collaborate with Harvard faculty outside one’s primary department
(4) Amount of personal interaction with colleagues
(5) Collegiality and supportiveness of one's department
(6) Having a voice in the decision-making that affects the direction of one’s department
(7) Opportunities to collaborate with faculty in one’s primary department
(8) Feeling respected by the faculty in one's department

Tenure-track faculty have significantly lower estimates than tenured faculty for all 8 of the issues above plus the issue of feeling respected by the students (i.e., all 9 ladder faculty issues).

For most of these issues, tenure-track women have significantly lower estimates of atmosphere than other groups of faculty because they experience two significant effects - they are tenuretrack and they are female. For one issue, however, the effect of being tenure-track and being female is not additive: comfort in raising personal responsibilities when scheduling department obligations. In this case, tenure-track women are the only group that stands out in that they uniquely experience lower levels of comfort.

The gender-based difference in "good fit" for the ladder faculty appears to be primarily driven by women's greater dissatisfaction with the following 4 issues: (1) opportunities to collaborate with faculty in one's primary department, (2) collegiality and supportiveness of one's department, (3) having a voice in the decision-making that affects the direction of one's department and (4) research/scholarship is valued by one's colleagues.

[^13]Of all 9 issues discussed above, the following 5 issues remain significant predictors of "good fit" when added simultaneously to the "good fit" baseline model for ladder faculty: (1) collegiality and supportiveness of one's department, (2) having a voice in the decision-making that affects the direction of one's department, (3) opportunities to collaborate with faculty in one's primary department, (4) feeling respected by the faculty in oen's department, and (5) comfort in raising personal responsibilities when scheduling department obligations. Agreement with the first issue (collegiality and supportiveness of one's department) is the best predictor.

## Aspects of Departmental Atmosphere (Non-Ladder Faculty)

Eight of the 12 non-ladder issues (excluding "good fit") overlap those of ladder faculty. ${ }^{34}$ For these 8 common issues, a similar percentage of ladder and non-ladder faculty are in agreement with the following 5 :
(1) Feeling respected by the students
(2) Opportunities to collaborate with faculty in one's primary department
(3) Amount of personal interaction with colleagues
(4) Collegiality and supportiveness of one's department
(5) Comfort in raising personal responsibilities when scheduling department obligations

However, a smaller percentage of the non-ladder faculty compared to the ladder faculty are in agreement with the remaining 3 :
(6) Feeling respected by the faculty in one's department
(7) Opportunities to collaborate with Harvard faculty outside one’s primary department
(8) Having a voice in the decision-making that affects the direction of one’s department

Among the non-ladder faculty, women have significantly lower assessments of atmosphere than men for 8 of the 12 issues. These 8 are as follows:
(1) Amount of personal interaction with colleagues
(2) Colleagues value one's work/contributions to the department
(3) Help from the department chair to understand one's role
(4) Opportunities to collaborate with Harvard faculty outside one’s primary department
(5) Collegiality and supportiveness of one's department
(6) Opportunities to collaborate with faculty in one's primary department
(7) Having a voice in the decision-making that affects the direction of one’s department
(8) Comfort in raising personal responsibilities when scheduling department obligations

The gender-based difference in "good fit" for the non-ladder faculty appears to be primarily driven by women's greater dissatisfaction with 5 issues: (1) collegiality and supportiveness of one's department, (2) opportunities to collaborate with faculty in one's primary department, (3) colleagues value one's work/contributions to the department, (4) having a voice in the decisionmaking that affects the direction of one's department, and (5) comfort in raising personal responsibilities when scheduling department obligations.

[^14]Of all 12 issues discussed above, the following 5 issues remain significant predictors of "good fit" when added simultaneously to the "good fit" baseline model for non-ladder faculty: (1) collegiality and supportiveness of one's department, (2) feeling respected by the faculty in one's department, (3) having a voice in the decision-making that affects the direction of one's department, (4) comfort in raising personal responsibilities when scheduling department obligations, and (5) one's department chair helping him/her understand his/her role in the department. As with the ladder faculty, collegiality and supportiveness of one's department is the best predictor for non-ladder faculty.

## Good Fit

Over two-thirds of the faculty (70\%) agree to some extent (40\%"strongly agree" and 30\% "somewhat agree") with the statement: "My department is a good fit for me." Figure A1 provides descriptive statistics of the faculty’s agreement with this statement by rank and gender.

Figure A1: Agreement with the Good Fit Statement by Rank and Gender

|  |  |  | \% of <br> Number of <br> Respondents | Respondents <br> in Somewhat <br> or Strong <br> Agreement | Mean |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Standard <br> Deviation |  |  |  |
| Rank | Tenured Faculty | 640 | $75 \%$ | 3.97 | 1.25 |
|  | Tenure-Track Faculty | 323 | $65 \%$ | 3.74 | 1.26 |
|  | Non-Ladder Faculty | 288 | $65 \%$ | 3.76 | 1.16 |
| Gender | Women | 367 | $58 \%$ | 3.54 | 1.37 |
|  | Men | 884 | $75 \%$ | 3.99 | 1.15 |

(1=strongly disagree $2=$ somewhat disagree $3=$ neither agree nor disagree $4=$ somewhat agree $5=$ strongly agree)
The most striking result in this table is the half-point difference in the extent to which men and women at the University find their departments to be a good fit. While the average level of agreement for men is very close to "somewhat agree" (mean=3.99), the average for women is between "neither agree nor disagree" and "somewhat agree" (mean=3.54).

Regression analysis, which takes into account rank, gender, ethnicity, citizenship, age and School (i.e. the baseline specification), indicates that there is a statistically significant difference between men and women ( 0.44 point difference). ${ }^{35}$ Likewise, the difference between tenuretrack and tenured faculty is statistically significant ( 0.24 point difference). However as the analysis below will reveal, this latter gap is driven primarily by tenure-track women, as tenuretrack men feel approximately the same as tenured men regarding this topic. (See Table A1 in the Atmosphere Appendix for all significant results.)

[^15]To better understand the gender and rank gaps at the University level, we examine the relationship between the two. In this regard, Figure A2 illustrates the average male and female agreement, disaggregated by rank, with the statement: "My department is a good fit for me".

Figure A2: Male and Female Average Agreement by Rank with the Good Fit Statement

( $1=$ strongly disagree $2=$ somewhat disagree $3=$ neither agree nor disagree $4=$ somewhat agree $5=$ strongly agree $)$
Figure A2 illustrates that men across all three ranks feel, on average, approximately the same about how well they fit with their departments. However, women in all three ranks find their departments to be less of a good fit than their male counterparts. Further, tenure-track and nonladder women on average, report even less positive assessments than tenured women.

In order to examine if differences across faculty groups are statistically significant, we add two gender-rank interaction terms (female tenure-track and female non-ladder) to our baseline specification and apply post-estimation F-tests. The following differences are statistically significant (see Table A1 in the Atmosphere Appendix for all significant results): ${ }^{36}$

- Gender differences within each rank: For all three ranks, women express less agreement with the good fit statement than their male counterparts.
- Rank differences by gender: Relative to tenured women, tenure-track women express less agreement with the good fit statement.

As mentioned previously, because there are no statistically significant differences among the men of different ranks, it appears that the gap between tenure-track and tenured faculty found in the baseline specification is driven primarily by tenure-track women.

[^16]According to School-specific analyses (of the same baseline specification above), women agree to a lesser extent than men that their departments are a good fit at two Schools: FAS ( 0.35 point gender gap) and HBS (1.23 point gender gap). (See Table A2 in the Atmosphere Appendix for all significant results.)

The remaining questions in the atmosphere section help to explain why women are less likely than men to feel that their departments are a good fit. In the following analysis, we group these questions into three categories: respect from colleagues and students, collaboration and camaraderie, and voice in governance decisions. Since the specific issues in each of these categories are somewhat different for ladder and non-ladder faculty, we analyze the two faculty groups separately. ${ }^{37}$ (We only perform this analysis at the University level. School-specific analyses will follow in separate reports.)

## Aspects of Departmental Atmosphere (Ladder Faculty)

## Respect from Colleagues and Students (Ladder Faculty)

The graph below depicts the ladder faculty's responses to the three survey questions regarding respect from colleagues and students. These questions ask the faculty to rate the extent to which they agree with the following statements:
(1) "My colleagues value my research/scholarship." (Value Research/Scholarship)
(2) "I am respected by the other faculty in my department." (Respected by Faculty)
(3) "I am respected by the students." (Respected by Students)

[^17]Figure A3: Respect from Colleagues and Students (Ladder Faculty)

( $1=$ strongly disagree $2=$ somewhat disagree $3=$ neither agree nor disagree $4=$ somewhat agree $5=$ strongly agree $)$
Approximately three-quarters of the ladder faculty agree to some extent that they are respected by the faculty in their departments and that their colleagues value their research/scholarship. Additionally, almost all of the ladder faculty (92\%) agree to some extent that they are respected by the students, with nearly twice as many faculty members in strong, rather than weak agreement, with this statement.

Applying the baseline specification to each statement, we find the following statistically significant rank- and gender-based results for ladder faculty (see Table A3 in the Atmosphere Appendix for all significant results):

- Rank: Relative to tenured faculty, tenure-track faculty express less agreement with all 3 statements (differences range from 0.29-0.53 points).
- Gender: Relative to men, women express less agreement with 2 of the 3 statements, namely, that they are respected by the faculty in their departments ( 0.29 point difference) and their colleagues value their research/scholarship (0.39 point difference).

To better understand these demographic differences, we examine the relationship between gender and rank. In this regard, Figure A4 illustrates the average male and female agreement, disaggregated by rank, with each of the 3 statements.

Figure A4: Average Agreement with Respect Statements by Gender and Rank (Ladder Faculty)

( $1=$ strongly disagree $2=$ somewhat disagree $3=$ neither agree nor disagree $4=$ somewhat agree $5=$ strongly agree $)$
Adding an interaction term for gender and rank to the baseline specification for each question and applying post-estimation F-tests, we find the following statistically significant differences (see Table A3 in the Atmosphere Appendix for all significant results): ${ }^{38,39}$

- Gender differences within each rank:
o Relative to tenured men, tenured women express less agreement with 1 of the 3 statements, namely that their colleagues value their research/scholarship.
o Relative to tenure-track men, tenure-track women express less agreement with 2 of the 3 statements, namely that they are respected by the faculty in their departments and that their colleagues value their research/scholarship.
- Rank differences by gender: For both men and women, tenure-track faculty express less agreement than their tenured counterparts with all 3 statements.


## Collaboration and Camaraderie (Ladder Faculty)

Figure A5 below depicts the ladder faculty's responses to the 4 survey questions regarding collaboration and camaraderie. These questions ask faculty to rate the extent to which they agree with the following statements:
(1) "I am satisfied with opportunities to collaborate with faculty in my primary department." (Collaborate Inside)

[^18](2) "I am satisfied with the opportunities to collaborate with Harvard faculty outside of my primary department." (Collaborate Outside)
(3) "I am satisfied with the amount of personal interaction I have with my colleagues." (Personal Interaction)
(4) "My department has a collegial and supportive environment." (Collegial Environment)

Figure A5: Collaboration and Camaraderie (Ladder Faculty)

( $1=$ strongly disagree $2=$ somewhat disagree $3=$ neither agree nor disagree $4=$ somewhat agree $5=$ strongly agree $)$
Ladder faculty have lower assessments of collaboration and camaraderie than they do with the respect they receive from their colleagues and students. Whereas approximately three-quarters or more agree with the statements regarding respect, only $60 \%$ of the ladder faculty agree to some extent with each of the statements above. Moreover, only approximately a quarter to a third of the faculty "strongly agree" with each statement.

Applying the baseline specification to each statement, we find the following statistically significant rank- and gender-based results for the ladder faculty (see Table A4 in the Atmosphere Appendix for all significant results):

- Rank: Relative to tenured faculty, tenure-track faculty express less agreement with all 4 statements (differences range from 0.37-0.67 points).
- Gender: Relative to men, women express less agreement with all 4 statements (differences range from 0.36-0.53 points).

To better understand these effects, we examine the relationship between gender and rank. In this regard, Figure A6 illustrates the average male and female agreement, disaggregated by rank, with each of the 4 statements.

Figure A6: Average Agreement with Collaboration and Camaraderie Statements by Gender and Rank (Ladder Faculty)

( $1=$ strongly disagree $2=$ somewhat disagree $3=$ neither agree nor disagree $4=$ somewhat agree $5=$ strongly agree)
Adding an interaction term for gender and rank to the baseline specification for each question and applying post-estimation F-tests, we find the following statistically significant differences (see Table A4 in the Atmosphere Appendix for all significant results): ${ }^{40,41}$

- Gender differences within each rank:
o Relative to tenured men, tenured women express less agreement with all 4 statements.
o Relative to tenure-track men, tenure-track women express less agreement with all 4 statements.
- Rank differences by gender:
o Relative to tenured women, tenure-track women express less agreement with all 4 statements.
o Relative to tenured men, tenure-track men express less agreement with all 4 statements.

[^19]
## Voice in Governance Decisions (Ladder Faculty)

Figure A7 below depicts the ladder faculty's responses to the 2 survey questions regarding voice in governance decisions. These questions ask faculty to rate the extent to which they agree with the following statements:
(1) "I have a voice in the decision-making that affects the direction of my department." (Voice in Decision-Making)
(2) "My department is a place where individual faculty may comfortably raise personal and/or family responsibilities when scheduling department obligations." (Raise Personal Responsibilities when Scheduling)

Figure A7: Voice in Governance Decisions (Ladder Faculty)
Strongly disagree $\square$ Somewhat disagree $\square$ Neither agree nor disagree $\square$ Somewhat agree $\square$ Strongly agree

( $1=$ strongly disagree $2=$ somewhat disagree $3=$ neither agree nor disagree $4=$ somewhat agree $5=$ strongly agree)
Approximately two-thirds of the ladder faculty agree to some extent with both statements, though only approximately a third of the faculty "strongly agree."

Applying the baseline specification to each statement, we find the following statistically significant rank- and gender-based results for ladder faculty (see Table A5 in the Atmosphere Appendix for all significant results):

- Rank: Relative to tenured faculty, tenure-track faculty express less agreement with both statements ( 1.08 point difference for voice in decision-making and 0.37 point difference for raise personal responsibilities when scheduling).
- Gender: Relative to men, women express less agreement with both statements ( 0.43 point difference for voice in decision-making and 0.33 point difference for raise personal responsibilities when scheduling).

As noted above, the baseline specification indicates that women and tenure-track faculty feel less comfortable raising personal and/or family responsibilities when scheduling department obligations. However, as indicated by the graph and analysis below, this result is primarily
driven by tenure-track women. In this case tenured men, tenured women and tenure-track men are nearly all, on average, equally satisfied with this issue.

Figure A8: Average Agreement with Voice in Governance Decision Statements by Gender and Rank (Ladder Faculty)

( $1=$ strongly disagree $2=$ somewhat disagree $3=$ neither agree nor disagree $4=$ somewhat agree $5=$ strongly agree)
Adding an interaction term for gender and rank to the baseline specification for each question and applying post-estimation F-tests, we find a significant interaction effect for the question about departmental scheduling and the following statistically significant rank- and gender-based results for both issues (see Table A5 in the Atmosphere Appendix for all significant results): ${ }^{42}$

- Gender differences within each rank:
- Relative to tenured men, tenured women express less agreement with 1 of the 2 statements, namely that they have a voice in decision-making.
- Relative to tenure-track men, tenure-track women express less agreement with both statements.
- Rank difference by gender:
- Relative to tenured women, tenure-track women express less agreement with both statements.
- Relative to tenured men, tenure track men express less agreement with 1 statement, namely that they have a voice in decision-making.

[^20]Including control variables for having children of various ages (i.e., pre-school age, school-age, and college-age or older) to the gender-rank interaction specification of comfort in raising personal responsibilities when scheduling department obligations does not change the results above. However, faculty with school-age children (i.e., 5-13 years old) express significantly less agreement with this statement than faculty with no children ( 0.19 point difference). (See Table A5 in the Atmosphere Appendix for all significant results.)

## Gender and Rank Gap Summary (Ladder Faculty)

The previous 3 sub-sections investigate demographic differences among the ladder faculty regarding the 9 different areas of atmosphere included in the survey. Together these issues help explain why the ladder faculty do or do not find their departments to be a good fit. Eight of the 9 issues have gender gaps that are statistically significant when controlling for rank, ethnicity, citizenship, age and School. The one issue for which men and women do not feel significantly different is: feeling respected by the students.

Figure A9 below graphs the mean responses for men and women to the following 9 atmosphere questions ordered from smallest to largest mean difference (the issues with significant gender gaps when tested using the baseline specification are starred):
(1) Respected by Students
(2) Respected by Faculty*
(3) Value Research/Scholarship*
(4) Raise Personal Resp. when Scheduling*
(5) Collaborate Outside*
(6) Personal Interaction*
(7) Collegial Environment*
(8) Voice in Decision-Making*
(9) Collaborate Inside*

Figure A9: Gender Gap in View of Atmosphere (Ladder Faculty)

( $1=$ strongly disagree $2=$ somewhat disagree $3=$ neither agree nor disagree $4=$ somewhat agree $5=$ strongly agree)
To determine whether these issues help to explain the gender gap in overall good fit, we add each separately to the baseline specification predicting good fit. Then we determine which issues have the largest effect on the coefficient of the gender variable. ${ }^{43}$ The following 4 issues have the largest impact on the gender gap for good fit: (1) satisfaction with opportunities to collaborate with faculty in one's primary department, (2) collegiality and supportiveness of one's department, (3) having a voice in the decision-making that affects the direction of one's department and (4) research/scholarship is valued by one's colleagues.

In particular, these are the only 4 issues that cause the gender coefficient to become statistically insignificant when included separately in the baseline regression. Also, controlling for these issues reduces the gender coefficient in the good fit baseline specification by $0.32,0.31,0.26$ and 0.24 points in absolute magnitude, respectively. (See Tables A6, A7, and A8 in the Atmosphere Appendix for all significant results.) This analysis, therefore, suggests that the gender gap operates through these channels. However, this analysis cannot establish causality and, thus, should be interpreted with caution.

Recall that all 9 questions in the atmosphere section of the survey have rank differences that are statistically significant when controlling for gender, ethnicity, citizenship, age and School. The

[^21]figure below graphs the mean responses for tenured and tenure-track faculty to the following 9 atmosphere questions ordered from smallest to largest mean difference (the issues with significant rank gaps in the baseline specification are starred):
(1) Collegial Environment*
(2) Respected by Students*
(3) Personal Interaction*
(4) Value Research/Scholarship*
(5) Collaborate Outside*
(6) Raise Personal Resp. when Scheduling*
(7) Respected by Faculty*
(8) Collaborate Inside*
(9) Voice in Decision-Making*

Figure A10: Rank Gap in View of Atmosphere (Ladder Faculty)

(1=strongly disagree $2=$ somewhat disagree $3=$ neither agree nor disagree $4=$ somewhat agree $5=$ strongly agree)
Not surprisingly, the largest absolute mean difference between tenured and tenure-track faculty is in their agreement with having a voice in the decision-making that affects the direction of their departments.

## Predicting Good Fit (Ladder Faculty):

In this section we examine which of the issues in the atmosphere section are best at predicting good fit. For the ladder faculty, all 9 atmosphere questions are statistically significant predictors of good fit when included separately in the baseline specification. In other words, faculty who are in more agreement with each statement feel that their departments are a better fit than faculty who are in less agreement with each statement (holding demographic characteristics constant).

When these 9 issues are included together in the baseline specification, the following 5 remain statistically significant: (1) collegiality and supportiveness of one's department, (2) having a voice in the decision-making that affects the direction of one's department, (3) opportunities to collaborate with faculty in one's primary department, (4) feeling respected by the faculty in one's department, and (5) comfort in raising personal responsibilities when scheduling department obligations. Furthermore, one's impression of the first issue (collegiality and supportiveness of one's department) is the best predictor of good fit for ladder faculty. ${ }^{44}$

## Aspects of Departmental Atmosphere (Non-Ladder Faculty)

This part of the analysis examines the non-ladder faculty's responses to 12 different atmosphere issues (also classified as respect from colleagues and students, collaboration and camaraderie, and voice in governance decisions).

## Respect from Colleagues and Students (Non-Ladder Faculty)

Figure A11 below depicts the non-ladder faculty's responses to the 3 survey questions regarding their feelings of respect from colleagues and students. Similarly to ladder faculty, these questions ask non-ladder faculty members to rate the extent to which they agree with the following statements:
(1) "My colleagues value my work/contributions to the department." (Value Work/Contributions)
(2) "I am respected by the other faculty in my department." (Respected by Faculty)
(3) "I am respected by the students." (Respected by Students)

[^22]Figure A11: Respect from Colleagues and Students (Non-Ladder Faculty)

( $1=$ strongly disagree $2=$ somewhat disagree $3=$ neither agree nor disagree $4=$ somewhat agree $5=$ strongly agree $)$
Approximately two-thirds of the non-ladder faculty agree to some extent that they are respected by their colleagues. Recall, nearly three-quarters of the ladder faculty agree with this statement. ${ }^{45}$ Likewise, approximately two-thirds of the non-ladder faculty agree that their colleagues value their work/contributions. ${ }^{46}$ Finally, like the ladder faculty, almost all of the non-ladder faculty ( $93 \%$ versus $92 \%$ of ladder faculty) agree to some extent that they are respected by the students, with nearly twice as many in strong, rather than weak agreement, with this statement. ${ }^{47}$

Applying the baseline specification to each statement, we find only 1 statistically significant gender-based result, namely, relative to men, women express less agreement with the statement that their colleagues value their work/contributions ( 0.44 point difference). (See Table A9 in the Atmosphere Appendix for all significant results.)

## Collaboration and Camaraderie (Non-Ladder Faculty)

Figure A12 below depicts the non-ladder faculty's responses to each of the 5 questions related to collaboration and camaraderie. These questions ask faculty to rate the extent to which they agree with the following statements:
(1) "I am satisfied with opportunities to collaborate with faculty in my primary

[^23]department." (Collaborate Inside)
(2) "I am satisfied with the opportunities to collaborate with Harvard faculty outside of my primary department." (Collaborate Outside)
(3) "I am satisfied with the amount of personal interaction I have with my colleagues." (Personal Interaction)
(4) "My department has a collegial and supportive environment." (Collegial Environment)
(5) "I feel excluded from an informal network in my department." (Excluded from Informal Network)

Figure A12: Collaboration and Camaraderie (Non-Ladder Faculty)

( $1=$ strongly disagree $2=$ somewhat disagree $3=$ neither agree nor disagree $4=$ somewhat agree $5=$ strongly agree)
As with the ladder faculty, approximately $60 \%$ of the non-ladder faculty agree to some extent with the following 3 statements: (1) "I am satisfied with the amount of personal interaction I have with my colleagues," (2) "My department has a collegial and supportive environment," and (3) "I am satisfied with opportunities to collaborate with faculty in my primary department." ${ }^{48}$ Non-ladder faculty members are less satisfied than ladder faculty members, however, with

[^24]opportunities to collaborate with Harvard faculty outside of their primary departments. ${ }^{49}$ Finally, approximately a third of the non-ladder faculty feel excluded from an informal network in their departments. (Note that agreement with this last statement has a negative connotation.)

Applying the baseline specification to each statement, we find that relative to non-ladder men, non-ladder women express significantly less agreement with 4 of the 5 statements (differences range from 0.38-0.59 points). They express similar levels of agreement with the statement: "I feel excluded from an informal network in my department." (See Table A10 in the Atmosphere Appendix for all significant results.)

## Voice in Governance Decisions (Non-Ladder Faculty)

Figure A13 below depicts the non-ladder faculty's response to the 4 issues related to their voice in governance decisions. The survey asks non-ladder faculty to rate the extent to which they agree with the following statements:
(1) "I have a voice in the decision-making that affects the direction of my department." (Voice in Decision-Making)
(2) "My department is a place where individual faculty may comfortably raise personal and/or family responsibilities when scheduling department obligations." (Raise Personal Resp. when Scheduling)
(3) "My department chair has helped me to understand my role in the department." (Understand My Role)
(4) "My department is formal/hierarchical place." (Department is Formal/Hierarchical)

[^25]Figure A13: Voice in Governance Decisions (Non-Ladder Faculty)

( $1=$ strongly disagree $2=$ somewhat disagree $3=$ neither agree nor disagree $4=$ somewhat agree $5=$ strongly agree $)$
Whereas $65 \%$ of the ladder faculty agree to some extent that they have a voice in the decisionmaking that affects the direction of their departments, only $40 \%$ of the non-ladder faculty agree to some extent with this statement. ${ }^{50}$ Further, $55 \%$ percent of the non-ladder faculty agree to some extent that they are comfortable raising personal issues when scheduling department obligations ( $63 \%$ of the ladder faculty agree to some extent with this question). ${ }^{51}$ Finally, approximately $40 \%$ of the non-ladder faculty agree to some extent that their department chairs have helped them understand their roles and that their departments are hierarchical places. ${ }^{52}$ (Note that agreement with the latter statement has a negative connotation.)

Applying the baseline specification to each statement, we find that relative to non-ladder men, non-ladder women express significantly less agreement with 3 of the 4 statements (differences range from 0.34-0.52 points). They express similar levels of agreement with the statement: "My department is formal/hierarchical place." (See Table A11 in the Atmosphere Appendix for all significant results.)

[^26]Finally, when we add control variables for having children of various ages (i.e., pre-school age, school-age, and college-age or older) to the baseline specification of feeling comfortable raising personal responsibilities when scheduling obligations, the gender gap remains statistically significant. Also, as with ladder faculty, non-ladder faculty with school-age children (i.e., 5-13 years old) express less agreement with this statement than those with no children ( 0.36 point difference). (See Table A11 in the Atmosphere Appendix for all significant results.)

## Gender Gap Summary (Non-Ladder Faculty):

The previous 3 sub-sections investigate gender differences among the non-ladder faculty regarding the 12 different areas of atmosphere included on the survey. Together these issues help explain why the non-ladder faculty do or do not find their departments to be a good fit. Eight of the 12 questions have gender gaps that are statistically significant while controlling for ethnicity, citizenship, age and School.

Figure A14 graphs the mean responses for men and women to the following 12 atmosphere questions ordered from smallest to largest mean difference (the issues with significant gender gaps in the baseline specification are starred):
(1) Respected by Students
(2) Excluded from Informal Network
(3) Respected by Faculty
(4) Department is Formal/Hierarchical
(5) Personal Interaction*
(6) Value Work/Contributions*
(7) Understand My Role*
(8) Raise Personal Resp. when Scheduling*
(9) Collaborate Outside*
(10) Collegial Environment*
(11) Collaborate Inside*
(12) Voice in Decision-Making*

Note that because agreeing with statements (2) and (4) above carry a negative connotation, when calculating the mean response for these two items in the figure below, we reversed the scale such that $1=$ strongly agree, $2=$ somewhat agree, $3=$ neither agree nor disagree, $4=$ somewhat disagree, and $5=$ strongly disagree.

Figure A14: Gender Gap in View of Atmosphere (Non-ladder Faculty)

(1=strongly disagree $2=$ somewhat disagree $3=$ neither agree nor disagree $4=$ somewhat agree $5=$ strongly agree)
As in the case of ladder faculty, to determine if these issues help to explain the gender gap in overall good fit, we add each, separately, to our baseline regression model predicting good fit. Then we estimate which issues have the largest effect on the coefficient of the gender variable. ${ }^{53}$ The following 5 issues have the largest impact on the gender gap for good fit: (1) collegiality and supportiveness of one's department, (2) opportunities to collaborate with faculty in one's primary department, (3) colleagues value one's work/contributions to the department, (4) having a voice in the decision-making that affects the direction of the department and (5) comfort in raising personal responsibilities when scheduling department obligations.

In particular, these are the only 5 issues that cause the gender coefficient to become statistically insignificant when included separately in the baseline regression. Also, controlling for these issues reduces the gender coefficient in the good fit baseline model by $0.31,0.28,0.23,0.23$, and 0.17 points in absolute magnitude, respectively. (See Tables A12, A13, and A14 of the Atmosphere Appendix for all significant results.) This analysis, therefore, suggests that the gender gap for non-ladder faculty operates through these channels. However, as we noted previously, this analysis cannot establish causality and, thus, should be viewed with caution.

[^27]
## Predicting Good Fit (Non-Ladder Faculty):

In this section we examine which of the 12 issues for non-ladder faculty in the atmosphere section are best at predicting good fit. For the non-ladder faculty, all 12 atmosphere questions are statistically significant predictors of good fit when included separately in the baseline model. When these 12 questions are included together in the baseline model, the following 5 remain statistically significant: (1) collegiality and supportiveness of one's department, (2) feeling respected by the faculty in one's department, (3) having a voice in the decision-making that affects the direction of one's department, (4) comfort in raising personal responsibilities when scheduling department obligations and (5) one's department chair helping him/her understand his/her role in the department. Furthermore, as with ladder faculty, one’s impression of the first issue (collegiality and supportiveness of one's department) is the best predictor of good fit for non-ladder faculty. ${ }^{54}$

[^28]
## AtMosphere Appendix

## Table A1: Good Fit (All Faculty)

| Dependent Variable: <br> Good Fit |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Regressor | Baseline | $(1)$ |
| Female | $-0.44^{* *}$ | $-0.31^{*}$ |
|  | $(0.08)$ | $(0.14)$ |
| Asian/Pacific Islander | 0.05 | 0.05 |
|  | $(0.12)$ | $(0.12)$ |
| Black | 0.24 | 0.24 |
|  | $(0.21)$ | $(0.21)$ |
| Hispanic | -0.04 | -0.02 |
|  | $(0.23)$ | $(0.23)$ |
| American Indian/Alaskan Native ${ }^{\dagger}$ | $\cdot$ | $\cdot$ |
|  | $\cdot$ | $\cdot$ |
| Unknown ${ }^{\dagger}$ | $\cdot$ | $\cdot$ |
| International | $\cdot$. | $\cdot$ |
|  | 0.15 | 0.15 |
| Tenure-Track | $(0.12)$ | $(0.12)$ |
|  | $-0.24^{*}$ | -0.17 |
| Non-Ladder | $(0.11)$ | $(0.12)$ |
|  | -0.16 | -0.10 |
| Age | $(0.09)$ | $(0.10)$ |
|  | -0.00 | -0.00 |
| School (8 dummy variables) | $(0.00)$ | $(0.00)$ |
|  | Controlled for | Controlled for |
| Female*Tenure-Track | but not reported | but not reported |
| Female*Non-Ladder |  | -0.24 |
|  |  | $(0.20)$ |
| Constant | -0.21 |  |
| Observations |  | $(0.20)$ |
| R-squared | $4.17^{* *}$ |  |
|  | 0.045 | $(0.23)$ |

Robust standard errors in parentheses

* significant at $5 \%$; ** significant at $1 \%$
${ }^{\dagger}$ This demographic group is controlled for in every model but its results are not reported because it contains less than 5 faculty.

Table A2: Good Fit by School (All Faculty)

| Dependent Variable: Good Fit |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Regressor | GSD <br> Baseline | HDS <br> Baseline | GSE <br> Baseline | FAS <br> Baseline | KSG <br> Baseline | HBS <br> Baseline | HLS <br> Baseline | HMS/ <br> HHSDM <br> Baseline | SPH <br> Baseline |
| Female | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \hline-0.61 \\ & (0.31) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline-0.03 \\ (0.75) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline-0.38 \\ & (0.48) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline-0.35^{* *} \\ (0.12) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline-0.45 \\ & (0.34) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline-1.23^{* *} \\ (0.24) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \hline-0.11 \\ & (0.52) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline-0.54 \\ (0.29) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline-0.03 \\ & (0.25) \end{aligned}$ |
| Asian/Pacific Islander ${ }^{\dagger}$ | . | . | . | $\begin{gathered} 0.11 \\ (0.16) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.17 \\ (0.76) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & -0.15 \\ & (0.29) \end{aligned}$ | . | $\begin{gathered} -0.06 \\ (0.39) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.38 \\ (0.26) \end{gathered}$ |
| Black ${ }^{\dagger}$ | . | . | . | $\begin{gathered} 0.22 \\ (0.31) \end{gathered}$ | (0.76) | (0.29) | . | (0.39) | (0.26) |
| Hispanic ${ }^{\dagger}$ | . | . | . | $\begin{gathered} -0.04 \\ (0.38) \end{gathered}$ | . | $\begin{gathered} -0.60 \\ (0.60) \end{gathered}$ | . | . | . |
| American Indian/Alaskan Native ${ }^{\dagger}$ | . | . | . | . | . | . | . | . | . |
| Unknown ${ }^{\dagger}$ | . | . | . | . | . | . | . | . | . |
| International ${ }^{\dagger}$ | . | . | . | $\begin{gathered} 0.12 \\ (0.18) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.30 \\ (0.50) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.81^{*} \\ & (0.31) \end{aligned}$ | . | $\begin{gathered} 0.96 * * \\ (0.30) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.42 \\ (0.31) \end{gathered}$ |
| Tenure-Track ${ }^{\dagger}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.62 \\ (0.50) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.92 \\ (1.21) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.28 \\ (0.88) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & -0.41^{*} \\ & (0.17) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.01 \\ (0.52) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.26 \\ (0.28) \end{gathered}$ | . | $\begin{gathered} 0.01 \\ (0.31) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.65 \\ (0.38) \end{gathered}$ |
| Non-Ladder ${ }^{\dagger}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.68 \\ (0.36) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.95 \\ (0.76) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.27 \\ (0.53) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & -0.29^{*} \\ & (0.14) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.05 \\ (0.27) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.54^{*} \\ & (0.24) \end{aligned}$ | $\stackrel{.}{ }$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.57 \\ (0.38) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.62^{*} \\ (0.26) \end{gathered}$ |
| Age | $\begin{gathered} 0.00 \\ (0.02) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.00 \\ (0.05) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.04 \\ (0.03) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & -0.00 \\ & (0.01) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & -0.01 \\ & (0.01) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & -0.02 \\ & (0.01) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.01 \\ (0.02) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.01 \\ (0.01) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.01 \\ (0.02) \end{gathered}$ |
| Constant | $\begin{gathered} 4.08^{* *} \\ (1.13) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 3.25 \\ (3.12) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 6.21^{* *} \\ & (2.12) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4.33^{* *} \\ (0.32) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4.25^{* *} \\ (0.81) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 5.07 * * \\ (0.68) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 3.44^{*} \\ & \text { (1.39) } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3.70^{* *} \\ (0.74) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4.71^{* *} \\ (1.03) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| Observations | 43 | 28 | 39 | 567 | 91 | 159 | 51 | 147 | 126 |
| R-squared | 0.210 | 0.145 | 0.286 | 0.042 | 0.052 | 0.227 | 0.054 | 0.103 | 0.081 |

Robust standard errors in parentheses

* significant at 5\%; ** significant at 1\%
${ }^{\dagger}$ This demographic group is controlled for in every model but its results are not reported because it contains less than 5 faculty.


## Table A3: Respect from Colleagues and Students (Ladder Faculty)

| Dependent Variable: | Respected by Students |  | Respected by Faculty |  | Value Research/Scholarship |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Regressor | Baseline | (1) | Baseline | (1) | Baseline | (1) |
| Female | -0.01 | 0.03 | -0.29** | -0.17 | -0.39** | -0.31** |
|  | (0.05) | (0.05) | (0.08) | (0.10) | (0.08) | (0.11) |
| Asian/Pacific Islander | 0.06 | 0.06 | -0.02 | -0.01 | -0.03 | -0.03 |
|  | (0.08) | (0.08) | (0.13) | (0.13) | (0.13) | (0.13) |
| Black | -0.17 | -0.17 | -0.05 | -0.05 | 0.32 | 0.32 |
|  | (0.19) | (0.19) | (0.21) | (0.21) | (0.19) | (0.20) |
| Hispanic | -0.06 | -0.05 | -0.20 | -0.18 | -0.05 | -0.03 |
|  | (0.15) | (0.16) | (0.22) | (0.22) | (0.21) | (0.21) |
| American Indian/ Alaskan Native ${ }^{\dagger}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Unknown ${ }^{\dagger}$ |  |  | . |  | . | . |
|  | . | . | . | . | . | . |
| International | -0.02 | -0.02 | 0.22 | 0.22 | 0.08 | 0.08 |
|  | (0.10) | (0.10) | (0.14) | (0.14) | (0.14) | (0.14) |
| Tenure-Track | -0.29** | -0.26** | -0.53** | -0.43** | -0.42** | -0.36** |
|  | (0.06) | (0.07) | (0.10) | (0.11) | (0.10) | (0.12) |
| Age | 0.00 | 0.00 | -0.00 | -0.00 | -0.01* | -0.01* |
|  | (0.00) | (0.00) | (0.00) | (0.00) | (0.00) | (0.00) |
| School (8 dummy variables) | Controlled | Controlled | Controlled | Controlled | Controlled | Controlled |
|  | for but not reported | for but not reported | for but not reported | for but not reported | for but not reported | for but not reported |
| Female*Tenure-Track |  | -0.09 |  | -0.28 |  | -0.18 |
|  |  | (0.11) |  | (0.17) |  | (0.17) |
| Constant | 4.57** | 4.55** | 4.46** | 4.40** | 4.73** | 4.69** |
|  | (0.15) | (0.15) | (0.24) | (0.24) | (0.24) | (0.24) |
| Observations | 956 | 956 | 964 | 964 | 965 | 965 |
| R-squared | 0.055 | 0.056 | 0.064 | 0.067 | 0.083 | 0.084 |

Robust standard errors in parentheses

* significant at 5\%; ** significant at 1\%
${ }^{\dagger}$ This demographic group is controlled for in every model but its results are not reported because it contains less than 5 faculty.

Table A4: Collaboration and Camaraderie (Ladder Faculty)

| Dependent Variable: | Collaboration Inside |  | Collaboration Outside |  | Collegial Environment |  | Personal Interaction |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Regressor | Baseline | (1) | Baseline | (1) | Baseline | (1) | Baseline | (1) |
| Female | $\begin{gathered} \hline-0.53^{* *} \\ (0.10) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline-0.47 * * \\ (0.12) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline-0.37 * * \\ (0.10) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline-0.40^{* *} \\ (0.13) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline-0.47 * * \\ (0.11) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \hline-0.34^{*} \\ (0.14) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline-0.36^{* *} \\ (0.10) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline-0.35^{* *} \\ (0.13) \end{gathered}$ |
| Asian/Pacific Islander | $\begin{gathered} 0.10 \\ (0.15) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.10 \\ (0.15) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.05 \\ (0.14) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.05 \\ (0.14) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.15 \\ (0.14) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.15 \\ (0.14) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.10 \\ (0.15) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.10 \\ (0.15) \end{gathered}$ |
| Black | $\begin{gathered} 0.01 \\ (0.26) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.01 \\ (0.26) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.02 \\ (0.25) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.02 \\ (0.25) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.21 \\ (0.27) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.22 \\ (0.27) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.30 \\ (0.26) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.29 \\ (0.26) \end{gathered}$ |
| Hispanic | $\begin{gathered} 0.03 \\ (0.27) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.04 \\ (0.27) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.10 \\ (0.26) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.09 \\ (0.27) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.10 \\ (0.27) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.07 \\ (0.27) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.38 \\ (0.25) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.38 \\ (0.25) \end{gathered}$ |
| American Indian/Alaskan Native ${ }^{\dagger}$ |  |  | . |  |  |  |  |  |
| Unknown ${ }^{\dagger}$ | . | . | . |  |  |  |  | . |
| International | $\begin{gathered} 0.14 \\ (0.18) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.14 \\ (0.18) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.17 \\ (0.17) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.17 \\ (0.17) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.38^{*} \\ & (0.16) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.38^{*} \\ & (0.16) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.32 \\ (0.17) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.32 \\ (0.17) \end{gathered}$ |
| Tenure-Track | $\begin{gathered} -0.67^{* *} \\ (0.12) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.63^{* *} \\ (0.14) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.50^{* *} \\ (0.12) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.52^{* *} \\ (0.13) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.41^{* *} \\ (0.13) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & -0.30^{*} \\ & (0.15) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.37 * * \\ (0.12) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.36^{* *} \\ (0.14) \end{gathered}$ |
| Age | $\begin{gathered} -0.01 \\ (0.00) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.01 \\ (0.00) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & -0.01^{*} \\ & (0.00) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & -0.01^{*} \\ & (0.00) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.01 \\ (0.01) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.01 \\ (0.01) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.00 \\ (0.00) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.00 \\ (0.00) \end{gathered}$ |
| School (8 dummy variables) Female*Tenure-Track | Controlled for but not reported | Controlled for but not reported -0.13 (0.20) | Controlled for but not reported | Controlled for but not reported 0.06 (0.19) | Controlled for but not reported | Controlled for but not reported -0.30 (0.21) | Controlled for but not reported | Controlled for but not reported -0.04 (0.20) |
| Constant | $\begin{array}{r} 4.43^{* *} \\ (0.27) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4.41^{* *} \\ (0.27) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 4.34^{* *} \\ (0.27) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 4.35 * * \\ & (0.28) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4.30 * * \\ (0.31) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4.24^{* *} \\ (0.31) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3.69^{* *} \\ (0.29) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3.68 * * \\ (0.29) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| Observations | 954 | 954 | 941 | 941 | 965 | 965 | 956 | 956 |
| R-squared | 0.125 | 0.125 | 0.106 | 0.106 | 0.077 | 0.079 | 0.076 | 0.076 |

Robust standard errors in parentheses

* significant at 5\%; ** significant at 1\%
${ }^{\dagger}$ This demographic group is controlled for in every model but its results are not reported because it contains less than 5 faculty.


## Table A5: Voice in Governance Decisions (Ladder Faculty)

| Dependent Variable: | Voice in Decision-Making |  | Raise Personal <br> Responsibilities when Scheduling |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Regressor | Baseline | (1) | Baseline | (1) | (2) |
| Female | $\begin{gathered} \hline-0.43^{* *} \\ (0.10) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \hline-0.27^{*} \\ & (0.14) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline-0.33^{* *} \\ (0.10) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline-0.06 \\ & (0.13) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline-0.02 \\ & (0.13) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |
| Asian/Pacific Islander | $\begin{gathered} -0.12 \\ (0.14) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.11 \\ (0.14) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.05 \\ (0.15) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.06 \\ (0.14) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.02 \\ (0.15) \end{gathered}$ |
| Black | $\begin{gathered} 0.16 \\ (0.27) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.17 \\ (0.27) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.20 \\ (0.28) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & -0.18 \\ & (0.28) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.34 \\ (0.30) \end{gathered}$ |
| Hispanic | $\begin{gathered} -0.35 \\ (0.26) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.32 \\ (0.25) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.26 \\ (0.29) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.21 \\ (0.28) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.16 \\ (0.28) \end{gathered}$ |
| American Indian/ Alaskan Native ${ }^{\dagger}$ | . |  | . | . |  |
| Unknown ${ }^{\dagger}$ | . |  | . | $\cdot$ | . |
| International | $\begin{gathered} -0.00 \\ (0.17) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.00 \\ (0.17) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.23 \\ (0.16) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.24 \\ (0.16) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.19 \\ (0.16) \end{gathered}$ |
| Tenure-Track | $\begin{gathered} -1.08^{* *} \\ (0.13) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.95^{* *} \\ (0.14) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.37 * * \\ (0.12) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.14 \\ (0.14) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.22 \\ (0.15) \end{gathered}$ |
| Age | $\begin{gathered} -0.02^{* *} \\ (0.01) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.01^{* *} \\ (0.01) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & -0.00 \\ & (0.01) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.00 \\ (0.00) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.01 \\ (0.01) \end{gathered}$ |
| School (8 dummy variables) | Controlled for but not reported | Controlled for but not reported | Controlled for but not reported | Controlled for but not reported | Controlled for but not reported |
| Female*Tenure-Track |  | $\begin{gathered} -0.37 \\ (0.21) \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} -0.65^{* *} \\ (0.20) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.59^{* *} \\ (0.20) \end{gathered}$ |
| Pre-School Age Children |  |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & -0.09 \\ & (0.13) \end{aligned}$ |
| School-Age Children |  |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & -0.19 * \\ & (0.10) \end{aligned}$ |
| College-Age Children or Older |  |  |  |  | $\begin{gathered} 0.14 \\ (0.13) \end{gathered}$ |
| Constant | $\begin{gathered} 5.00^{* *} \\ (0.29) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4.92^{* *} \\ (0.29) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3.80^{* *} \\ (0.29) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3.66 * * \\ (0.29) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4.14^{* *} \\ (0.35) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| Observations | 963 | 963 | 919 | 919 | 886 |
| R-squared | 0.135 | 0.138 | 0.074 | 0.086 | 0.087 |
| Robust standard errors in parentheses <br> * significant at 5\%; ** significant at $1 \%$ <br> ${ }^{\dagger}$ This demographic group is controlled for in every model but its results are not reported because it contains less than 5 faculty. |  |  |  |  |  |

Table A6: Impact of Respect from Colleagues and Students on Good Fit (Ladder Faculty)

| Dependent Variable: Good Fit |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Restricted |  | Restricted |  | Restricted |  |
| Regressor | Baseline | (1) | Baseline | (1) | Baseline | (1) |
| Female | -0.42** | -0.42** | -0.41** | -0.20* | -0.41** | -0.17 |
|  | (0.10) | (0.10) | (0.10) | (0.08) | (0.10) | (0.09) |
| Asian/Pacific Islander | 0.08 | 0.05 | 0.07 | 0.08 | 0.08 | 0.10 |
|  | (0.13) | (0.12) | (0.13) | (0.10) | (0.13) | (0.10) |
| Black | 0.18 | 0.26 | 0.18 | 0.19 | 0.19 | -0.01 |
|  | (0.27) | (0.25) | (0.27) | (0.19) | (0.28) | (0.25) |
| Hispanic | 0.03 | 0.07 | 0.09 | 0.21 | 0.09 | 0.08 |
|  | (0.24) | (0.23) | (0.24) | (0.17) | (0.24) | (0.19) |
| American Indian/ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Alaskan Native ${ }^{\dagger}$ | . | . | . | . | . | . |
| Unknown ${ }^{\dagger}$ | . | . | . |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| International | 0.20 | 0.21 | 0.20 | 0.05 | 0.19 | 0.16 |
|  | (0.16) | (0.14) | (0.16) | (0.12) | (0.16) | (0.13) |
| Tenure-Track | -0.35** | -0.21 | -0.34** | 0.05 | -0.33** | -0.07 |
|  | (0.12) | (0.12) | (0.12) | (0.09) | (0.12) | (0.10) |
| Age | -0.01 | -0.01 | -0.01 | -0.00 | -0.01 | -0.00 |
|  | (0.00) | (0.00) | (0.00) | (0.00) | (0.00) | (0.00) |
| School (8 dummy variables) | Controlled for but not reported | Controlled for but not reported | Controlled for but not reported | Controlled for but not reported | Controlled for but not reported | Controlled for but not reported |
| Respected by Students |  | $\begin{gathered} 0.48 * * \\ (0.06) \end{gathered}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Respected by Faculty |  |  |  | $\begin{gathered} 0.71^{* *} \\ (0.03) \end{gathered}$ |  |  |
| Value Research/ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Scholarship |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{gathered} 0.62 * * \\ (0.03) \end{gathered}$ |
| Constant | $4.50^{* *}$ | $2.31^{* *}$ | $4.49 * *$ | $1.28^{* *}$ | $4.49 * *$ | $1.56 * *$ |
|  | $(0.28)$ | (0.39) | $(0.28)$ | $(0.26)$ | $(0.28)$ | $(0.28)$ |
| Observations | 949 | 949 | 957 | 957 | 958 | 958 |
| R-squared | 0.044 | 0.113 | 0.041 | 0.400 | 0.042 | 0.303 |
| Robust standard errors in parentheses <br> * significant at 5\%; ** significant at $1 \%$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ${ }^{\dagger}$ This demographic group is controlled for in every model but its results are not reported because it contains less than 5 faculty. |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Table A7: Impact of Collaboration and Camaraderie on Good Fit (Ladder Faculty)

| Dependent Variable: Good Fit |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Regressor | Restricted Baseline | (1) | Restricted Baseline | (1) | Restricted Baseline | (1) | Restricted Baseline | (1) |
| Female | $\begin{gathered} \hline \hline-0.43^{* *} \\ (0.10) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline-0.11 \\ & (0.08) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \hline-0.43^{* *} \\ (0.10) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \hline-0.30^{* *} \\ (0.10) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline-0.42^{* *} \\ (0.10) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline-0.12 \\ (0.07) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \hline-0.44^{* *} \\ (0.10) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \hline-0.23^{*} \\ & (0.09) \end{aligned}$ |
| Asian/Pacific Islander | $\begin{gathered} 0.08 \\ (0.13) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.02 \\ (0.10) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.11 \\ (0.13) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.12 \\ (0.12) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.08 \\ (0.13) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.02 \\ (0.10) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.07 \\ (0.13) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.01 \\ (0.10) \end{gathered}$ |
| Black | $\begin{gathered} 0.18 \\ (0.27) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.16 \\ (0.18) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.20 \\ (0.27) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.20 \\ (0.23) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.18 \\ (0.27) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.05 \\ (0.17) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.18 \\ (0.28) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.32 \\ (0.26) \end{gathered}$ |
| Hispanic | $\begin{gathered} 0.09 \\ (0.24) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.04 \\ (0.22) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.05 \\ (0.24) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.01 \\ (0.22) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.09 \\ (0.24) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.16 \\ (0.14) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.10 \\ (0.24) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.32 \\ (0.20) \end{gathered}$ |
| American Indian/ Alaskan Native ${ }^{\dagger}$ | . | . | . | . | . | . |  | . |
| Unknown ${ }^{\dagger}$ | . | . | . | . | . | . | . | $\cdot$ |
| International | $\begin{gathered} 0.19 \\ (0.16) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.12 \\ (0.11) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.20 \\ (0.16) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.26 \\ (0.15) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.20 \\ (0.16) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} .0 .04 \\ (0.12) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.18 \\ (0.16) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.02 \\ (0.12) \end{gathered}$ |
| Tenure-Track | $\begin{gathered} -0.36^{* *} \\ (0.12) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.04 \\ (0.10) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.35^{* *} \\ (0.12) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.18 \\ (0.12) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.33^{* *} \\ (0.12) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.05 \\ (0.08) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.32^{* *} \\ (0.12) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.11 \\ (0.10) \end{gathered}$ |
| Age | $\begin{gathered} -0.01 \\ (0.01) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.00 \\ (0.00) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & -0.01 \\ & (0.01) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.01 \\ (0.00) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.01 \\ (0.00) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.00 \\ (0.00) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.01 \\ (0.00) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.01 \\ (0.00) \end{gathered}$ |
| School (8 dummy variables) <br> Collaboration Inside | Controlled for but not reported | Controlled for but not reported 0.59** (0.03) | Controlled for but not reported | Controlled for but not reported | Controlled for but not reported | Controlled for but not reported | Controlled for but not reported | Controlled for but not reported |
| Collaboration Outside |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & 0.33^{* *} \\ & (0.04) \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Collegial Environment |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{gathered} 0.65 * * \\ (0.02) \end{gathered}$ |  |  |
| Personal Interaction |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & 0.55 * * \\ & (0.03) \end{aligned}$ |
| Constant | $\begin{gathered} 4.55^{* *} \\ (0.28) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.94^{* *} \\ & (0.26) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4.53^{* *} \\ (0.29) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3.10^{* *} \\ (0.31) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4.47 * * \\ (0.28) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1.66 * * \\ (0.22) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4.47 * * \\ (0.28) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2.41^{* *} \\ (0.25) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| Observations | 948 | 948 | 936 | 936 | 959 | 959 | 950 | 950 |
| R-squared | 0.044 | 0.378 | 0.044 | 0.140 | 0.043 | 0.510 | 0.042 | 0.339 |

Robust standard errors in parentheses

* significant at 5\%; ** significant at 1\%
${ }^{\dagger}$ This demographic group is controlled for in every model but its results are not reported because it contains less than 5 faculty.

Table A8: Impact of Voice in Governance Decisions on Good Fit (Ladder Faculty)

| Dependent Variable: Good Fit |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Regressor | Restricted Baseline | (1) | Restricted Baseline | (1) |
| Female | $\begin{gathered} \hline-0.41^{* *} \\ (0.10) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline-0.15 \\ (0.08) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline-0.40^{* *} \\ (0.10) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \hline-0.22^{*} \\ (0.09) \end{gathered}$ |
| Asian/Pacific Islander | $\begin{gathered} 0.10 \\ (0.13) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.17 \\ (0.10) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.14 \\ (0.13) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.11 \\ (0.11) \end{gathered}$ |
| Black | $\begin{gathered} 0.18 \\ (0.27) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.12 \\ (0.20) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.03 \\ (0.31) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.15 \\ (0.29) \end{gathered}$ |
| Hispanic | $\begin{gathered} 0.09 \\ (0.23) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.25 \\ (0.16) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.03 \\ (0.24) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.17 \\ (0.18) \end{gathered}$ |
| American Indian/Alaskan Native ${ }^{\dagger}$ | . | . | . | . |
| Unknown ${ }^{\dagger}$ | . | . | . | . |
| International | $\begin{gathered} 0.20 \\ (0.16) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.21 \\ (0.14) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.21 \\ (0.16) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} . \\ 0.10 \\ (0.14) \end{gathered}$ |
| Tenure-Track | $\begin{gathered} -0.34^{* *} \\ (0.12) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.32^{* *} \\ (0.10) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.37 * * \\ (0.12) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & -0.17 \\ & (0.11) \end{aligned}$ |
| Age | $\begin{gathered} -0.01 \\ (0.00) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.00 \\ (0.00) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.01 \\ (0.01) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.01 \\ (0.00) \end{gathered}$ |
| School (8 dummy variables) Voice in DecisionMaking | Controlled for but not reported | Controlled for but not reported $\begin{gathered} 0.61^{* *} \\ (0.03) \end{gathered}$ | Controlled for but not reported | Controlled for but not reported |
| Raise Personal Resp. when Scheduling |  |  |  | $\begin{gathered} 0.51^{* *} \\ (0.03) \end{gathered}$ |
| Constant | $\begin{gathered} 4.51^{* *} \\ (0.28) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1.49^{* *} \\ (0.25) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4.47 * * \\ (0.29) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2.53^{* *} \\ (0.27) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| Observations | 957 | 957 | 913 | 913 |
| R-squared | 0.042 | 0.428 | 0.043 | 0.290 |

Robust standard errors in parentheses

* significant at 5\%; ** significant at 1\%
${ }^{\dagger}$ This demographic group is controlled for in every model but its results are not reported because it contains less than 5 faculty.

Table A9: Respect from Colleagues and Students (Non-Ladder Faculty)

| Dependent Variable: | Value Work/ <br> Contributions | Respected <br> by Faculty | Respected <br> by Students |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Regressor | Baseline | Baseline | Baseline |
| Female | $-0.44^{* *}$ | -0.26 | -0.05 |
|  | $(0.15)$ | $(0.15)$ | $(0.10)$ |
| Asian/Pacific Islander | 0.19 | -0.16 | -0.31 |
|  | $(0.29)$ | $(0.27)$ | $(0.29)$ |
| Black | 0.20 | 0.53 | 0.07 |
|  | $(0.37)$ | $(0.28)$ | $(0.16)$ |
| Hispanic | 0.50 | -0.32 | 0.14 |
|  | $(0.27)$ | $(0.63)$ | $(0.21)$ |
| American Indian/Alaskan Native ${ }^{\dagger}$ | $\cdot$ | $\cdot$ | $\cdot$ |
|  | $\cdot$ | $\cdot$ | $\cdot$ |
| Unknown ${ }^{\dagger}$ | $\cdot$ | $\cdot$ | - |
| International | -0.22 | 0.06 | 0.11 |
|  | $(0.25)$ | $(0.27)$ | $(0.17)$ |
| Age | -0.00 | 0.00 | 0.01 |
|  | $(0.01)$ | $(0.01)$ | $(0.01)$ |
| School (8 dummy variables) | Controlled for | Controlled for | Controlled for |
|  | but not reported | but not reported | but not reported |
| Constant | $4.22^{* *}$ | $3.62^{* *}$ | $4.13^{* *}$ |
|  | $(0.37)$ | $(0.36)$ | $(0.28)$ |
| Observations | 291 | 293 | 288 |
| R-squared | 0.091 | 0.075 | 0.043 |

Robust standard errors in parentheses

* significant at 5\%; ** significant at $1 \%$
${ }^{\dagger}$ This demographic group is controlled for in every model but its results are not reported because it contains less than 5 faculty.

Table A10: Collaboration and Camaraderie (Non-Ladder Faculty)

| Dependent Variable: | Collaboration Inside | Collaboration Outside | Collegial Environment | Personal Interaction | Excluded from Informal Network |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Regressor | Baseline | Baseline | Baseline | Baseline | Baseline |
| Female | $\begin{gathered} \hline-0.57 * * \\ (0.16) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline-0.46^{* *} \\ (0.17) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline-0.59 * * \\ (0.16) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \hline-0.38^{*} \\ & (0.15) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0.21 \\ (0.18) \end{gathered}$ |
| Asian/Pacific Islander | $\begin{gathered} -0.16 \\ (0.25) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.37 \\ (0.34) \end{gathered}$ | -0.01 $(0.32)$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.07 \\ (0.31) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.27 \\ (0.35) \end{gathered}$ |
| Black | $\begin{gathered} 0.04 \\ (0.43) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.16 \\ (0.48) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.29 \\ (0.41) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.41 \\ (0.40) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.54 \\ (0.70) \end{gathered}$ |
| Hispanic | $\begin{aligned} & 1.27 * * \\ & (0.20) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.94^{*} \\ & (0.44) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.68 \\ (0.46) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.23 \\ (0.39) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.51 \\ (0.59) \end{gathered}$ |
| American Indian/ Alaskan Native ${ }^{\dagger}$ | . | . | . | . |  |
| Unknown ${ }^{\dagger}$ | . | . | . | . |  |
| International | $\begin{gathered} 0.26 \\ (0.27) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.26 \\ (0.28) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.16 \\ (0.26) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.02 \\ (0.26) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.08 \\ (0.30) \end{gathered}$ |
| Age | $\begin{gathered} 0.00 \\ (0.01) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.01 \\ (0.01) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & -0.01 \\ & (0.01) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.01 \\ (0.01) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.00 \\ (0.01) \end{gathered}$ |
| School <br> (8 dummy variables) <br> Constant | $\begin{gathered} \text { Controlled for } \\ \text { but not reported } \\ 3.52^{* *} \\ (0.43) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Controlled for } \\ \text { but not reported } \\ 2.57^{* *} \\ (0.47) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Controlled for } \\ & \text { but not reported } \\ & 4.20^{* *} \\ & (0.40) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Controlled for } \\ \text { but not reported } \\ 3.96^{* *} \\ (0.39) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Controlled for but not reported 2.63** (0.47) |
| Observations | 279 | 262 | 291 | 288 | 275 |
| R-squared | 0.132 | 0.135 | 0.146 | 0.106 | 0.056 |

Robust standard errors in parentheses

* significant at 5\%; ** significant at $1 \%$
${ }^{\dagger}$ This demographic group is controlled for in every model but its results are not reported because it contains less than 5 faculty.

Table A11: Baseline Specifications for Voice in Governance Decisions (Non-Ladder Faculty)

| Dependent Variable: | Voice in DecisionMaking | Raise Personal Resp. when Scheduling |  | Understand My Role | Department is Hierarchical |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Regressor | Baseline | Baseline | (1) | Baseline | Baseline |
| Female | $\begin{gathered} \hline-0.52^{* *} \\ (0.18) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline-0.34^{*} \\ & (0.16) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline-0.38^{*} \\ & (0.16) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline-0.41^{*} \\ & (0.17) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0.27 \\ (0.17) \end{gathered}$ |
| Asian/Pacific Islander | $\begin{aligned} & -0.29 \\ & (0.33) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.02 \\ (0.32) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.10 \\ (0.33) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.46 \\ (0.30) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.13 \\ (0.36) \end{gathered}$ |
| Black | $\begin{gathered} 0.43 \\ (0.43) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.22 \\ (0.44) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.16 \\ (0.41) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.39 \\ (0.33) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.33 \\ (0.40) \end{gathered}$ |
| Hispanic | $\begin{gathered} 0.27 \\ (0.63) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.51 \\ (0.62) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.39 \\ (0.61) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.27 \\ (0.56) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.94^{* *} \\ (0.25) \end{gathered}$ |
| American Indian/ Alaskan Native ${ }^{\dagger}$ | . | . | . | . | . |
| Unknown ${ }^{\dagger}$ | . | . | . | . |  |
| International | $\begin{gathered} -0.28 \\ (0.28) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.16 \\ (0.24) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.09 \\ (0.26) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.27 \\ (0.27) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.37 \\ (0.26) \end{gathered}$ |
| Age | $\begin{gathered} 0.00 \\ (0.01) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.00 \\ (0.01) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & -0.01 \\ & (0.01) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & -0.02 \\ & (0.01) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.01 \\ (0.01) \end{gathered}$ |
| School <br> (8 dummy variables) Pre-School Age Children | Controlled for but not reported | Controlled for but not reported | Controlled for but not reported 0.17 <br> (0.27) | Controlled for but not reported | Controlled for but not reported |
| School-Age Children |  |  | $\begin{gathered} -0.36^{*} \\ (0.17) \end{gathered}$ |  |  |
| College-Age Children or Older |  |  | $\begin{gathered} -0.05 \\ (0.20) \end{gathered}$ |  |  |
| Constant | $\begin{array}{r} 2.76 * * \\ (0.48) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3.60^{* *} \\ (0.41) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3.94^{* *} \\ (0.53) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 3.99^{* *} \\ (0.46) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3.65 * * \\ (0.49) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| Observations | 282 | 257 | 245 | 265 | 286 |
| R-squared | 0.112 | 0.085 | 0.103 | 0.083 | 0.092 |

Robust standard errors in parentheses

* significant at 5\%; ** significant at $1 \%$
${ }^{\dagger}$ This demographic group is controlled for in every model but its results are not reported because it contains less than 5 faculty.

Table A12: Impact of Respect from Colleagues and Students on Good Fit (Non-Ladder Faculty)

| Dependent Variable: Good Fit |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Regressor | Restricted Baseline | (1) | Restricted Baseline | (1) | Restricted Baseline | (1) |
| Female | $\begin{gathered} \hline-0.40^{* *} \\ (0.15) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \hline-0.41^{* *} \\ (0.15) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline-0.48^{* *} \\ (0.15) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \hline-0.32^{*} \\ (0.13) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline-0.47 * * \\ (0.15) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.24 \\ (0.14) \end{gathered}$ |
| Asian/Pacific Islander | $\begin{gathered} 0.12 \\ (0.31) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.15 \\ (0.31) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.11 \\ (0.31) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.13 \\ (0.23) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.07 \\ (0.32) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.01 \\ (0.29) \end{gathered}$ |
| Black | $\begin{gathered} 0.30 \\ (0.30) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.29 \\ (0.28) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.35 \\ (0.30) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.07 \\ (0.23) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.33 \\ (0.30) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.25 \\ (0.22) \end{gathered}$ |
| Hispanic | $\begin{gathered} -0.75 \\ (0.67) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.79 \\ (0.66) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.69 \\ (0.68) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.52 \\ (0.47) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.67 \\ (0.67) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.91 \\ (0.75) \end{gathered}$ |
| American Indian/Alaskan Native ${ }^{\dagger}$ | . | . | . | . | . | . |
| Unknown ${ }^{\dagger}$ | . | . | . | . | . | . |
| International | $\begin{gathered} 0.08 \\ (0.23) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} . \\ 0.06 \\ (0.23) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.14 \\ (0.23) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.13 \\ (0.14) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} . \dot{15} \\ (0.23) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.27 \\ (0.17) \end{gathered}$ |
| Age | $\begin{gathered} 0.00 \\ (0.01) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.00 \\ (0.01) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.00 \\ (0.01) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & -0.00 \\ & (0.01) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.00 \\ (0.01) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.01 \\ (0.01) \end{gathered}$ |
| School (8 dummy variables) Respected by Students | Controlled for but not reported | Controlled for but not reported 0.21* (0.09) | Controlled for but not reported | Controlled for but not reported | Controlled for but not reported | Controlled for but not reported |
| Respected by Faculty |  |  |  | $\begin{gathered} 0.56 * * \\ (0.06) \end{gathered}$ |  |  |
| Value Work/Contributions |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{gathered} 0.48^{* *} \\ (0.06) \end{gathered}$ |
| Constant | $\begin{gathered} 3.85 * * \\ (0.38) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3.02 * * \\ (0.52) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3.86 * * \\ (0.38) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.85 * * \\ & (0.43) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3.72 * * \\ (0.38) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.66 * * \\ & (0.43) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |
| Observations | 279 | 279 | 284 | 284 | 283 | 283 |
| R-squared | 0.107 | 0.121 | 0.121 | 0.375 | 0.121 | 0.325 |
| Robust standard errors in parentheses <br> * significant at $5 \%$; ** significant at $1 \%$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Table A13: Impact of Collaboration and Camaraderie on Good Fit (Non-Ladder Faculty)

| Dependent Variable: Good Fit |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Regressor | Restricted Baseline | (1) | Restricted Baseline | (1) | Restricted Baseline | (1) | Restricted Baseline | (1) | Restricted Baseline | (1) |
| Female | $\begin{gathered} \hline-0.48^{* *} \\ (0.16) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline-0.20 \\ (0.14) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline-0.51^{* *} \\ (0.16) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \hline-0.41^{*} \\ (0.16) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline-0.49 * * \\ (0.15) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline-0.18 \\ (0.13) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline-0.49 * * \\ (0.15) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline-0.32^{*} \\ (0.14) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline-0.48^{* *} \\ (0.16) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline-0.44^{* *} \\ (0.15) \end{gathered}$ |
| Asian/Pacific Islander | -0.07 | 0.02 | -0.11 | -0.04 | 0.06 | 0.08 | 0.11 | 0.09 | 0.08 | 0.17 |
| Black | $\begin{gathered} (0.34) \\ 0.32 \\ (0.30) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} (0.29) \\ 0.32 \\ (0.26) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} (0.35) \\ 0.37 \\ (0.29) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} (0.32) \\ 0.41 \\ (0.25) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} (0.32) \\ 0.34 \\ (0.30) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} (0.23) \\ 0.21 \\ (0.23) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} (0.30) \\ 0.36 \\ (0.30) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} (0.25) \\ 0.18 \\ (0.24) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} (0.32) \\ 0.42 \\ (0.31) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & (0.29) \\ & 0.53^{*} \\ & (0.20) \end{aligned}$ |
| Hispanic | $\begin{gathered} -0.71 \\ (0.67) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & -1.29 \\ & (0.71) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.70 \\ (0.68) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.88 \\ (0.67) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.69 \\ (0.68) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -1.01 \\ (0.56) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & -0.67 \\ & (0.68) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.78 \\ (0.53) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.70 \\ (0.67) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.80 \\ (0.76) \end{gathered}$ |
| American <br> Indian/Alaskan <br> Native ${ }^{\dagger}$ | (0.67) | (0.71) | (0.68) | (0.67) | (0.68) | (0.56) | (0.68) | (0.53) | (0.67) | (0.76) |
| Unknown ${ }^{\dagger}$ | . | . | . | . | . | . | . | . | . | . |
| International | $\begin{gathered} 0.15 \\ (0.23) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.05 \\ (0.18) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.10 \\ (0.24) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.05 \\ (0.23) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.13 \\ (0.23) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.07 \\ (0.18) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.16 \\ (0.23) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.18 \\ (0.16) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.19 \\ (0.23) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.20 \\ (0.20) \end{gathered}$ |
| Age | $\begin{gathered} 0.00 \\ (0.01) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.00 \\ (0.01) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.00 \\ (0.01) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.00 \\ (0.01) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.00 \\ (0.01) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.01 \\ (0.01) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.00 \\ (0.01) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.00 \\ (0.01) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.00 \\ (0.01) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.00 \\ (0.01) \end{gathered}$ |
| School (8 dummy variables) Collaboration Inside | Controlled for but not reported | Controlled for but not reported $\begin{gathered} 0.45 * * \\ (0.06) \end{gathered}$ | Controlled for but not reported | Controlled for but not reported | Controlled for but not reported | Controlled for but not reported | Controlled for but not reported | Controlled for but not reported | Controlled for but not reported | Controlled for but not reported |
| Collaboration Outside |  |  |  | $\begin{gathered} 0.19 * * \\ (0.06) \end{gathered}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Collegial Environment |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{gathered} 0.47 * * \\ (0.06) \end{gathered}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Personal <br> Interaction |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{gathered} 0.44^{* *} \\ (0.06) \end{gathered}$ |  |  |
| Excluded from Informal Network |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{gathered} -0.20^{* *} \\ (0.05) \end{gathered}$ |
| Constant | $\begin{gathered} 3.77 * * \\ (0.38) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2.13 * * \\ (0.38) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3.90^{* *} \\ (0.40) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3.41^{* *} \\ (0.43) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3.89 * * \\ (0.37) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1.86^{* *} \\ (0.42) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3.82 * * \\ (0.38) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2.06 * * \\ (0.40) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3.80^{* *} \\ (0.39) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4.33^{* *} \\ (0.41) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| Observations | 273 | 273 | 257 | 257 | 284 | 284 | 281 | 281 | 268 | 268 |
| R-squared | 0.127 | 0.338 | 0.139 | 0.177 | 0.122 | 0.358 | 0.123 | 0.301 | 0.128 | 0.181 |

Robust standard errors in parentheses

* significant at 5\%; ** significant at $1 \%$
${ }^{\dagger}$ This demographic group is controlled for in every model but its results are not reported because it contains less than 5 faculty.

Table A14: Impact of Voice in Governance Decisions on Good Fit (Non-Ladder Faculty)

| Dependent Variable: Good Fit |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Regressor | Restricted Baseline | (1) | Restricted Baseline | (1) | Restricted Baseline | (1) | Restricted Baseline | (1) |
| Female | $\begin{gathered} \hline-0.43^{* *} \\ (0.15) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \hline-0.21 \\ & (0.14) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \hline-0.35^{*} \\ & (0.15) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline-0.18 \\ (0.14) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline-0.56^{* *} \\ (0.16) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline-0.46^{* *} \\ (0.15) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline-0.47 * * \\ (0.15) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline-0.39^{* *} \\ (0.15) \end{gathered}$ |
| Asian/Pacific Islander | $0.06$ | $0.18$ | $0.17$ | $0.22$ | $0.06$ | $-0.06$ | $0.12$ | 0.13 |
| Black | $\begin{gathered} (0.32) \\ 0.36 \\ (0.30) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} (0.26) \\ 0.19 \\ (0.20) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} (0.31) \\ 0.22 \\ (0.32) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} (0.27) \\ 0.13 \\ (0.22) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} (0.36) \\ 0.46 \\ (0.28) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} (0.32) \\ 0.36 \\ (0.27) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} (0.32) \\ 0.52 \\ (0.28) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & (0.32) \\ & 0.60^{*} \\ & (0.23) \end{aligned}$ |
| Hispanic | $\begin{gathered} -0.67 \\ (0.68) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.78 \\ (0.55) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.78 \\ (0.67) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.54 \\ (0.50) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.68 \\ (0.67) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.61 \\ (0.54) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.68 \\ (0.66) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.91 \\ (0.71) \end{gathered}$ |
| American <br> Indian/Alaskan Native ${ }^{\dagger}$ | . | . | . | . | . | . | . | . |
| Unknown ${ }^{\dagger}$ | . | . | . | . | . | . | . | . |
| International | $\begin{gathered} . \\ 0.10 \\ (0.25) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.21 \\ (0.20) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \dot{.} \\ (0.12 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} . \\ 0.19 \\ (0.22) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} . \\ 0.17 \\ (0.25) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} . \\ 0.10 \\ (0.23) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} . \\ 0.21 \\ (0.23) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} . \dot{12} \\ (0.21) \end{gathered}$ |
| Age | $\begin{gathered} 0.00 \\ (0.01) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.00 \\ (0.01) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & -0.00 \\ & (0.01) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.00 \\ (0.01) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.00 \\ (0.01) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.00 \\ (0.01) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.00 \\ (0.01) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.00 \\ (0.01) \end{gathered}$ |
| School (8 dummy variables) Voice in DecisionMaking | Controlled for but not reported | Controlled for but not reported $\begin{gathered} 0.40^{* *} \\ (0.04) \end{gathered}$ | Controlled for but not reported | Controlled for but not reported | Controlled for but not reported | Controlled for but not reported | Controlled for but not reported | Controlled for but not reported |
| Raise Personal Resp. when Scheduling |  |  |  | $\begin{gathered} 0.45 * * \\ (0.06) \end{gathered}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Understand My Role |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{gathered} 0.26 * * \\ (0.06) \end{gathered}$ |  |  |
| Department is Hierarchical |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{gathered} -0.25^{* *} \\ (0.05) \end{gathered}$ |
| Constant | $\begin{gathered} 3.77 * * \\ (0.38) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2.63 * * \\ (0.36) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3.83^{* *} \\ (0.40) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2.19 * * \\ (0.41) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3.85 * * \\ (0.40) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2.82^{* *} \\ (0.49) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3.70^{* *} \\ (0.38) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4.56 * * \\ (0.41) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| Observations | 277 | 277 | 252 | 252 | 261 | 261 | 277 | 277 |
| R-squared | 0.118 | 0.330 | 0.120 | 0.322 | 0.142 | 0.220 | 0.126 | 0.197 |

Robust standard errors in parentheses

* significant at 5\%; ** significant at $1 \%$
${ }^{\dagger}$ This demographic group is controlled for in every model but its results are not reported because it contains less than 5 faculty.


## WORKLOAD

- Hours Spent Working per Week
- Committee Service
- REASONABLENESS OF HARVARD's Expectations
- Sources of AcAdemic Stress


## Summary

The Workload section of the survey examines different aspects of the faculty's day-to-day responsibilities as they relate to teaching, research, and service. In this section we analyze only a subset of these issues, namely hours spent working per week, committee service, the reasonableness of Harvard's expectations and sources of academic stress. The remaining issues are highly dependent on a faculty member's School and academic discipline and, therefore, will be analyzed in separate School-specific reports to follow. ${ }^{55}$ The results of this section are summarized below.

## Hours Spent Working per Week

Tenured and tenure-track faculty work an average of 62 and 60 hours per week, respectively. Differences in the hours spent working are statistically significant according to a regression analysis of the ladder faculty that takes into account rank, gender, ethnicity, citizenship, age and School. This difference persists (in significance as well as magnitude) when also controlling for children and spouse's/domestic partner's employment status. ${ }^{56}$ Additionally, ladder faculty with pre-school age children work significantly fewer hours than those without children ( 3.59 hours on average).

Non-ladder faculty, meanwhile, work an average of 53 hours per week. As in the case of ladder faculty, non-ladder faculty with pre-school age children work significantly fewer hours per week than faculty with no children ( 8.58 hours on average). Furthermore, non-ladder faculty with spouses who are "not employed outside the home and not actively seeking employment" work significantly fewer hours than non-ladder faculty with employed spouses ( 7.18 hours on average).

## Committee Service

Tenured faculty report serving on the most committees of all faculty ranks, regardless of committee type. Moreover, tenured women serve on significantly more University/School committees than tenured men. The type of committees asked about on the survey are: graduate dissertation committees, department committees, University/School committees, and external professional committees/boards. ${ }^{57,58}$

[^29]
## Reasonableness of Harvard's Expectations

Tenured and tenure-track faculty, regardless of gender, report that expectations for service to their departments and Schools are too high. ${ }^{59}$ Meanwhile, tenured women report that expectations for service to the University are also too high, while tenured and tenure-track men report that they are too low. In fact, tenured women report that service expectations for all three areas are significantly higher than all other groups (i.e., tenure-track women, tenured men, and tenure-track men).

Tenured and tenure-track faculty also think that teaching expectations are about right, while tenure-track faculty think that research expectations are too high. Of all ladder faculty groups, tenure-track women express the most dissatisfaction with research expectations, reporting that they are significantly too high.

Meanwhile, both non-ladder men and women think the research expectations are too high. In contrast, both non-ladder men and women feel the expectations for teaching and service to the University are significantly too low.

## Sources of Academic Stress

Of the 15 potential academic sources of stress for ladder faculty and 16 for non-ladder faculty on the survey, Harvard faculty, regardless of rank, report that they are most stressed about their time for scholarly work. In addition to this issue, approximately one-third of tenured faculty respondents find 2 issues to be extensive sources of stress: (1) securing funding for research and (2) administrative responsibilities to the department or the University. Besides time for scholarly work, at least half of the tenure-track faculty find 3 issues to be extensive sources of stress: (1) scholarly productivity, (2) the review/promotion process and (3) securing funding for research. Less than one-third of the non-ladder faculty find all other areas besides time for scholarly work to be an extensive source of stress.

## Hours Spent Working per Week

A good indicator of the faculty's overall workload is the number of hours they spend working each week. Although this indicator does not tell us how faculty allocate their time among various activities, it does present a picture of how demanding the faculty's work responsibilities are as a whole. For this analysis, we look at the faculty's responses to the following question: "How many hours a week do you spend working? " ${ }^{60}$ Since this question does not specify hours spent working at Harvard, faculty may have included hours dedicated to work outside of the University in their estimates (e.g., external professional committees and consulting).

[^30]We begin by examining the average number of hours faculty report they spend working per week by rank and illustrate them in Figure W1 below. We do this because faculty of different ranks may have unique demands and work opportunities available to them. Note that we do include part-time faculty in these figures. ${ }^{61}$

Figure W1: Hours Spent Working per Week by Rank

|  |  | Hours Spent <br> Number of <br> Respondents |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Working per Week |  |
| Mean | Standard <br> Deviation |  |  |
| Tenured Faculty | 498 | 61.82 | 12.57 |
| Tenure-Track Faculty | 302 | 59.66 | 11.37 |
| Non-Ladder Faculty | 264 | 53.24 | 14.24 |

Ladder faculty (i.e., tenured and tenure-track) work between 60 and 62 hours per week on average, while non-ladder faculty work approximately 53 hours per week on average. (See Table W1 in the Workload Appendix for these results broken down by part-time and full-time faculty.) Since the factors that influence how much time faculty spend working per week may vary substantially by rank, we perform in-depth analyses of ladder and non-ladder faculty separately below.

## Ladder Faculty

This section analyzes the number of hours, on average, ladder faculty spend working per week. Figure W1 above provides summary statistics by rank and W2 below shows these statistics by gender.

Figure W2: Ladder Faculty Hours Spent Working per Week by Gender

|  |  | Hours Spent <br> Number of <br> Working per Week |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Standard <br> Respondents <br> Deviation |  |  |
| Gender | Men | 594 | 61.08 | 11.98 |
|  | Women | 206 | 60.78 | 12.72 |

From Figures W1 and W2 it appears that, on average, most ladder faculty work a similar number of hours per week. Regression analysis that takes into account rank, gender, ethnicity, citizenship, age and School (i.e., the baseline specification), however, reveals that tenure-track faculty spend significantly fewer hours working per week than tenured faculty. The model

[^31]predicts a 3.31 hour difference between these two groups. ${ }^{62}$ There are no other statistically significant demographic differences in hours spent working for ladder faculty. (See Table W2 in the Workload Appendix.)

In order to understand the relationship between family life and time spent working, we add the following 2 types of variables to the baseline specification: (1) having at least one child of various age categories (i.e., pre-school age children, school-age children, college-age or older children and no children) and (2) spousal employment (i.e., employed, seeking employment, unemployed (and not seeking), "other" employment status, and no spouse). ${ }^{63,64}$ (Spouse includes married and domestic partners.) The analysis shows that ladder faculty - regardless of rank with pre-school age children spend significantly fewer hours working per week than ladder faculty with no children ( 3.59 hour difference). Although a larger percentage of tenure-track faculty have pre-school age children (see the Life Outside Harvard section), controlling for children of different ages does not explain the difference in the hours spent working between tenured and tenure-track faculty. In particular, tenure-track faculty continue to work approximately 3 fewer hours on average than tenured faculty regardless of the composition of their family (including spousal employment status). (See Table W2 in the Workload Appendix for all significant results.)

## Non-Ladder Faculty

In order to explore potential demographic differences in the time non-ladder faculty spend working on average each week, Figure W3 provides descriptive statistics of their hours spent working per week by gender.

Figure W3: Non-Ladder Faculty Hours Worked per Week by Gender

|  |  | $\begin{array}{c}\text { Hours Spent } \\ \text { Number of } \\ \text { Respondents }\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{c}\text { Working per Week }\end{array}$ |  |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | Mean |
| Standard |  |  |  |
| Deviation |  |  |  |  |$]$

As in the case of the ladder faculty, non-ladder men and women report that they work approximately the same number of hours per week on average. Using the baseline specification, we find only statistically significant differences in age. In particular, older faculty members work fewer hours working per week than younger faculty. For every 10-year increase in age, for

[^32]example, the analysis finds that non-ladder faculty work 2.25 fewer hours per week on average. (See Table W3 in the Workload Appendix for all significant results.)

This age effect is no longer significant, however, if we add variables to the baseline specification for part-time status, having children of various ages, and spousal employment status. This analysis also reveals that faculty with pre-school age children (i.e., ages $0-4$ ) work 8.58 hours less per week than faculty with no children. Also, faculty with spouses who are "not employed outside the home and not actively seeking employment" work 7.18 hours less per week than faculty with employed spouses. (See Table W3 in the Workload Appendix for all significant results.)

## Committee Service

A significant part of the time faculty spend working each week may be devoted to service. Departments, as a result, are particularly concerned with maintaining an equitable distribution of committee assignments among the faculty, and likewise with protecting faculty, who have not yet been tenured, from dedicating too much time to committee work.

To illustrate differences in the distribution of committee assignments among faculty, Figure W4 illustrates the average number of committees the faculty have served on in the previous academic year disaggregated by rank and gender. Committee assignments are divided into four categories: graduate dissertation committees, department committees, University/School committees, and external professional committees/boards. ${ }^{65,66}$ The question on which this figure is based asks the faculty to "[p]lease indicate the number of committees (formal and informal) you served on and chaired during the previous academic year.,"67

[^33]Figure W4: Average Number of Committees Served on within the Previous Year by Gender and Rank

| $\square$ Tenured Women | ■ Tenured Men | $\square$ Tenure-Track Women |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $\square$ Tenure-Track Men | $\square$ Non-Ladder Women | $\square$ Non-Ladder Men |



The graph above illustrates that both tenured men and tenured women sit on more committees than men and women of the other two ranks. However, the graph also suggests that tenuredwomen serve on more of all 4 committee types than all other faculty groups. Adding interaction terms for rank and gender to the baseline specification and applying post-estimation F-tests, we find the following statistically significant differences (see Table W4 of the Workload Appendix for all significant results): ${ }^{68}$

- Gender differences within each rank: Relative to tenured men, tenured women serve on more University/School committees.
- Rank differences within gender:
o Relative to tenure-track and non-ladder women, tenured women serve on more of all 4 types of committees.
o Relative to non-ladder women, tenure-track women serve on more graduate dissertation committees.
o Relative to tenure-track and non-ladder men, tenured men serve on more of all 4 types of committees.
o Relative to non-ladder men, tenure-track men serve on more graduate dissertation committees and department committees.

We do not analyze other aspects of workload, such as course load, advising, and work submissions in this report, because these issues depend highly on a faculty member's School and

[^34]academic discipline. ${ }^{69}$ An analysis of these workload responsibilities will follow in separate School-specific reports.

## Reasonableness of Harvard's Expectations

An important aspect of the faculty workload is their sentiment regarding Harvard's workload expectations. This section analyzes this topic by investigating responses to the survey question that asks the faculty to rate the reasonableness of expectations at Harvard regarding the following 5 areas: research, teaching, service to one's department, service to one's School, and service to the University. Reasonableness is measured on a 5-point scale where $1=$ much too low, 2=too low, $3=$ about right, $4=$ too high and $5=$ much too high.

Over two-thirds of Harvard's faculty (i.e., 70-77\%) report that the expectations regarding each of these areas are "about right." ${ }^{70}$ Although the faculty express similar views about expectations regarding these 5 issues, ladder and non-ladder faculty often have different roles and responsibilities at the University, and, thus, encounter different expectations surrounding them. We, therefore, analyze ladder and non-ladder faculty separately in the remainder of this section.

## Ladder Faculty

Over two-thirds (i.e., 68-77\%) of Harvard’s ladder faculty find expectations regarding teaching, research and service to be "about right." The extent, however, to which ladder faculty find expectations regarding each of these areas to be reasonable varies somewhat by issue. To illustrate these differences, Figure W5 depicts the range of ladder faculty responses for each. The question on which this figure is based asks: "How reasonable are the expectations for the following at Harvard University?"

[^35]Figure W5: Reasonableness of Various Expectations at Harvard for Ladder Faculty


On average ladder faculty believe that the expectations regarding teaching and service to the University are about right. However, they think the expectations regarding service to their departments, research, and service to their Schools are significantly too high. ${ }^{71}$ (See Table W5 in the Workload Appendix and the text underneath it for a discussion of similar analyses at the School level.)

To determine if there are demographic differences in ladder faculty responses at the University level, we analyze expectations by rank and gender in the following 2 sections: (1) service expectations (i.e., service to one's department, service to one's School, and service to the University) and (2) teaching and research expectations. School-specific analyses of demographic differences in expectations surrounding these issues will follow in separate reports.

## Service Expectations (Ladder Faculty)

As illustrated in Figure W6 below, ladder men and women of both ranks regard the expectations for service to their departments and their Schools as too high. Tenured women also report that the expectations regarding service to the University are too high. In contrast, men of both ranks find them to be too low. ${ }^{72}$ (See Table W6 in the Workload Appendix and the text underneath it for a discussion of the ladder faculty sentiment about the service expectations by rank and gender.)

[^36]Figure W6: Ladder Faculty Average Reasonableness Ratings of Service Expectations Relative to "About Right" by Gender and Rank


To investigate these differences, we add a gender and rank interaction term to the baseline specification and apply post-estimation F-tests. The following gender differences within each rank and rank differences within gender are statistically significant (see Table W7 in the Workload Appendix for all significant results):

- Gender differences within each rank: Relative to tenured men, tenured women rate the expectations for all three services higher.
- Rank differences within each gender:
o Relative to tenure-track women and men, tenured women rate the expectations for all three services higher. ${ }^{73}$
o Relative to tenure-track men, tenured men rate the expectations for service to their departments and their Schools higher.

Of all faculty groups, tenured women, thus, find service expectations to be the least reasonable. To better understand why this is the case, we analyze and illustrate in Figure W7 the average number of service committees (i.e., department committees and University/School committees excluding dissertation committees) faculty report having served on in the previous academic year by gender and rank.

[^37]Figure W7: Average Number of Service Committees Faculty Served on at Harvard in the Previous Academic Year by Gender and Rank


As one might expect, Figure W7 indicates that in the previous academic year tenured women sat on the most service committees at Harvard of all four groups. Furthermore, these differences are statistically significant according to regression analysis. (See Table W8 in the Workload Appendix for all significant results.)

To determine whether these data regarding committees help to explain why tenured women, relative to other faculty groups, differ in their evaluations of service expectations, we add a variable for the number of committees served on to the regression analyses of all three types of service expectations. As expected, the more committees on which one serves, the higher one rates Harvard's expectations for all 3 service types. However, the effect is not large in magnitude. In particular, the models predict that for an increase of 1 service committee, there is a 0.03-0.06 point increase in ratings of the service expectations. Furthermore, even taking into account the number of service committees on which faculty report they have served, tenured women still find the service expectations (to one's School, department and to the University) to be higher than all 3 other faculty groups. (See Table W9 in the Workload Appendix for all significant results.)

## Teaching and Research Expectations (Ladder Faculty)

As illustrated in Figure W8 below, all faculty groups find expectations regarding teaching at Harvard to be "about right." 74 In contrast, all faculty groups except tenured men report that the expectations for research are significantly too high. ${ }^{75}$ Of all faculty groups, tenure-track women find expectations regarding research to be the highest. (See Table W10 in the Workload Appendix and the text underneath it for a discussion of the ladder faculty sentiment about the teaching and research expectations by rank and gender.)

[^38]Figure W8: Ladder Faculty Average Reasonableness Ratings of Teaching and Research Relative to "About Right" by Gender and Rank


From this graph it is clear that the tenure-track faculty report that the expectations regarding research are higher compared to tenured faculty. Specifically, only $56 \%$ of the tenure-track faculty indicate the research expectations at Harvard are "about right" compared to $84 \%$ of tenured faculty. The tenure-track faculty expressed a similar sentiment in the 2005/2006 Collaboration on Academic Careers in Higher Educations (COACHE) survey. In COACHE, $57 \%$ of tenure-track faculty said they were satisfied (either somewhat or very) with expectations of them as a researcher. Furthermore, their mean rating for this question was significantly below that of our peers.

To investigate these rank and gender differences, we add a gender and rank interaction term to the baseline specification for each issue and apply post-estimation F-tests. The following gender differences within each rank and rank differences within each gender are statistically significant (see Table W11 in the Workload Appendix for all significant results): ${ }^{76}$

- Gender differences within each rank: For both tenured and tenure-track faculty, women rate the expectations for research higher than their male counterparts.
- Rank differences within each gender: For both men and women, tenured-track faculty rate the expectations for research higher than their tenured counterparts.


## Non-Ladder Faculty

We now turn to the non-ladder faculty's sentiment regarding workload expectations. Approximately three-quarters (i.e., 73-79\%) of Harvard's non-ladder faculty - slightly more than ladder faculty at $68-77 \%$ - find expectations regarding teaching, research and service to be "about right." Figure W9 illustrates the range of their responses. The question on which this figure is based asks: "How reasonable are the expectations for the following at Harvard University?"

[^39]Figure W9: Reasonableness of Expectations at Harvard (Non-Ladder Faculty)

(1=much too low $2=$ too low $3=$ about right $4=$ too high $5=$ much too high $)$
On average, non-ladder faculty believe that expectations regarding research are too high, expectations regarding teaching and service to the University are too low, and expectations regarding service to their departments and their Schools are about right. ${ }^{77}$ (See Table W12 in the Workload Appendix and the text underneath it for discussion on similar analyses at the School level.) These trends are similar for non-ladder men and women. ${ }^{78}$ (See Table W13 in the Workload Appendix for the means for each demographic group.) Furthermore, using the baseline specification, we do not find any statistically significant gender-based differences in the extent to which non-ladder faculty find each expectation to be reasonable. (See Table W14 in the Workload Appendix for all significant results.)

## Sources of Academic Stress

Beyond asking the faculty about the reasonableness of their workloads, the survey also investigates the extent to which faculty find different academic issues and pursuits stressful. To determine potential sources of stress for the faculty, the survey asks "To what extent have the following been a source of stress over the past twelve months?" Stress is measured on a 3-point scale, where $1=$ "not at all," 2="somewhat," and 3="extensive." The surveys asks the faculty at

[^40]all Schools about the following 17 sources of stress ( 15 for ladder faculty and 16 for non-ladder faculty): ${ }^{79}$
(1) administrative responsibilities to one's department or the University
(2) advising responsibilities
(3) commuting
(4) department or campus politics
(5) external service responsibilities
(6) finding a tenure-track position (non-ladder faculty only)
(7) hiring and managing employees
(8) managing a research group or grant ${ }^{80}$
(9) process of obtaining reimbursements for travel and research-related expenses
(10) review of employment contract (non-ladder faculty only)
(11) review/promotion process (ladder faculty only)
(12) scholarly productivity
(13) securing funding for research ${ }^{81}$
(14) teaching responsibilities
(15) time for scholarly work
(16) timing of department meetings and functions ${ }^{82}$
(17) timing of School-wide or Harvard-wide meetings and functions

The issue that all faculty - regardless of rank - find to be the greatest source of stress is time for scholarly work. By greatest source of stress, we mean the issue that the largest percentage of respondents cite as an "extensive" source of stress and that has the highest mean stress level. The extent to which faculty find the remaining issues to be stressful varies considerably by rank. We, therefore, analyze the different sources of stress for each rank separately below.

## Tenured Faculty

This section analyzes which academic issues and pursuits the tenured faculty report as the most extensive sources of stress. Along with other summary statistics, Figure W10 illustrates the percentage of tenured faculty respondents that find each issue in the survey to be an extensive source of stress (the sources of stress are listed in order from the highest to the lowest percentage of respondents reporting each issue as an extensive source of stress). Over one-third of the tenured faculty find the following 2 issues to be extensive sources of stress: (1) time for scholarly work and (2) securing funding for research.

[^41]Figure W10: Tenured Faculty Sources of Academic Stress

|  | Number of <br> Respondents | \% of <br> Respondents <br> Reporting <br> Extensive | \% of <br> Respondents <br> Reporting <br> Somewhat <br> or Extensive | Mean | S.D. |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Time for scholarly work | 621 | $43 \%$ | $87 \%$ | 2.31 | 0.68 |
| Securing funding for research $^{\dagger}$ | 470 | $34 \%$ | $70 \%$ | 2.05 | 0.80 |
| Administrative responsibilities <br> to the department or the <br> University | 613 | $30 \%$ | $71 \%$ | 2.01 | 0.77 |
| Department or campus politics | 615 | $26 \%$ | $63 \%$ | 1.89 | 0.78 |
| Scholarly productivity | 623 | $19 \%$ | $73 \%$ | 1.92 | 0.68 |
| Managing a research group or <br> grant |  |  |  |  |  |
| Teaching responsibilities | 427 | $18 \%$ | $66 \%$ | 1.84 | 0.70 |
| Review/ promotion process | 573 | $14 \%$ | $41 \%$ | 1.55 | 0.72 |
| Hiring and managing employees | 570 | $14 \%$ | $54 \%$ | 1.68 | 0.70 |
| Timing of department <br> meetings and functions | 616 | $13 \%$ | $61 \%$ | 1.74 | 0.67 |
| Advising responsibilities | 621 | $11 \%$ | $57 \%$ | 1.68 | 0.66 |
| Process of obtaining <br> reimbursements for travel and <br> research-related expenses | 571 | $10 \%$ | $38 \%$ | 1.49 | 0.68 |
| External service responsibilities | 599 | $10 \%$ | $51 \%$ | 1.61 | 0.66 |
| Timing of School-wide or <br> Harvard-wide meetings and <br> functions | 605 | $10 \%$ | $51 \%$ | 1.61 | 0.66 |
| Commuting | 583 | $6 \%$ | $33 \%$ | 1.39 | 0.60 |

${ }^{\dagger}$ This question was not included on the HBS or HLS survey.
(1=not at all $2=$ somewhat $3=$ extensive)
Based on a population-weighted mean of these sources of stress (above), the average stress level for tenured faculty is 1.78 or just under "somewhat" stressed by all of these issues.

Using the baseline specification on each source of stress, we find that tenured women are significantly more stressed than tenured men by 7 of the 15 issues (See Tables W15 and W16 in the Workload Appendix for all significant results):
(1) time for scholarly work ( 0.32 point difference),
(2) scholarly productivity ( 0.32 point difference),
(3) teaching responsibilities ( 0.22 point difference),
(4) timing of School-wide or Harvard-wide meetings and functions (0.19 point difference),
(5) advising responsibilities ( 0.16 point difference),
(6) external service responsibilities ( 0.16 point difference), and
(7) timing of department meetings and functions ( 0.14 point difference).

## Tenure-Track Faculty

This section repeats the previous analysis for tenure-track faculty. Half or more of the tenuretrack faculty find the following 4 issues to be extensive sources of stress: (1) time for scholarly work, (2) scholarly productivity, (3) review/ promotion process, and (4) securing funding for research. Figure W11 provides summary statistics for each source of stress for tenure-track faculty, listed in order from the highest to the lowest percentage of respondents citing the item as an extensive source of stress.

Figure W11: Tenure-Track Faculty Sources of Academic Stress

|  | Number of <br> Respondents | \% of <br> Respondents <br> Reporting <br> Extensive | \% of <br> Respondents <br> Reporting <br> Somewhat <br> or Extensive | Mean | S.D. |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Time for scholarly work | 324 | $62 \%$ | $94 \%$ | 2.56 | 0.61 |
| Scholarly productivity | 326 | $57 \%$ | $93 \%$ | 2.50 | 0.63 |
| Review/ promotion process | 313 | $51 \%$ | $85 \%$ | 2.37 | 0.73 |
| Securing funding for research $^{\dagger}$ | 241 | $50 \%$ | $79 \%$ | 2.29 | 0.79 |
| Teaching responsibilities | 327 | $25 \%$ | $82 \%$ | 2.08 | 0.65 |
| Managing a research group or grant ${ }^{\dagger}$ | 219 | $23 \%$ | $66 \%$ | 1.89 | 0.75 |
| Department or campus politics | 322 | $21 \%$ | $54 \%$ | 1.75 | 0.78 |
| Process of obtaining reimbursements for <br> travel and research-related expenses | 316 | $12 \%$ | $40 \%$ | 1.52 | 0.70 |
| Advising responsibilities | 321 | $12 \%$ | $57 \%$ | 1.69 | 0.68 |
| Hiring and managing employees | 282 | $11 \%$ | $51 \%$ | 1.63 | 0.68 |
| Administrative responsibilities to the <br> department or the University | 318 | $9 \%$ | $52 \%$ | 1.61 | 0.65 |
| Commuting | 315 | $8 \%$ | $34 \%$ | 1.43 | 0.64 |
| Timing of department meetings and <br> functions | 324 | $7 \%$ | $50 \%$ | 1.57 | 0.62 |
| External service responsibilities | 305 | $5 \%$ | $34 \%$ | 1.40 | 0.59 |
| Timing of School-wide or Harvard-wide <br> meetings and functions | 316 | $3 \%$ | $34 \%$ | 1.37 | 0.54 |

${ }^{\dagger}$ This question was not included on the HBS or HLS survey.
( $1=$ not at all $2=$ somewhat $3=$ extensive)
Based on a population-weighted mean of these sources of stress (above), the average stress level for tenure-track faculty is 1.84 or close to "somewhat" stressed by all of these issues and slightly higher than that of tenured faculty (1.78).

Again, using the baseline specification on each source of stress, we find that tenure-track women are significant more stress than tenure-track men regarding 3 of the 15 issues (See Tables W17 and W18 in the Workload Appendix for all significant results):
(1) scholarly productivity ( 0.23 point difference),
(2) time for scholarly work ( 0.16 point difference), and
(3) department or campus politics ( 0.25 point difference).

## Non-Ladder Faculty

This section repeats the previous analysis for non-ladder faculty. More than two-fifths of the non-ladder faculty (41\%) find time for scholarly work to be an extensive source of stress. In contrast, less than a third of non-ladder faculty identify the remaining items as extensive sources of stress. Figure W12 provides summary statistics for each source of stress for non-ladder faculty, listed in order from the highest to the lowest percentage of respondents identifying the item as an extensive source of stress.

Figure W12: Non-Ladder Faculty Sources of Academic Stress

|  |  | \% of <br> \%umber of <br> Respondents <br> Reporting <br> Extensive | \%espondents <br> Respondents <br> Reporting <br> or Extensive | Mean | S.D. |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Time for scholarly work | 267 | $41 \%$ | $85 \%$ | 2.27 | 0.70 |
| Securing funding for research ${ }^{\dagger}$ | 196 | $28 \%$ | $67 \%$ | 1.95 | 0.78 |
| Scholarly productivity | 265 | $28 \%$ | $75 \%$ | 2.03 | 0.72 |
| Finding a tenure-track position | 190 | $27 \%$ | $41 \%$ | 1.68 | 0.88 |
| Review of employment contract | 253 | $23 \%$ | $45 \%$ | 1.68 | 0.82 |
| Department or campus politics | 265 | $21 \%$ | $50 \%$ | 1.71 | 0.79 |
| Teaching responsibilities | 284 | $19 \%$ | $76 \%$ | 1.95 | 0.65 |
| Administrative responsibilities to <br> the department or the University | 243 | $19 \%$ | $62 \%$ | 1.80 | 0.73 |
| Managing a research group or <br> grant ${ }^{\top}$ | 165 | $16 \%$ | $53 \%$ | 1.70 | 0.74 |
| Hiring and managing employees | 218 | $12 \%$ | $56 \%$ | 1.68 | 0.68 |
| Commuting | 278 | $12 \%$ | $37 \%$ | 1.48 | 0.69 |
| Advising responsibilities | 253 | $10 \%$ | $51 \%$ | 1.61 | 0.66 |
| External service responsibilities | 227 | $10 \%$ | $43 \%$ | 1.52 | 0.67 |
| Timing of department meetings <br> and functions | 263 | $7 \%$ | $49 \%$ | 1.56 | 0.62 |
| Process of obtaining <br> reimbursements for travel and <br> research-related expenses | 246 | $6 \%$ | $33 \%$ | 1.39 | 0.60 |
| Timing of School-wide or <br> Harvard-wide meetings and <br> functions | 246 | $3 \%$ | $33 \%$ | 1.36 | 0.55 |

[^42] ( $1=$ not at all $2=$ somewhat $3=$ extensive)

Based on a population-weighted mean of these sources of stress (above), the average stress level for non-ladder faculty is 1.71 or close to "somewhat" stressed by all of these issues and lower than that of both tenure-track faculty (1.84) and tenured faculty (1.78). ${ }^{83}$

Finally, using the baseline specification we find only 1 statistically significant gender difference for non-ladder faculty (see Tables W19 and W20 in the Workload Appendix for all significant results): women are more stressed than men regarding securing funding for research ( 0.45 point difference).

[^43]
## WORKLOAD APPENDIX

Table W1: Part-Time and Full-Time Hours Worked by Rank

|  | Part-Time Faculty |  |  | Full-Time Faculty |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Number of Respondents | Hours Spent Working per Week |  | Number of Respondents | Hours Spent Working per Week |  |
|  |  | Mean | Standard <br> Deviation |  | Mean | Standard <br> Deviation |
| Tenured Faculty | 19 | 58.03 | 18.19 | 470 | 61.99 | 12.30 |
| Tenure-Track Faculty | 5 | 64.80 | 22.25 | 287 | 59.61 | 11.07 |
| Non-Ladder Faculty | 65 | 48.03 | 16.72 | 191 | 54.81 | 12.96 |

## Faculty Climate Survey | Workload Appendix

Table W2: Hours Spent Working per Week (Ladder Faculty)

| Dependent Variable: <br> Hours Spent Working per Week |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Regressor | Baseline | (1) |
| Female | $\begin{gathered} \hline-0.47 \\ (1.05) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline-0.75 \\ (1.11) \end{gathered}$ |
| Asian/Pacific Islander | $\begin{gathered} 2.29 \\ (1.48) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1.56 \\ (1.54) \end{gathered}$ |
| Black | $\begin{gathered} 2.06 \\ (2.60) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2.07 \\ (2.76) \end{gathered}$ |
| Hispanic | $\begin{gathered} 0.07 \\ (2.31) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.46 \\ (2.50) \end{gathered}$ |
| American Indian/Alaskan Native ${ }^{\dagger}$ | . | . |
| Unknown ${ }^{\dagger}$ | . |  |
| Tenure-Track | $\begin{gathered} -3.31^{* *} \\ (1.18) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -3.33^{* *} \\ (1.22) \end{gathered}$ |
| International | $\begin{gathered} -0.03 \\ (1.76) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & -0.61 \\ & (1.78) \end{aligned}$ |
| Age | $\begin{gathered} -0.09 \\ (0.05) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & -0.18^{*} \\ & (0.07) \end{aligned}$ |
| School (8 dummy variables) | Controlled for but not reported | Controlled for but not reported |
| Pre-School Age Children |  | $\begin{gathered} -3.59^{* *} \\ (1.13) \end{gathered}$ |
| School-Age Children |  | $\begin{aligned} & -1.73 \\ & (0.93) \end{aligned}$ |
| College Ave Children or Older |  | $\begin{gathered} 1.01 \\ (1.49) \end{gathered}$ |
| Unemployed Spouse |  | $\begin{gathered} 0.02 \\ (1.19) \end{gathered}$ |
| Spouse Seeking Employment |  | $\begin{gathered} -1.38 \\ (2.16) \end{gathered}$ |
| Spouse with Other Work Status |  | $\begin{gathered} -2.57 \\ (2.35) \end{gathered}$ |
| No Spouse |  | $\begin{gathered} 1.68 \\ (1.88) \end{gathered}$ |
| Constant | $\begin{gathered} 68.49 * * \\ (3.03) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 73.76 * * \\ (3.71) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| Observations | 800 | 762 |
| R-squared | 0.042 | 0.059 |
| Robust standard errors in parentheses <br> * significant at 5\%; ** significant at $1 \%$ <br> ${ }^{\dagger}$ This demographic group is controlled for in every model but its results are not reported because it contains less than 5 faculty. |  |  |

Table W3: Hours Spent Working per Week (Non-Ladder Faculty)

| Dependent Variable: Hours Spent Working per Week |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Regressor | Baseline | (1) |
| Female | $\begin{aligned} & \hline-0.54 \\ & (1.98) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline-0.60 \\ (2.07) \end{gathered}$ |
| Asian/Pacific Islander | $\begin{gathered} -0.51 \\ (4.87) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.75 \\ (5.18) \end{gathered}$ |
| Black ${ }^{\dagger}$ | $\begin{gathered} -6.19 \\ (3.38) \end{gathered}$ | (5.8) |
| Hispanic | $\begin{gathered} -0.46 \\ (8.19) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -3.41 \\ (8.17) \end{gathered}$ |
| American Indian/Alaskan Native $^{\dagger}$ | (8.19) | (8.17) |
| Unknown ${ }^{\dagger}$ | . | . |
| International | $\begin{gathered} -3.51 \\ (2.89) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & -3.85 \\ & (2.74) \end{aligned}$ |
| Age | $\begin{gathered} -0.22^{*} \\ (0.11) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.26 \\ (0.15) \end{gathered}$ |
| School (8 dummy variables) | Controlled for but not reported | Controlled for but not reported |
| Part-Time |  | $\begin{gathered} -4.51 \\ (2.43) \end{gathered}$ |
| Pre-School Age Children |  | $\begin{gathered} -8.58^{* *} \\ (2.74) \end{gathered}$ |
| School-Age Children |  | $\begin{gathered} 0.98 \\ (1.91) \end{gathered}$ |
| College-Age Children or Older |  | $\begin{gathered} 1.26 \\ (2.59) \end{gathered}$ |
| Unemployed Spouse |  | $\begin{aligned} & -7.18 * \\ & (3.15) \end{aligned}$ |
| Spouse Seeking Employment |  | $\begin{aligned} & -4.79 \\ & (7.30) \end{aligned}$ |
| Spouse with Other Work Status |  | $\begin{gathered} 3.77 \\ (3.35) \end{gathered}$ |
| No Spouse |  | $\begin{gathered} -2.81 \\ (2.66) \end{gathered}$ |
| Constant | $\begin{gathered} 64.56^{* *} \\ (5.31) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 69.40^{* *} \\ (6.92) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| Observations | 264 | 245 |
| R-squared | 0.052 | 0.149 |
| Robust standard errors in parentheses <br> * significant at 5\%; ** significant at $1 \%$ <br> ${ }^{\dagger}$ This demographic group is controlled for in every model but its results are not reported because it contains less than 5 faculty. |  |  |

Table W4: Committees Served on with Gender-Rank Interactions (All Faculty)

| Dependent Variable: | Graduate Dissertation Committees | Department Committees | University/School Committees | External Professional Committees/Boards |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Regressor | (1) | (1) | (1) | (1) |
| Female | 0.35 | 0.27 | 0.82** | 0.45 |
|  | (0.51) | (0.18) | (0.22) | (0.24) |
| Asian/Pacific Islander | -0.13 | 0.21 | -0.07 | 0.33 |
|  | (0.37) | (0.26) | (0.18) | (0.31) |
| Black | -0.95 | -0.20 | 0.16 | 0.80 |
|  | (0.53) | (0.21) | (0.29) | (0.49) |
| Hispanic | $1.00$ |  |  | $-0.11$ |
|  | (0.93) | (0.25) | (0.37) | (0.50) |
| American Indian/ <br> Alaskan Native ${ }^{\dagger}$ |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Unknown ${ }^{\dagger}$ | . | . | . | . |
|  |  |  |  | 113** |
| Tenure-Track | $-1.61^{* *}$ | $-0.78 * *$ | $-1.04^{* *}$ | $-1.13^{* *}$ |
|  | $(0.34)$ | (0.18) | (0.17) | $(0.21)$ |
| Non-Ladder | -2.91** | -1.15** | -0.89** | -1.09** |
|  | (0.23) | (0.14) | (0.16) | (0.19) |
| Female*Tenure-Track | $-0.26$ | $-0.46^{*}$ | $-0.62^{*}$ | $-0.51$ |
|  | (0.62) | $(0.23)$ | (0.28) | $(0.30)$ |
| Female*Non-Ladder | -0.85 | 0.03 | -0.64 | -0.02 |
|  | (0.58) | (0.31) | (0.33) | (0.43) |
| International | -0.29 | -0.18 | -0.23 | -0.26 |
|  | (0.33) | (0.18) | (0.21) | (0.33) |
| Age | $-0.02$ | -0.02** |  | 0.02* |
|  | (0.01) | $(0.01)$ | $(0.01)$ | (0.01) |
| School (8 dummy variables) Constant | Controlled for but not reported | Controlled for but not reported | Controlled for but not reported | Controlled for but not reported |
|  | 5.68** | $4.01^{* *}$ | 2.12** | 1.94** |
|  | (0.66) | (0.33) | (0.35) | (0.42) |
| Observations | 1024 | 1105 | 1064 | 1009 |
| R-squared | 0.219 | 0.196 | 0.174 | 0.132 |

Robust standard errors in parentheses

* significant at 5\%; ** significant at $1 \%$
${ }^{\dagger}$ This demographic group is controlled for in every model but its results are not reported because it contains less than 5 faculty.

Table W5: Summary Statistics for the Reasonableness of Harvard's Expectations by School (Ladder Faculty)

|  | Service to <br> Department |  | Research |  | Service to <br> School |  | Teaching |  | Service to <br> University |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | Mean | S.D | Mean | S.D | Mean | S.D | Mean | S.D | Mean | S.D |
| Business | $3.15^{*}$ | 0.62 | N/A | N/A | $3.26^{*}$ | 0.69 | N/A | N/A | $2.79^{*}$ | 0.55 |
| Design | 3.15 | 0.53 | 2.88 | 0.71 | 3.04 | 0.54 | 3.15 | 0.53 | $2.62^{*}$ | 0.75 |
| Divinity | 3.36 | 0.85 | 3.14 | 0.64 | $3.82^{*}$ | 1.01 | 2.95 | 0.49 | 3.05 | 0.79 |
| Education | $3.81^{*}$ | 0.63 | 3.15 | 0.54 | $3.81^{*}$ | 0.63 | 3.08 | 0.27 | 3.04 | 0.45 |
| FAS | $3.40^{*}$ | 0.74 | $3.20^{*}$ | 0.58 | $3.19^{*}$ | 0.63 | 2.98 | 0.61 | $3.13^{*}$ | 0.63 |
| Government | 3.02 | 0.50 | 3.13 | 0.50 | $3.28^{*}$ | 0.67 | 3.02 | 0.49 | $2.82^{*}$ | 0.49 |
| Law | 3.18 | 0.74 | 2.84 | 0.58 | 3.18 | 0.74 | 3.06 | 0.51 | $2.80^{*}$ | 0.49 |
| Med./Dent. | 2.98 | 0.52 | $3.23^{*}$ | 0.64 | 2.98 | 0.55 | $2.85^{*}$ | 0.63 | $2.83^{*}$ | 0.60 |
| Public Health | $3.14^{*}$ | 0.51 | $3.48^{*}$ | 0.69 | 3.10 | 0.53 | 2.93 | 0.67 | 2.94 | 0.46 |

* Mean is significantly different from "about right" using a one-sample mean comparison t-test.
( 1 = much too low $2=$ too low $3=$ about right $4=$ too high 5=much too high)
Using a one-sample mean comparison t-test to see if any of the means in Table W5 are significantly different from "about right," we find the following statistically significant results for ladder faculty at the School level that are consistent with the ladder faculty University-level sentiment:
- HBS, GSE, FAS and SPH ladder faculty think the expectations for service to their department are too high.
- Ladder faculty at FAS, HMS/HSDM, and SPH feel the expectations for research are too high.
- HBS, HDS, GSE, FAS, and KSG ladder faculty believe the expectations for service to their School are too high.

However, ladder faculty at the University level feel the expectations for teaching and service to the University are about right, while at the School-level, we find the following statistically significant results:

- HMS/HSDM ladder faculty think the expectations for teaching are too low.
- HBS, GSD, KSG, HLS, and HMS/HSDM ladder faculty believe the expectations for service to the University are too low, while FAS ladder faculty feel these expectations are too high.
Finally, at all other Schools, ladder faculty on average believe each expectation is about right.

Table W6: Average Reasonableness of the Service Expectations by Rank, Gender and Ethnicity (Ladder Faculty)

|  |  | Service to <br> Department |  | Service to <br> School |  | Service to <br> University |  |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | S.D. | Mean | S.D. | Mean | S.D. |  |
| Rank | Tenured Faculty | $3.30^{*}$ | 0.73 | $3.22^{*}$ | 0.70 | 3.00 | 0.64 |
|  | Tenure-Track Faculty | $3.19^{*}$ | 0.57 | $3.14^{*}$ | 0.56 | $2.94^{*}$ | 0.55 |
| Gender | Women | $3.42^{*}$ | 0.74 | $3.40^{*}$ | 0.73 | $3.18^{*}$ | 0.67 |
|  | Men | $3.20^{*}$ | 0.65 | $3.12^{*}$ | 0.61 | $2.90^{*}$ | 0.57 |

* Mean is significantly different from "about right" using a one-sample mean comparison t-test.
( 1 = much too low $2=$ too low $3=$ about right $4=$ too high 5=much too high)
Table W6 illustrates the average ladder faculty reasonableness rating of each of the three service expectations by rank and gender. The stars signify means that are significantly different from "about right" (i.e., significantly too high or too low), using a one-sample mean comparison t-test. All other means are statistically similar to "about right."

All demographic groups think the expectations for service to their departments and service to their Schools are significantly too high, while tenure-track faculty and men think the expectations for service to the University are too low and women think they are too high.

## Faculty Climate Survey | Workload Appendix

Table W7: Service Expectations (Ladder Faculty)

| Dependent Variable: | Service to Department |  | Service to School |  | Service to University |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Regressor | Baseline | (1) | Baseline | (1) | Baseline | (1) |
| Female | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0.19 * * \\ (0.05) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0.28^{* *} \\ (0.07) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0.26 * * \\ (0.05) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0.40^{* *} \\ (0.07) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0.26 * * \\ (0.05) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0.40^{* *} \\ (0.07) \end{gathered}$ |
| Asian/Pacific Islander | $\begin{gathered} 0.05 \\ (0.07) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.05 \\ (0.07) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & -0.02 \\ & (0.07) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & -0.02 \\ & (0.07) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.01 \\ (0.07) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.02 \\ (0.07) \end{gathered}$ |
| Black | $\begin{gathered} -0.04 \\ (0.17) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.05 \\ (0.16) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.01 \\ (0.13) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.00 \\ (0.13) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.06 \\ (0.12) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.06 \\ (0.12) \end{gathered}$ |
| Hispanic | $\begin{gathered} 0.21 \\ (0.17) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.23 \\ (0.17) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.22 \\ (0.16) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.25 \\ (0.16) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.13 \\ (0.17) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.16 \\ (0.17) \end{gathered}$ |
| American Indian/ Alaskan Native ${ }^{\dagger}$ | . | . | . | . | . | . |
| Unknown ${ }^{\dagger}$ | . | . | . | . | . | . |
| Tenure-Track | $\begin{gathered} -0.23 * * \\ (0.07) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & -0.16^{*} \\ & (0.07) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.26^{* *} \\ (0.06) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.15^{*} \\ (0.07) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.17 * * \\ (0.06) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.05 \\ (0.06) \end{gathered}$ |
| International | $\begin{gathered} -0.02 \\ (0.07) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.02 \\ (0.07) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.04 \\ (0.07) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.04 \\ (0.07) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.04 \\ (0.06) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.04 \\ (0.06) \end{gathered}$ |
| Age | $\begin{gathered} -0.01^{* *} \\ (0.00) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & -0.01^{*} \\ & (0.00) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.01^{* *} \\ (0.00) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.01^{* *} \\ (0.00) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.01^{* *} \\ (0.00) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & -0.01 * \\ & (0.00) \end{aligned}$ |
| School (8 dummy variables) | Controlled for but not reported | Controlled for but not reported | Controlled for but not reported | Controlled for but not reported | Controlled for but not reported | Controlled for but not reported |
| Female*Tenure-Track |  | $\begin{gathered} -0.22^{*} \\ (0.10) \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} -0.32 * * \\ (0.10) \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} -0.33 * * \\ (0.09) \end{gathered}$ |
| Constant | $\begin{gathered} 3.76 * * \\ (0.15) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3.71^{* *} \\ (0.15) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3.59 * * \\ (0.15) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3.52^{* *} \\ (0.15) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3.42^{* *} \\ (0.13) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3.35^{* *} \\ (0.13) \end{gathered}$ |
| Observations | 998 | 998 | 986 | 986 | 988 | 988 |
| R-squared | 0.102 | 0.107 | 0.112 | 0.123 | 0.114 | 0.127 |

Robust standard errors in parentheses

* significant at 5\%; ** significant at $1 \%$
${ }^{\dagger}$ This demographic group is controlled for in every model but its results are not reported because it contains less than 5 faculty.

Table W8: Service Committees Served on in the Previous Academic Year (Ladder Faculty)

| Dependent Variable: <br> Service Committees Served on |  |
| :--- | :---: |
| Regressor | $(1)$ |
| Female | $1.19^{* *}$ |
|  | $(0.32)$ |
| Asian/Pacific Islander | 0.26 |
|  | $(0.44)$ |
| Black | -0.59 |
|  | $(0.43)$ |
| Hispanic | 0.38 |
|  | $(0.57)$ |
| American Indian/Alaskan Native ${ }^{\dagger}$ | $\cdot$ |
|  | $\cdot$ |
| Unknown ${ }^{\dagger}$ | $\cdot$ |
|  | $\cdot$ |
| Tenure-Track | $-1.94^{* *}$ |
|  | $(0.31)$ |
| Female*Tenure-Track | $-1.21^{* *}$ |
|  | $(0.41)$ |
| International | -0.43 |
|  | $(0.33)$ |
| Age | $-0.03^{*}$ |
|  | $(0.01)$ |
| School (8 dummy variables) | Controlled for |
|  | but not reported |
| Constant | $6.61^{* *}$ |
|  | $(0.67)$ |
| Observations | 808 |
| R-squared | 0.213 |
| Robust standard errors in parentheses |  |
| * significant at 5\%; ** significant at 1\% |  |
| ${ }^{\dagger}$ This demographic group is controlled for in every model but its results are not |  |
| reported because it contains less than 5 faculty. |  |

## Faculty Climate Survey | Workload Appendix

Table W9: Service Expectations with Gender-Rank Interactions and Service Committees Served on (Ladder Faculty)

| Dependent Variable: | Service to Department | Service to School | School to University |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Regressor | (1) | (1) | (1) |
| Female | 0.29** | 0.37** | 0.43** |
|  | (0.08) | (0.08) | (0.07) |
| Asian/Pacific Islander | 0.11 | 0.02 | 0.02 |
|  | (0.08) | (0.08) | (0.08) |
| Black | -0.11 | -0.02 | -0.03 |
|  | (0.18) | (0.14) | (0.11) |
| Hispanic | 0.21 | 0.14 | 0.15 |
|  | (0.19) | (0.18) | (0.23) |
| American Indian/ <br> Alaskan Native ${ }^{\dagger}$ |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| Unknown ${ }^{\dagger}$ | . | . | $\cdot$ |
| Tenure-Track | -0.07 | -0.02 | 0.00 |
|  | (0.08) | (0.07) | (0.07) |
| Female*Tenure-Track | -0.23* | -0.30** | -0.34** |
|  | (0.11) | (0.11) | (0.10) |
| International | 0.04 | -0.03 | 0.00 |
|  | (0.09) | (0.08) | (0.08) |
| Age | -0.00 | -0.00 | -0.00 |
|  | (0.00) | (0.00) | (0.00) |
| Committees Served on | 0.04** | 0.06** | 0.03** |
|  | (0.01) | (0.01) | (0.01) |
| School (8 dummy variables) | Controlled for but not reported | Controlled for but not reported | Controlled for but not reported |
| Constant | $3.34^{* *}$ | 3.01 ** | 3.08** |
|  | (0.18) | (0.16) | (0.15) |
| Observations | 802 | 794 | 796 |
| R-squared | 0.147 | 0.169 | 0.161 |

Robust standard errors in parentheses

* significant at 5\%; ** significant at $1 \%$
${ }^{\dagger}$ This demographic group is controlled for in every model but its results are not reported because it contains less than 5 faculty.

Table W10: Average Reasonableness of the Expectations for Teaching and Research by Rank, Gender, and Ethnicity (Ladder Faculty)

|  |  | Teaching |  | Research |  |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | S.D | Mean | S.D. |  |
| Rank | Tenured Faculty | 2.97 | 0.56 | 3.04 | 0.46 |
|  | Tenure-Track Faculty | 2.98 | 0.67 | $3.56^{*}$ | 0.75 |
| Gender | Women | 3.05 | 0.64 | $3.37^{*}$ | 0.70 |
|  | Men | $2.94^{*}$ | 0.58 | $3.14^{*}$ | 0.57 |

* Mean is significantly different from "about right" using a one-sample mean comparison t-test. (1=much too low 2=too low 3=about right 4=too high 5=much too high)

Table W10 illustrates the average ladder faculty reasonableness rating of Harvard's expectations for teaching and research by rank and gender. The stars signify means that are significantly different from "about right" (i.e., significantly too high or too low), again using a one-sample mean comparison t-test. All other means are statistically similar to "about right."

All faculty groups except tenured faculty think the research expectations are significantly too high, while the teaching expectations are close to "about right." (While men rate the teaching expectations significantly too low, their mean is quite close in magnitude to "about right.")

## Faculty Climate Survey | Workload Appendix

Table W11: Teaching and Research Expectations (Ladder Faculty)

| Dependent Variable: | Teaching |  | Research |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Regressor | Baseline | (1) | Baseline | (1) |
| Female | 0.11* | 0.08 | 0.14** | 0.11* |
|  | (0.05) | (0.06) | (0.05) | (0.05) |
| Asian/Pacific Islander | 0.11 | 0.11 | -0.14 | -0.14 |
|  | (0.07) | (0.07) | (0.08) | (0.08) |
| Black | 0.02 | 0.02 | 0.16 | 0.16 |
|  | (0.12) | (0.12) | (0.16) | (0.16) |
| Hispanic | 0.12 | 0.11 | 0.51** | 0.50** |
|  | (0.20) | (0.20) | (0.19) | (0.19) |
| American Indian/ <br> Alaskan Native ${ }^{\dagger}$ |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Unknown ${ }^{\dagger}$ | . | . | . | . |
|  | 0.01 |  | 0.54** | 0.51** |
| Tenure-Track | 0.01 | -0.02 | 0.54** | 0.51** |
|  | (0.06) | (0.07) | (0.07) | (0.07) |
| International | 0.01 | 0.01 | -0.12 | -0.12 |
|  | (0.10) | (0.10) | (0.09) | (0.09) |
| Age | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
|  | (0.00) | (0.00) | (0.00) | (0.00) |
| School <br> (8 dummy variables) <br> Female*Tenure-Track | Controlled for but not reported | Controlled for but not reported | Controlled for but not reported | Controlled for but not reported |
|  |  | 0.08 |  | 0.08 |
|  |  | (0.10) |  | (0.10) |
| Constant | 2.89** | 2.91** | 2.91** | 2.92** |
|  | (0.13) | (0.13) | (0.12) | (0.12) |
| Observations | 866 | 866 | 861 | 861 |
| R-squared | 0.023 | 0.023 | 0.223 | 0.224 |

Robust standard errors in parentheses

* significant at 5\%; ** significant at $1 \%$
${ }^{\dagger}$ This demographic group is controlled for in every model but its results are not reported because it contains less than 5 faculty.

Table W12: Summary Statistics for the Reasonableness of Harvard's Expectations by School (Non-Ladder Faculty)

|  | Research |  | Service to Department |  | Service to School |  | Teaching |  | Service to University |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Mean | S.D | Mean | S.D | Mean | S.D | Mean | S.D | Mean | S.D |
| Business | N/A | N/A | 2.96 | 0.43 | 3.00 | 0.38 | N/A | N/A | 2.71* | 0.53 |
| Design | 3.21 | 0.54 | 2.89 | 0.57 | 2.83 | 0.62 | 3.00 | 0.33 | 2.71 | 0.59 |
| Divinity | 3.33 | 0.52 | 2.67 | 0.82 | 3.50 | 1.22 | 3.00 | 0.00 | 3.17 | 0.41 |
| Education | 3.08 | 0.29 | 3.36 | 0.74 | 3.36 | 0.74 | 2.86 | 0.36 | 2.92 | 0.49 |
| FAS | 3.21* | 0.65 | 3.12* | 0.55 | 2.99 | 0.50 | 2.87* | 0.68 | 2.91 | 0.53 |
| Government | 3.18* | 0.49 | 2.89 | 0.52 | 2.87 | 0.50 | 2.92 | 0.45 | 2.79* | 0.46 |
| $\mathrm{Law}^{\dagger}$ |  | . |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Med./Dent. | 3.41* | 0.91 | 2.91 | 0.61 | 2.91 | 0.68 | 2.95 | 0.72 | 2.77 | 0.61 |
| Public Health | 3.37* | 0.74 | 3.07 | 0.38 | 3.00 | 0.49 | 2.67* | 0.62 | 2.96 | 0.52 |

* Mean is significantly different from "about right" using a one-sample mean comparison t-test.
${ }^{\dagger}$ We do not report results for the Law School because there are fewer than 5 non-ladder Law School faculty who responded to each of these questions.
( 1 = much too low $2=$ too low 3=about right 4=too high 5=much too high)
Using a one-sample mean comparison t-test to see if any of the means in Table W12 are significantly different from "about right," we find the following statistically significant Schoollevel results for non-ladder faculty:
- Research: Non-ladder faculty at FAS, KSG, HMS/HSDM, and SPH believe that these expectations are significantly too high.
- Service to one's department: Non-ladder faculty at FAS believe these expectations are too high.
- Service to one's School: Non-ladder faculty at all of the Schools think these expectations are about right.
- Teaching: Non-ladder faculty at FAS and SPH believe these expectations are too low.
- Service to the University: HBS and KSG non-ladder faculty think these expectations are too low.

Table W13: Average Reasonableness of Harvard's Expectations by Gender (Non-Ladder Faculty)

|  | Research |  | Service to <br> Department |  | Service to <br> School |  | Teaching |  | Service to <br> University |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Mean | S.D. | Mean | S.D. | Mean | S.D. | Mean | S.D. | Mean | S.D. |
| Women | $3.28^{*}$ | 0.76 | 3.05 | 0.61 | 3.02 | 0.60 | $2.84^{*}$ | 0.64 | $2.91^{*}$ | 0.48 |
| Men | $3.20^{*}$ | 0.54 | 3.04 | 0.52 | 2.97 | 0.53 | $2.89^{*}$ | 0.58 | $2.84^{*}$ | 0.55 |

* Mean is significantly different from "about right" using a one-sample mean comparison t-test.
( 1 = much too low $2=$ too low $3=$ about right $4=$ too high $5=$ much too high)
Table W13 illustrates the non-ladder faculty views of expectations by gender. The stars signify means that are significantly different from "about right" (i.e., significantly too high or too low), using a one-sample mean comparison t-test. All other means are statistically similar to "about right."

Both non-ladder men and women think Harvard's research expectations are too high, while teaching and service to the University expectations are too low.

## Faculty Climate Survey | Workload Appendix

Table W14: All of Harvard's Expectations (Non-Ladder Faculty)

| Dependent Variable: | Teaching | Research | Service to Department | Service to School | Service to University |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Regressor | Baseline | Baseline | Baseline | Baseline | Baseline |
| Female | $\begin{aligned} & \hline-0.08 \\ & (0.08) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0.08 \\ (0.09) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0.00 \\ (0.07) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0.02 \\ (0.07) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0.04 \\ (0.07) \end{gathered}$ |
| Asian/Pacific Islander | $\begin{gathered} 0.01 \\ (0.17) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.17 \\ (0.19) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & -0.02 \\ & (0.13) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.05 \\ (0.14) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.10 \\ (0.12) \end{gathered}$ |
| Black | $\begin{aligned} & 0.25^{*} \\ & (0.11) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.08 \\ (0.13) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.05 \\ (0.24) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & -0.17 \\ & (0.25) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.01 \\ (0.11) \end{gathered}$ |
| Hispanic | $\begin{gathered} 0.04 \\ (0.06) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & -0.25 \\ & (0.25) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.23 \\ (0.38) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.21 \\ (0.38) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.22 \\ (0.27) \end{gathered}$ |
| American Indian/ Alaskan Native ${ }^{\dagger}$ | . | . | . | . | . |
| Unknown ${ }^{\dagger}$ | . | . |  | . | . |
| International | $\begin{gathered} 0.01 \\ (0.12) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.06 \\ (0.15) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.01 \\ (0.09) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.04 \\ (0.09) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.01 \\ (0.09) \end{gathered}$ |
| Age | $\begin{aligned} & -0.01^{*} \\ & (0.00) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.00 \\ (0.00) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.00 \\ (0.00) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.00 \\ (0.00) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.00 \\ (0.00) \end{gathered}$ |
| School (8 dummy variables) <br> Constant | Controlled for but not reported 3.32** (0.20) | Controlled for but not reported 3.27** (0.22) | Controlled for but not reported 3.02** (0.20) | Controlled for but not reported 3.06** (0.17) | Controlled for but not reported 2.88** (0.20) |
| Observations | 290 | 277 | 308 | 298 | 297 |
| R-squared | 0.051 | 0.029 | 0.061 | 0.064 | 0.039 |

Robust standard errors in parentheses

* significant at 5\%; ** significant at $1 \%$
${ }^{\dagger}$ This demographic group is controlled for in every model but its results are not reported because it contains less than 5 faculty.

Table W15: Sources of Academic Stress (Tenured Faculty)

| Dependent Variable: | Scholarly Productivity | Teaching Responsibilities | Advising Responsibilities | Administrative Responsibilities | External Service Responsibilities | Time for Scholarly Work | Timing of Department Meetings | Timing of School/Univ. Meetings |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Regressor | Baseline | Baseline | Baseline | Baseline | Baseline | Baseline | Baseline | Baseline |
| Female | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0.32 * * \\ (0.07) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0.22^{* *} \\ (0.06) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 0.16^{*} \\ & (0.07) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.06 \\ (0.07) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 0.16^{*} \\ & (0.07) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0.32 * * \\ (0.06) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 0.14^{*} \\ & (0.07) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0.19 * * \\ (0.07) \end{gathered}$ |
| Asian/Pacific Islander | $\begin{gathered} -0.16 \\ (0.10) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.03 \\ (0.11) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.14 \\ (0.10) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.01 \\ (0.12) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.27^{*} \\ & (0.12) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.08 \\ (0.10) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.02 \\ (0.11) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.01 \\ (0.12) \end{gathered}$ |
| Black | $\begin{gathered} 0.10 \\ (0.14) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.17 \\ (0.16) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.03 \\ (0.18) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.27 \\ (0.16) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.51^{* *} \\ (0.18) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.08 \\ (0.16) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.35^{*} \\ & (0.14) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.19 \\ (0.11) \end{gathered}$ |
| Hispanic | $\begin{gathered} -0.30 \\ (0.22) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.05 \\ (0.20) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.17 \\ (0.24) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.13 \\ (0.24) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.09 \\ (0.27) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.01 \\ (0.25) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.51^{* *} \\ (0.17) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.38 \\ (0.21) \end{gathered}$ |
| American Indian/ Alaskan Native ${ }^{\dagger}$ | . | . | . | . | . | . | . |  |
| Unknown ${ }^{\dagger}$ | . | . | . | . |  | . | . | . |
| International | $\begin{aligned} & -0.43^{*} \\ & (0.17) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.09 \\ (0.20) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} . \dot{0} \\ 0.07 \\ (0.19) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.20 \\ (0.21) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.14 \\ (0.17) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.18 \\ (0.15) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & -0.10 \\ & (0.12) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.16 \\ (0.16) \end{gathered}$ |
| Age | $\begin{gathered} -0.01^{* *} \\ (0.00) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.01^{* *} \\ (0.00) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.01^{* *} \\ (0.00) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.02^{* *} \\ (0.00) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.01^{*} \\ (0.00) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.01^{* *} \\ (0.00) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & -0.00 \\ & (0.00) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.00 \\ (0.00) \end{gathered}$ |
| School (8 dummy variables) Constant | Controlled for but not reported 2.68** (0.17) | Controlled for but not reported 2.48** (0.17) | Controlled for but not reported 2.28** (0.16) | Controlled for but not reported 3.29** (0.19) | Controlled for but not reported 1.92** (0.17) | Controlled for but not reported 3.10** (0.17) | Controlled for but not reported 2.00** (0.18) | Controlled for but not reported 1.76** (0.16) |
| Observations | 623 | 626 | 621 | 613 | 599 | 621 | 616 | 605 |
| R-squared | 0.125 | 0.080 | 0.107 | 0.155 | 0.098 | 0.129 | 0.073 | 0.075 |

Robust standard errors in parentheses

* significant at $5 \%$; ** significant at $1 \%$
${ }^{\dagger}$ This demographic group is controlled for in every model but its results are not reported because it contains less than 5 faculty.

Table W16: Sources of Academic Stress Continued (Tenured Faculty)

| Dependent Variable: | Commuting | Department or Campus Politics | Review/ Promotion Process | Hiring and Managing Employees | Managing a Research Group or Grant | Securing <br> Funding for Research | Process of Obtaining Reimbursements |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Regressor | Baseline | Baseline | Baseline | Baseline | Baseline | Baseline | Baseline |
| Female | $\begin{gathered} 0.06 \\ (0.07) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.13 \\ (0.07) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline-0.04 \\ & (0.08) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.11 \\ (0.08) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.01 \\ (0.09) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline-0.01 \\ & (0.09) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.02 \\ (0.07) \end{gathered}$ |
| Asian/Pacific Islander | $\begin{gathered} 0.12 \\ (0.11) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.09 \\ (0.14) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.05 \\ (0.12) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.01 \\ (0.14) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.02 \\ (0.13) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.13 \\ (0.14) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.28^{*} \\ & (0.12) \end{aligned}$ |
| Black | $\begin{gathered} -0.04 \\ (0.14) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.16 \\ (0.15) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.22 \\ (0.24) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.46^{* *} \\ (0.17) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.26 \\ (0.23) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.04 \\ (0.22) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.09 \\ (0.21) \end{gathered}$ |
| Hispanic | $\begin{gathered} -0.11 \\ (0.14) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.08 \\ (0.25) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.10 \\ (0.26) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.58^{*} \\ & (0.26) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.20 \\ (0.35) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.05 \\ (0.25) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.00 \\ (0.25) \end{gathered}$ |
| American Indian/ Alaskan Native ${ }^{\dagger}$ | (0.14) | (0.25) | (0.26) | (0.26) | (0.35) | (0.25) |  |
| Unknown ${ }^{\dagger}$ | . | . | . | . | . | . | . |
| International | $\begin{gathered} 0.13 \\ (0.23) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.17 \\ (0.19) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.36^{*} \\ (0.16) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.21 \\ (0.14) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.53 * * \\ (0.17) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.22 \\ (0.23) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.09 \\ (0.17) \end{gathered}$ |
| Age | $\begin{gathered} -0.00 \\ (0.00) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.01^{* *} \\ (0.00) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.00 \\ (0.00) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.01^{* *} \\ (0.00) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & -0.01^{*} \\ & (0.00) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & -0.01 \\ & (0.00) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.00 \\ (0.00) \end{gathered}$ |
| School <br> (8 dummy variables) <br> Constant | Controlled for but not reported 1.52** (0.16) | Controlled for but not reported 2.72** (0.20) | Controlled for <br> but not <br> reported <br> $1.83^{* *}$ <br> $(0.19)$ | Controlled for but not reported 2.39** (0.17) | Controlled for but not reported 2.29** (0.21) | Controlled for but not reported 2.33** (0.23) | Controlled for but not reported 1.35** (0.19) |
| Observations | 583 | 615 | 573 | 570 | 427 | 470 | 571 |
| R-squared | 0.045 | 0.113 | 0.077 | 0.082 | 0.099 | 0.142 | 0.037 |

Robust standard errors in parentheses

* significant at $5 \%$; ** significant at $1 \%$
${ }^{\dagger}$ This demographic group is controlled for in every model but its results are not reported because it contains less than 5 faculty.


## Table W17: Sources of Academic Stress (Tenure-Track Faculty)

| Dependent Variable: | Scholarly Productivity | Teaching Responsibilities | Advising Responsibilities | Administrative Responsibilities | External Service Responsibilities | Time for Scholarly Work | Timing of Dept. Meetings | Timing of School/Univ. Meetings |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Regressor | Baseline | Baseline | Baseline | Baseline | Baseline | Baseline | Baseline | Baseline |
| Female | $\begin{gathered} \hline \hline 0.23^{* *} \\ (0.07) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0.14 \\ (0.08) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline-0.02 \\ & (0.08) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.08 \\ (0.08) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline-0.01 \\ (0.07) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 0.16^{*} \\ & (0.07) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0.08 \\ (0.07) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0.03 \\ (0.06) \end{gathered}$ |
| Asian/Pacific Islander | $\begin{gathered} -0.13 \\ (0.11) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.05 \\ (0.10) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.09 \\ (0.10) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.13 \\ (0.11) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.05 \\ (0.09) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.05 \\ (0.09) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.14 \\ (0.10) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.01 \\ (0.09) \end{gathered}$ |
| Black | $\begin{gathered} 0.18 \\ (0.15) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.15 \\ (0.24) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.21 \\ (0.23) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & -0.13 \\ & (0.18) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.21 \\ (0.17) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.23 \\ (0.14) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.29 \\ (0.22) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.34 \\ (0.23) \end{gathered}$ |
| Hispanic | $\begin{gathered} 0.10 \\ (0.12) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.06 \\ (0.15) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.36 \\ (0.22) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.33 \\ (0.23) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.06 \\ (0.22) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.23 \\ (0.14) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.30 \\ (0.22) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.21 \\ (0.18) \end{gathered}$ |
| American Indian/ Alaskan Native ${ }^{\dagger}$ | . | . | . |  | . |  | . |  |
| Unknown ${ }^{\dagger}$ | . | . | . |  | . |  | . | . |
| International | $\begin{gathered} -0.28^{* *} \\ (0.10) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.01 \\ (0.11) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.01 \\ (0.11) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.05 \\ (0.10) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.01 \\ (0.11) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.10 \\ (0.10) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.04 \\ (0.09) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.06 \\ (0.08) \end{gathered}$ |
| Age | $\begin{gathered} 0.00 \\ (0.01) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.00 \\ (0.01) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.01 \\ (0.01) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.01^{*} \\ & (0.01) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.01 \\ (0.01) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.01 \\ (0.01) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.02 * * \\ (0.01) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.01 \\ (0.01) \end{gathered}$ |
| School <br> (8 dummy variables) | Controlled for but not reported | Controlled for but not reported | Controlled for but not reported | Controlled for but not reported | Controlled for but not reported | Controlled for but not reported | Controlled for but not reported | Controlled for but not reported |
| Constant | $\begin{gathered} 2.49 * * \\ (0.25) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2.21^{* *} \\ (0.29) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1.44^{* *} \\ (0.26) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1.13^{* *} \\ (0.27) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.25^{* *} \\ & (0.24) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2.24^{* *} \\ (0.25) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.91^{* *} \\ (0.25) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1.04^{* *} \\ (0.21) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| Observations | 326 | 327 | 321 | 318 | 305 | 324 | 324 | 316 |
| R-squared | 0.129 | 0.115 | 0.168 | 0.083 | 0.071 | 0.131 | 0.095 | 0.094 |

Robust standard errors in parentheses

* significant at 5\%; ** significant at $1 \%$
${ }^{\dagger}$ This demographic group is controlled for in every model but its results are not reported because it contains less than 5 faculty.

Table W18: Sources of Academic Stress (Tenure-Track Faculty)

| Dependent Variable: | Commuting | Dept. or Campus Politics | Review/ Promotion Process | Hiring and Managing Employees | Managing a Research Group or Grant | Securing Funding for Research | Process of Obtaining Reimbursements |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Regressor | Baseline | Baseline | Baseline | Baseline | Baseline | Baseline | Baseline |
| Female | $\begin{gathered} 0.10 \\ (0.07) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \hline 0.25^{* *} \\ (0.09) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0.07 \\ (0.08) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline-0.07 \\ (0.08) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.03 \\ (0.11) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.11 \\ (0.10) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0.07 \\ (0.08) \end{gathered}$ |
| Asian/Pacific Islander | $\begin{gathered} 0.06 \\ (0.10) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.01 \\ (0.12) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.01 \\ (0.10) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.20 \\ (0.11) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.09 \\ (0.14) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.22 \\ (0.13) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.08 \\ (0.11) \end{gathered}$ |
| Black | $\begin{gathered} 0.46 \\ (0.24) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.47^{*} \\ & (0.19) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.04 \\ (0.23) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.06 \\ (0.23) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.16 \\ (0.32) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.25 \\ (0.26) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.12 \\ (0.27) \end{gathered}$ |
| Hispanic | $\begin{gathered} 0.02 \\ (0.18) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.22 \\ (0.22) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.20 \\ (0.18) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.12 \\ (0.20) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.27 \\ (0.23) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.11 \\ (0.26) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.45^{* *} \\ (0.17) \end{gathered}$ |
| American Indian/ Alaskan Native ${ }^{\dagger}$ | . | . | . | . | . | . | . |
| Unknown ${ }^{\dagger}$ | . | . | . | . |  | . | . |
| International | $\begin{gathered} -0.11 \\ (0.10) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.06 \\ (0.13) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.45^{* *} \\ (0.13) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.03 \\ (0.11) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.15 \\ (0.13) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.05 \\ (0.14) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.04 \\ (0.12) \end{gathered}$ |
| Age | $\begin{gathered} -0.00 \\ (0.01) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.02^{* *} \\ (0.01) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.03^{* *} \\ (0.01) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.00 \\ (0.01) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.01 \\ (0.01) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.00 \\ (0.01) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.01 \\ (0.01) \end{gathered}$ |
| School (8 dummy variables) <br> Constant | Controlled for but not reported 1.42** (0.23) | Controlled for but not reported 0.85** (0.29) | Controlled for but not reported 1.26** (0.33) | Controlled for but not reported 1.83** (0.28) | Controlled for but not reported 1.52** (0.34) | Controlled for but not reported 2.19** (0.38) | Controlled for but not reported 1.98** (0.27) |
| Observations | 315 | 322 | 313 | 282 | 219 | 241 | 316 |
| R -squared | 0.086 | 0.129 | 0.175 | 0.092 | 0.130 | 0.183 | 0.109 |

Robust standard errors in parentheses

* significant at 5\%; ** significant at $1 \%$
${ }^{\dagger}$ This demographic group is controlled for in every model but its results are not reported because it contains less than 5 faculty.

Table W19: Sources of Academic Stress (Non-Ladder Faculty)

| Dependent Variable: | Scholarly Productivity | Teaching Responsibilities | Advising Responsibilities | Administrative Responsibilities | External Service Responsibilities | Time for Scholarly Work | Timing of Dept. Meetings | Timing of School/Univ. Meetings |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Regressor | Baseline | Baseline | Baseline | Baseline | Baseline | Baseline | Baseline | Baseline |
| Female | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0.12 \\ (0.10) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.11 \\ (0.08) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.09 \\ (0.09) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0.06 \\ (0.10) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.06 \\ (0.10) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0.12 \\ (0.09) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0.03 \\ (0.08) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0.11 \\ (0.08) \end{gathered}$ |
| Asian/Pacific Islander | $\begin{gathered} 0.17 \\ (0.20) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.15 \\ (0.16) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.06 \\ (0.17) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.16 \\ (0.22) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.18 \\ (0.16) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.02 \\ (0.18) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.06 \\ (0.19) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.02 \\ (0.21) \end{gathered}$ |
| Black | $\begin{gathered} -0.27 \\ (0.17) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.13 \\ (0.18) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.70^{*} \\ & (0.28) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.05 \\ (0.17) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.22 \\ (0.29) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.02 \\ (0.14) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.45 \\ (0.31) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.20 \\ (0.17) \end{gathered}$ |
| Hispanic ${ }^{\dagger}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.28 \\ (0.33) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.59 \\ (0.37) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.38 \\ (0.21) \end{gathered}$ | (0.17) | (0.29) | $\begin{gathered} 0.29 \\ (0.31) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.76 * * \\ (0.21) \end{gathered}$ | (0.7) |
| American Indian/ Alaskan Native ${ }^{\dagger}$ | . | . | . |  | . | . | . | . |
| Unknown ${ }^{\dagger}$ | . | . | . |  |  |  |  |  |
| International | $\begin{gathered} -0.01 \\ (0.16) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.15 \\ (0.15) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.09 \\ (0.16) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.31 \\ (0.16) \end{gathered}$ | 0.09 <br> (0.17) | $\begin{gathered} -0.13 \\ (0.15) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.18 \\ (0.13) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.20 \\ (0.13) \end{gathered}$ |
| Age | $\begin{gathered} -0.02^{* *} \\ (0.00) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.02^{* *} \\ (0.00) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.01^{* *} \\ (0.00) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & -0.01^{*} \\ & (0.01) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.01 \\ (0.01) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.01^{* *} \\ (0.00) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.00 \\ (0.00) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.00 \\ (0.00) \end{gathered}$ |
| School (8 dummy variables) | Controlled for but not | Controlled for but not | Controlled for but not | Controlled for but not | Controlled for but not | Controlled for but not | Controlled for but not | Controlled for but not |
| Constant | $\begin{gathered} \text { reported } \\ 2.84^{* *} \\ (0.25) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { reported } \\ 2.93^{* *} \\ (0.22) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { reported } \\ 2.32^{* *} \\ (0.25) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { reported } \\ 2.46^{* *} \\ (0.28) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { reported } \\ 2.01^{* *} \\ (0.29) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { reported } \\ 3.01^{* *} \\ (0.26) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { reported } \\ 1.74^{* *} \\ (0.24) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { reported } \\ 1.33^{* *} \\ (0.22) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| Observations | 265 | 284 | 253 | 243 | 227 | 267 | 263 | 246 |
| R-squared | 0.166 | 0.168 | 0.208 | 0.135 | 0.071 | 0.183 | 0.090 | 0.084 |

Robust standard errors in parentheses

* significant at 5\%; ** significant at $1 \%$
${ }^{\dagger}$ This demographic group is controlled for in every model but its results are not reported because it contains less than 5 faculty.

Table W20: Sources of Academic Stress Continued (Non-Ladder Faculty)
$\left.\begin{array}{lc|c|c|c|c|c|c|c}\hline \text { Dependent Variable: } & \text { Commuting } & \begin{array}{c}\text { Department } \\ \text { or Campus } \\ \text { Politics }\end{array} & \begin{array}{c}\text { Review/ } \\ \text { Promotion } \\ \text { Process }\end{array} & \begin{array}{c}\text { Finding a } \\ \text { Tenure- } \\ \text { Track } \\ \text { Position }\end{array} & \begin{array}{c}\text { Hiring and } \\ \text { Managing } \\ \text { Employees }\end{array} & \begin{array}{c}\text { Managing } \\ \text { a Research } \\ \text { Group or } \\ \text { Grant }\end{array} & \begin{array}{c}\text { Securing } \\ \text { Funding } \\ \text { for }\end{array} & \begin{array}{c}\text { Process of } \\ \text { Obesearch }\end{array} \\ \text { Reimbursements }\end{array}\right]$

[^44]* significant at 5\%; ** significant at $1 \%$
${ }^{\dagger}$ This demographic group is controlled for in every model but its results are not reported because it contains less than 5 faculty.
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## Summary

The Mentoring section of the survey examines how effective the faculty find mentoring in general, as well as in several different areas in particular. As faculty advance in their academic careers, mentoring -- either formal or informal -- can provide invaluable guidance, particularly for tenure-track faculty who are at the early stages of their careers. The main results of this section are summarized below.

## Effectiveness of Overall Mentoring

Only $40 \%$ of the tenure-track faculty and $31 \%$ of the non-ladder faculty consider their departments effective at mentoring. ${ }^{84}$ By contrast, $62 \%$ of the tenured faculty consider mentoring of "junior" faculty to be effective. Furthermore, among tenure-track and non-ladder faculty, women view their departments as less effective at mentoring than their male counterparts according to regression analysis that takes into account gender, ethnicity, citizenship, age and School.

## Types of Mentoring

Informal mentoring is more common at the University than formal mentoring. While $80 \%$ of the tenure-track faculty report having an informal mentor (either within or outside of Harvard), only $38 \%$ report having a formal mentor at Harvard. Moreover, the practice of formal mentoring is most common at SPH where $71 \%$ of the tenure-track faculty indicate that they have had a formal mentor. Among tenure-track faculty with informal mentors (either within or outside Harvard), $95 \%$ find informal mentoring to be helpful while $68 \%$ of the tenure-track faculty with formal mentors consider formal mentoring to be helpful. Also, for tenure-track faculty, having an informal mentor only or having both a formal and informal mentor increases the extent to which faculty consider mentoring to be effective overall.

## Areas of Mentoring

Tenure-track faculty find mentoring to be more adequate in some areas than in others. The issue for which the largest percentage of tenure-track faculty consider mentoring to be adequate is teaching. Sixty-five percent of tenure-track faculty find mentoring regarding teaching to be either "mostly adequate," "adequate" or "more than adequate."

For all remaining issues (i.e., requirements for promotion and tenure, publishing scholarly work, securing funds for research, distribution of time among work-related activities, advising student research assistants, negotiating office politics, running a lab or research group, and work-life balance), $45 \%$ to $61 \%$ of the tenure-track faculty consider their departments to be "inadequate" to "barely adequate" at mentoring. Over half of these areas also exhibit a statistically significant difference between tenure-track men and women while controlling for ethnicity, citizenship, age and School. Namely, tenure-track women view mentoring regarding teaching, requirements for

[^45]promotion and tenure, publishing scholarly work, negotiating office politics, and work-life balance as less adequate than tenure-track men.

Similarly, the non-ladder faculty consider their departments to be more effective at mentoring in some areas than in others. As in the case of tenure-track faculty, the issue for which the largest percentage of non-ladder faculty consider mentoring to be adequate is teaching. Fifty-seven percent of non-ladder faculty find mentoring regarding teaching to be either "mostly adequate," "adequate" or "more than adequate." In contrast, however, approximately $60 \%$ of the non-ladder faculty find mentoring to be "inadequate" or "barely adequate" for the remaining 3 areas: worklife balance (60\%), negotiating office politics (61\%) and their career (62\%). For these three issues, women have significantly lower estimates of mentoring than men while controlling for ethnicity, citizenship, age and School.

## Effectiveness of Overall Mentoring

This section analyzes the effectiveness of "junior" and non-ladder faculty mentoring. ${ }^{85}$

## Mentoring of "Junior" Faculty

Overall $40 \%$ of the tenure-track faculty consider their departments to be "very" or "somewhat" effective in mentoring their "junior" faculty, while $62 \%$ of tenured faculty share this view. Figure M1 provides these results as well as other descriptive statistics of the faculty's responses by rank and gender to the question: "Overall, how effective is your department at mentoring its junior faculty?"

Figure M1: Effectiveness of Overall Mentoring (Ladder Faculty)

|  |  | Number of Respondents | \% of <br> Respondents Reporting Somewhat or Very Effective | Effectiveness |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Mean |  | Standard <br> Deviation |
| Rank | Tenured Faculty |  | 641 | 62\% | 3.47 | 1.14 |
|  | Tenure-Track Faculty | 326 | 40\% | 2.82 | 1.39 |
| Gender | Women | 258 | 46\% | 2.94 | 1.38 |
|  | Men | 709 | 58\% | 3.37 | 1.21 |

(1=very ineffective $2=$ somewhat ineffective 3=neither effective nor ineffective $4=$ somewhat effective $5=$ very effective)
Using the baseline specification (i.e., rank, gender, ethnicity, citizenship, age and School), we test if there are statistically significant demographic differences in views of overall mentoring

[^46]and find the following statistically significant rank- and gender-based results for ladder faculty (see Table M1 in the Mentoring Appendix for all significant results):

- Rank: Relative to tenured faculty, tenure-track faculty consider overall mentoring to be less effective ( 0.54 point difference). ${ }^{86}$
- Gender: Relative to men, women consider overall mentoring to be less effective (0.32 point difference). ${ }^{87}$

To understand the relationship between gender and rank, we use both graphical and statistical analysis to explore gender differences in overall mentoring within and across faculty ranks. In this regard, Figure M2 depicts the mean response of men and women within each ladder rank to the overall mentoring question.

Figure M2: Department's Effectiveness in Overall Mentoring of Junior Faculty by Gender and Rank

( $1=$ very ineffective $2=$ somewhat ineffective $3=$ neither effective nor ineffective $4=$ somewhat effective $5=v e r y$ effective)
Adding an interaction term for gender and rank to our baseline specification and applying postestimation F-tests, we find the following statistically significant differences (see Table M1 in the Mentoring Appendix for all significant results): ${ }^{88}$

- Gender differences within each rank: Relative to tenure-track men, tenure-track women consider their departments to be less effective in overall mentoring.
- Rank differences by gender:

[^47]- Relative to tenured women, tenure-track women consider their departments to be less effective in overall mentoring.
- Relative to tenured men, tenure-track men consider their departments to be less effective in overall mentoring.

Therefore, the rank difference found in the baseline specification persists for both men and women. However, the gender difference is seemingly driven by tenure-track faculty as tenured men and women have similar views regarding their departments’ effectiveness in mentoring its junior faculty.

To examine whether the gender gap between tenure-track men and women at the University level persists at the School level, we restrict the baseline specification to the tenure-track faculty at each of the Schools. According to these analyses, tenure-track women consider mentoring to be significantly less effective than tenure-track men at HBS (1.24 point difference) and HMS/HSDM ( 0.89 point difference). (See Table M2 in the Mentoring Appendix for all significant results.)

## Mentoring of Non-Ladder Faculty

The non-ladder faculty hold a similar view of overall mentoring in their departments as the tenure-track faculty. Only 31\% percent of the non-ladder faculty consider their departments to be either "somewhat" or "very" effective in mentoring its non-ladder faculty. Figure M3 provides descriptive statistics of the faculty's responses by gender to the following question: "Overall, how effective is your department at mentoring its non-tenure track faculty?"

Figure M3: Overall Effectiveness of Mentoring (Non-Ladder Faculty)

|  |  | Number of <br> Respondents | \% of Respondents <br> Reporting Somewhat <br> or Very Effective | Effectiveness |  |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Mean | Standard <br> Deviation |  |  |  |  |
| Gender | Women | 109 | $23 \%$ | 2.28 | 1.28 |
|  | Men | 179 | $36 \%$ | 2.79 | 1.25 |

(1=very ineffective $2=$ somewhat ineffective $3=$ neither effective nor ineffective $4=$ somewhat effective $5=$ very effective)
Regression analysis of our baseline specification (i.e., gender, ethnicity, citizenship, age and School), indicates that non-ladder women consider overall mentoring to be significantly less effective than men ( 0.44 point difference). ${ }^{89}$ (See Table M3 in the Mentoring Appendix for all significant results.)

In the School-specific analyses (of the same baseline regression model above), non-ladder women consider overall mentoring to be significantly less effective than non-ladder men only at

[^48]FAS (0.51 point difference). (See Table M4 in the Mentoring Appendix for all significant results.)

## Types of Mentoring

Mentoring may involve formal mentoring, where tenure-track faculty either choose or are assigned official mentors by their departments, or it may consist of informal mentoring. The latter is more common within the University as one can see in Figure M4 below.

Figure M4 below depicts the frequency with which the tenured faculty report that they have served as formal and/or informal mentors. The question on which this figure is based asks: "While a faculty member at Harvard University, have you served as a mentor for another faculty member?" ${ }^{90}$

Figure M4: Served as a Formal and/or Informal Mentor (Tenured Faculty)


Ninety percent of the tenured faculty report that they have served as a mentor of some kind (i.e., formal, informal, or both) for another faculty member, while only $25 \%$ indicate that they have served as a formal mentor. ${ }^{91}$

The same percentage of tenured men and women have served as informal mentors (78\% of both men and women), while more tenured women than tenured men have served as formal mentors ( $32 \%$ versus $24 \%$, respectively). However, logistic regression analysis of the baseline specification indicates that across the University there are no statistically significant genderbased differences in the tenured faculty's propensity to serve as formal or informal mentors. (See Table M5 in the Mentoring Appendix for all significant results.)

[^49]The low propensity of the tenured faculty to serve as formal mentors is consistent with the likelihood of tenure-track faculty to have formal mentors as can be seen in Figure M5 below.

Figure M5 depicts the frequency with which tenure-track faculty say they have had formal and/or informal mentors. The questions on which this figure is based ask: (1) "Have you ever had a formal mentor(s) within your department?" and (2) "While at Harvard University, have you ever had one or more informal mentors (someone not officially assigned to you who gives advice on career issues and/or advocates for you in your discipline; this could be someone outside Harvard University?",92

Figure M5: Having a Formal and/or Informal Mentor (Tenure-Track Faculty)


Only 38\% of the tenure-track faculty report having formal mentors, whereas $80 \%$ report having informal mentors. ${ }^{93}$ The practice of formal mentoring appears to be most common at SPH, where nearly $71 \%$ of the tenure-track faculty indicate that they have had a formal mentor, as opposed to all other Schools where less than half of their faculty report having had one.

To determine whether having an informal or formal mentor affects the tenure-track faculty's assessment of overall mentoring, we add variables for the type of mentoring they have received to the baseline specification that predicts the effectiveness of overall mentoring and restrict the population to tenure-track faculty only. ${ }^{94}$ This analysis reveals that having an informal mentor alone, and having both a formal and informal mentor, increases the tenure-track faculty's evaluation of overall mentoring in their departments relative to not having a mentor at all. Having an informal mentor alone increases how effective the tenure-track faculty consider mentoring by 0.62 points over not having a mentor at all, while having both a formal and

[^50]informal mentor increases it by 1.28 points. Having a formal mentor alone does not significantly affect the tenure-track faculty's views of overall mentoring within their departments. This is not surprising since faculty report that informal mentoring is more helpful than formal mentoring, as shown below. (See Table M6 in the Mentoring Appendix for all significant results.)

Since having a mentor is related to how effective tenure-track faculty find overall mentoring, we analyze via regression analysis of the baseline specification whether there are particular groups of tenure-track faculty who are more or less likely to have formal and/or informal mentors. This analysis indicates in particular that there are no statistically significant gender-based differences in the tenure-track faculty's propensity to have formal and/or informal mentors. (See Table M7 in the Mentoring Appendix for all significant results.)

The survey also asks the tenure-track faculty who have had mentors to rate the helpfulness of formal and informal mentoring. In this regard, Figure M6 below depicts the responses of the tenure-track faculty to the following two questions: (1) "How helpful have you found this formal mentoring?" and (2) "How helpful have you found this informal mentoring?

Figure M6: Helpfulness of Informal and Formal Mentoring (Tenure-Track Faculty)

(1=very helpful $2=$ somewhat helpful $3=$ neither helpful nor unhelpful $4=$ somewhat helpful $5=$ very helpful)
Of the tenure-track faculty who have had formal mentors, $68 \%$ find formal mentoring to be "somewhat" or "very" helpful. In comparison, $95 \%$ of the tenure-track faculty who have had informal mentors consider informal mentoring to be helpful. The 2005 COACHE survey of tenure-track faculty similarly found that tenure-track faculty have more positive evaluations of informal mentoring than formal mentoring.

To make a direct comparison between the two types of mentoring, we examine the extent to which only faculty who have had both formal and informal mentors find each to be helpful. Accordingly, they too find informal mentoring to be significantly more helpful than formal mentoring (means of 4.54 versus 3.80, respectively, with the difference being significant at less than the $1 \%$ level using a simple t-test). The responses for both questions are on a five-point
scale (1=very unhelpful, 2=somewhat unhelpful, 3=neither helpful nor unhelpful, 4=somewhat helpful and 5=very helpful).

Finally, analysis of the baseline specifications reveals no statistically significant gender-based differences in the extent to which the tenure-track faculty find informal or formal mentoring helpful. (See Table M8 in the Mentoring Appendix for all significant results.)

## Areas of Mentoring

Mentoring, whether it consists of formal or informal mentoring, may encompass many different issues related to teaching, research, tenure or promotion, as well as personal or work-life issues. The first subsection below examines 9 areas of mentoring for the tenure-track faculty. The next subsection examines 4 areas of mentoring for the non-ladder faculty.

## Tenure-Track Faculty

On the whole, $55 \%$ of the tenure-track faculty consider the mentoring they have received while at Harvard to be adequate ("mostly adequate," "adequate," or "more than adequate"). The extent to which the tenure-track faculty find the guidance they have received to be adequate regarding 9 different areas of mentoring are depicted in Figure M7 below. This figure is based on the following question: "While at Harvard University, do you feel as though you have received adequate mentoring regarding the following areas?"95

[^51]Figure M7: Tenure-Track Faculty's View of Mentoring by Area

(1=inadequate $2=$ barely adequate $3=$ mostly adequate $4=$ adequate $5=$ more than adequate)
The issue for which the largest percentage of tenure-track faculty (65\%) consider mentoring to be adequate (i.e., "mostly adequate," "adequate," or "more than adequate") is teaching. ${ }^{96}$ For all of the remaining areas of mentoring, $45 \%$ to $61 \%$ of the tenure-track faculty respondents consider the mentoring they have received to be either "inadequate" or "barely adequate." Among these areas, mentoring regarding work-life balance is associated with the largest percentage of tenure-track responses in the "inadequate" to "barely adequate" range.

Applying the baseline specification to the extent to which tenure-track find each of these 9 areas of mentoring to be adequate, we find gender-based differences in 5 of them. Namely, relative to tenure-track men, tenure-track women view mentoring as less adequate regarding publishing scholarly work ( 0.57 point difference), teaching ( 0.28 point difference), requirements for promotion and tenure ( 0.52 point difference), negotiating office politics ( 0.55 point difference) and work-life balance ( 0.45 point difference). (See Table M9 in the Mentoring Appendix for all significant results.)

## Non-Ladder Faculty

On the whole, $50 \%$ of the non-ladder faculty consider the mentoring that they have received overall to be adequate (i.e., "mostly adequate," "adequate," or "more than adequate"). In

[^52]addition, the non-ladder faculty were asked on the survey to evaluate the adequacy of 4 specific areas of mentoring. ${ }^{97}$ Figure M8 below represents responses to the following question regarding these 4 areas: "While at Harvard University, do you feel as though you have received adequate mentoring regarding the following areas?"

Figure M8: Non-Ladder Faculty's View of Mentoring by Area

( $1=$ inadequate $2=$ barely adequate $3=$ mostly adequate $4=$ adequate $5=$ more than adequate)
As with the tenure-track faculty, the issue for which the greatest percentage of the non-ladder faculty (57\%) consider mentoring to be adequate (i.e., "mostly adequate," "adequate," or "more than adequate") is teaching. Less than a majority of the non-ladder faculty share this view of mentoring regarding work-life balance, negotiating office politics and career.

Applying the baseline specification to the extent to which non-ladder find each of these 4 areas of mentoring to be adequate, we find gender-based differences in 3 of them. Namely, relative to non-ladder men, non-ladder women find mentoring to be less adequate regarding work-life balance ( 0.50 points difference), negotiating office politics ( 0.43 point difference), and their career ( 0.47 point difference). (See Table M10 of the Mentoring Appendix for all significant results.)

[^53]Mentoring Appendix

Table M1: Effectiveness of Overall Mentoring for Junior Faculty (Ladder Faculty)

| Dependent Variable: <br> Effectiveness of Overall Mentoring |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Regressor | Baseline | $(1)$ |
| Female | $-0.32^{* *}$ | -0.18 |
|  | $(0.09)$ | $(0.11)$ |
| Asian/Pacific Islander | 0.19 | 0.20 |
|  | $(0.14)$ | $(0.14)$ |
| Black | 0.05 | $(0.05$ |
|  | $(0.24)$ | 0.13 |
| Hispanic | 0.11 | $(0.26)$ |
|  | $(0.26)$ | $\cdot$ |
| American Indian/Alaskan Native ${ }^{\dagger}$ | $\cdot$ | $\cdot$ |
|  | $\cdot$ | $\cdot$ |
| Unknown ${ }^{\dagger}$ | $\cdot$ | $\cdot$ |
|  | $\cdot$ | 0.25 |
| International | 0.25 | $(0.17)$ |
|  | $(0.17)$ | $-0.42^{* *}$ |
| Tenure-Track | $-0.54^{* *}$ | $(0.14)$ |
|  | $(0.12)$ | 0.01 |
| Age | 0.01 | $(0.00)$ |
|  | $(0.00)$ | Controlled for |
| School (8 dummy variables) | Controlled for | but not reported |
|  | but not reported | -0.34 |
| Female*Tenure-Track |  | $(0.19)$ |
|  |  | $3.21^{* *}$ |
| Constant | $3.29^{* *}$ | $(0.26)$ |
| Observations | $(0.26)$ | 967 |
| R-squared | 967 | 0.142 |
| Robust standard errors in parentheses | 0.139 |  |
| * significant at 5\%; ** significant at 1\% |  |  |
| This demographic group is controlled for in every model but its results are not reported because it contains less than |  |  |
| 5 faculty. |  |  |

Table M2: Effectiveness of Overall Mentoring for Junior Faculty by School ${ }^{\dagger \dagger}$ (Ladder Faculty)

| Dependent Variable: <br> Effectiveness of Overall Mentoring |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Regressor | FAS <br> Baseline | HBS <br> Baseline | HMS/HSDM Baseline | SPH Baseline |
| Female | $\begin{aligned} & \hline-0.31 \\ & (0.28) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline-1.24^{* *} \\ (0.36) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline-0.89^{*} \\ & (0.43) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & -0.22 \\ & (0.44) \end{aligned}$ |
| Asian/Pacific Islander ${ }^{\dagger}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.09 \\ (0.37) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.46 \\ (0.38) \end{gathered}$ | (0.43) | $\begin{gathered} 0.08 \\ (0.51) \end{gathered}$ |
| Black ${ }^{\dagger}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.27 \\ (0.57) \end{gathered}$ | . | . | . |
| Hispanic ${ }^{\dagger}$ | . | $\begin{gathered} -1.10^{* *} \\ (0.29) \end{gathered}$ | . | . |
| American Indian/Alaskan Native ${ }^{\dagger}$ | . | (0.29) | . | . |
| Unknown ${ }^{\dagger}$ | . | . | . | . |
| International | $\begin{gathered} 0.08 \\ (0.32) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.71 \\ (0.39) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.93 \\ (0.55) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.24 \\ (0.60) \end{gathered}$ |
| Age | $\begin{aligned} & -0.02 \\ & (0.03) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.04 \\ (0.03) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.04 \\ (0.03) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.07 \\ (0.05) \end{gathered}$ |
| Constant | $\begin{gathered} 3.74^{* *} \\ (1.10) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4.72 * * \\ (1.18) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 5.34^{* *} \\ (1.21) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 5.29 * * \\ (1.90) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| Observations | 118 | 68 | 45 | 51 |
| R-squared | 0.046 | 0.268 | 0.231 | 0.110 |

Robust standard errors in parentheses

* significant at 5\%; ** significant at $1 \%$
${ }^{\dagger}$ This demographic group is controlled for in every model but its results are not reported because it contains less than 5 faculty.
${ }^{\dagger \dagger}$ GSD, GSE, HDS, KSG, and HLS are not shown because they have fewer than 5 tenure-track faculty members belonging to any demographic group.

Table M3: Effectiveness of Overall Mentoring for Non-Ladder Faculty (Non-Ladder Faculty)

| Dependent Variable: <br> Effectiveness of Overall Mentoring |  |
| :--- | :---: |
| Regressor | Baseline |
| Female | $-0.44^{* *}$ |
|  | $(0.16)$ |
| Asian/Pacific Islander | -0.10 |
|  | $(0.27)$ |
| Black | -0.26 |
|  | $(0.38)$ |
| Hispanic | 0.42 |
|  | $(0.58)$ |
| American Indian/Alaskan Native ${ }^{\dagger}$ | $\cdot$ |
|  | $\cdot$ |
| Unknown ${ }^{\dagger}$ | $\cdot$ |
|  | . |
| International | 0.31 |
|  | $(0.25)$ |
| Age | 0.01 |
|  | $(0.01)$ |
| School (8 dummy variables) | Controlled for |
|  | but not reported |
| Constant | $2.23^{* *}$ |
|  | $(0.44)$ |
| Observations | 288 |
| R-squared | 0.134 |
| Robust standard errors in parentheses |  |
| * significant at $5 \%$; ** significant at $1 \%$ |  |
| ${ }^{\dagger}$ This demographic group is controlled for in every model but its results are not |  |
| reported because it contains less than 5 faculty. |  |

Table M4: Effectiveness of Overall Mentoring for Non-Ladder Faculty by School ${ }^{\dagger \dagger}$ (Non-Ladder Faculty)

| Dependent Variable: <br> Effectiveness of Overall Mentoring |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | FAS | GSE | KSG | HMS/HSDM | SPH |
| Regressor | Baseline | Baseline | Baseline | Baseline | Baseline |
| Female | -0.51* | 0.49 | -0.60 | -0.08 | -0.10 |
|  | (0.24) | (0.52) | (0.36) | (0.65) | (0.58) |
| Asian/Pacific Islander ${ }^{\dagger}$ | 0.05 | . | . | -0.14 | . |
|  | (0.36) | . | . | (0.59) | . |
| Black ${ }^{\dagger}$ | . | . | . | . | . |
| Hispanic ${ }^{\dagger}$ |  | - | , |  |  |
|  | - | . | . | - | . |
| American Indian/ Alaskan Native ${ }^{\dagger}$ |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | . | . | . | . | . |
| Unknown ${ }^{\dagger}$ | . | . | . | . | . |
| International ${ }^{\dagger}$ |  | . | . |  |  |
|  | 0.14 | . | . | 1.00 | . |
|  | (0.35) | . | . | (0.69) | . |
| Age | 0.00 | 0.02 | 0.04** | -0.06 | 0.01 |
|  | (0.01) | (0.04) | (0.02) | (0.03) | (0.03) |
| Constant | 2.81** | 0.76 | -0.19 | 4.86** | 2.22 |
|  | (0.61) | (2.22) | (0.96) | (1.56) | (2.03) |
| Observations | 127 | 14 | 47 | 21 | 27 |
| R-squared | 0.040 | 0.377 | 0.226 | 0.320 | 0.096 |

Robust standard errors in parentheses

* significant at 5\%; ** significant at $1 \%$
${ }^{\dagger}$ This demographic group is controlled for in every model but its results are not reported because it contains less than 5 faculty.
${ }^{\text {Ht}}$ GSD, HBS, HDS, and HLS are not shown because they have fewer than 5 non-ladder faculty members in any demographic group.

Table M5: Served as a Formal or an Informal Mentor (Tenured Faculty)

| Dependent Variable: | Served as Formal Mentor | Served as Informal Mentor |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Regressor | Baseline | Baseline |
| Female | 0.43 | -0.01 |
|  | $(0.23)$ | $(0.25)$ |
| Asian/Pacific Islander | -0.29 | -0.01 |
|  | $(0.44)$ | $(0.44)$ |
| Black | -0.31 | 0.45 |
|  | $(0.67)$ | $(0.74)$ |
| Hispanic | -0.66 | -0.46 |
|  | $(1.03)$ | $(0.82)$ |
| American Indian/Alaskan Native ${ }^{\dagger}$ | $\cdot$ | $\cdot$ |
|  | $\cdot$ | $\cdot$ |
| Unknown |  |  |
|  | $\cdot$ | $\cdot$ |
| International | - | - |
|  | -1.48 | 0.09 |
| Age | $(1.05)$ | $(0.68)$ |
|  | -0.00 | -0.01 |
| School (8 dummy variables) | $(0.01)$ | $(0.01)$ |
| Constant | Controlled for | Controlled for |
|  | but not reported | but not reported |
| Observations | $-1.21^{*}$ | $1.63^{*}$ |
| Loglikelihood | $(0.59)$ | $(0.65)$ |

Robust standard errors in parentheses

* significant at 5\%; ** significant at $1 \%$
${ }^{\dagger}$ This demographic group is controlled for in every model but its results are not reported because it contains less than 5 faculty.

Table M6: Effectiveness of Overall Mentoring of Junior Faculty with Variables for Having Mentors (Tenure-Track Faculty)

| Dependent Variable: <br> Effectiveness of Overall Mentoring |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| Regressor | (1) |
| Female | $\begin{gathered} \hline-0.43^{* *} \\ (0.15) \end{gathered}$ |
| Asian/Pacific Islander | $\begin{gathered} 0.09 \\ (0.20) \end{gathered}$ |
| Black | $\begin{gathered} -0.05 \\ (0.39) \end{gathered}$ |
| Hispanic | $\begin{gathered} -0.59 \\ (0.33) \end{gathered}$ |
| American Indian/Alaskan Native $^{\dagger}$ | (0.33) |
| Unknown ${ }^{\dagger}$ | . |
| International | $\begin{gathered} 0.34 \\ (0.20) \end{gathered}$ |
| Age | $\begin{gathered} -0.04 * * \\ (0.01) \end{gathered}$ |
| School (8 dummy variables) | Controlled for but not reported |
| Had Formal Mentor Only | $\begin{gathered} 0.52 \\ (0.33) \end{gathered}$ |
| Had Informal Mentor Only | $\begin{gathered} 0.62 * * \\ (0.20) \end{gathered}$ |
| Had Both Formal and Informal Mentor | $\begin{aligned} & 1.28^{* *} \\ & (0.23) \end{aligned}$ |
| Constant | $\begin{gathered} 3.64 * * \\ (0.56) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| Observations | 326 |
| R-squared | 0.230 |
| Robust standard errors in parentheses * significant at 5\%; ** significant at $1 \%$ ${ }^{\dagger}$ This demographic group is controlled f reported because it contains less than 5 | but its results are not |

Table M7: The Likelihood of Having a Formal and/or an Informal Mentor (Tenure-Track Faculty)

| Dependent Variable: | Had Formal Mentor Only | Had Informal Mentor Only | Had Both Formal and <br> Informal Mentor |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Regressor | Baseline | Baseline | Baseline |

Robust standard errors in parentheses

* significant at 5\%; ** significant at $1 \%$
${ }^{\dagger}$ This demographic group is controlled for in every model but its results are not reported because it contains less than 5 faculty.

Table M8: Helpfulness of Formal and Informal Mentoring (Tenure-Track Faculty)

| Dependent Variable: | Helpfulness of <br> Formal Mentoring | Helpfulness of <br> Informal Mentoring |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Regressor | Baseline | Baseline |
| Female | -0.42 | -0.04 |
|  | $(0.25)$ | $(0.10)$ |
| Asian/Pacific Islander | 0.05 | -0.09 |
|  | $(0.33)$ | $(0.11)$ |
| Black | -0.05 | 0.10 |
|  | $(0.47)$ | $(0.15)$ |
| Hispanic | 0.06 | -0.56 |
|  | $(0.42)$ | $(0.42)$ |
| American Indian/Alaskan Native ${ }^{\dagger}$ | $\cdot$ | $\cdot$ |
|  | $\cdot$ | $\cdot$ |
| Unknown ${ }^{\dagger}$ | $\cdot$ | $\cdot$ |
| International | $\cdot$ | - |
|  | 0.53 | -0.03 |
| Age | $(0.30)$ | $(0.12)$ |
|  | $-0.05^{*}$ | $-0.01^{*}$ |
| School (8 dummy variables) | $(0.02)$ | $(0.01)$ |
| Constant | Controlled for | Controlled for |
|  | but not reported | but not reported |
| Observations | $5.59^{* *}$ | $5.06^{* *}$ |
| R-squared | $(0.79)$ | $(0.28)$ |
| Robust standard errors in parentheses | 123 | 262 |
| * significant at 5\%; ** significant at 1\% | 0.171 | 0.086 |
| ${ }^{\dagger}$ This demographic group is controlled for in every model but its results are not reported because it contains less than |  |  |
| 5 faculty. |  |  |

Table M9: Adequacy of Mentoring Regarding 9 Different Areas (Tenure-Track Faculty)

| Dependent Variable: Adequacy of Mentoring Regarding: | Dist. Of Time Among WorkRelated Activities | Securing <br> Funds for <br> Research | Publishing Scholarly Work | Teaching | Advising Student Research Assistants | Requirements for Promotion and Tenure | Negotiating Office Politics | Work-Life Balance | Running a Lab or Research Group |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Regressor | Baseline | Baseline | Baseline | Baseline | Baseline | Baseline | Baseline | Baseline | Baseline |
| Female | $\begin{gathered} \hline-0.23 \\ (0.16) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline-0.11 \\ & (0.16) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline-0.57 * * \\ (0.14) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline-0.28^{*} \\ (0.14) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline-0.31 \\ (0.16) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline-0.52^{* *} \\ (0.15) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline-0.55^{* *} \\ (0.16) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline-0.45^{* *} \\ (0.14) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline-0.20 \\ & (0.21) \end{aligned}$ |
| Asian/Pacific Islander | $\begin{gathered} 0.12 \\ (0.21) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.05 \\ (0.22) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.19 \\ (0.19) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.03 \\ (0.16) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.15 \\ (0.20) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.36 \\ (0.21) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.36 \\ (0.20) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.25 \\ (0.17) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.08 \\ (0.23) \end{gathered}$ |
| Black ${ }^{\dagger}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.21 \\ (0.44) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.31 \\ (0.31) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.41 \\ (0.38) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.49 \\ (0.27) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.19 \\ (0.34) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.11 \\ (0.49) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.19 \\ (0.44) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & -0.25 \\ & (0.40) \end{aligned}$ | . |
| Hispanic | $\begin{gathered} -0.75^{*} \\ (0.32) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.53 \\ (0.38) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.42 \\ (0.37) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.23 \\ (0.32) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.30 \\ (0.46) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.37 \\ (0.36) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.55 \\ (0.47) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & -0.42 \\ & (0.32) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.62 \\ (0.56) \end{gathered}$ |
| American Indian/Alaskan Native ${ }^{\dagger}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Unknown ${ }^{\dagger}$ | . | . | . | . | . | . | . | . | . |
| International | $\begin{gathered} 0.17 \\ (0.24) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.04 \\ (0.21) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.27 \\ (0.20) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.00 \\ (0.18) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.17 \\ (0.22) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.34 \\ (0.21) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.03 \\ (0.25) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.23 \\ (0.20) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.40 \\ (0.25) \end{gathered}$ |
| Age | $\begin{gathered} -0.04 * * \\ (0.01) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.06^{* *} \\ (0.01) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.04 * * \\ (0.01) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.04 * * \\ (0.01) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.04 * * \\ (0.01) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.03^{* *} \\ (0.01) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.04 * * \\ (0.01) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.02 * \\ (0.01) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.04 * * \\ (0.01) \end{gathered}$ |
| School (8 dummy variables) | Controlled for but not reported | Controlled for but not reported | Controlled for but not reported | Controlled for but not reported | Controlled for but not reported | Controlled for but not reported | Controlled for but not reported | Controlled for but not reported | Controlled for but not reported |
| Constant | $\begin{gathered} 4.16 * * \\ (0.55) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4.95 * * \\ (0.51) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4.44^{* *} \\ (0.54) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4.17 * * \\ (0.46) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3.79 * * \\ (0.53) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4.32^{* *} \\ (0.48) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4.40^{* *} \\ (0.54) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3.15^{* *} \\ (0.45) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3.86 * * \\ (0.59) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| Observations R-squared | $\begin{gathered} 234 \\ 0.150 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 239 \\ 0.186 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 313 \\ 0.165 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 309 \\ 0.288 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 226 \\ 0.109 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 315 \\ 0.179 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 275 \\ 0.167 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 286 \\ 0.155 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} 143 \\ 0.183 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |

Robust standard errors in parentheses

* significant at 5\%; ** significant at $1 \%$
${ }^{\dagger}$ This demographic group is controlled for in every model but its results are not reported because it contains less than 5 faculty.

Table M10: Adequacy of Mentoring Regarding 4 Different Areas (Non-Ladder Faculty)

| Dependent Variable: <br> Adequacy of <br> Mentoring <br> Regarding: | Teaching | Work-Life Balance | Negotiating Office Politics | Their Career |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Regressor | Baseline | Baseline | Baseline | Baseline |
| Female | $\begin{gathered} \hline \hline-0.07 \\ (0.17) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline-0.50^{* *} \\ (0.16) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline-0.43^{*} \\ & (0.17) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline-0.47 * * \\ (0.17) \end{gathered}$ |
| Asian/Pacific Islander | $\begin{gathered} -0.55 \\ (0.34) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & -0.42 \\ & (0.30) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & -0.65 * \\ & (0.30) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.28 \\ (0.35) \end{gathered}$ |
| Black | $\begin{gathered} -0.80 \\ (0.49) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & -0.61 \\ & (0.34) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.57 \\ (0.40) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & -0.38 \\ & (0.41) \end{aligned}$ |
| Hispanic ${ }^{\dagger}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.36 \\ (0.50) \end{gathered}$ | (0.34) | (0.40) | $\begin{gathered} -0.43 \\ (0.44) \end{gathered}$ |
| American Indian/ Alaskan Native ${ }^{\dagger}$ | (0.50) | . | . | (0.44) |
| Unknown ${ }^{\dagger}$ | . | . | . | . |
| International | $\begin{gathered} -0.37 \\ (0.27) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.12 \\ (0.27) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.20 \\ (0.26) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.15 \\ (0.28) \end{gathered}$ |
| Age | $\begin{gathered} -0.02 \\ (0.01) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.00 \\ (0.01) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.01 \\ (0.01) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.00 \\ (0.01) \end{gathered}$ |
| School (8 dummy variables) Constant | Controlled for but not reported 4.21** <br> (0.48) | Controlled for but not reported $2.34^{* *}$ $(0.47)$ | Controlled for but not reported $3.02^{* *}$ <br> (0.48) | Controlled for but not reported 2.81** <br> (0.54) |
| Observations | 257 | 219 | 229 | 244 |
| R-squared | 0.255 | 0.157 | 0.141 | 0.117 |

Robust standard errors in parentheses

* significant at 5\%; ** significant at $1 \%$
${ }^{\dagger}$ This demographic group is controlled for in every model but its results are not reported because it contains less than 5 faculty.


## Tenure

- Clarity of the Tenure Criteria
- BASIS OF THE TENURE CRITERIA
- Appropriateness of the Tenure Criteria
- Feedback on Tenure Prospects
- Stopping the Tenure Clock


## Summary

The Tenure section of the survey touches on many different issues related to the tenure process at Harvard, including the content and clarity of the tenure criteria, the junior faculty's prospects for tenure and their use of stop-the-clock policies. For many of these issues, the tenured and tenure-track faculty have significantly different views, as do women compared to men. The results of this analysis are further summarized below.

## Clarity of the Tenure Criteria

Overall, $58 \%$ of the ladder faculty respondents report that the criteria for tenure are clearly communicated. However, only $39 \%$ of the tenure-track faculty find these criteria to be clearly communicated while $68 \%$ of the tenured faculty do. Further, $64 \%$ of men compared to $44 \%$ of women report that the criteria for tenure are clearly communicated.

Taking into account rank, gender, ethnicity, citizenship, age and School, the mean differences between tenured and tenure-track faculty, as well as those between men and women, are statistically significant.

Additionally, effective mentoring is associated with a clearer understanding of the tenure criteria. In particular, tenure-track faculty who find mentoring to be effective tend to find the tenure criteria to be more clearly communicated.

## Basis of the Tenure Criteria

The survey also asks the ladder faculty to indicate the extent to which 3 issues in particular are valued in the tenure process at their Schools. These issues are: (1) research/scholarly work, (2) teaching contributions and (3) service.

Overall, $94 \%$ of the ladder faculty respondents consider research/scholarly work to be "highly valued" in the tenure process. In contrast, only $20 \%$ consider teaching contributions to be "highly valued" and only $9 \%$ believe that service is "highly valued."

Across these 3 issues, men and women, as well as tenured and tenure-track faculty, do not have significantly different views with 1 exception. Tenure-track faculty report that teaching contributions are valued less highly at their Schools than tenured faculty.

## Appropriateness of the Tenure Criteria

For the 3 issues above, as well as 1 other, namely student evaluations, the survey asks the ladder faculty to indicate whether or not each issue is valued appropriately in the tenure process. While $71 \%$ of the ladder faculty find that research/scholarly work is valued appropriately, far fewer faculty find that service (50\%), student evaluations (48\%) and teaching contributions (38\%) are valued appropriately.

On average, tenured and tenure-track faculty report that teaching and service are undervalued, while research/scholarly work is overvalued. Additionally, tenured faculty report that student
evaluations are valued appropriately, whereas tenure-track faculty find these to be undervalued. Taking into account rank, gender, ethnicity, citizenship, age and School, the mean differences between tenured and tenure-track faculty for all 4 issues are statistically significant. Relative to tenured faculty, tenure-track faculty report that research/scholarly work is more overvalued, while the remaining 3 issues are more undervalued.

On average, women and men believe that teaching, service and student evaluations are undervalued, while research/scholarly work is overvalued. For 2 of these 4 issues (i.e., research/scholarly work and service), women have significantly different views than men holding all other demographic characteristics constant. Relative to men, women report that research is more overvalued and service is more undervalued.

## Feedback on Tenure Prospects

Overall, $54 \%$ of ladder faculty respondents find that junior faculty in their departments receive clear feedback on their likelihood of getting tenure. However, $67 \%$ of tenured faculty find that the "junior" faculty"s tenure prospects are clearly communicated while only $27 \%$ of the tenuretrack faculty do. Additionally, $58 \%$ of ladder men compared to $41 \%$ of ladder women report that tenure prospects are clearly communicated.

Taking into account rank, gender, ethnicity, citizenship, age and School, the mean differences between tenured and tenure-track faculty, as well as that between men and women, are statistically significant.

Additionally, the more effective tenure-track faculty find overall mentoring in their departments, the more they tend to agree that junior faculty in their department(s) receive clear feedback on their likelihood of tenure.

## Stop-the-Clock Policies (Frequency and Supportiveness)

At the time of the survey in the Fall/Winter 2006/7, only 9\% of ladder faculty respondents indicated that they had had their tenure clock slowed or stopped while at Harvard. Of the tenure-track faculty who did, $73 \%$ say they have found their departments to be supportive of this process. There are no statistically significant gender-based differences in views of this subject.

## Clarity of the Tenure Criteria

A majority of the ladder faculty find the criteria for tenure to be clearly communicated, with $58 \%$ agreeing "somewhat" or "strongly" with this view. The extent, however, to which the ladder faculty believe that they are clearly communicated varies across demographic groups. To illustrate these differences, Figure T1 presents descriptive statistics of the faculty's responses to the following question by rank and gender: "To what extent do you agree that the criteria for tenure are clearly communicated?"

Figure T1: Extent to which the Tenure Criteria are Clearly Communicated by Rank and Gender (Ladder Faculty)

|  |  |  | \% of <br> Number of <br> Respondents | Respondents <br> in Somewhat <br> or Strong | Agreement |  |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Mean | Standard <br> Deviation |  |  |  |
| Rank | Tenured Faculty | 618 | $68 \%$ | 3.66 | 1.19 |  |
|  | Tenure-Track Faculty | 312 | $39 \%$ | 2.71 | 1.40 |  |
| Gender | Women | 252 | $44 \%$ | 2.97 | 1.40 |  |
|  | Men | 678 | $64 \%$ | 3.49 | 1.29 |  |

(1=strongly disagree $2=$ somewhat disagree 3=neither agree nor disagree $4=$ somewhat agree $5=$ strongly agree)
The most striking difference in the table above is the nearly 1-point difference between the means (on a 5-point scale) for tenured and tenure-track faculty. Whereas, the tenured faculty, on average, agree "somewhat" that the criteria are clearly communicated, the tenure-track faculty are more ambivalent - neither agreeing nor disagreeing with this view. (The tenuretrack faculty expressed a similar view of the tenure criteria in the 2005 COACHE survey. In COACHE, $44 \%$ of the tenure-track faculty considered the tenure criteria to be "fairly" or "very" clear. In the 2006-2007 Faculty Climate Survey, 39\% of the tenure-track faculty agree "somewhat" or "strongly" that the criteria for tenure are clearly communicated.)

The above table also highlights a half-point difference between men and women, which although substantial in size, is half the difference between tenured and tenure-track faculty. According to these data, on average women agree less strongly than men that the tenure criteria are clearly communicated.

Applying the baseline specification (i.e., rank, gender, ethnicity, citizenship, age and School), we test if these demographic differences in the clarity of the tenure criteria question are statistically significant and find the following statistically significant rank- and gender-based results (see Table T1 in the Tenure Appendix for all significant results):

- Rank: Relative to tenured faculty, tenure-track faculty agree to a lesser extent that the tenure criteria are clearly communicated ( 0.71 point difference).
- Gender: Relative to men, women agree to a lesser extent that the tenure criteria are clearly communicated ( 0.33 point difference).

Given that Schools play a crucial role at Harvard in establishing and communicating the tenure criteria, we look to see if these results persist at the School level. According to these Schoolspecific analyses (of the same baseline specification above), the following rank- and genderbased results are statistically significant (see Table T1 in the Tenure Appendix for all significant results):

- Rank: Relative to tenured faculty, tenure-track faculty agree to a lesser extent that the criteria for tenure are clearly communicated at FAS ( 0.75 point difference) and KSG (2.32 point difference).
- Gender: Relative to men, women agree to a lesser extent with this view at FAS (0.37 point difference) and HBS (0.62 point difference).

In order to explore the relationship between gender and rank at the University level, that also persists in some cases at the School level, Figure T2 depicts the extent to which men and women by rank agree that the criteria for tenure are clearly communicated.

Figure T2: Average Agreement by Gender and Rank with "The criteria for tenure are clearly communicated"

(1=strongly disagree $2=$ somewhat disagree $3=$ neither agree nor disagree $4=$ somewhat agree $5=$ strongly agree)
According to the above graph, the mean value for women is lower than that of men within each rank, and the difference in means between tenured women and tenured men is slightly larger than the difference between tenure-track women and tenure-track men. Nonetheless, tenuretrack faculty of both genders report lower average scores than their tenured counterparts.

When we add an interaction term for gender and rank to the baseline specification and apply post-estimation F-tests to the analysis, we find the following differences are statistically significant (see Table T1 in the Tenure Appendix for all significant results): ${ }^{98}$

- Gender Differences within each Rank: Relative to tenured men, tenured women agree to a lesser extent that the criteria for tenure are clearly communicated.
- Rank Differences by Gender:
o Relative to tenured men, tenure-track men agree to a lesser extent that the criteria for tenure are clearly communicated.
o Relative to tenured women, tenure-track women agree to a lesser extent that the tenure the criteria for tenure are clearly communicated.

Mentoring (either formal or informal) is one mode through which tenured faculty may communicate information about the criteria for tenure to the tenure-track faculty. Therefore, since tenure-track faculty of both genders find the tenure criteria to be rather unclear, we

[^54]investigate whether or not mentoring helps clarify them. To perform this analysis, we restrict the population to the tenure-track faculty and add a variable representing the effectiveness of overall mentoring to the baseline specification predicting the clarity of the tenure criteria. According to this analysis, finding mentoring to be more effective is associated with a clearer understanding of the tenure criteria for tenure-track faculty. In particular, the model predicts a 0.41 point increase in clarity for every one point increase in the effectiveness of mentoring. ${ }^{99}$ (See Table T2 in the Tenure Appendix for all significant results.)

## Basis of the Tenure Criteria (Teaching, Research and Service)

Ladder faculty were also asked about the specific criteria on which the tenure process is based. Figure T3 presents descriptive statistics of their responses to the following question: "In your experience, to what extent are the following items valued in the tenure process at your School: research/scholarly work, teaching contributions, and service?"

Figure T3: The Value Placed on Research, Teaching and Service in the Tenure Process

(1=valued slightly or not at all 2=somewhat valued 3=highly valued)
Ladder faculty feel that research/scholarly work is valued the most in the tenure process as $94 \%$ believe that it is "highly valued." Teaching and service, on the other hand, are believed to be much less valued as only $20 \%$ consider teaching contributions to be "highly valued" and $9 \%$ find that service is "highly valued" in the tenure process.

Tenured and tenure-track faculty have similar views on how much research/scholarly work is valued in the tenure process, but they differ over the extent to which they think teaching contributions and service are valued. To illustrate these differences, Figure T4 depicts the tenured and tenure-track faculty's mean responses to the question regarding the value placed on research, teaching and service in the tenure process.

[^55]Figure T4: The Value Placed on Research, Teaching and Service in the Tenure Process (Mean Agreement by Rank)

(1=valued slightly or not at all 2=somewhat valued 3=highly valued)
According to the baseline specification, there are no statistically significant differences between men and women regarding any of these 3 issues. However, this analysis does reveal that relative to tenured faculty, tenure-track faculty report teaching contributions to be valued significantly less highly at their Schools ( 0.20 point difference). (See Table T3 in the Tenure Appendix for all significant results.)

## Appropriateness of the Tenure Criteria

In addition to identifying the value placed on research, teaching and service in the tenure process, ladder faculty were also asked to indicate the extent to which they believe each of these items are valued appropriately in the tenure process. Figure T5 illustrates these views.

Figure T5: Tenure Criteria: Appropriateness of the Value
Placed on Research, Teaching and Service

(1=very undervalued $2=$ somewhat undervalued $3=$ valued appropriately $4=$ somewhat overvalued $5=$ very overvalued)
Of all 4 issues identified above, research/scholarly work is the issue that the largest percentage of ladder faculty (71\%) believes is "valued appropriately" in the tenure process. Recall that this is also the issue that the largest percentage of ladder faculty believes is "highly valued" in the tenure process.

Far fewer ladder faculty, however, feel that the remaining issues are "valued appropriately" (i.e., teaching contributions, service and student evaluations). Fifty-five percent of the ladder faculty respondents indicate that teaching contributions are "very" or "somewhat" undervalued in the tenure process, while $43 \%$ of the faculty find that service is "very" or "somewhat" undervalued. ${ }^{100}$ The faculty's assessment of whether student evaluations are overvalued or undervalued in the tenure process is fairly evenly split, with $32 \%$ feeling they are undervalued and $21 \%$ indicating they are overvalued.

Since the tenured faculty's views of these issues may differ from those of the tenure-track faculty, Figure T6 below graphs the faculty's mean responses for each of these areas by rank.

[^56]Figure T6: Average Appropriateness of the Value Placed on Teaching, Service, Student Evaluations and Research by Rank

( $1=$ very undervalued $2=$ somewhat undervalued $3=$ valued appropriately $4=$ somewhat overvalued $5=$ very overvalued)
The figure above shows that both ranks believe that teaching and service are undervalued, while research/scholarly work is overvalued. Additionally, tenured faculty report that student evaluations are valued appropriately whereas tenure-track faculty find them to be undervalued. ${ }^{101}$ However, each group varies in the extent to which they share these views.

Applying the baseline specification, we find the following statistically significant rank- and gender-based results for ladder faculty (see Table T4 in the Tenure Appendix for all significant results):

- Rank: Relative to tenured faculty, tenure-track faculty find that research is more overvalued in the tenure process ( 0.22 point difference), and that teaching ( 0.29 point difference), student evaluations ( 0.47 point difference) and service ( 0.32 point difference) are valued less appropriately in the tenure process.
- Gender: Relative to men, women find that research is more overvalued in the tenure process at their Schools ( 0.19 point difference), and service is more undervalued ( 0.23 point difference).

To understand the relationship between gender and rank, we examine the average appropriateness evaluation disaggregated by gender and rank, with each of the above 4 issues. These results are presented in Figure T7 below.

[^57]Figure T7: The Appropriateness of the Value Placed on Teaching, Service, Student Evaluations and Research (Mean Value by Gender and Rank)

( $1=$ very undervalued $2=$ somewhat undervalued $3=$ valued appropriately $4=$ somewhat overvalued $5=$ very overvalued)

Adding an interaction term for gender and rank to our baseline specification and applying postestimation F-tests to these models, we find the following statistically significant differences (see Table T5 of the Tenure Appendix for all significant results): ${ }^{102}$

- Gender differences within each rank:
o Relative to tenured men, tenured women believe that teaching, service and student evaluations are more undervalued in the tenure process at their Schools.
o Relative to tenure-track men, tenure-track women believe that research/scholarly work is more overvalued in the tenure process at their Schools.
- Rank differences by gender:
o Relative to tenured men, tenure-track men believe that teaching, student evaluations and service are more undervalued in the tenure process at their Schools.
o Relative to tenured women, tenure-track women believe that research is more overvalued in the tenure process at their Schools.


## Feedback on Tenure Prospects

While knowledge of the tenure criteria and its various components is very important, the tenure-track faculty are arguably most interested in knowing how well they individually meet

[^58]these criteria and, thus, how likely they are to get tenure. Overall, $54 \%$ of the ladder faculty feel that the "junior faculty in [their] department receive clear feedback on their likelihood of getting tenure." However, there are notable disparities in the tenured and tenure-track faculty's view of this issue, as well as that of men compared to women. Accordingly, tenure-track faculty agree to a lesser extent than tenured faculty that "junior faculty receive clear feedback on their likelihood of getting tenure." Likewise, women agree to a lesser extent than men.

To illustrate these differences, Figure T8 presents descriptive statistics of the ladder faculty's responses to the following question according to demographic group: "To what extent do you agree that junior faculty in your department receive clear feedback on their likelihood of getting tenure?"

Figure T8: Extent to which Junior Faculty Receive Clear Feedback on their Likelihood of Getting Tenure by Rank and Gender (Ladder Faculty)

|  |  |  | \% of <br> Number of | Respondents <br> in Somewhat <br> or Strong <br> Agreement | Agreement |  |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Mean | Standard <br> Despondention |  |  |  |
| Rank | Tenured Faculty | 631 | $67 \%$ | 3.68 | 1.12 |  |
|  | Tenure-Track Faculty | 321 | $27 \%$ | 2.62 | 1.24 |  |
| Gender | Women | 256 | $41 \%$ | 2.93 | 1.36 |  |
|  | Men | 696 | $58 \%$ | 3.47 | 1.20 |  |

(1=strongly disagree $2=$ somewhat disagree $3=$ neither agree nor disagree $4=$ somewhat agree $5=$ strongly agree)
As with clarity of the tenure criteria, what is most striking in the above graph is the 1-point difference in the means between tenured and tenure-track faculty. Also noteworthy is the halfpoint difference in the means between men and women.

Applying the baseline specification, we find the following statistically significant rank- and gender-based differences (see Table T6 in the Tenure Appendix for all significant results):

- Rank: Relative to tenured faculty, tenure-track faculty agree to a lesser extent that "junior faculty in their departments receive clear feedback on their likelihood of tenure" ( 0.86 point difference).
- Gender: Relative to men, women agree to a lesser extent that "junior faculty in their department receive clear feedback on their likelihood of tenure" ( 0.33 point difference).

Since tenure-track faculty receive feedback about their tenure prospects primarily at the School and departmental level, we also analyze this issue within each of the Schools (using the same baseline specification above). According to School-specific analyses, the following rank- and gender-based results are statistically significant (see Table T6 in the Tenure Appendix for all significant results):

- Rank: Relative to tenured faculty, tenure-track faculty agree to a lesser extent with this position at 4 Schools: FAS ( 0.82 point rank gap), KSG (1.23 point rank gap),

HMS/HSDM (0.78 point rank gap), SPH (1.20 point rank gap) and GSE (1.84 point rank gap).

- Gender: Relative to men, women agree to a lesser extent with this position at 4 Schools: FAS ( 0.27 point gender gap), GSD (1.22 point gender gap), HDS (1.20 point gender gap) and KSG (0.95 point gender gap).

In order to explore the relationship between gender and rank at the University level, that also persists in many cases at the School level, Figure T9 graphs, by gender and rank, the average ladder faculty agreement with the view that "junior faculty receive clear feedback on their likelihood of tenure."

Figure T9: Average Agreement with the View that "Junior Faculty Receive Clear Feedback on their Likelihood of Tenure," by Gender and Rank

( $1=$ strongly disagree $2=$ somewhat disagree $3=$ neither agree nor disagree $4=$ somewhat agree $5=$ strongly agree $)$
Adding an interaction term for gender and rank to our baseline specification and applying postestimation F-tests to the analysis, we find the following statistically significant differences (see Table T6 in the Tenure Appendix for all significant results): ${ }^{103}$

- Gender differences within each rank: For both ranks, women agree to a lesser extent than their male counterparts that "junior faculty in their departments receive clear feedback on their likelihood of tenure."
- Rank differences by gender:
o Relative to tenured women, tenure-track women agree to a lesser extent that "junior faculty in their departments receive clear feedback on their likelihood of tenure."
o Relative to tenured men, tenure-track men agree to a lesser extent that "junior faculty in their departments receive clear feedback on their likelihood of tenure."

Additionally, since mentoring is one way in which tenure-track faculty may receive feedback about their tenure prospects, we add a variable for the effectiveness of overall mentoring to the

[^59]baseline specification of receiving clear feedback and restrict the analysis to tenure-track faculty. As expected, the model predicts that the effectiveness of mentoring is positively associated with the extent to which junior faculty receive clear feedback about their prospects for tenure. In particular, the more effective faculty find mentoring in their departments, the more they agree with the feedback statement. The model predicts that for every 1-point increase in the effectiveness of overall mentoring, the extent to which tenure-track faculty agree that "junior faculty receive clear feedback on their likelihood of tenure" increases by 0.39 points. ${ }^{104}$ (See Table T7 in the Tenure Appendix for all significant results.)

## Stopping the Tenure Clock

A faculty member's pursuit of tenure may be complicated by personal and/or family issues. For this reason Harvard has policies in place, which allow faculty members to extend their contracts and in essence stop their tenure clocks (hereafter referred to as stop-the-clock policies). At the time the survey was conducted in the Fall/Winter 2006/7, however, only a small percentage of ladder faculty (9\%) indicated that they had used stop-the-clock policies for any reason while a faculty member at Harvard.

As of July 1, 2006, the University established new guidelines regarding stop-the-clock policies according to which tenure-track faculty who take teaching relief or maternity/parental leave are entitled to an automatic one-year extension of their contract. This policy applies to both men and women. With the establishment of these new guidelines, the number of faculty members, who will have taken advantage of stop-the-clock policies will likely increase.

Since concerns may arise (even with these new guidelines in place) as to whether departments are supportive of their faculty taking advantage of these policies, the survey asks faculty who had taken advantage of these policies the following question: "How supportive was your department concerning your having your tenure clock stopped or slowed?" Figure T10 depicts the tenure-track faculty's responses to this question by gender. We exclude tenured faculty from the graph and analysis below because so few tenured faculty had utilized stop-the-clock policies as tenure-track faculty members at Harvard.

[^60]Figure T10: Supportiveness of Slowing or Stopping the Tenure Clock by Gender (Tenure-Track Faculty)


As this graph illustrates, $71 \%$ of tenure-track women and $78 \%$ of tenure-track men indicate that they found their units to be "very" or "somewhat" supportive. According to the baseline specification, there are no statistically significant gender-based differences in responses to this issue (see Table T8 of the Tenure Appendix for all significant results).

## Tenure Appendix

Table T1: Clarity of the Tenure Criteria at the University and within Each School (Ladder Faculty)

| Dependent Variable: <br> Clarity of the Tenure Criteria |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Regressor | University Baseline | (1) | GSD Baseline | HDS Baseline | GSE Baseline | FAS Baseline | KSG Baseline | HBS Baseline | HLS Baseline | $\begin{gathered} \text { HMS/HSDM } \\ \text { Baseline } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | SPH Baseline |
| Female ${ }^{\dagger}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline-0.33^{* *} \\ (0.10) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline-0.35^{* *} \\ (0.12) \end{gathered}$ | . | $\begin{gathered} \hline-1.17 \\ (0.64) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline-0.82 \\ (0.68) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline-0.37^{*} \\ (0.14) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline-0.33 \\ (0.50) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \hline-0.62^{*} \\ & (0.25) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline-0.24 \\ & (0.45) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline-0.26 \\ (0.31) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0.56 \\ (0.34) \end{gathered}$ |
| Asian/Pacific Islander ${ }^{\dagger}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.04 \\ (0.15) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.04 \\ (0.15) \end{gathered}$ | . | (0.6) | (0.68) | $\begin{gathered} 0.02 \\ (0.23) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.55 \\ (0.64) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.16 \\ (0.27) \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} 0.22 \\ (0.63) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.20 \\ (0.46) \end{gathered}$ |
| Black ${ }^{\dagger}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.01 \\ (0.22) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & -0.01 \\ & (0.22) \end{aligned}$ | . | . | . | $\begin{gathered} -0.42 \\ (0.36) \end{gathered}$ | (0.64) | . | . | . | . |
| Hispanic ${ }^{\dagger}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.04 \\ (0.26) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.04 \\ (0.26) \end{gathered}$ | . | . | . | $\begin{gathered} -0.91 \\ (0.51) \end{gathered}$ | . | $\begin{gathered} 0.09 \\ (0.47) \end{gathered}$ | $\cdot$ | . | . |
| American Indian/ Alaskan Native ${ }^{\dagger}$ | . | . | . | . | . | . | . | . | . | . | . |
| Unknown ${ }^{\dagger}$ | . | . | . | . | . | . | . | . | . | . | . |
| International ${ }^{\dagger}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.20 \\ (0.19) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.20 \\ (0.19) \end{gathered}$ | . | . | . | $\begin{gathered} 0.07 \\ (0.30) \end{gathered}$ | . | $\begin{gathered} 0.54 \\ (0.37) \end{gathered}$ | . | $\begin{gathered} 0 . \dot{20} \\ (0.63) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.33 \\ (0.59) \end{gathered}$ |
| Tenure-Track ${ }^{\dagger}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.71^{* *} \\ (0.13) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.72^{* *} \\ (0.15) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.06 \\ (0.85) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -1.02 \\ (0.96) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.87 \\ (1.00) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.75^{* *} \\ (0.21) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -2.32 * * \\ (0.58) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.32 \\ (0.34) \end{gathered}$ | . | $\begin{gathered} -0.63 \\ (0.35) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.67 \\ (0.42) \end{gathered}$ |
| Age | $\begin{gathered} 0.01 \\ (0.00) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.01 \\ (0.00) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.10^{*} \\ & (0.04) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.01 \\ (0.03) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.01 \\ (0.04) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.01 \\ (0.01) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.07^{*} \\ (0.02) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.00 \\ (0.02) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.00 \\ (0.01) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.02 \\ (0.01) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.01 \\ (0.02) \end{gathered}$ |
| School <br> (8 dummy variables) <br> Female*Tenure-Track | Controlled for but not reported | Controlled for but not reported 0.04 (0.20) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Constant | $\begin{gathered} 3.31^{* *} \\ (0.28) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3.32^{* *} \\ (0.28) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -2.74 \\ (2.29) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4.35 \\ (2.22) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2.84 \\ (2.62) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3.24^{* *} \\ (0.39) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 7.39 * * \\ (1.32) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3.64^{* *} \\ (0.96) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3.92^{* *} \\ (0.93) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2.64 * * \\ (0.85) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2.71^{*} \\ & (1.03) \end{aligned}$ |
| Observations | 930 | 930 | 23 | 22 | 25 | 417 | 43 | 131 | 47 | 120 | 102 |
| R-squared | 0.164 | 0.164 | 0.742 | 0.338 | 0.342 | 0.163 | 0.370 | 0.094 | 0.056 | 0.139 | 0.103 |

[^61]Table T2: Clarity of the Tenure Criteria with Variable for Effectiveness of Mentoring the Junior Faculty (Tenure-Track Faculty)

| Dependent Variable: |
| :--- | :---: |
| Clarity of the Tenure Criteria |$\quad(1)$

Table T3: The Extent that Research, Teaching, and Service are Valued in the Tenure Process at One’s School (Ladder Faculty)

| Dependent Variable: Extent Valued in the Tenure Process: | Research/scholarly work | Teaching contributions | Service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Regressor | Baseline | Baseline | Baseline |
| Female | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0.00 \\ (0.02) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline-0.02 \\ (0.05) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline-0.03 \\ & (0.05) \end{aligned}$ |
| Asian/Pacific Islander | $\begin{gathered} -0.02 \\ (0.04) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.09 \\ (0.08) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.07 \\ (0.09) \end{gathered}$ |
| Black | $\begin{gathered} 0.03 \\ (0.05) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.11 \\ (0.10) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.26^{*} \\ (0.12) \end{gathered}$ |
| Hispanic | $\begin{gathered} -0.03 \\ (0.09) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.05 \\ (0.15) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.16 \\ (0.16) \end{gathered}$ |
| American Indian/ Alaskan Native ${ }^{\dagger}$ | (0.09) |  | (0. |
| Unknown ${ }^{\dagger}$ | . |  |  |
| International | $\begin{gathered} 0.04 \\ (0.03) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.13 \\ (0.10) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.11 \\ (0.10) \end{gathered}$ |
| Tenure-Track | $\begin{gathered} -0.03 \\ (0.03) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.20^{* *} \\ (0.07) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.11 \\ (0.06) \end{gathered}$ |
| Age | $\begin{gathered} 0.00 \\ (0.00) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.01^{* *} \\ (0.00) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.00 \\ (0.00) \end{gathered}$ |
| School <br> (8 dummy variables) <br> Constant | Controlled for but not reported 2.96** (0.07) | Controlled for but not reported 1.53** (0.15) | Controlled for but not reported 1.42** (0.15) |
| Observations | 931 | 915 | 877 |
| R-squared | 0.102 | 0.217 | 0.072 |
| Robust standard errors in parentheses <br> * significant at 5\%; ** significant at $1 \%$ <br> ${ }^{\dagger}$ This demographic group is controlled for in every model but its results are not reported because it contains less than 5 faculty. |  |  |  |

Table T4: Appropriateness of the Value Placed on Research, Teaching, Student Evaluations and Service in the Tenure Process (Ladder Faculty)

| Dependent Variable: <br> Appropriateness of <br> Value in the Tenure <br> Process | Research/ <br> Scholarly Work | Teaching <br> Contributions | Student <br> Evaluations | Service |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |

Robust standard errors in parentheses

* significant at 5\%; ** significant at $1 \%$
${ }^{\dagger}$ This demographic group is controlled for in every model but its results are not reported because it contains less than 5 faculty.

Table T5: Appropriateness of the Value Placed on Research, Teaching, Student Evaluations and Service in the Tenure Process with a Gender-Rank Interaction Variable (Ladder Faculty)

| Dependent Variable: Appropriateness of Value in the Tenure Process | Research/ <br> Scholarly Work | Teaching Contributions | Student Evaluations | Service |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Regressor | (1) | (1) | (1) | (1) |
| Female | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0.08 \\ (0.06) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline-0.15^{*} \\ & (0.07) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline-0.27^{*} \\ & (0.12) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline-0.29 * * \\ (0.09) \end{gathered}$ |
| Asian/Pacific Islander | $\begin{gathered} 0.05 \\ (0.09) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.05 \\ (0.10) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.24 \\ (0.14) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & -0.07 \\ & (0.12) \end{aligned}$ |
| Black | $\begin{gathered} 0.21 \\ (0.13) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.36^{*} \\ (0.15) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.04 \\ (0.25) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.45^{* *} \\ (0.15) \end{gathered}$ |
| Hispanic | $\begin{gathered} -0.17 \\ (0.20) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.08 \\ (0.23) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.51 \\ (0.44) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.03 \\ (0.23) \end{gathered}$ |
| American Indian/ Alaskan Native ${ }^{\dagger}$ | . |  | . | . |
| Unknown ${ }^{\dagger}$ | . |  |  | . |
| International | $\begin{gathered} 0.09 \\ (0.08) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.11 \\ (0.11) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} . \\ 0.05 \\ (0.22) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.03 \\ (0.13) \end{gathered}$ |
| Tenure-Track | $\begin{gathered} 0.12 \\ (0.08) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.33^{* *} \\ (0.10) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.55^{* *} \\ (0.17) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.38^{* *} \\ (0.10) \end{gathered}$ |
| Female*Tenure-Track | $\begin{aligned} & 0.29^{*} \\ & (0.12) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.11 \\ (0.13) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.22 \\ (0.23) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.17 \\ (0.14) \end{gathered}$ |
| Age | $\begin{aligned} & 0.01^{*} \\ & (0.00) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.00 \\ (0.00) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & -0.01 \\ & (0.01) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.01^{*} \\ (0.00) \end{gathered}$ |
| School (8 dummy variables) Constant | Controlled for but not reported 2.86** (0.16) | Controlled for but not reported 2.60** (0.19) | Controlled for but not reported $3.33^{* *}$ <br> (0.30) | Controlled for but not reported $3.05^{* *}$ <br> (0.20) |
| Observations | 915 | 904 | 505 | 861 |
| R-squared | 0.107 | 0.179 | 0.168 | 0.088 |
| Robust standard errors in parentheses <br> * significant at 5\%; ** significant at $1 \%$ <br> ${ }^{\dagger}$ This demographic group is controlled for in every model but its results are not reported because it contains less than 5 faculty. |  |  |  |  |

Table T6: Clarity of Feedback on Likelihood of Getting Tenure for All Ladder Faculty and by School (Ladder Faculty)

| Dependent Variable: <br> Clarity of Feedback on Likelihood of Getting Tenure |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Regressor | Univ. Baseline | (1) | GSD Baseline | HDS Baseline | GSE Baseline | FAS Baseline | KSG Baseline | HBS Baseline | HLS Baseline | $\begin{gathered} \text { HMS/HSDM } \\ \text { Baseline } \end{gathered}$ | SPH <br> Baseline |
| Female | $\begin{gathered} \hline \hline-0.33^{* *} \\ (0.09) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline-0.25^{*} \\ & (0.12) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline-1.22^{*} \\ & (0.53) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline-1.20^{*} \\ (0.55) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline-0.92 \\ & (0.51) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline-0.27^{*} \\ (0.12) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline-0.95^{*} \\ (0.38) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline-0.25 \\ & (0.25) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.41 \\ (0.40) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline-0.44 \\ & (0.28) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.10 \\ (0.31) \end{gathered}$ |
| Asian/Pacific Islander | $\begin{gathered} 0.01 \\ (0.14) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.02 \\ (0.14) \end{gathered}$ | . | . | . | $\begin{gathered} 0.18 \\ (0.20) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.72 \\ (0.54) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.07 \\ (0.26) \end{gathered}$ | . | $\begin{gathered} -0.71 \\ (0.51) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.13 \\ (0.41) \end{gathered}$ |
| Black | $\begin{gathered} -0.26 \\ (0.20) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.26 \\ (0.20) \end{gathered}$ | . | . | . | $\begin{gathered} -0.40 \\ (0.27) \end{gathered}$ | . | . | $\cdot$ | . | . |
| Hispanic | $\begin{aligned} & -0.23 \\ & (0.24) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.22 \\ (0.24) \end{gathered}$ | . | . | . | $\begin{gathered} -1.42^{* *} \\ (0.35) \end{gathered}$ | $\cdot$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.28 \\ (0.46) \end{gathered}$ | $\cdot$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.09 \\ (0.44) \end{gathered}$ | $\stackrel{ }{ }$ |
| American Indian/ Alaskan Native ${ }^{\dagger}$ | . | . | . | . | . | . | . | . | . | . | . |
| Unknown ${ }^{\dagger}$ | . | . | . | . | . | . | . | . | . | . | . |
| International | $\begin{gathered} 0.25 \\ (0.16) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.25 \\ (0.16) \end{gathered}$ | $\stackrel{.}{ }$ | $\stackrel{.}{ }$ | . | $\begin{gathered} 0.20 \\ (0.25) \end{gathered}$ | $\stackrel{.}{ }$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.48 \\ (0.34) \end{gathered}$ | . | $\begin{gathered} -0.11 \\ (0.42) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.16 \\ (0.38) \end{gathered}$ |
| Tenure-Track | $\begin{gathered} -0.86^{* *} \\ (0.11) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.80^{* *} \\ (0.13) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -1.40 \\ (0.88) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & -1.16 \\ & (0.92) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} -1.84^{* *} \\ (0.49) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.82^{* *} \\ (0.18) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -1.23 * \\ (0.54) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.53 \\ (0.32) \end{gathered}$ | $\stackrel{.}{ }$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.78^{* *} \\ (0.29) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -1.20^{* *} \\ (0.35) \end{gathered}$ |
| Age | $\begin{gathered} 0.01 \\ (0.00) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.01 \\ (0.00) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.03 \\ (0.04) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.03 \\ (0.03) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.08 \\ (0.05) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.01^{*} \\ & (0.01) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.01 \\ (0.02) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.01 \\ (0.02) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.01 \\ (0.02) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.01 \\ (0.01) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.01 \\ (0.02) \end{gathered}$ |
| School <br> (8 dummy variables) <br> Female*Tenure-Track | Controlled for but not reported | Controlled for but not reported -0.18 (0.18) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Constant | $\begin{gathered} 3.53^{* *} \\ (0.25) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3.49^{* *} \\ (0.25) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1.96 \\ (2.68) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 4.83^{*} \\ & (2.02) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 8.32 * \\ & (3.08) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3.25 * * \\ (0.33) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3.62 * * \\ (1.04) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3.21^{* *} \\ (0.95) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3.39 * * \\ (0.94) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3.42^{* *} \\ (0.69) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4.16^{* *} \\ (0.94) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| Observations | 952 | 952 | 26 | 23 | 25 | 430 | 44 | 131 | 47 | 123 | 103 |
| R -squared | 0.221 | 0.222 | 0.671 | 0.284 | 0.372 | 0.211 | 0.459 | 0.096 | 0.103 | 0.194 | 0.155 |

Robust standard errors in parentheses

* significant at 5\%; ** significant at $1 \%$
${ }^{\dagger}$ This demographic group is controlled for in every model but its results are not reported because it contains less than 5 faculty.

Table T7: Clarity of Feedback on Likelihood of Getting Tenure with a Variable for Effectiveness of Mentoring Junior Faculty (Ladder Faculty)

| Dependent Variable: <br> Clarity of Feedback on Likelihood of Getting Tenure |  |
| :--- | :---: |
| Regressor | $(1)$ |
| Female | -0.23 |
|  | $(0.13)$ |
| Asian/Pacific Islander | -0.01 |
| Black | $(0.17)$ |
|  | -0.41 |
| Hispanic | $(0.35)$ |
|  | -0.42 |
| American Indian/Alaskan Native ${ }^{\dagger}$ | $(0.26)$ |
| Unknown ${ }^{\dagger}$ | $\cdot$ |
|  | $\cdot$ |
| International | $\cdot$ |
|  | . |
| Tenure-Track | 0.27 |
| Effectiveness of Mentoring Junior Faculty | $(0.16)$ |
|  | 0.00 |
| Age | $(0.00)$ |
|  | $0.39 * *$ |
| School (8 dummy variables) | $(0.05)$ |
| Constant | -0.01 |
|  | $(0.01)$ |
| Observations | Controlled for |
| R -squared | but not reported |
| Robust standard errors in parentheses | $2.18^{* *}$ |
| * significant at 5\%; ** significant at 1\% | $(0.54)$ |
| ${ }^{\dagger}$ This demographic group is controlled for in every model but its results are |  |
| not reported because it contains less than 5 faculty. |  |

## Table T8: Supportiveness of Having Tenure Clock Slowed or Stopped (Tenure-Track Faculty)

| Dependent Variable: <br> Supportiveness of Having Tenure Clock Stopped |  |
| :--- | :---: |
| Regressor | Baseline |
| Female | -0.14 |
|  | $(0.29)$ |
| Asian/Pacific Islander | -0.39 |
| Black $^{\dagger}$ | $(0.41)$ |
|  | . |
| Hispanic $^{\dagger}$ | . |
|  | . |
| American Indian/Alaskan Native |  |

## Hiring and Retention

- TENURED FACULTY RETENTION
- TENURE-TRACK FACULTY RETENTION
- Non-LAdder Faculty Hiring and Retention
- Harvard as a Stepping Stone (All Faculty)


## Summary

The Hiring and Retention section of the survey examines the faculty's likelihood of leaving Harvard within the next 3 years and the reasons they have considered leaving. The survey also assesses whether faculty have received proper guidance in how to use Harvard as a stepping stone for future career opportunities. For non-ladder faculty, the survey further asks about the nature of employment contracts, job descriptions and the contract renewal process. Since each faculty group is asked a number of different questions regarding hiring and retention on the survey, we analyze tenured faculty, tenure-track faculty and non-ladder faculty separately in this section of the report. The main findings are summarized below.

## Tenured Faculty

Overall, $20 \%$ of tenured faculty respondents report that they are "somewhat" or "very" likely to leave Harvard in the next 3 years, including retirement. ${ }^{105}$ There are no gender-based differences in the tenured faculty's likelihood of leaving Harvard, according to regression analysis that takes into account gender, ethnicity, citizenship, age and School. However, age is a significant factor in the likelihood of leaving for those who are 65 or older, but not for those who are under 65. Nonetheless, only $36 \%$ of tenured faculty who are at least 65 years old say that they have considered leaving Harvard "to a great extent" for retirement. Among all tenured faculty, the two "top reasons" faculty have considered leaving Harvard are to increase time to do research and to find a more supportive work environment.

Additionally, $31 \%$ of tenured faculty respondents say they have sought outside job opportunities and $24 \%$ of the tenured faculty respondents say they have received outside offers that they have brought to their deans.

Of those who have brought outside job offers to their deans, $63 \%$ say that they have received adjustments to their contracts in response - the most common type of which is a salary adjustment. There are no gender-based differences in the tenured faculty's likelihood of receiving an adjustment to their contract in response to an outside offer, although there are agebased differences.

## Tenure-Track Faculty

A larger percentage of tenure-track respondents (46\%) than tenured respondents report that they are "somewhat" or "very" likely to leave Harvard in the next 3 years. Moreover, tenure-track women say they are more likely to leave Harvard than tenure-track men. Older tenure-track faculty also report a higher likelihood of leaving than younger tenure-track faculty. The two "top reasons" tenure-track faculty say that they have considered leaving Harvard are to improve their prospects for tenure and to find a more supportive work environment.

Additionally, $40 \%$ of tenure-track faculty say that they have sought outside job offers, but only $20 \%$ say they have received an outside offer that they have brought to their dean.

[^62]Of those faculty who have brought outside job offers to their deans, less than half (44\%) have received adjustments to their contracts in response. As with tenured faculty, salary adjustments are the most common type of adjustment tenure-track faculty report receiving in response to an outside offer.

Finally, only $14 \%$ of the tenure-track faculty (compared to $51 \%$ of the tenured faculty) agree that "junior" faculty members are given clear advice on how to use their department as a stepping stone for future job opportunities.

## Non-Ladder Faculty

Only $9 \%$ of non-ladder faculty report that they are "somewhat" or "very" unlikely to renew their contract if given the opportunity (i.e., likely to leave). The two "top reasons" for which nonladder faculty say they have considered leaving Harvard are to move to a tenure-track position and to enhance their career in other ways.

Almost $70 \%$ of the non-ladder faculty report that their primary role is teaching. Despite this, only $60 \%$ agree that teaching is extensively considered in the contract renewal process, and $43 \%$ believe that it is undervalued in this process.

Finally, similarly to tenure-track faculty, only $15 \%$ of the non-ladder faculty believe that they are given clear advice on how to use Harvard as a stepping stone for future job opportunities.

## Tenured Faculty Retention

This section of the report analyzes the likelihood and reasons for which tenured faculty would consider leaving Harvard. It also examines the frequency with which they seek and receive outside offers.

## Likelihood of Leaving Harvard

Twenty percent of tenured faculty respondents report that they are "somewhat" to "very" likely to leave Harvard in the next 3 years, although only 8\% say they are "very likely." Figure H1 provides descriptive statistics of the faculty's response to the following question by gender: "In the next three years, how likely are you to leave Harvard University (including retirement)?"

Figure H1: Likelihood of Leaving Harvard by Gender - Tenured Faculty

|  |  | Number of <br> Respondents | \% of Respondents <br> Somewhat or <br> Very Likely | Likelihood |  |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $n$ |  |  | $18 \%$ | 2.05 | 1.26 |
| Mean | Standard <br> Deviation |  |  |  |
| Gender | Women | 491 | $20 \%$ | 2.21 | 1.35 |

(1=very unlikely $2=$ somewhat unlikely $3=$ neither likely nor unlikely $4=$ somewhat likely $5=v e r y ~ l i k e l y) ~$

As the above table illustrates, the difference between men and women in terms of their reported likelihood of leaving Harvard is small. Further, regression analysis, which takes into account gender, ethnicity, citizenship, age and School (i.e., the baseline specification), indicates that the gender-based difference in tenured faculty's likelihood of leaving is not statistically significant. However, analysis of this specification does show that older tenured faculty have a greater likelihood of leaving Harvard than younger tenured faculty ( 0.26 point difference for every 10 years of age). (See Table H1 in the Hiring and Retention Appendix for all significant results.) As one might expect, however, the relationship between age and likelihood of leaving is nonlinear as illustrated in Figure H2 below.

Figure H2: Likelihood of Leaving Harvard by Age - Tenured Faculty

(1 = very unlikely $2=$ somewhat unlikely $3=$ neither likely nor unlikely $4=$ somewhat likely $5=$ very likely)
For all age groups except the oldest (i.e., 70+), the mean likelihood of leaving is close to "somewhat unlikely." ${ }^{106}$ Surprisingly, even for faculty of retirement age (i.e., ages 70 and older), the mean likelihood of leaving in the next 3 years only lies between "neither likely nor unlikely" and "somewhat likely" to leave. To take into account this nonlinearity in age, we replace the age variable in our baseline specification with a spline of age knotted at 65 years old (i.e., allowing for a fitted approximation for those ages 30-65 and another fitted approximation for those 65 or older as similarly illustrated in the figure above). ${ }^{107}$ This analysis shows that age is not a factor in leaving for faculty under 65 , but is a significant factor for those 65 or older. In particular, for every 5 year increase in age above 65, the faculty have a 0.65 point increase in their likelihood of leaving. (See Table H1 in the Hiring and Retention Appendix for all significant results.)

## Reasons to Leave

In order to maintain its premier status as a university, Harvard must retain top faculty. To do this, it is important to understand not only how likely faculty are to leave Harvard, but also why they are considering leaving. Whereas the previous subsection analyzed the faculty's likelihood of leaving Harvard, this subsection examines 10 items that tenured faculty may consider as

[^63]reasons to leave. ${ }^{108}$ Figure H3 illustrates the tenured faculty's responses to the following question: "To what extent, if at all, have you considered the following as reasons to leave?"

Figure H3: Reasons to Leave Harvard - Tenured Faculty

|  |  | $\%$ of Respondents Reporting to a Great Extent | \% of Respondents Reporting to Some Extent or a Great Extent |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Increase your time to do research |  | 26\% | 58\% |
| Find a more supportive work environment |  | 24\% | 50\% |
| Enhance your career in other ways |  | 19\% | 56\% |
| Reduce stress |  | 15\% | 47\% |
| Improve the employment situation of your spouse/partner |  | 14\% | 28\% |
| Increase your salary |  | 12\% | 42\% |
| Retirement |  | 12\% | 36\% |
| Address child-related issues |  | 6\% | 15\% |
| Lower your cost of living |  | 5\% | 23\% |
| Pursue a non-academic job |  | 3\% | 17\% |
| Reason Largest \% of Tenured Respondents Consider Leaving to a Great Extent, by School |  |  |  |
| Business <br> Design <br> Divinity <br> Education <br> FAS <br> Government <br> Law <br> Medical/Dental <br> Public Health | Increase your time to do research |  |  |
|  | Improve the employment situation of your spouse/partner |  |  |
|  | Find a more supportive work environment |  |  |
|  | Increase your time to do research |  |  |
|  | Increase your time to do research |  |  |
|  | Find a more supportive work environment |  |  |
|  | Increase your time to do research |  |  |
|  | Enhance your career in other ways |  |  |
|  | Find a more supportive work environment |  |  |

(1=not at all $2=$ to some extent $3=$ to $a$ great extent)
The two "top reasons" tenured faculty say they have considered leaving Harvard are to increase their time to do research and to find a more supportive work environment. ${ }^{109,110}$ Approximately one-quarter of respondents report that they have considered leaving Harvard "to a great extent" for each of these reasons. These are also the "top reasons" that tenured faculty in 7 of the 9 Schools say they have considered leaving Harvard "to a great extent."

[^64]Using the baseline specification (i.e., gender, ethnicity, citizenship, age and School), we test if there are statistically significant demographic differences in the two "top reasons" to leave at the University level. ${ }^{111}$ This analysis indicates that women are more likely than men to consider leaving Harvard to increase their time to do research ( 0.29 point difference) and to find a more supportive work environment ( 0.21 point difference). Additionally, older faculty are less likely to consider leaving to increase their time to do research and to find a more supportive work environment (both 0.12 point decreases for every 10 year increase in age). (See Table H2 in the Hiring and Retention Appendix for all significant results.)

## Outside Job Offers

Another measure of Harvard's ability to retain faculty is the frequency with which they seek outside job offers. This subsection examines this frequency as well as how often faculty receive outside job offers that they bring to their dean, and how often these outside job offers result in adjustments to their contracts. Overall, $31 \%$ of tenured faculty respondents have sought outside job offers, and $24 \%$ of tenured faculty respondents have received outside offers that they took to their dean. ${ }^{12,113}$

The figure below shows the percentage of tenured men and women who answered "yes" to the following questions: (1) "In the last five years, while at Harvard University, have you actively sought outside job offers or responded to job solicitations?" and (2) "In the last five years, while at Harvard University, have you received a formal or informal outside job offer that you took to your dean?"114

Figure H4: Percent of Tenured Faculty Who Sought and Received Outside Job Offers within the Last 5 Years by Gender

|  |  | Number of <br> Respondents | \% of <br> Respondents <br> Who Sought an <br> Outside Offer | \%umber of <br> Respondents | \% of <br> Respondents <br> Who Received <br> an Outside <br> Offer |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Gender | Women | 124 | $39 \%$ | 124 | $31 \%$ |
| Men | 465 | $29 \%$ | 464 | $23 \%$ |  |

Although Figure H4 indicates that there may be a gender-based difference in seeking outside offers, logistic regression analyses of the baseline specifications indicate no significant genderbased differences in either seeking or receiving outside offers. However, they do indicate that relative to younger faculty, older faculty are significantly less likely to seek or receive outside

[^65]job offers. A 50-year old tenured faculty member, for example, is 12.21 percentage points less likely to seek an outside offer than a 40 -year old tenured faculty member. Likewise, a 50 -year old tenured faculty member is 16.50 percentage points less likely to receive an outside job offer that they take to their dean. ${ }^{115}$ (See Table H3 in the Hiring and Retention Appendix for all significant results.)

Of the 144 tenured faculty who say they received an outside offer that they brought to their dean, 140 also indicate whether or not they received an adjustment based on that offer. Sixty-three percent of the latter population received at least 1 adjustment based on their outside offer.

Applying the baseline specification to the faculty's propensity to receive an adjustment, we find that relative to younger faculty, older faculty are less likely to receive an adjustment based on an outside job offer. For example a 50 -year old tenured faculty member is 14.49 percentage points less likely to receive an adjustment than a 40-year old tenured faculty member. ${ }^{116}$ There are no other statistically significant demographic differences in receiving an adjustment based on an outside job offer. (See Table H3 in the Hiring and Retention Appendix.)

Faculty may receive a wide range of adjustments based on their outside job offers. Figure H5 shows the types of adjustments that tenured faculty say they have received, the percentage of faculty receiving each, and the percentage of all adjustments that each type of adjustment constitutes. ${ }^{117}$

Figure H5: Adjustments Given to Tenured Faculty within the Last 5 Years

| Type of Adjustment | Percent of <br> Respondents <br> Receiving | Percent of Total <br> Adjustments |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Salary | $77 \%$ | $35 \%$ |
| Summer salary | $27 \%$ | $13 \%$ |
| Equipment/laboratory/research start-up | $27 \%$ | $13 \%$ |
| Leave time | $16 \%$ | $7 \%$ |
| Promotion to a higher rank | $15 \%$ | $7 \%$ |
| Administrative responsibilities | $13 \%$ | $6 \%$ |
| Employment for spouse/partner | $9 \%$ | $4 \%$ |
| Course load | $7 \%$ | $3 \%$ |
| Special timing of tenure clock | $3 \%$ | $2 \%$ |
| Other | $24 \%$ | $11 \%$ |

Thirty-five percent of the adjustments received by tenured faculty members are salary adjustments. When combined with adjustments to summer salaries, these two adjustments make

[^66]up almost half of all adjustments. Of faculty who received at least one adjustment, $77 \%$ received a salary adjustment and $27 \%$ received a summer salary adjustment.

## Tenure-Track Faculty Retention

This section analyzes the likelihood and reasons for which tenure-track faculty say they have considered leaving Harvard. It also examines the frequency with which they seek and receive outside job offers.

## Likelihood of Leaving Harvard

A larger percentage of tenure-track faculty than tenured faculty report that they are likely to leave Harvard. Almost half of tenure-track faculty respondents ( $46 \%$ versus $20 \%$ of tenured faculty) report that they are "somewhat" to "very" likely to leave Harvard in the next 3 years, and almost a quarter ( $23 \%$ versus $8 \%$ of tenured faculty) report that they are "very likely" to leave. Tenure-track women, however, are more likely to consider leaving than tenure-track men. Figure H6 provides descriptive statistics of the tenure-track faculty's response to the following question by gender: "In the next three years, how likely are you to leave Harvard University (including retirement)?"

Figure H6: Likelihood of Leaving Harvard by Gender - Tenure-Track Faculty

|  |  | Number of | \% of Respondents <br> Somewhat or Very | Likelihood |  |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Mespondents |  |  |  |  |
| Likely to Leave | Meandard |  |  |  |  |
| Reniation |  |  |  |  |  |

( 1 = very unlikely $2=$ somewhat unlikely $3=$ neither likely nor unlikely $4=$ somewhat likely $5=$ very likely)
The mean likelihood for women falls between "neither likely nor unlikely" and "somewhat likely," whereas the mean likelihood for men is closer to "neither likely nor unlikely." Recall that among tenured faculty, the mean likelihood for both men and women is close to "somewhat unlikely."

Applying the baseline specification, we find that tenure-track women are significantly more likely to leave than tenure-track men ( 0.37 point difference). Also, older tenure-track faculty are more likely to leave than younger tenure-track faculty ( 0.31 point increase for every 10 year increase in age). This latter result, however, can be explained by taking into account whether a faculty member is an assistant or associate professor. ${ }^{118}$ (See Table H4 in the Hiring and Retention Appendix for all significant results.)

[^67]
## Reasons to Leave

As with tenured faculty, in addition to examining the likelihood of leaving, we also look at the reasons for which tenure-track faculty say they have considered leaving Harvard. This is especially important given the high percentage of tenure-track faculty who report being "somewhat" or "very" likely to leave in the next 3 years (46\%). This subsection examines 11 items that tenure-track faculty may consider as reasons to leave Harvard. Figure H7 below illustrates these items below in response to the following question: "To what extent, if at all, have you considered the following as reasons to leave?"

Figure H7: Reasons to Leave Harvard - Tenure-Track Faculty

|  |  | \% of Respondents Reporting to a Great Extent | \% of Respondents Reporting to Some Extent or a Great Extent |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Improve your prospects for tenure |  | 44\% | 79\% |
| Find a more supportive work environment |  | 36\% | 62\% |
| Enhance your career in other ways |  | 33\% | 70\% |
| Reduce stress |  | 31\% | 70\% |
| Increase your time to do research |  | 23\% | 50\% |
| Address child-related issues |  | 18\% | 42\% |
| Lower your cost of living |  | 16\% | 43\% |
| Improve the employment situation of your spouse/partner |  | 16\% | 40\% |
| Increase your salary |  | 12\% | 42\% |
| Pursue a non-academic job |  | 4\% | 22\% |
| Retirement |  | 1\% | 6\% |
| Reason Largest \% of Tenure-Track Respondents Consider Leaving to a Great Extent, by School |  |  |  |
| Business <br> Design <br> Divinity <br> Education <br> FAS <br> Government <br> Medical/Dental <br> Public Health | Enhance your career in other |  |  |
|  | Improve your prospects for te |  |  |
|  | Improve your prospects for te |  |  |
|  | Improve your prospects for te |  |  |
|  | Improve your prospects for te |  |  |
|  | Improve your prospects for te | re/Enhance your | er in other ways |
|  | Reduce stress |  |  |
|  | Find a more supportive work | vironment |  |

(1=not at all $2=$ to some extent $3=$ to a great extent)
Note: HLS is not included because only 2 tenure-track faculty responded to these items.
The two "top reasons" for which tenure-track faculty say that they have considered leaving Harvard are to improve their prospects for tenure and to find a more supportive work environment. ${ }^{119,120}$ Almost half of tenure-track respondents (44\%) say that they have considered leaving Harvard "to a great extent" to improve their prospects for tenure. More than a third

[^68](36\%), meanwhile, say that they have considered leaving Harvard "to a great extent" to find $a$ more supportive work environment. Together these two reasons are also the "top reasons" tenure-track faculty at 6 of the 8 Schools have considered leaving Harvard "to a great extent." ${ }^{121}$

Applying the baseline specification to the two "top reasons" to leave, we find the following statistically significant gender-based and age-based results (see Table H5 in the Hiring and Retention Appendix for all significant results): ${ }^{122,123}$

- Gender: Relative to men, women say they are more likely to consider leaving Harvard to improve their prospects for tenure ( 0.24 point difference) and to find a more supportive work environment ( 0.41 point difference).
- Age: Relative to younger faculty, older faculty report they are more likely to leave Harvard to find a more supportive work environment ( 0.29 point increase for every 10 year increase in age).

The Atmosphere section of the survey examines a number of issues in depth that may contribute to the faculty's view of what constitutes a supportive work environment. These issues are: (1) departmental good fit, (2) collegiality and supportiveness of one's department, (3) opportunities to collaborate with faculty in one's primary department, (4) feeling respected by the faculty in one's department, (5) having a voice in the decision-making that affects the direction of one's department, and (6) comfort in raising personal responsibilities when scheduling department obligations. For all of these issues, tenure-track women have significantly less positive assessments of departmental atmosphere than tenure-track men. ${ }^{124}$ (See Table H6 in the Hiring and Retention Appendix for all significant results.)

## Outside Job Offers

Given the relatively large percentage of tenure-track faculty who report that they are likely to leave, and who have extensively considered leaving for a number of reasons, it is important to know how often tenure-track faculty seek and receive outside job offers. This subsection delves into this topic by examining how often tenure-track faculty seek outside job offers, how often they receive outside job offers that they bring to their dean, and how often these outside offers result in adjustments to their contracts. ${ }^{125}$

[^69]Overall, a larger percentage of the tenure-track faculty (40\%) compared to the tenured faculty (31\%) have sought outside job offers. However, despite the larger percentage of tenure-track faculty who have sought outside job offers, a smaller percentage of tenure-track faculty (20\%) compared to tenured faculty (24\%) have received outside offers that they took to their dean. ${ }^{126,127}$ The figure below shows the percentage of tenure-track faculty who answered "yes" to the following questions: (1) "In the last five years, while at Harvard University, have you actively sought outside job offers or responded to job solicitations?" and (2) "In the last five years, while at Harvard University, have you received a formal or informal outside job offer that you took to your dean?" ${ }^{128}$

Figure H8: Percentage of Tenure-Track Faculty Who Sought and Received Outside Job Offers within the Last 5 Years

|  |  | Number of <br> Respondents | \% of <br> Respondents <br> Who Sought <br> an Outside <br> Offer | Number of <br> Respondents | \% of <br> Respondents <br> Who <br> Received an <br> Outside Offer |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Gender | Women <br> Men | 122 | $48 \%$ | 122 | $23 \%$ |

As the above table illustrates, there is a considerable difference between the fractions of tenuretrack men and women have sought outside offers, but a smaller difference in the fractions who have received outside offers. Nonetheless, logistic regression analysis of the baseline specification does not show significant gender-based differences in either seeking or receiving outside offers. It only shows that older faculty are significantly more likely than younger faculty to seek outside job offers (e.g., 11.17 point difference between 30 and 40 year old tenure-track faculty), while indicating no age-based difference in receiving outside offers. (See Table H7 in the Hiring and Retention Appendix for all significant results.)

Of the 64 tenure-track respondents who say they received an outside offer that they brought to their deans, 63 also indicate whether or not they have received an adjustment based on that offer. Less than half (44\%) of the latter population say they received at least 1 adjustment based on their outside offer. Logistic regression analysis of the baseline specification indicates no statistically significant demographic differences among tenure-track faculty's propensity to receive an adjustment. (See Table H7 in the Hiring and Retention Appendix.)

Tenure-track faculty may receive a wide variety of adjustments based on their outside job offers. Figure H9 shows the types of adjustments tenure-track faculty say they have received, the

[^70]percentage of faculty who received each type of adjustment, and the percentage of all adjustments that each type of adjustment constitutes. ${ }^{129}$

Figure H9: Adjustments Given to Tenure-Track Faculty within the Last 5 Years

| Adjustment Received | Percent of <br> Respondents | Percent of Total <br> Adjustments |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Salary | $61 \%$ | $32 \%$ |
| Summer salary | $32 \%$ | $17 \%$ |
| Special timing of the tenure clock | $21 \%$ | $11 \%$ |
| Promotion to a higher rank | $14 \%$ | $8 \%$ |
| Equipment/laboratory/research start-up | $11 \%$ | $6 \%$ |
| Leave time | $11 \%$ | $6 \%$ |
| Administrative responsibilities | $11 \%$ | $6 \%$ |
| Course load | $11 \%$ | $6 \%$ |
| Employment for spouse/partner | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ |
| Other | $14 \%$ | $9 \%$ |

Thirty-two percent of the adjustments received by the tenure-track faculty are salary adjustments. Similar to what was found among the tenured faculty, when regular salary adjustments are combined with adjustments to summer salaries, they make up almost half of all adjustments received. Of tenure-track faculty respondents who received an adjustment, $61 \%$ received a salary adjustment and $32 \%$ received a summer salary adjustment. ${ }^{130}$

## Non-Ladder Faculty Hiring and Retention

This section analyzes the likelihood and reasons for which non-ladder faculty say they have considered leaving Harvard, or conversely, their likelihood of renewing their contracts with Harvard. It also provides descriptive information on the roles, duties, titles, contracts and contract renewal process of the non-ladder faculty.

## Likelihood of Leaving Harvard

Non-ladder faculty who have a renewable contract are asked, "Given the opportunity, how likely would you be to renew your contract?" In order to make this question more comparable to the question asked of the ladder faculty, we reverse the values associated with each response such that higher values correspond with a greater likelihood of not renewing their contracts (i.e., a greater likelihood of leaving).

Overall, only $9 \%$ of the non-ladder faculty report that they are "somewhat" or "very" unlikely to renew their contract (i.e., "somewhat" or "very" likely to leave). Figure H10 disaggregates these results by gender. The figure is based only on the responses of the 143 non-ladder faculty

[^71]respondents who report that they have renewable contracts and also responded to the question regarding the likelihood of renewing it. We cannot make inferences, therefore, about the likelihood of leaving Harvard among non-ladder faculty without renewable contracts.

Figure H10: Likelihood of Not Renewing Contract (Leaving) - Non-Ladder Faculty

|  |  | Number of Respondents | \% of Respondents Somewhat or Very Unlikely to Renew | Likelihood |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Mean |  | Standard <br> Deviation |
| Gender | Women |  | 45 | 7\% | 1.67 | 0.98 |
|  | Men | 91 | 10\% | 1.76 | 1.16 |

Applying the baseline specification, we find no statistically significant demographic differences in the non-ladder faculty's propensity to renew their contracts. (See Table H8 in the Hiring and Retention Appendix.)

## Reasons to Leave

Although only a small percentage of the non-ladder faculty are asked about their likelihood of leaving, the survey asks all non-ladder faculty about the reasons for which they have considered leaving Harvard. These issues capture the non-ladder's satisfaction with Harvard in general, as well as their interests and career goals. Figure H11 illustrates these issues through non-ladder faculty's responses to the following question: "To what extent, if at all, have you considered the following as reasons to leave?"

Figure H11: Reasons to Leave Harvard - Non-Ladder Faculty


The two "top reasons" for which non-ladder faculty members say that they have considered leaving Harvard are to move to a tenure-track position and to enhance their career in other ways. ${ }^{131,132}$ Forty-one percent of the non-ladder faculty report having considered leaving Harvard "to a great extent" to move to a tenure-track position, while $33 \%$ report having considered leaving Harvard "to a great extent" to enhance their career in other ways. Together these two reasons are the "top reasons" non-ladder faculty at 5 of the 8 Schools have considered leaving Harvard "to a great extent." ${ }^{133}$

Applying the baseline specification to the two "top reasons" for leaving, we find the following statistically significant gender- and age-based results (see Table H9 in the Hiring and Retention Appendix for all significant results): ${ }^{134}$

[^72]- Gender: Relative to men, women are more likely to consider leaving Harvard to enhance their career in other ways ( 0.26 point difference).
- Age: Relative to older faculty, younger faculty are more likely to consider leaving Harvard both to move to a tenure-track position and to enhance their career in other ways (point differences of 0.25 and 0.22 for every 10 year increase in age for these issues, respectively).


## Title, Role and Duties of Non-Ladder Faculty

The hiring process for non-ladder faculty at Harvard occurs through different avenues: 53\% of the non-ladder faculty say that they were contacted by a faculty member or administrator at the University, $23 \%$ indicate that they were hired after responding to a job posting, and $16 \%$ say they specifically contacted their departments/units to see if there was a position open or to ask their departments to create a position for them. Meanwhile, $9 \%$ indicate that they came to their position in another way. Some of these "other" ways that faculty identify include: moving from a tenure-track to a non-tenure track position, promotion and spousal hire.

Sixty-nine percent of non-ladder faculty respondents report that teaching is their primary role at Harvard. An additional $15 \%$ of the faculty report that their primary role is research, while $4 \%$ report that it is advising and $12 \%$ report that they have some other primary responsibility. Some of the "other" primary roles that faculty respondents identify include: administrative roles (such as a dean, director of an academic program, or director of a center or institute), dual primary roles (equal roles teaching and advising) and no primary role.

With regards to the nature of their positions, only slightly more than half (54\%) of non-ladder faculty have formal job descriptions. However, of those that do, $86 \%$ report that their job descriptions match the duties they actually perform. Only $28 \%$ report that they have annual performance reviews with their unit head. ${ }^{135}$ Furthermore, 55\% of the non-ladder faculty report that they are "somewhat" or "very" satisfied with their current titles while 32\% report that they are "somewhat" or "very" unsatisfied with their current titles. (See Figure H10 in the Hiring and Retention Appendix for a graph of satisfaction with one’s title by gender.)

A sizable number of the non-ladder faculty surveyed also report being recognized by their individual Schools or deans for their contributions to teaching, advising, and research. Specifically, $39 \%$ of non-ladder faculty respondents indicate that they have been recognized by their School or dean for their contributions to teaching, while $15 \%$ say they have been recognized for their contributions to advising, and $10 \%$ say they have been recognized for their contributions to research. ${ }^{136}$

[^73]
## Contract Renewal Process

Figure H12 shows descriptive statistics on the contract renewal process for non-ladder faculty. Only $60 \%$ of the non-ladder faculty report that they have a formal contract. Of these faculty members, $89 \%$ report that their contract is renewable and $45 \%$ report that the length of their contract is 5 or more years. However, despite the fact that the majority of contract-holding faculty have a renewable contract, only $65 \%$ report that their department has an established contract renewal process.

Figure H12: Contract Renewal Process - Non-Ladder Faculty

| Contract Length | Contract <br> Renewable | Limit on Contract <br> Renewal | Established <br> Renewal Process |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $27 \%$ (1 year or less) | $89 \%$ (Yes) | $65 \%$ (No limit) | $65 \%$ (Yes) |
| $28 \%$ (2-4 years) | $11 \%$ (No) | $14 \%$ (1-3 times) | $35 \%$ (No) |
| $45 \%$ (5 or more years) |  | $22 \%$ (4 or more times) |  |
| $\mathrm{N}=164$ | $\mathrm{~N}=160$ | $\mathrm{~N}=88$ | $\mathrm{~N}=164$ |

Of the non-ladder faculty who report that their departments have an established renewal of contract process, almost half (49\%) "somewhat" or "strongly" agree that the renewal of contract criteria are clearly communicated, whereas almost one-third (32\%) "somewhat" or "strongly" disagree.

In addition to being asked whether the renewal of contract criteria are clearly communicated, non-ladder faculty are also asked what criteria are valued the most in the contract renewal process. Figure H13 shows the non-ladder faculty's responses to the question, "In your experience, to what extent are the following items valued in the renewal of contract process at your School?"

Figure H13: Extent Valued in Contract Renewal Process - Non-Ladder Faculty


Despite the fact that almost $70 \%$ of non-ladder faculty respondents report that their primary role is teaching, only $60 \%$ report that it is valued "extensively" in the contract renewal process. In comparison, almost the same percent (56\%) of the non-ladder respondents report that research is valued "extensively" in the contract renewal process.

Non-ladder faculty are also asked how appropriately they believe each of the aforementioned items, along with student evaluations, are valued in the contract renewal process. Figure H14 illustrates the responses to this question.

Figure H14: Extent Appropriately Valued in Contract Renewal Process - Non-Ladder Faculty

$(1=$ very undervalued $2=$ somewhat undervalued $3=$ valued appropriately $4=$ somewhat overvalued $5=$ very overvalued $)$
Over half of the non-ladder respondents believe that all 4 items above are appropriately valued in the contract renewal process. Further, just under half of non-ladder respondents believe that teaching and service are undervalued, whereas a quarter feel that research is overvalued. Approximately the same percentage of non-ladder faculty believe student evaluations are undervalued as overvalued.

## Harvard as a Stepping Stone (All Faculty)

While some faculty members leave Harvard, their experiences here may help them further their careers elsewhere. Thus, all ladder faculty are asked, "To what extent do you agree that junior faculty in your department receive clear advice on how to use your School as a stepping stone for future job opportunities?" Similarly, non-ladder faculty are asked, "To what extent do you agree that non-tenure track faculty in your department receive clear advice on how to use Harvard University as a stepping stone for future job opportunities?" Figure H15 illustrates the faculty's responses to these questions.

Figure H15: Using Harvard as a Stepping Stone - All Faculty

( $1=$ strongly disagree $2=$ somewhat disagree $3=$ neither agree nor disagree $4=$ somewhat agree $5=$ strongly agree $)$
A much larger percentage of tenured faculty (51\%) than tenure-track faculty (14\%) "somewhat" or "strongly" agree that the junior faculty are given clear advice on how to use their School as a stepping stone for future job opportunities. ${ }^{137}$ Although non-ladder faculty members are asked a slightly different question, the distribution of their agreement closely resembles that of tenuretrack faculty members. Like tenure-track faculty, only $15 \%$ of non-ladder faculty respondents "somewhat" or "strongly" agree with the statement. However, because the wording of the question is slightly different for ladder and non-ladder faculty, we perform all remaining analyses separately for these two groups.

## Ladder Faculty

Restricting the analysis to the ladder faculty and applying the baseline specification to their agreement with the stepping stone statement, we find the following statistically significant rank-, gender- and age-based results (see Table H11 in the Hiring and Retention Appendix for all significant results):

- Rank: Relative to tenured faculty, tenure-track faculty agree to a lesser extent that junior faculty receive clear advice on how to use their School as a stepping stone ( 0.87 point difference).
- Gender: Relative to men, women agree to a lesser extent with the stepping stone question (0.29 point difference).
- Age: Relative to older faculty, younger faculty agree to a lesser extent with the stepping stone question ( 0.11 point difference for every 10 years of age).

[^74]To better understand the rank and gender gaps, we examine the relationship between the two. In this regard, Figure H16 illustrates the average agreement with the stepping stone statement, disaggregated by rank and gender.

Figure H16: Average Male and Female Agreement with the "Stepping Stone" Statement, by Rank

( $1=$ strongly disagree $2=$ somewhat disagree $3=$ neither agree nor disagree $4=$ somewhat agree $5=$ strongly agree)
Adding an interaction term for gender and rank to the baseline specification and applying postestimation F-tests, we find the following statistically significant differences (see Table H11 in the Hiring and Retention Appendix for all significant differences): ${ }^{138}$

- Gender differences within each rank: For both ranks, women agree to a lesser extent with the stepping stone statement than their male counterparts.
- Rank differences by gender: For both men and women, tenure-track faculty agree to a lesser extent than their tenured counterparts with the stepping stone statement.


## Non-Ladder Faculty

Restricting the analysis to non-ladder faculty and applying the baseline specification to their agreement with the stepping stone statement, we find that non-ladder women are 0.41 points less likely to agree than non-ladder men. Additionally, older non-ladder faculty members express greater agreement with the stepping stone statement than younger non-ladder faculty members ( 0.20 point increase for every 10 year increase in age). (See Table H12 in the Hiring and Retention Appendix for all significant results.)

[^75]
## Hiring and Retention Appendix

Table H1: Likelihood of Leaving Harvard in the Next 3 Years (Tenured Faculty)

| Dependent Variable: <br> Likelihood of Leaving |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Regressor | Baseline | $(1)$ |
| Female | -0.11 | -0.07 |
|  | $(0.12)$ | $(0.12)$ |
| Asian/Pacific Islander | 0.20 | 0.12 |
|  | $(0.21)$ | $(0.21)$ |
| Black | 0.31 | 0.29 |
|  | $(0.40)$ | $(0.39)$ |
| Hispanic | -0.08 | -0.01 |
|  | $(0.51)$ | $(0.49)$ |
| American Indian/Alaskan Native ${ }^{\dagger}$ | $\cdot$ | $\cdot$ |
|  | $\cdot$ | $\cdot$ |
| Unknown ${ }^{\dagger}$ | $\cdot$ | $\cdot$ |
| International | $\cdot$. | -0.00 |
|  | $(0.30)$ | $(0.29)$ |
| Age | $0.03^{* *}$ |  |
|  | $(0.01)$ | Controlled for |
| School (8 dummy variables) | Controlled for | nut not reported |
|  | but reported | 0.00 |
| Age knot (30,65) |  | $(0.01)$ |
|  |  | $0.13^{* *}$ |
| Age knot (65,100) |  | $(0.03)$ |
|  | $1.84^{* *}$ |  |
| Constant | $0.70^{*}$ | $(0.39)$ |
| Observations | $(0.35)$ | 623 |
| R-squared | 623 | 0.093 |
| Robust standard errors in parentheses | 0.057 |  |
| * significant at 5\%; ** significant at 1\% |  |  |
| ${ }^{\dagger}$ This demographic group is controlled for in every model but its results are not reported because it contains |  |  |
| less than 5 faculty. |  |  |
|  |  |  |

## Faculty Climate Survey | Hiring and Retention Appendix

Table H2: Two "Top" Reasons for Leaving Harvard (Tenured Faculty)

| Dependent Variable: <br> Reason to Leave: | To Increase One's <br> Time to Do Research | To Find a More Supportive <br> Work Environment |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Regressor | Baseline | Baseline |
| Female | $0.29^{* *}$ | $0.21^{*}$ |
|  | $(0.09)$ | $(0.09)$ |
| Asian/Pacific Islander | -0.19 | -0.00 |
|  | $(0.15)$ | $(0.17)$ |
| Black | -0.27 | -0.05 |
|  | $(0.19)$ | $(0.26)$ |
| Hispanic | 0.23 | 0.02 |
|  | $(0.31)$ | $(0.31)$ |
| American Indian/Alaskan Native ${ }^{\dagger}$ | $\cdot$ | $\cdot$ |
|  | $\cdot$ | $\cdot$ |
| Unknown |  |  |
|  | $\cdot$ | $\cdot$ |
| International | -.02 | -0.07 |
|  | $(0.19)$ | $(0.26)$ |
| Age | $-0.01^{* *}$ | $-0.01^{* *}$ |
|  | $(0.00)$ | $(0.00)$ |
| School (8 dummy variables) | Controlled for | Controlled for |
|  | but not reported | but not reported |
| Constant | $2.62^{* *}$ | $2.38^{* *}$ |
| Observations | $(0.21)$ | $(0.21)$ |
| R-squared | 560 | 536 |

Robust standard errors in parentheses

* significant at 5\%; ** significant at 1\%
${ }^{\dagger}$ This demographic group is controlled for in every model but its results are not reported because it contains less than 5 faculty.

Table H3: Outside Job Offers (Tenured Faculty)

| Dependent Variable: | Sought Outside Offer | Received Outside Offer and Took It to One's Dean | Received an Adjustment Resulting from That Outside Offer |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Regressor | Baseline | Baseline | Baseline |
| Female | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0.37 \\ (0.22) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0.43 \\ (0.23) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0.27 \\ (0.54) \end{gathered}$ |
| Asian/Pacific Islander | $\begin{gathered} -0.81 \\ (0.42) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.40 \\ (0.48) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.20 \\ (0.72) \end{gathered}$ |
| Black | $\begin{gathered} 0.78 \\ (0.64) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1.22 \\ (0.65) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1.18 \\ (1.10) \end{gathered}$ |
| Hispanic | $\begin{gathered} 0.13 \\ (0.80) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1.10 \\ (0.73) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.29 \\ (0.89) \end{gathered}$ |
| American Indian/ Alaskan Native ${ }^{\dagger}$ | . | . |  |
| Unknown ${ }^{\dagger}$ | . | . |  |
| International | $\begin{gathered} . \dot{64} \\ (0.50) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1.69 * * \\ (0.55) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & -0.95 \\ & (0.78) \end{aligned}$ |
| Age | $\begin{gathered} -0.05^{* *} \\ (0.01) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.07 * * \\ (0.01) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.08^{* *} \\ (0.03) \end{gathered}$ |
| School (7 dummy variables) ${ }^{\dagger \dagger}$ Constant | Controlled for <br> but not reported <br> $1.78^{* *}$ <br> $(0.58)$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Controlled for } \\ \text { but not reported } \\ 2.45^{* *} \\ (0.63) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Controlled for } \\ \text { but not reported } \\ 5.06^{* *} \\ (1.53) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| Observations | 588 | 587 | 140 |
| Loglikelihood | -341.33 | -292.58 | -78.21 |

Robust standard errors in parentheses

* significant at 5\%; ** significant at $1 \%$
${ }^{\dagger}$ This demographic group is controlled for in every model but its results are not reported because it contains less than 5 faculty.
${ }^{\text {H† }} \mathrm{HLS}$ is not included because they were not asked about outside offers in the same manner as faculty at other Schools.

Table H4: Likelihood of Leaving Harvard in the Next 3 Years (Tenure-Track Faculty)

| Dependent Variable: <br> Likelihood of Leaving |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Regressor | Baseline | $(1)$ |
| Female | $0.37^{*}$ | $0.40^{*}$ |
|  | $(0.16)$ | $(0.16)$ |
| Asian/Pacific Islander | -0.11 | -0.12 |
|  | $(0.20)$ | $(0.20)$ |
| Black | 0.46 | 0.44 |
|  | $(0.40)$ | $(0.41)$ |
| Hispanic | -0.05 | -0.04 |
|  | $(0.44)$ | $(0.45)$ |
| American Indian/Alaskan Native ${ }^{\dagger}$ | $\cdot$ | $\cdot$ |
|  | $\cdot$ | $\cdot$ |
| Unknown ${ }^{\dagger}$ | $\cdot$ | $\cdot$ |
|  | $\cdot$. | - |
| International | -0.15 | -0.13 |
|  | $(0.21)$ | $(0.21)$ |
| Age | $0.03^{*}$ | 0.02 |
|  | $(0.01)$ | $(0.02)$ |
| School (8 dummy variables) | Controlled for | Controlled for |
|  | but not reported | but not reported |
| Assistant Professor |  | -0.31 |
| Constant | $2.20^{* *}$ | $(0.16)$ |
|  | $(0.53)$ | $2.82^{* *}$ |
| Observations | 322 | $(0.63)$ |
| R-squared | 0.140 | 322 |
| Robust standard errors in parentheses |  | 0.150 |
| significant at 5\%; ** significant at $1 \%$ |  |  |
| ${ }^{\dagger}$ This demographic group is controlled for in every model but its results are not reported because it contains less |  |  |
| than 5 faculty. |  |  |

## Faculty Climate Survey | Hiring and Retention Appendix

Table H5: Two "Top" Reasons for Leaving Harvard (Tenure-Track Faculty)

| Dependent Variable: Reason to Leave: | To Improve One's Prospects for Tenure |  | To Find a More Supportive Work Environment |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Regressor | Baseline | (1) | Baseline | (1) |
| Female | 0.24** | 0.23** | 0.41** | 0.42** |
|  | (0.09) | (0.09) | (0.10) | (0.10) |
| Asian/Pacific Islander | -0.02 | -0.02 | 0.10 | 0.10 |
|  | (0.13) | (0.13) | (0.14) | (0.14) |
| Black | -0.22 | -0.22 | 0.04 | 0.04 |
|  | (0.25) | (0.25) | (0.23) | (0.23) |
| Hispanic | 0.22 | 0.21 | 0.03 | 0.04 |
|  | (0.22) | (0.22) | (0.25) | (0.25) |
| American Indian/ |  |  |  |  |
| Alaskan Native ${ }^{\dagger}$ | . | . | . | . |
| Unknown ${ }^{\dagger}$ | . | . |  | . |
| International |  | 0 |  | , |
|  | -0.17 | -0.18 | -0.14 | -0.14 |
|  | (0.12) | (0.12) | (0.15) | (0.15) |
| Age | 0.01 | 0.01 | 0.03** | 0.03* |
|  | (0.01) | (0.01) | (0.01) | (0.01) |
| School (8 dummy variables) | Controlled for but not reported | Controlled for but not reported | Controlled for but not reported | Controlled for but not reported |
| Assistant Professor |  | 0.08 |  | -0.07 |
|  |  | (0.10) |  | (0.11) |
| Constant | 2.08** | 1.91** | 0.75* | 0.90* |
|  | (0.34) | (0.40) | (0.36) | (0.43) |
| Observations | 304 | 304 | 306 | 306 |
| R-squared | 0.149 | 0.151 | 0.131 | 0.132 |
| Robust standard errors in parentheses <br> * significant at 5\%; ** significant at $1 \%$ |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| ${ }^{\dagger}$ This demographic group is controlled for in every model but its results are not reported because it contains less than 5 faculty. |  |  |  |  |

Faculty Climate Survey | Hiring and Retention Appendix

Table H6: Issues that Contribute to a Supportive Work Environment (Tenure-Track Faculty)

| Dependent Variable: | Good Fit | Collegial Environment | Collaborate Inside | Respected by Faculty | Voice in DecisionMaking | Comfort in Raising Personal Resp. when Scheduling |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Regressor | Baseline | Baseline | Baseline | Baseline | Baseline | Baseline |
| Female | $\begin{gathered} -0.57 * * \\ (0.15) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline-0.64^{* *} \\ (0.16) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline-0.63^{* *} \\ (0.16) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline-0.46^{* *} \\ (0.14) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline-0.64^{* *} \\ (0.16) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline-0.70^{* *} \\ (0.16) \end{gathered}$ |
| Asian/Pacific Islander | $\begin{gathered} 0.00 \\ (0.18) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.16 \\ (0.19) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.01 \\ (0.23) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & -0.07 \\ & (0.19) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & -0.12 \\ & (0.20) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & -0.03 \\ & (0.21) \end{aligned}$ |
| Black | $\begin{gathered} 0.26 \\ (0.37) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.15 \\ (0.40) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.33 \\ (0.42) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.15 \\ (0.35) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.11 \\ (0.51) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.16 \\ (0.46) \end{gathered}$ |
| Hispanic | $\begin{gathered} 0.15 \\ (0.26) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.46 \\ (0.34) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.22 \\ (0.40) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.25 \\ (0.26) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & -0.60 \\ & (0.33) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.10 \\ (0.32) \end{gathered}$ |
| American Indian/ Alaskan Native ${ }^{\dagger}$ | (0.26) | (0.34) | (0.40) | (0.26) | (0.33) | (0.32) |
| Unknown ${ }^{\dagger}$ | . | . | . | . | . | $\cdot$ |
| International | $\begin{gathered} 0.23 \\ (0.18) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.34 \\ (0.19) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} . \\ 0.18 \\ (0.23) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.17 \\ (0.19) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.08 \\ (0.23) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.16 \\ (0.21) \end{gathered}$ |
| Age | $\begin{gathered} -0.04^{* *} \\ (0.01) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.05^{* *} \\ (0.01) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.04^{* *} \\ (0.01) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.02 \\ (0.01) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.04^{* *} \\ (0.01) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & -0.03^{*} \\ & (0.01) \end{aligned}$ |
| School (8 dummy variables) Constant | Controlled for but not reported 5.18** (0.48) | Controlled for but not reported 5.29** (0.54) | Controlled <br> for but not <br> reported <br> $5.11^{* *}$ <br> $(0.51)$ | Controlled for but not reported 4.39** (0.44) | Controlled for but not reported 5.02** (0.57) | Controlled <br> for but not <br> reported <br> $4.50^{* *}$ <br> $(0.55)$ |
| Observations | 323 | 325 | 320 | 325 | 324 | 311 |
| R-squared | 0.111 | 0.159 | 0.159 | 0.094 | 0.134 | 0.141 |

Robust standard errors in parentheses

* significant at 5\%; ** significant at $1 \%$
${ }^{\dagger}$ This demographic group is controlled for in every model but its results are not reported because it contains less than 5 faculty.


## Table H7: Outside Job Offers (Tenure-Track Faculty)

| Dependent Variable: | Sought Outside Offer | Received Outside <br> Offer and Took It <br> to One's Dean | Received an Adjustment <br> Resulting from That <br> Outside Offer |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Regressor | Baseline | Baseline | Baseline |

Table H8: Likelihood of Not Renewing One's Contract (Non-Ladder Faculty)

| Dependent Variable: <br> Likelihood of Not Renewing Contract |  |
| :--- | :---: |
| Regressor | Baseline |
| Female | -0.11 |
|  | $(0.22)$ |
| Asian/Pacific Islander | -0.37 |
|  | $(0.37)$ |
| Black | 0.50 |
|  | $(0.73)$ |
| Hispanic $^{\dagger}$ | $\cdot$ |
|  | $\cdot$ |
| American Indian/Alaskan Native |  |
|  | $\dagger$ |
| Unknown $^{\dagger}$ | $\cdot$ |
|  | $\cdot$ |
| International | $\cdot$ |
|  | $\cdot$ |
| Age | 0.04 |
|  | $(0.25)$ |
| School (8 dummy variables) | 0.00 |
|  | $(0.01)$ |
| Constant | Controlled for |
|  | but not reported |
| Observations | $1.79 * *$ |
| R-squared | $(0.68)$ |
| Robust standard errors in parentheses | 136 |
| * significant at 5\%; ** significant at 1\% | 0.083 |
| ${ }^{\dagger}$ This demographic group is controlled for in every model but its results are not |  |
| reported because it contains less than 5 faculty. |  |

Table H9: Two "Top" Reasons for Leaving Harvard (Non-Ladder Faculty)

| Dependent Variable: Reason to Leave | To Move to a Tenure-Track Position | To Enhance One's Career in Other Ways |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Regressor | Baseline | Baseline |
| Female | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0.08 \\ (0.11) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0.26 * * \\ (0.09) \end{gathered}$ |
| Asian/Pacific Islander | $\begin{aligned} & 0.41^{*} \\ & (0.16) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & -0.06 \\ & (0.19) \end{aligned}$ |
| Black | $\begin{gathered} -0.36 \\ (0.28) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.07 \\ (0.24) \end{gathered}$ |
| Hispanic ${ }^{\dagger}$ | (0.28) | $\begin{gathered} 0.26 \\ (0.26) \end{gathered}$ |
| American Indian/Alaskan Native $^{\dagger}$ | . | . |
| Unknown ${ }^{\dagger}$ | . |  |
| International | $\begin{gathered} 0.23 \\ (0.15) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.32 * \\ & (0.16) \end{aligned}$ |
| Age | $\begin{gathered} -0.03 * * \\ (0.01) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.02^{* *} \\ (0.00) \end{gathered}$ |
| School (8 dummy variables) | Controlled for but not reported | Controlled for but not reported |
| Constant | $\begin{gathered} 3.47 * * \\ (0.27) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3.14^{* *} \\ (0.24) \end{gathered}$ |
| Observations | 255 | 276 |
| R-squared | 0.350 | 0.228 |

Robust standard errors in parentheses

* significant at 5\%; ** significant at $1 \%$
${ }^{\dagger}$ This demographic group is controlled for in every model but its results are not reported because it contains less than 5 faculty.

Figure H10: Satisfaction with Title - Non-Ladder Faculty

(1 = very dissatisfied $2=$ somewhat dissatisfied $3=$ neither satisfied nor dissatisfied $4=$ somewhat satisfied $5=v e r y$ satisfied $)$

Table H11: Tenure-Track Faculty Receive Clear Advice on Using School as a Stepping Stone (Ladder Faculty)

| Dependent Variable: |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Tenure-Track Faculty Receive Clear Advice on Using School as Stepping Stone |  |  |
| Regressor | Baseline | (1) |
| Female | -0.29** | -0.24* |
|  | (0.09) | (0.12) |
| Asian/Pacific Islander | 0.09 | 0.09 |
|  | (0.14) | (0.14) |
| Black | -0.23 | -0.23 |
|  | (0.22) | (0.22) |
| Hispanic | 0.01 | 0.02 |
|  | (0.19) | (0.19) |
| American Indian/Alaskan Native ${ }^{\dagger}$ | (0.9) | (0.19) |
| Unknown ${ }^{\dagger}$ | . | . |
|  |  |  |
| International | 0.02 | 0.02 |
|  | (0.15) | (0.15) |
| Age | 0.01** | 0.01** |
|  | (0.00) | (0.00) |
| Tenure-Track | -0.87** | -0.83** |
|  | (0.11) | (0.13) |
| School (8 dummy variables) | Controlled for | Controlled for |
|  | but not reported | but not reported |
| Female*Tenure-Track |  | -0.13 |
|  |  | (0.17) |
| Constant | 2.93** | 2.90** |
|  | (0.26) | (0.26) |
| Observations | 897 | 897 |
| R-squared | 0.241 | 0.241 |
| Robust standard errors in parentheses <br> * significant at 5\%; ** significant at $1 \%$ |  |  |
|  |  |  |
| ${ }^{\dagger}$ This demographic group is controlled for in every model but its results are not reported because it contains less than 5 faculty. |  |  |

Table H12: Non-Ladder Faculty Receive Clear Advice on Using School as Stepping Stone (Non-Ladder Faculty)

| Dependent Variable: <br> Non-Ladder Faculty Receive Clear Advice <br> on Using School as Stepping Stone |  |
| :--- | :---: |
| Regressor | Baseline |
| Female | $-0.41^{* *}$ |
|  | $(0.13)$ |
| Asian/Pacific Islander | -0.09 |
|  | $(0.21)$ |
| Black | -0.21 |
|  | $(0.45)$ |
| Hispanic | 0.39 |
|  | $(0.46)$ |
| American Indian/Alaskan Native ${ }^{\dagger}$ | $\cdot$ |
|  | $\cdot$ |
| Unknown ${ }^{\dagger}$ | . |
|  | . |
| International | 0.29 |
|  | $(0.23)$ |
| Age | $0.02^{* *}$ |
|  | $(0.01)$ |
| School (8 dummy variables) | Controlled for |
|  | but not reported |
| Constant | $1.61^{* *}$ |
|  | $(0.37)$ |
| Observations | 279 |
| R-squared | 0.127 |
| Robust standard errors in parentheses |  |
| * significant at 5\%; ** significant at 1\% |  |
| ${ }^{\dagger}$ This demographic group is controlled for in every model but its results |  |
| are not reported because it contains less than 5 faculty. |  |
|  |  |
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Table H13: Reasons to Leave Harvard (Tenured Faculty)

| Dependent <br> Variable: <br> Reason to Leave Harvard: | Increase Salary | Enhance Career in Other Ways | Pursue a NonAcademic Job | Reduce Stress | Address ChildRelated Issues | Improve Employment Situation of Spouse/Partner | Lower Cost of Living | Retirement |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Regressor | Baseline | Baseline | Baseline | Baseline | Baseline | Baseline | Baseline | Baseline |
| Female | $\begin{gathered} \hline-0.09 \\ (0.07) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 0.18^{*} \\ & (0.09) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 0.12^{*} \\ & (0.06) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \hline 0.37 * * \\ (0.08) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \hline 0.27 * * \\ (0.08) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.15 \\ (0.09) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline-0.04 \\ (0.06) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.09 \\ (0.08) \end{gathered}$ |
| Asian/Pacific Islander | -0.02 | 0.19 | 0.03 | -0.12 | 0.10 | 0.34* | 0.04 | -0.03 |
| Black | $\begin{gathered} (0.14) \\ 0.09 \\ (0.19) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} (0.14) \\ 0.26 \\ (0.23) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} (0.10) \\ 0.19 \\ (0.18) \end{gathered}$ | (0.13) <br> -0.43** <br> (0.13) | $\begin{gathered} (0.10) \\ -0.16 \\ (0.10) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} (0.14) \\ 0.23 \\ (0.22) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} (0.12) \\ 0.01 \\ (0.10) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} (0.08) \\ -0.08 \\ (0.25) \end{gathered}$ |
| Hispanic | $\begin{gathered} 0.49 \\ (0.32) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.23 \\ (0.26) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.02 \\ (0.15) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.13 \\ (0.24) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.19 \\ (0.28) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.05 \\ (0.32) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.09 \\ (0.14) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.09 \\ (0.18) \end{gathered}$ |
| American <br> Indian/ <br> Alaskan <br> Native ${ }^{\dagger}$ | . | (0.26) | (0.15) | (0.24) | (0.28) | (0.32) | (0.14) | (0.18) |
| Unknown ${ }^{\dagger}$ | . | . | . |  |  |  | . |  |
| International | $\begin{gathered} . \\ 0.22 \\ (0.23) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.21 \\ (0.19) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} . \\ -0.02 \\ (0.10) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.25 \\ (0.13) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.48 \\ (0.25) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.26 \\ (0.26) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.02 \\ (0.17) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.02 \\ (0.17) \end{gathered}$ |
| Age | $\begin{gathered} -0.02^{* *} \\ (0.00) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.01^{* *} \\ (0.00) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.00 \\ (0.00) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.01^{* *} \\ (0.00) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.01^{* *} \\ (0.00) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.01^{* *} \\ (0.00) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.01^{* *} \\ (0.00) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.04^{* *} \\ (0.00) \end{gathered}$ |
| School (8 dummy variables) <br> Constant | Controlled for but not reported 2.45** (0.18) | Controlled for but not reported 2.34** (0.19) | Controlled for but not reported 1.07** (0.11) | Controlled for but not reported 2.28** (0.19) | Controlled for but not reported 1.82** (0.13) | Controlled for but not reported 2.17** (0.20) | Controlled for but not reported 1.96** (0.15) | Controlled for but not reported -0.83** (0.15) |
| Observations | 552 | 530 | 499 | 543 | 465 | 495 | 520 | 497 |
| R-squared | 0.101 | 0.068 | 0.055 | 0.131 | 0.158 | 0.109 | 0.090 | 0.323 |

Robust standard errors in parentheses

* significant at 5\%; ** significant at $1 \%$
${ }^{\dagger}$ This demographic group is controlled for in every model but its results are not reported because it contains less than 5 faculty.

Table H14: Reasons to Leave (Tenure-Track Faculty)


Robust standard errors in parentheses

* significant at 5\%; ** significant at 1\%
${ }^{\dagger}$ This demographic group is controlled for in every model but its results are not reported because it contains less than 5 faculty.

Table H15: Reasons to Leave (Non-Ladder Faculty)


Robust standard errors in parentheses

* significant at 5\%; ** significant at $1 \%$
${ }^{\dagger}$ This demographic group is controlled for in every model but its results are not reported because it contains less than 5 faculty.


## Life Outside Harvard

- FAMILY LIFE
- UsE of Policies to Support Faculty and Their Families
- THE IMPACT OF FAMILY LIFE ON CAREER
- Scheduling Conflicts
- SoURCES OF PERSONAL STRESS


## Summary

The Life Outside Harvard section of the survey attempts to understand the external demands faculty face and how these demands influence their careers. The first part of this section presents information about the faculty's family lives (e.g., spouse/domestic partners and children). The second part uses this information to analyze three issues, namely the impact of family life on career, scheduling conflicts, and sources of personal stress. The results of these analyses are summarized below.

## Family Life

According to the survey, $89 \%$ of the faculty have a spouse or domestic partner. Seventy-six percent have at least one child and $17 \%$ have at least one child under the age of 5 . Thirty-nine percent of tenure-track faculty have children in this age category.

Of faculty that have children in need of childcare, less than one-quarter (21\%) say that they currently use Harvard-affiliated childcare services. An additional 19\% say they wanted to use Harvard-affiliated childcare but could not get in. Nearly two-thirds (60\%) say they chose to make alternative child-care arrangement instead of using Harvard childcare facilities.

Almost one third (31\%) of the ladder faculty have spouses that currently work in academia - as faculty members, post-doctoral fellows/research associates, or graduate students. Forty-nine percent of these faculty members report that their spouses work at Harvard, while the remaining are at other institutions. Of the faculty with spouses at other institutions, over half (51\%) report that they are in commuting relationships (i.e., at least one person is commuting more than an hour to work or they are living in separate communities more than an hour apart from each other). Seventy-eight percent of the faculty in commuting relationships report that their spouses had problems finding appropriate jobs locally and only $6 \%$ received help from their School finding local employment for their spouses.

## The Impact of Family Life on Career

Overall, $32 \%$ of the faculty "strongly" or "somewhat" agree that caregiving and/or other domestic responsibilities have had a negative impact on their career. While only $26 \%$ of the tenured faculty are of this opinion, $46 \%$ of the tenure-track faculty and $33 \%$ of non-ladder faculty share this view. Further, $49 \%$ of women "strongly" or "somewhat" agree with this statement whereas only $25 \%$ of men feel this way.

Taking into account rank, gender, ethnicity, citizenship, age and School, the mean differences between tenured and tenure-track faculty, between tenure-track and non-ladder faculty and between men and women are statistically significant.

Additionally, faculty who have pre-school age children (i.e., ages $0-4$ ) or school-age children (i.e., ages 5-17) - compared to faculty without children - agree more strongly that their caregiving and/or other domestic responsibilities have had a negative impact on their career.

Finally, faculty with employed spouses agree more strongly than faculty with unemployed spouses.

## Scheduling Conflicts

Forty-three percent of the faculty report that they have never had to miss all or a part of an important work-related meeting or commitment in the past year due to caregiving and/or other domestic responsibilities and $44 \%$ report having had to do this at most two or three times a semester. Although a smaller number (13\%) report they have had to miss a meeting either in part or in full at least once or twice a month, a larger percentage of women than men ( $17 \%$ versus $11 \%$ ) report they have had to miss meetings with this frequency. Taking into account rank, gender, ethnicity, citizenship, age and School, non-ladder faculty report that they are less likely than tenured and tenure-track faculty to miss meetings this often. The difference between men and women is also statistically significant in this model, but does not remain so when other variables such as children and spousal employment are added.

Faculty who have pre-school age or school-age children are more likely to miss all or part of an important meeting at least once or twice a month compared to faculty with no children. Faculty who are responsible for an aging or ill relative are also more likely to miss all or part of an important meeting this often than faculty are with no dependent care responsibilities. Finally, faculty with unemployed spouses are less likely to miss all or part of an important meeting this often than faculty with employed spouses.

## Sources of Personal Stress

To examine sources of personal stress, the survey asks the faculty the extent to which they find 6 different areas of their lives to be stressful. The extent to which respondents find each to be an extensive source of stress is as follows: managing household responsibilities (21\%), childcare (20\%), cost of living (16\%), dependent care (12\%), reproductive decisions and issues (7\%), and their health (6\%).

Taking into account rank, gender, ethnicity, citizenship, age and School, women are significantly more stressed than men regarding all of these issues, except the cost of living. Tenure-track faculty report significantly more stress regarding reproductive decisions than tenured faculty and non-ladder faculty, but significantly less stress regarding dependent care. Non-ladder faculty and tenure-track faculty report significantly less stress than tenured faculty regarding managing household responsibilities. Finally, non-ladder faculty report significantly more stress than tenured faculty regarding cost of living.

Additionally, faculty with pre-school age or school-age children find managing household responsibilities and childcare to be greater sources of stress than faculty without children. Faculty with pre-school age children also find reproductive decisions/issues to be a greater source of stress than faculty without children, while faculty with school-age children find them to be a lesser source of stress than faculty without children. In contrast, faculty with school-age children report more stress regarding the cost of living than faculty without children. Lastly, relative to faculty without children, faculty with adult children report less stress regarding
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managing household responsibilities. Stress levels for some of these issues also vary with spousal employment status and whether or not one is caring for an aging/ill family member.

## Family Life

Before examining the relationship between family and work life, we first describe characteristics of the faculty's family such as marriage and children. According to the survey, 89\% of the faculty have a spouse or domestic partner, and $79 \%$ of these faculty members report that they were with this person before coming to Harvard.

Of those faculty members who have a spouse or domestic partner, $20 \%$ report that their spouse or domestic partner works at Harvard ( $15 \%$ are academics and $5 \%$ are non-academics). ${ }^{139}$ Another $14 \%$ report that their spouse or domestic partner is employed at another university as an academic. However, faculty report most commonly that their spouse/domestic partner is employed in a non-academic position outside of Harvard (41\%). Finally, $16 \%$ are not employed outside the home and are not seeking employment, $3 \%$ are not employed but are actively seeking employment, and $7 \%$ are of another employment status. This information is disaggregated by rank and gender in Figure L1 below.

Figure L1: Spousal Employment for All Faculty and by Gender and Rank

|  | All | Gender |  | Rank |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Women | Men | Tenured <br> Faculty | Tenure- <br> Track <br> Faculty | Non- <br> Ladder <br> Faculty |
| Spouse or domestic partner | $89 \%$ | $84 \%$ | $91 \%$ | $90 \%$ | $89 \%$ | $85 \%$ |
| Spouse/domestic partner employment: <br> Employed at Harvard (academic) | $15 \%$ | $22 \%$ | $12 \%$ | $16 \%$ | $14 \%$ | $12 \%$ |
| Employed at another university |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| (academic) | $14 \%$ | $17 \%$ | $13 \%$ | $14 \%$ | $20 \%$ | $9 \%$ |
| Employed at Harvard (non-academic) | $5 \%$ | $3 \%$ | $6 \%$ | $6 \%$ | $5 \%$ | $4 \%$ |
| Employed elsewhere in some other |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| capacity | $41 \%$ | $43 \%$ | $39 \%$ | $36 \%$ | $45 \%$ | $44 \%$ |
| Not employed outside the home | $16 \%$ | $5 \%$ | $20 \%$ | $19 \%$ | $8 \%$ | $17 \%$ |
| Actively seeking employment | $3 \%$ | $2 \%$ | $4 \%$ | $3 \%$ | $4 \%$ | $3 \%$ |
| Other | $7 \%$ | $8 \%$ | $6 \%$ | $7 \%$ | $4 \%$ | $10 \%$ |

Figure L1 indicates that 30\% of tenured faculty and 34\% of tenure-track faculty have spouses that currently work in academia at Harvard or at another institution - either as faculty members, post-doctoral fellow/research associates, or graduate students. This is true of only $21 \%$ of the non-ladder faculty.

[^76]To investigate this topic further, we restrict the population to ladder faculty with spouses in academia and analyze where their spouses work and whether they are in a commuting relationship. A commuting relationship is defined as a relationship in which (1) one or both individuals commute to another community more than an hour away or (2) they live in different communities more than an hour away from one another. Figure L2 demonstrates the percentage of ladder faculty with spouses who work in academia at Harvard, the percentage that have spouses working at another institution and are not in a commuting relationship, and the percentage of faculty whose spouses work at another institution and are in a commuting relationship.

Figure L2: Ladder Faculty Spousal Employment in Academia


Approximately half (49\%) of these ladder faculty with spouses in academia have spouses that work at Harvard. A quarter (25\%) have spouses that work at another institution and are not in a commuting relationship. ${ }^{140}$ The last quarter (26\%) have spouses that work at another institution and are in a commuting relationship. Of these faculty members who are in a commuting relationship with someone who works in academia at another institution, $78 \%$ have spouses who had problems finding an appropriate job locally, and only 6\% received help from their School finding local employment for their spouse.

Commuting may be particularly problematic for faculty with children. In fact, including nonladder faculty, $43 \%$ of all faculty in a commuting relationship have at least one child under the age of 18 .

Having young children is closely related to the age of a faculty member, as is the need to care or manage care for an aging and/or ill parent, spouse, or other relative. Thus, we present descriptive statistics about age, children, and caring or managing care for others, by gender and rank in Figure L3 below.

[^77]Figure L3: Age, Children, and Care of Others

|  | All Faculty | Gender |  | Rank |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Women | Men | Tenured Faculty | TenureTrack Faculty | Non- <br> Ladder Faculty |
| Age (Mean) | $\begin{gathered} \hline 50.43 \\ (11.75) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 47.23 \\ (10.30) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 51.78 \\ (12.06) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 56.21 \\ & (9.65) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 38.57 \\ & (6.19) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \hline 51.00 \\ (10.91) \end{gathered}$ |
| Number of children (Mean) | $\begin{gathered} 1.62 \\ (1.33) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1.26 \\ (1.09) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1.76 \\ (1.39) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1.88 \\ (1.37) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1.05 \\ (1.06) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1.66 \\ (1.33) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| Have at least 1 child (\%) ${ }^{141}$ | 76\% | 69\% | 79\% | 85\% | 58\% | 76\% |
| Have at least 1 age 0-4 (\%) | 17\% | 20\% | 16\% | 9\% | 39\% | 11\% |
| Have at least 1 child age 5-17 (\%) | 34\% | 34\% | 35\% | 36\% | 30\% | 35\% |
| Have at least 1 child over age 18 (\%) | 39\% | 27\% | 44\% | 55\% | 4\% | 46\% |
| Caring/Managing care for others ${ }^{142}$ (\%) | 16\% | 20\% | 15\% | 19\% | 7\% | 20\% |

Standard deviations for the means are in parentheses.
One can see from the figure above that tenured and non-ladder faculty have more children on average than tenure-track faculty. Likewise, men have more children on average than women. Once we control for age and other demographics, though, the rank differences decrease and are not statistically significant. The gender difference, however, remains large and significant (women have 0.29 fewer children than men). This implies that the rank differences seen in the figure above are for the most part attributable to the differences in average age among faculty groups (as also demonstrated in the figure above). The gender difference, though, is not explained by age or any of the other demographics that we control for in the baseline specification. (See Table L1 of the Life Outside Harvard Appendix for all significant results.)

Another notable disparity shown in Figure L3 relates to child and dependent care responsibilities of faculty of different ranks. A larger percentage of tenure-track faculty than tenured and nonladder faculty have young children (i.e., ages 0-4). A smaller percentage, though, cares for an aging and/or ill parent, spouse, or other relative. Again, once we control for age and other demographics in our baseline specification (i.e., gender, ethnicity, rank, citizenship, age and School), the rank differences found in having young children are not statistically significant. However, the rank differences are significant in the model of caring for an aging and/or ill family member. In this model, tenure-track faculty are 10.01 percentage points less likely than tenured faculty and 11.38 percentage points less likely than non-ladder faculty to be caring for an aging and/or ill family member. (See Table L1 of the Life Outside Harvard Appendix for all significant results.)

[^78]
## Use of Policies to Support Faculty and Their Families

Teaching relief, available to both ladder and non-ladder faculty, is intended to relieve stress by allowing faculty members to reduce their workload. ${ }^{143}$ At the time of the survey, only $19 \%$ of the faculty reported taking advantage of teaching relief policies at Harvard. Since the survey was administered in the Fall/Winter 2006/07, the faculty may not have had an opportunity to take advantage of Harvard's new guidelines on teaching relief. These guidelines, established in July 2006, provide faculty with "paid relief from classroom duties for a full load during one semester/term" or, if possible, a half-load for two semesters/terms.

A larger percentage of women (32\%) than men (13\%) report they have used teaching relief. Also, a larger percentage of tenure-track faculty (22\%) than both tenured faculty (18\%) and nonladder faculty (18\%) report having used it.

Figure L4 below illustrates the percentage of faculty that received teaching relief for any reason while at Harvard by rank and gender. The question on which this figure is based asks: "At any time since you started working at Harvard University, have you received relief from teaching or other workload duties for any of the following: caregiving for a child or parents, your own health concerns, and/or a family crisis?"

Figure L4: Percent Received Teaching Relief by Gender and Rank


According to this graph, tenure-track women use teaching relief more often than any other faculty group in this figure. This is likely because of childcare as $83 \%$ of tenure-track women who received relief, received it for "caregiving for a child or parents."

In hopes of alleviating some of the burden associated with childcare, Harvard University offers childcare services to the faculty. Of faculty that have children in need of childcare, less than one-quarter (21\%) say that they currently use Harvard-affiliated childcare services. An additional

[^79]$19 \%$ say they wanted to use Harvard-affiliated childcare but could not get in. Nearly two-thirds (60\%), meanwhile, indicate they have chosen to make alternative child-care arrangement instead of using Harvard childcare facilities. ${ }^{144}$

## The Impact of Family Life on Career

The burden that can be associated with childcare and other domestic responsibilities raises the question of whether or not family life has had a negative impact on faculty members' careers. Overall, almost one-third (32\%) of the faculty agree with the statement: "My caregiving and/or other domestic responsibilities have had a negative impact on my career." The extent to which faculty agree with this statement is different for men and women and faculty of different ranks. These differences are illustrated in Figure L5.

Figure L5: Agreement that Caregiving and Domestic Responsibilities Have Had a Negative Impact on Career

|  |  |  | \% of <br> Respondents <br> Reporting <br> Nomewhat | Agreement |  |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Mean | Standard <br> Respondents <br> Deviation <br> Agreement |  |  |
| Rank | Tenured Faculty | 553 | $26 \%$ | 2.28 | 1.37 |
|  | Tenure-Track Faculty | 273 | $46 \%$ | 3.12 | 1.43 |
|  | Non-Ladder Faculty | 240 | $33 \%$ | 2.50 | 1.44 |
| Gender | Women | 321 | $49 \%$ | 3.09 | 1.44 |
|  | Men | 745 | $25 \%$ | 2.31 | 1.38 |

(1=strongly disagree $2=$ somewhat disagree $3=$ neither agree nor disagree $4=$ somewhat agree $5=$ strongly agree)
On average, most groups tend to "somewhat disagree" to "neither agree nor disagree" with this statement. However, as this table illustrates, women agree more strongly than men that caregiving and domestic responsibilities have had a negative impact on their careers. Tenuretrack faculty also agree more strongly with this statement than both tenured and non-ladder faculty.

Applying the baseline specification to this statement, we find the following statistically significant rank-, gender-, and age-based differences (see Table L2 in the Life Outside of Harvard Appendix for all significant results): ${ }^{145}$

[^80]- Rank: Relative to tenure-track faculty, tenured and non-ladder faculty agree less strongly that their domestic responsibilities have had a negative impact on their career ( 0.39 and 0.36 point differences, respectively).
- Gender: Relative to men, women express more agreement with this statement ( 0.66 point difference).
- Age: Relative to younger faculty, older faculty express less agreement with this statement (0.23 points for every 10 years).

To better understand these gender and rank gaps, we examine the relationship between the two. As Figure L6 illustrates, the extent to which women agree that caregiving and/or other domestic responsibilities have had a negative impact on their career is greater than men within each of the three ranks.

Figure L6: Mean Agreement with Caregiving and Domestic Responsibilities having Negative Impact on Career by Gender and Rank

(1=strongly disagree $2=$ somewhat disagree $3=$ neither agree nor disagree $4=$ somewhat agree $5=$ strongly agree $)$
Adding interaction terms for gender and rank to our baseline specification and applying postestimation F-tests, we find the following statistically significant differences (see Table L2 in the Life Outside Harvard Appendix for all significant results): ${ }^{146}$

- Gender differences within each rank: For all three ranks, women agree to a greater extent than their male counterparts that domestic responsibilities have had a negative impact on their careers.
- Rank differences by gender:
o Relative to tenured and non-ladder women, tenure-track women agree to a greater extent with this view.

[^81]
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o Relative to tenured men, tenure-track men agree to a greater extent with this view.

Adding variables for children of different ages and spousal employment status to the baseline specification, we seek to understand the relationship between these variables and the extent to which faculty feel that childcare and domestic responsibilities have had a negative impact on their careers. ${ }^{147,148}$ This model predicts the following (see Table L2 in the Life Outside Harvard Appendix for all significant results):

- Faculty with pre-school age children (ages 0-4) and faculty with school-age children (ages 5-17) agree to a greater extent that their domestic responsibilities have had a negative impact on their career than faculty without children (1.02 and 0.64 point differences, respectively).
- Faculty with unemployed spouses agree to a lesser extent than faculty with employed spouses ( 0.34 point difference).
The gender and rank effects found in the baseline specification persist with similar magnitudes under this model, but age is no longer statistically significant. ${ }^{149}$

To better understand if having children affects men and women differently, we examine the relationship between gender and having children of different ages by adding interaction terms for gender and children's age to the previous model. We apply post-estimation F-tests to this analysis and find that women with children of any age, except college-age children, agree more strongly with this statement than men with children of the same age. (See Table L2 in the Life Outside Harvard Appendix for all significant results.)

According to School-specific analyses (of the same baseline specification above), women agree to a greater extent than men that their domestic responsibilities have had a negative impact on their careers at four Schools: FAS ( 0.51 point difference), GSD ( 2.40 point difference), KSG (1.18 point difference) and HMS/HSDM ( 0.80 point difference). (See Table L3 in the Life Outside Harvard Appendix.)

## Scheduling Conflicts

Another way to understand the impact of childrearing on one's career is to examine the frequency with which faculty report missing an important work-related meeting or commitment (either in part or in full) due to caregiving and/or other domestic responsibilities. Overall, 43\% of faculty report that they have never had to miss a meeting in the last year either in part or in full,

[^82]$44 \%$ report having had to do so at most two or three times a semester, and $13 \%$ report that they have had to do so at least once or twice a month in the past year. (We only perform this analysis at the University level. School-specific analyses will follow in separate reports.)

Since one may reasonably expect that the frequency with which faculty miss meetings may vary by gender, Figure L7 depicts how often men and women say that caregiving and/or other domestic responsibilities have caused them to miss a work-related meeting or commitment (either in part or in full). The question specifically asks, "In the last year, how often have you had to leave early from, arrive late to, or miss an important work-related meeting or commitment because of caregiving and/or other domestic responsibilities?"

Figure L7: Percentage of Faculty Who Have Missed a Meeting (in part or full) due to Caregiving and/or Domestic Responsibilities


As this graph illustrates, a larger percentage of women than men report frequently missing important work-related meetings or commitments either in part or in full. In particular, $17 \%$ of women compared to only $11 \%$ of men report that they have had to miss a meeting either in part or in full at least once a month. ${ }^{150}$

In order to determine if these and other demographic differences are statistically significant, we collapse this question into two categories (missing a meeting at least once or twice a month or missing a meeting less than once a month) and analyze the likelihood of faculty having to miss a meeting at least once or twice a month. We analyze this new variable using a logistic regression of our baseline specification and find the following statistically significant results (see Table L4 in the Life Outside Harvard Appendix for all significant results):

- Rank: Relative to tenured and tenure-track faculty, non-ladder faculty are less likely to report having missed a meeting (either in part or in full) at least once or twice a month (7.89 and 6.35 percentage point differences, respectively). ${ }^{151}$

[^83]
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- Gender: Relative to men, women are 4.61 percentage points more likely to report having missed a meeting (either in part or in full) at least once or twice a month.
- Age: Relative to younger faculty, older faculty are less likely to report having missed a meeting (either in part or in full) at least once or twice a month. For example, a 50 -year old faculty member is 5.76 percentage points less likely to have missed a meeting that often than a 40-year old faculty member.

To better understand the relationship between caregiving and other domestic responsibilities on this issue, we add the following variables to the baseline specification: spousal employment status, children of different age categories (as above), and caring for an aging or ill family member. According to this analysis, having children, dependent care responsibilities, and an unemployed spouses influences how often faculty miss work-related meetings or commitments as follows (see Table L4 in the Life Outside Harvard Appendix for all significant results):

- Relative to faculty members without children, faculty with pre-school children and with school-age children are 12.98 and 12.54 percentage points, respectively, more likely to have missed a meeting (either in part or in full) more than once a month. ${ }^{152}$
- Faculty who care or manage care of an aging or ill relative are 11.53 percentage points more likely to have missed a meeting that often than faculty who do not care or manage care. ${ }^{153}$
- Faculty with unemployed spouses are 6.39 percentage points less likely to have missed a meeting that often than faculty with employed spouses.

In this model, the rank-based differences remain statistically significant, while the gender- and age-based differences are no longer statistically significant.

## Sources of Personal Stress

In order to gain further insight into the relationship between the faculty's personal lives and their careers, the survey asks the faculty about the extent to which they find certain areas of their lives to be stressful. The survey asks about 6 areas in particular: managing household responsibilities, childcare, reproductive decisions/issues, dependent care, ${ }^{154}$ their own health, and the cost of living. (We only perform this analysis at the University level. School-specific analyses will follow in separate reports.)

Figure L8 below depicts the faculty's responses to these questions. The question on which this figure is based asks: "To what extent have the following been a source of stress over the past twelve months: managing household responsibilities; childcare; reproductive decisions/issues;

[^84]
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care of someone who is ill, disabled, aging and/or in need of special services; your health; and cost of living?"

Figure L8: Sources of Personal Stress


Twenty-one percent of the faculty indicate that managing household responsibilities has been an extensive source of stress, followed closely by $20 \%$ of the faculty that find childcare an extensive source of stress.

Since men and women may differ in the extent to which they find these issues stressful, Figure L9 disaggregates the faculty's mean responses to each issue by gender.

Figure L9: Mean Sources of Personal Stress by Gender

(1=not at all $2=$ somewhat $3=$ extensive $)$
Women report higher levels of stress than men for all 6 issues although the difference between men and women regarding cost of living is quite small and not significant as we will see below. Women and men differ most in regards to childcare ( 0.31 point difference). ${ }^{155}$

Applying the baseline specification to each source of stress, we find the following statically significant rank-, gender- and age-based differences in levels of stress (see Table L5 in the Life Outside Harvard Appendix for all significant results):

- Rank:
o Relative to tenured faculty, tenure-track faculty report more stress regarding reproductive decisions ( 0.27 point difference), but less stress regarding dependent care ( 0.16 point difference) and managing household responsibilities ( 0.14 point difference).
o Relative to tenured faculty, non-ladder faculty report less stress regarding managing household responsibilities ( 0.17 point difference), but more stress regarding cost of living ( 0.25 point difference).
o Relative to tenure-track faculty, non-ladder faculty report less stress regarding reproductive decisions/issues ( 0.25 point difference), but more stress regarding dependant care ( 0.19 point difference).
- Gender: Relative to men, women report more stress regarding all issues except the cost of living (differences range from 0.12-0.22 points).

[^85]- Age: Relative to younger faculty, older faculty report less stress regarding all issues except their health (differences range from 0.13-0.28 points for every 10 year increase in age), but more stress regarding dependent care ( 0.10 point difference for every 10 year increase in age).

Since we find many significant rank- and gender-based differences in these sources of stress, we examine the relationship between the two demographics for each stressor. In this regard, Figure L10 provides the average level of stress faculty report for each of the 6 issues disaggregated by rank and gender.

Figure L10: Mean Sources of Personal Stress by Rank and Gender

|  | Tenured <br> Faculty |  | Tenure-Track <br> Faculty |  | Non-Ladder <br> Faculty |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Women | Men | Women | Men | Women | Men |
| Managing Household | 2.10 | 1.76 | 2.28 | 1.91 | 1.81 | 1.76 |
| Responsibilities | $(0.71)$ | $(0.71)$ | $(0.69)$ | $(0.73)$ | $(0.75)$ | $(0.68)$ |
| Childcare | 1.84 | 1.51 | 2.13 | 1.87 | 1.69 | 1.60 |
|  | $(0.82)$ | $(0.69)$ | $(0.89)$ | $(0.79)$ | $(0.75)$ | $(0.73)$ |
| Cost of Living | 1.52 | 1.47 | 1.76 | 1.88 | 1.84 | 1.76 |
|  | $(0.68)$ | $(0.65)$ | $(0.78)$ | $(0.80)$ | $(0.75)$ | $(0.77)$ |
| Dependent Care | 1.76 | 1.52 | 1.44 | 1.23 | 1.67 | 1.55 |
|  | $(0.76)$ | $(0.69)$ | $(0.74)$ | $(0.51)$ | $(0.75)$ | $(0.71)$ |
| Your Health | 1.50 | 1.38 | 1.52 | 1.37 | 1.47 | 1.42 |
| Reproductive | $(0.60)$ | $(0.57)$ | $(0.67)$ | $(0.60)$ | $(0.61)$ | $(0.57)$ |
| Decisions/Issues | 1.14 | 1.08 | 1.80 | 1.51 | 1.33 | 1.15 |
|  | $(0.49)$ | $(0.31)$ | $(0.87)$ | $(0.72)$ | $(0.61)$ | $(0.42)$ |

(1=not at all $2=$ somewhat $3=$ extensive)
Standard deviations are in parentheses.
Adding interaction terms for gender and rank to the baseline specification for each issue and applying post-estimation F-tests, we find the following statistically significant differences (see Table L6 in the Life Outside Harvard Appendix for all significant results): ${ }^{156}$

- Gender differences within each rank:
o Relative to tenured men, tenured women report more stress regarding 4 of the 6 issues, namely managing household responsibilities, childcare, dependant care and their health.
o Relative to tenure-track men, tenure-track women report more stress regarding 5 of the 6 issues, namely managing household responsibilities, childcare, reproductive decisions/issues, dependant care, and their health.
- Rank differences within gender:

[^86]o Relative to tenured women, tenure-track women report more stress regarding reproductive decisions/issues.
o Relative to tenured women, non-ladder women report more stress regarding the cost of living, but less stress regarding managing household responsibilities and childcare.
o Relative to tenure-track women, non-ladder women report less stress regarding managing household responsibilities and reproductive decisions/issues.
o Relative to tenured men and non-ladder men, tenure-track men report less stress regarding reproductive decisions/issues.
o Relative to tenured men, tenure-track men report more stress regarding managing household responsibilities.
o Relative to tenure-track men, non-ladder men report more stress regarding dependant care and cost of living.

Family characteristics, such as spousal employment status, having children, and caring for others, may influence how stressful faculty find some of these issues. To understand the relationship between these characteristics and the above sources of personal stress, we add variables for each of them to the baseline specification. ${ }^{157}$ We do this for all 6 issues and find the following statistically significant results below (see Table L7 in the Life Outside Harvard Appendix for all significant results):

- Relative to faculty without children, faculty with pre-school age children report more stress regarding managing household responsibilities ( 0.41 point difference), childcare ( 0.98 point difference) and reproductive decisions/issues ( 0.14 point difference).
- Relative to faculty without children, faculty with school-age children report more stress regarding managing household responsibilities ( 0.31 point difference), childcare ( 0.66 point difference), and the cost of living ( 0.16 point difference), but less stress regarding reproductive decisions/ issues (0.34 point difference).
- Relative to faculty without children, faculty with adult children report less stress regarding managing household responsibilities ( 0.18 point difference).
- Relative to faculty with an employed spouse, faculty with an unemployed spouse report less stress regarding childcare ( 0.20 point difference).
- Relative to faculty with an employed spouse, faculty with a spouse seeking employment report more stress regarding cost of living ( 0.27 point difference).
- Relative to faculty with an employed spouse, faculty with a spouse of some "other" employment status report less stress regarding reproductive decisions/issues ( 0.12 point

[^87]difference), but more stress regarding cost of living (0.22 point difference) and dependent care ( 0.20 point difference).

- Relative to faculty with an employed spouse, faculty with no spouse report less stress regarding reproductive decisions/issues (0.19 point difference).
- Faculty who are caring for an aging/ill family member report more stress regarding managing household responsibilities ( 0.25 point difference), dependent care ( 0.94 point difference) and their health ( 0.12 point difference).

Gender results from the baseline models persist when we add variables for family characteristics. ${ }^{158}$ To better understand these gender gaps, we add interaction terms for gender and children's age to the previous specification for each of the 6 issues. Applying postestimation F-tests to these analyses, we find the following statistically significant gender differences within each age category of children (see Table L8 in the Life Outside Harvard Appendix for all significant results): ${ }^{159}$

- Relative to men with pre-school age children, women with pre-school age children report more stress regarding managing household responsibilities, childcare, reproductive decisions/issues and their health, but less stress regarding cost of living.
- Relative to men with school-age children, women with school-age children report more stress regarding managing household responsibilities and childcare.
- Relative to men with college-age children, women with college-age children reported more stress regarding reproductive decisions/issues.
- Relative to men with adult children, women with adult children report more stress regarding managing household responsibilities and dependent care.
- Relative to men without children, women without children report more stress regarding managing household responsibilities, reproductive decisions/issues, dependent care, and their health.


## Predicting Domestic Responsibilities Negative Impact on Career

Finally, we examine which of the 6 potential sources of stress are most closely associated with the belief that one's domestic responsibilities have had a negative impact on their career. All of the factors, except reproductive decisions/issues, are statistically significant predictors of agreement when included separately in the baseline model. In other words, faculty who feel more stressed by each factor agree to a greater extent that their caregiving and/or domestic responsibilities have a negative impact their career. (See Table L9 in the Life Outside Harvard Appendix for all significant results.)

[^88]When the 5 significant sources of stress are included together in the baseline regression, managing household responsibilities, childcare and cost of living remain statistically significant with childcare being the strongest predictor of agreement with this statement. Additionally, the gender gap found earlier showing that women agree more strongly with the statement that their caregiving and/or domestic responsibilities have had a negative impact on their career, remains statistically significant when these 5 factors are included in the model. In this model women are 0.49 points more likely than men to agree with this statement. (In the baseline model, women are 0.64 points more likely to agree with this statement.) ${ }^{160}$
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Table L1: Children and Caring for Aging and/or Ill Family Members (All Faculty)

| Dependent Variable: | Number of Children | Has a Pre-School Age Child | Caring for Aging/Ill Family Member |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Regressor | Baseline | Baseline | Baseline |
| Female | $\begin{gathered} \hline-0.29 * * \\ (0.07) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline-0.14 \\ (0.19) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0.53^{* *} \\ (0.17) \end{gathered}$ |
| Asian/Pacific Islander | $\begin{gathered} -0.04 \\ (0.11) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.13 \\ (0.27) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.23 \\ (0.34) \end{gathered}$ |
| Black | $\begin{gathered} -0.10 \\ (0.20) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.26 \\ (0.65) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.44 \\ (0.53) \end{gathered}$ |
| Hispanic | $\begin{gathered} 0.54 \\ (0.65) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.83 \\ (0.65) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.26 \\ (0.61) \end{gathered}$ |
| American Indian/ Alaskan Native ${ }^{\dagger}$ | . | . | . |
| Unknown ${ }^{\dagger}$ | . | . |  |
| Tenure-Track | $\begin{gathered} \cdot \\ -0.15 \\ (0.11) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} . \\ 0.26 \\ (0.26) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.96 * * \\ (0.31) \end{gathered}$ |
| Non-Ladder | $\begin{gathered} -0.00 \\ (0.09) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.27 \\ (0.27) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.09 \\ (0.19) \end{gathered}$ |
| International | $\begin{gathered} -0.22 \\ (0.13) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.60^{*} \\ (0.30) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.49 \\ (0.42) \end{gathered}$ |
| Age | $\begin{gathered} 0.04 * * \\ (0.00) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.12 * * \\ (0.01) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.02^{*} \\ & (0.01) \end{aligned}$ |
| School (8 dummy variables) Constant | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Controlled for } \\ & \text { but not reported } \\ & -0.17 \\ & (0.21) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Controlled for } \\ & \text { but not reported } \\ & 4.25^{* *} \\ & (0.69) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Controlled for } \\ & \text { but not reported } \\ & -2.70^{* *} \\ & (0.48) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |
| Observations | 1223 | 1220 | 1238 |
| R-squared | 0.177 | N/A | N/A |
| Loglikelihood | N/A | -427.16 | -522.55 |
| Robust standard errors in parentheses <br> * significant at 5\%; ** significant at $1 \%$ <br> ${ }^{\dagger}$ This demographic group is controlled for in every model but its results are not reported because it contains less than 5 faculty. |  |  |  |

Table L2: Caregiving and Domestic Resp. Have Had a Neg. Impact on Career (All Faculty)

| Dependent Variable: <br> Caregiving and Domestic Responsibilities Had a Negative Impact on Career |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Regressor | Baseline | (1) | (2) | (3) |
| Female | $\begin{gathered} \hline \hline 0.66^{* *} \\ (0.10) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \hline 0.60 * * \\ (0.14) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \hline 0.66 * * \\ (0.09) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0.17 \\ (0.16) \end{gathered}$ |
| Asian/Pacific Islander | $\begin{gathered} 0.30 \\ (0.16) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.30 \\ (0.16) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.32^{*} \\ & (0.15) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.29 \\ (0.15) \end{gathered}$ |
| Black | $\begin{gathered} -0.53^{*} \\ (0.23) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.53^{*} \\ (0.23) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.36 \\ (0.23) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.33 \\ (0.25) \end{gathered}$ |
| Hispanic | $\begin{gathered} -0.01 \\ (0.27) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & -0.01 \\ & (0.27) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.07 \\ (0.27) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.07 \\ (0.27) \end{gathered}$ |
| American Indian/Alaskan Native $^{\dagger}$ | , | (0.27) | (0.27) | ) |
| Unknown ${ }^{\dagger}$ | . | . | . | . |
| Tenure-Track | $\begin{gathered} 0.39 * * \\ (0.13) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.33^{*} \\ & (0.15) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.46 * * \\ (0.13) \end{gathered}$ | 0.44** (0.13) |
| Non-Ladder | $\begin{gathered} 0.03 \\ (0.11) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.02 \\ (0.13) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.14 \\ (0.11) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.12 \\ (0.11) \end{gathered}$ |
| International | $\begin{gathered} -0.08 \\ (0.18) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.09 \\ (0.18) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.01 \\ (0.17) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.01 \\ (0.17) \end{gathered}$ |
| Age | $\begin{gathered} -0.02^{* *} \\ (0.00) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.02^{* *} \\ (0.00) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & -0.00 \\ & (0.01) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.00 \\ (0.01) \end{gathered}$ |
| School (8 dummy variables) | Controlled for but not reported | Controlled for but not reported | Controlled for but not reported | Controlled for but not reported |
| Female*Tenure-Track |  | $\begin{gathered} 0.17 \\ (0.22) \end{gathered}$ |  |  |
| Female*Non-Ladder |  | $\begin{gathered} 0.04 \\ (0.23) \end{gathered}$ |  |  |
| Pre-School Age Children |  |  | $\begin{gathered} 1.02^{* *} \\ (0.12) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.91^{* *} \\ (0.14) \end{gathered}$ |
| School-Age Children |  |  | $\begin{gathered} 0.64 * * \\ (0.09) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.51^{* *} \\ (0.11) \end{gathered}$ |
| College-Age Children |  |  | $\begin{gathered} 0.21 \\ (0.12) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.15 \\ (0.13) \end{gathered}$ |
| Adult Children |  |  | $\begin{gathered} 0.14 \\ (0.13) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.12 \\ (0.14) \end{gathered}$ |
| Unemployed Spouse |  |  | $\begin{gathered} -0.34^{* *} \\ (0.12) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.32^{* *} \\ (0.12) \end{gathered}$ |
| Spouse Seeking Employment |  |  | $\begin{gathered} 0.01 \\ (0.26) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.01 \\ (0.26) \end{gathered}$ |
| Spouse of Other Employment Status |  |  | $\begin{gathered} -0.12 \\ (0.15) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.15 \\ (0.14) \end{gathered}$ |
| No Spouse |  |  | $\begin{gathered} 0.45^{* *} \\ (0.17) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.44^{* *} \\ (0.17) \end{gathered}$ |
| Female*Pre-School Age Children |  |  |  | $\begin{gathered} 0.36 \\ (0.22) \end{gathered}$ |
| Female*School-Age Children |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & 0.42^{*} \\ & (0.19) \end{aligned}$ |
| Female*College-Age Children |  |  |  | $\begin{gathered} 0.24 \\ (0.27) \end{gathered}$ |
| Female*Adult Children |  |  |  | $\begin{gathered} 0.97 * * \\ (0.23) \end{gathered}$ |
| Constant | $\begin{gathered} 3.51^{* *} \\ (0.28) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3.53^{* *} \\ (0.28) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.95^{* *} \\ & (0.34) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2.12^{* *} \\ & (0.35) \end{aligned}$ |
| Observations | 1066 | 1066 | 1029 | 1029 |
| R-squared | 0.149 | 0.149 | 0.245 | 0.261 |
| Robust standard errors in parentheses <br> * significant at $5 \%$; ** significant at $1 \%$ |  |  |  |  |
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Table L3: Agreement with Caregiving and Domestic Resp. Have Had a Negative Impact on Career by School (All Faculty)

| Dependent Variable: Caregiving and Domestic Respo | ilities $H$ | Negati | act on |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Regressor | GSD <br> Baseline | HDS Baseline | GSE Baseline | FAS Baseline | KSG Baseline | HBS Baseline | HLS Baseline | $\begin{gathered} \text { HMS/HSDM } \\ \text { Baseline } \end{gathered}$ | SPH <br> Baseline |
| Female | $\begin{gathered} \hline \hline 2.40^{* *} \\ (0.28) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.70 \\ (0.53) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.67 \\ (0.49) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \hline 0.51^{* *} \\ (0.15) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \hline 1.18^{* *} \\ & (0.31) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.49 \\ (0.28) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.71 \\ (0.66) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \hline 0.80^{* *} \\ (0.28) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.39 \\ (0.29) \end{gathered}$ |
| Asian/Pacific Islander ${ }^{\dagger}$ | (0.28) | (0.53) | (0.4) | $\begin{gathered} -0.02 \\ (0.22) \end{gathered}$ | (0.31) | $\begin{gathered} 0.87 * * \\ (0.32) \end{gathered}$ | (0.6) | $\begin{gathered} 0.25 \\ (0.50) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.06 \\ (0.52) \end{gathered}$ |
| Black ${ }^{\dagger}$ | . | . | . | $\begin{gathered} -0.23 \\ (0.40) \end{gathered}$ | . | (0) | . | . | . |
| Hispanic ${ }^{\dagger}$ | . | . | . | (0.40) | . | $\begin{gathered} -0.18 \\ (0.55) \end{gathered}$ | . | . | . |
| American Indian/Alaskan Native ${ }^{\dagger}$ | . | . | . | . | . | (0.55) | . | . | . |
| Unknown ${ }^{\dagger}$ | . | . | . | . | . | . | . | . | . |
| Tenure-Track ${ }^{\dagger}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.73 \\ (0.73) \end{gathered}$ | . | $\begin{gathered} 0.34 \\ (0.96) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.35 \\ (0.20) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.55 \\ (0.44) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.72 * \\ & (0.33) \end{aligned}$ | . | $\begin{gathered} 0.69 \\ (0.35) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.17 \\ (0.40) \end{gathered}$ |
| Non-Ladder ${ }^{\dagger}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.73 \\ (0.48) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.37 \\ (0.69) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.22 \\ (0.56) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.18 \\ (0.18) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.50 \\ (0.35) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.18 \\ (0.33) \end{gathered}$ | . | $\begin{gathered} 0.29 \\ (0.40) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.44 \\ (0.34) \end{gathered}$ |
| International ${ }^{\dagger}$ | (0.4) | (0.6) | (0.56) | $\begin{gathered} -0.32 \\ (0.25) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.97 \\ (0.54) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1.15 * * \\ (0.31) \end{gathered}$ | . | $\begin{gathered} -0.99 \\ (0.51) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.78 \\ (0.64) \end{gathered}$ |
| Age | $\begin{gathered} -0.02 \\ (0.03) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.04 \\ (0.02) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.00 \\ (0.04) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.02^{* *} \\ (0.01) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.05^{*} \\ (0.02) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.00 \\ (0.02) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.02 \\ (0.02) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.03^{*} \\ (0.01) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.04 * \\ (0.01) \end{gathered}$ |
| Constant | $\begin{gathered} 3.19 \\ (1.82) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.28 \\ (1.48) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1.80 \\ (2.68) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3.51^{* *} \\ (0.41) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 5.13^{* *} \\ & (1.12) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.88^{*} \\ & (0.82) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 3.17^{*} \\ & \text { (1.54) } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3.76 * * \\ (0.86) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3.93 * * \\ (0.84) \end{gathered}$ |
| Observations | 31 | 24 | 36 | 473 | 79 | 141 | 45 | 125 | 112 |
| R-squared | 0.697 | 0.124 | 0.189 | 0.098 | 0.431 | 0.248 | 0.149 | 0.256 | 0.185 |

Robust standard errors in parentheses

* significant at 5\%; ** significant at $1 \%$
${ }^{\dagger}$ This demographic group is controlled for in every model but its results are not reported because it contains less than 5 faculty.

Table L4: Have Missed a Meeting (in Part or in Full) at Least Once a Month (All Faculty)

| Dependent Variable: <br> Have Missed a Meeting at Least Once a Month |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Regressor | Baseline | (1) |
| Female | 0.45* | 0.42 |
|  | (0.19) | (0.22) |
| Asian/Pacific Islander | -0.40 | -0.30 |
|  | (0.32) | (0.36) |
| Black | -0.98 | -0.63 |
|  | (0.76) | (0.79) |
| Hispanic | -0.60 | -0.43 |
|  | (0.70) | (0.68) |
| American Indian/ Alaskan Native ${ }^{\dagger}$ | (0.70) | (0.68) |
| Unknown ${ }^{\dagger}$ | . | . |
|  |  |  |
| Tenure-Track | -0.14 | 0.12 |
|  | (0.28) | (0.31) |
| Non-Ladder | -0.98** | -0.92** |
|  | (0.30) | (0.32) |
| International | -0.13 | 0.33 |
|  | (0.34) | (0.34) |
| Age | -0.05** | -0.01 |
|  | (0.01) | (0.02) |
| School (8 dummy variables) | Controlled for | Controlled for |
|  | but not reported | but not reported |
| Pre-School Age Children |  | 1.67** |
|  |  | (0.24) |
| School-Age Children |  | 1.63** |
|  |  | (0.23) |
| College-Age Children |  | -0.38 |
|  |  | (0.33) |
| Adult Children |  | -0.00 |
|  |  | (0.40) |
| Unemployed Spouse |  | -1.20** |
|  |  | (0.42) |
| Spouse Seeking Employment |  | 0.02 |
|  |  | (0.53) |
| Spouse of Other Employment Status |  | -0.58 |
|  |  | (0.52) |
| No Spouse |  | -0.25 |
|  |  | (0.37) |
| Caring for Aging/Ill Family Member |  | 1.16** |
|  |  | (0.25) |
| Constant | 0.63 | -2.70** |
|  | (0.62) | (0.87) |
| Observations | 1235 | 1180 |
| Loglikelihood | -439.69 | -358.34 |
| Robust standard errors in parentheses$*$ significant at $5 \%$;* significant at $1 \%$ |  |  |
|  |  |  |
| ${ }^{\dagger}$ This demographic group is controlled for in every model but its results are not reported because it contains less than 5 faculty. |  |  |
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Table L5: Sources of Personal Stress (All Faculty)

| Dependent Variable: | Managing Household Responsibilities | Childcare | Reproductive Decisions/ Issues | Dependent Care | One's Health | Cost of Living |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Regressor | Baseline | Baseline | Baseline | Baseline | Baseline | Baseline |
| Female | $\begin{gathered} \hline \hline 0.21^{* *} \\ (0.05) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \hline 0.20^{* *} \\ (0.06) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \hline 0.14^{* *} \\ (0.05) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0.22^{* *} \\ (0.05) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \hline 0.12^{* *} \\ (0.04) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \hline-0.07 \\ & (0.05) \end{aligned}$ |
| Asian/Pacific Islander | $\begin{aligned} & -0.03 \\ & (0.08) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.03 \\ (0.09) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.05 \\ (0.07) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.03 \\ (0.08) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.05 \\ (0.07) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.05 \\ (0.07) \end{gathered}$ |
| Black | $\begin{gathered} 0.08 \\ (0.12) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.10 \\ (0.15) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.14 \\ (0.11) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.19 \\ (0.10) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.01 \\ (0.11) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.22 \\ (0.11) \end{gathered}$ |
| Hispanic | $\begin{gathered} 0.22 \\ (0.15) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.16 \\ (0.19) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.13 \\ (0.12) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.12 \\ (0.17) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.05 \\ (0.13) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.19 \\ (0.16) \end{gathered}$ |
| American Indian/ Alaskan Native ${ }^{\dagger}$ | (0.15) | (0.19) | ) | (0.17) | (0.13) | ) |
| Unknown ${ }^{\dagger}$ | . | . | . | $\cdot$ | . | . |
| Tenure-Track | $\begin{gathered} -0.14^{*} \\ (0.06) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.07 \\ (0.08) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.27 * * \\ & (0.06) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.16^{*} \\ (0.07) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \dot{0} 06 \\ (0.06) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.12 \\ (0.06) \end{gathered}$ |
| Non-Ladder | $\begin{gathered} -0.17 * * \\ (0.05) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.07 \\ (0.06) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.02 \\ (0.04) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.03 \\ (0.06) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.03 \\ (0.05) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.25^{* *} \\ (0.05) \end{gathered}$ |
| International | $\begin{gathered} -0.35^{* *} \\ (0.08) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.05 \\ (0.11) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.00 \\ (0.09) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.00 \\ (0.08) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & -0.02 \\ & (0.07) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & -0.03 \\ & (0.09) \end{aligned}$ |
| Age | $\begin{gathered} -0.02^{* *} \\ (0.00) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.03^{* *} \\ (0.00) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.01^{* *} \\ (0.00) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.01^{* *} \\ (0.00) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.00 \\ (0.00) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.02^{* *} \\ (0.00) \end{gathered}$ |
| School (8 dummy variables) | Controlled for but not reported | Controlled for but not reported | Controlled for but not reported | Controlled for but not reported | Controlled for but not reported | Controlled for but not reported |
| Constant | $\begin{gathered} 3.08^{* *} \\ (0.13) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3.13^{* *} \\ (0.16) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.85^{* *} \\ & (0.11) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1.02 * * \\ (0.14) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1.23^{* *} \\ (0.11) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2.57 * * \\ (0.13) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| Observations | 1199 | 937 | 939 | 1000 | 1155 | 1182 |
| R-squared | 0.140 | 0.179 | 0.221 | 0.073 | 0.032 | 0.174 |

Robust standard errors in parentheses

* significant at 5\%; ** significant at $1 \%$
${ }^{\dagger}$ This demographic group is controlled for in every model but its results are not reported because it contains less than 5 faculty.

Table L6: Sources of Personal Stress with Gender-Rank Interactions (All Faculty)

| Dependent Variable: | Managing Household Responsibilities | Childcare | Reproductive Decisions/ Issues | Dependent Care | One's Health | Cost of Living |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Regressor | (1) | (1) | (1) | (1) | (1) | (1) |
| Female | $\begin{gathered} \hline \hline 0.27 * * \\ (0.07) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \hline 0.26^{* *} \\ (0.09) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0.02 \\ (0.05) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0.27 * * \\ (0.08) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 0.12^{*} \\ & (0.06) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \hline-0.04 \\ & (0.07) \end{aligned}$ |
| Asian/Pacific Islander | $\begin{gathered} -0.04 \\ (0.08) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.03 \\ (0.09) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.06 \\ (0.07) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.04 \\ (0.08) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.05 \\ (0.07) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.05 \\ (0.08) \end{gathered}$ |
| Black | $\begin{gathered} 0.08 \\ (0.12) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.11 \\ (0.15) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.14 \\ (0.11) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.19 \\ (0.10) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.01 \\ (0.11) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.22 \\ (0.11) \end{gathered}$ |
| Hispanic | $\begin{gathered} 0.22 \\ (0.16) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.16 \\ (0.20) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.11 \\ (0.12) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.13 \\ (0.17) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.05 \\ (0.13) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.19 \\ (0.16) \end{gathered}$ |
| American Indian/ <br> Alaskan Native ${ }^{\dagger}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Unknown ${ }^{\dagger}$ | . | . | . |  | . | . |
| Tenure-Track | $\begin{gathered} -0.20^{* *} \\ (0.07) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.10 \\ (0.09) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.19 * * \\ (0.07) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.14 \\ (0.07) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.04 \\ (0.06) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.15 \\ (0.08) \end{gathered}$ |
| Non-Ladder | $\begin{gathered} -0.05 \\ (0.06) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.02 \\ (0.07) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.01 \\ (0.04) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.05 \\ (0.07) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.05 \\ (0.05) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.25^{* *} \\ (0.06) \end{gathered}$ |
| International | $\begin{gathered} -0.35^{* *} \\ (0.08) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.05 \\ (0.11) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.00 \\ (0.09) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.00 \\ (0.08) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & -0.02 \\ & (0.07) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.03 \\ (0.09) \end{gathered}$ |
| Age | $\begin{gathered} -0.02^{* *} \\ (0.00) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.03^{* *} \\ (0.00) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.01^{* *} \\ (0.00) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.01^{* *} \\ (0.00) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.00 \\ (0.00) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.02^{* *} \\ (0.00) \end{gathered}$ |
| Female*Tenure-Track | $\begin{gathered} 0.11 \\ (0.11) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.04 \\ (0.14) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.26^{*} \\ & (0.11) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.08 \\ (0.12) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.04 \\ (0.10) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.08 \\ (0.11) \end{gathered}$ |
| Female*Non-Ladder | $\begin{gathered} -0.34^{* *} \\ (0.11) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & -0.30^{*} \\ & (0.13) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.10 \\ (0.10) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.09 \\ (0.13) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.05 \\ (0.10) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & -0.01 \\ & (0.10) \end{aligned}$ |
| School (8 dummy variables) | Controlled for but not | Controlled for but not | Controlled for but not | Controlled for but not | Controlled for but not | Controlled for but not |
| Constant | $\begin{aligned} & \text { reported } \\ & 3.11^{* *} \end{aligned}$ | reported 3.14** | reported 1.89** | reported 1.01** | reported 1.24** | reported $2.56 * *$ |
|  | (0.13) | (0.16) | (0.11) | (0.15) | (0.11) | (0.13) |
| Observations | 1199 | 937 | 939 | 1000 | 1155 | 1182 |
| R-squared | 0.151 | 0.185 | 0.229 | 0.074 | 0.033 | 0.175 |

Robust standard errors in parentheses

* significant at 5\%; ** significant at $1 \%$
${ }^{\dagger}$ This demographic group is controlled for in every model but its results are not reported because it contains less than 5 faculty.
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Table L7: Sources of Personal Stress with Family Characteristic Variables (All Faculty)
$\left.\begin{array}{lc|c|c|c|c}\hline \text { Dependent Variable: } & \begin{array}{c}\text { Managing } \\ \text { Household } \\ \text { Responsibilities }\end{array} & \text { Childcare } & \begin{array}{c}\text { Reproductive } \\ \text { Decisions/ } \\ \text { Issues }\end{array} & \begin{array}{c}\text { Cost of } \\ \text { Living }\end{array} & \begin{array}{c}\text { Dependent } \\ \text { Care }\end{array} \\ \hline \text { Regressor } & (2) & (2) & (2) & (2) & \text { One’s } \\ \text { Health }\end{array}\right]$

Robust standard errors in parentheses

* significant at 5\%; ** significant at $1 \%$
${ }^{\dagger}$ This demographic group is controlled for in every model but its results are not reported because it contains less than 5 faculty.

Table L8: Sources of Stress with Child-Gender Interactions (All Faculty)

| Dependent Variable: | Managing Household Resp. | Childcare | Reproductive Decisions/ Issues | Dependent Care | Cost of Living | One's Health |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Regressor | (3) | (3) | (3) | (3) | (3) | (3) |
| Female | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 0.16^{*} \\ & (0.07) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline-0.07 \\ (0.06) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 0.34^{* *} \\ (0.09) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 0.17^{*} \\ & (0.08) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \hline 0.03 \\ (0.08) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 0.14^{*} \\ & (0.07) \end{aligned}$ |
| Asian/Pacific Islander | $\begin{gathered} -0.01 \\ (0.08) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.06 \\ (0.07) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.09 \\ (0.07) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.07 \\ (0.07) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.04 \\ (0.08) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.03 \\ (0.07) \end{gathered}$ |
| Black | $\begin{gathered} 0.15 \\ (0.12) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.10 \\ (0.10) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.06 \\ (0.12) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.11 \\ (0.09) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.21 \\ (0.12) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.01 \\ (0.11) \end{gathered}$ |
| Hispanic | $\begin{gathered} 0.24 \\ (0.14) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.20 \\ (0.15) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.11 \\ (0.10) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.18 \\ (0.16) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.20 \\ (0.15) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.05 \\ (0.13) \end{gathered}$ |
| American Indian/Alaskan Native $^{\dagger}$ | (0.14) | (0.15) | (0.10) | (0.16) | (0.15) | (0.13) |
| Unknown ${ }^{\dagger}$ | . | . | . | . | - | $\cdot$ |
| Tenure-Track | $\begin{gathered} -0.06 \\ (0.06) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.00 \\ (0.06) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.14^{*} \\ & (0.06) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.02 \\ (0.06) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { 0.17* } \\ (0.07) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.07 \\ (0.06) \end{gathered}$ |
| Non-Ladder | $\begin{gathered} -0.16^{* *} \\ (0.05) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.07 \\ (0.05) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.01 \\ (0.04) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.02 \\ (0.05) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.27^{* *} \\ (0.05) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.03 \\ (0.05) \end{gathered}$ |
| International | $\begin{gathered} -0.26^{* *} \\ (0.08) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.10 \\ (0.08) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.03 \\ (0.10) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.04 \\ (0.08) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.03 \\ (0.09) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.01 \\ (0.07) \end{gathered}$ |
| Age | $\begin{gathered} -0.01^{*} \\ (0.00) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.00 \\ (0.00) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.01^{* *} \\ (0.00) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.01^{* *} \\ (0.00) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.01^{* *} \\ (0.00) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.00 \\ (0.00) \end{gathered}$ |
| Pre-School Age Children | $\begin{gathered} 0.38^{* *} \\ (0.07) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.88^{* *} \\ & (0.07) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.12 \\ (0.06) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.02 \\ (0.06) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.23^{* *} \\ & (0.08) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.10 \\ (0.06) \end{gathered}$ |
| School-Age Children | $\begin{gathered} 0.27^{* *} \\ (0.05) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.58 * * \\ (0.05) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.24^{* *} \\ (0.04) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.08 \\ (0.05) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.22^{* *} \\ (0.06) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.02 \\ (0.05) \end{gathered}$ |
| College-Age Children | $\begin{gathered} 0.08 \\ (0.06) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.08 \\ (0.06) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.00 \\ (0.03) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.08 \\ (0.06) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.10 \\ (0.06) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.04 \\ (0.06) \end{gathered}$ |
| Adult Children | $\begin{gathered} -0.20^{* *} \\ (0.07) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.10 \\ (0.06) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.03 \\ (0.05) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.06 \\ (0.07) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.07 \\ (0.07) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.06 \\ (0.06) \end{gathered}$ |
| Female*Pre-School Age Children | $\begin{gathered} 0.09 \\ (0.11) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.33^{* *} \\ (0.11) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.07 \\ (0.13) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.10 \\ (0.11) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & -0.30^{*} \\ & (0.13) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.12 \\ (0.12) \end{gathered}$ |
| Female*School-Age Children | $\begin{gathered} 0.13 \\ (0.09) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.28^{* *} \\ (0.09) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.31^{* *} \\ (0.09) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.11 \\ (0.09) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.09 \\ (0.10) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & -0.06 \\ & (0.09) \end{aligned}$ |
| Female*College-Age Children | $\begin{gathered} -0.18 \\ (0.13) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.25^{*} \\ & (0.12) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.18^{* *} \\ (0.07) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.12 \\ (0.13) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.11 \\ (0.13) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.29^{* *} \\ (0.10) \end{gathered}$ |
| Female*Adult Children | $\begin{gathered} 0.08 \\ (0.12) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.07 \\ (0.10) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.33^{* *} \\ (0.08) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.07 \\ (0.12) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.08 \\ (0.11) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.03 \\ (0.11) \end{gathered}$ |
| Unemployed Spouse | $\begin{gathered} -0.07 \\ (0.06) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.19 * * \\ (0.06) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.07 \\ (0.04) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.05 \\ (0.05) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.03 \\ (0.06) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.04 \\ (0.05) \end{gathered}$ |
| Spouse Seeking Employment | $\begin{gathered} 0.20 \\ (0.13) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.14 \\ (0.11) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.03 \\ (0.11) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.02 \\ (0.11) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.28 \\ (0.14) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.17 \\ (0.11) \end{gathered}$ |
| Spouse of Other Employment Status | $\begin{gathered} 0.10 \\ (0.08) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.08 \\ (0.07) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.09 \\ (0.05) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.19^{*} \\ & (0.09) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.21^{*} \\ & (0.09) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.02 \\ (0.08) \end{gathered}$ |
| No Spouse | $\begin{gathered} -0.01 \\ (0.07) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.03 \\ (0.08) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & -0.19^{*} \\ & (0.08) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.09 \\ (0.08) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.09 \\ (0.07) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.02 \\ (0.06) \end{gathered}$ |
| Caring for Aging/Ill Family Member | $\begin{gathered} 0.25^{* *} \\ (0.05) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.08 \\ (0.05) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.01 \\ (0.04) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.94^{* *} \\ (0.05) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.00 \\ (0.05) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.12^{*} \\ & (0.05) \end{aligned}$ |
| School (8 dummy variables) | Controlled for but not reported | Controlled for but not reported | Controlled for but not reported | Controlled for but not reported | Controlled for but not reported | Controlled for but not reported |
| Constant | $\begin{aligned} & 2.20 * * \\ & (0.17) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.32^{* *} \\ & (0.16) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.97^{* *} \\ & (0.14) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.80 * * \\ (0.16) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2.12^{* *} \\ & (0.17) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.21^{* *} \\ & (0.14) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |
| Observations | 1151 | 917 | 911 | 967 | 1133 | 1110 |
| R-squared | 0.246 | 0.511 | 0.329 | 0.349 | 0.214 | 0.054 |

Robust standard errors in parentheses

* significant at 5\%; ** significant at $1 \%$
${ }^{\dagger}$ This demographic group is controlled for in every model but its results are not reported because it contains less than 5 faculty.


## Faculty Climate Survey | Life Outside Harvard Appendix

Table L9: Impact of Sources of Stress on Agreement with Caregiving and Domestic Resp. Having Had a Negative Impact on Career (All Faculty)

| Dependent Variable: <br> Domestic Responsibilities Having a Negative Impact on Career |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Regressor | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | (6) | (7) |
| Female | $\begin{gathered} \hline \hline 0.52^{* *} \\ (0.09) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \hline 0.51^{* *} \\ (0.10) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \hline 0.59^{* *} \\ & (0.11) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \hline 0.64 * * \\ (0.11) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \hline 0.71^{* *} \\ (0.10) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \hline 0.63^{* *} \\ & (0.10) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \hline 0.49^{* *} \\ (0.10) \end{gathered}$ |
| Asian/Pacific Islander | $\begin{aligned} & 0.34^{*} \\ & (0.15) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \\ 0.26 \\ (0.15) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.37 * \\ & (0.17) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \\ 0.31 \\ (0.17) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.30 \\ (0.16) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \\ 0.30 \\ (0.17) \end{gathered}$ | 0.36* (0.15) |
| Black | $\begin{gathered} -0.62^{* *} \\ (0.24) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & -0.53^{*} \\ & (0.26) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.46 \\ (0.27) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.46 \\ (0.24) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.61^{* *} \\ (0.22) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.51^{*} \\ (0.25) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.55^{*} \\ (0.26) \end{gathered}$ |
| Hispanic | $\begin{aligned} & -0.07 \\ & (0.22) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.11 \\ (0.23) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.16 \\ (0.30) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.07 \\ (0.26) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & -0.10 \\ & (0.26) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.04 \\ (0.31) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & -0.16 \\ & (0.18) \end{aligned}$ |
| American Indian/ Alaskan Native ${ }^{\dagger}$ | . | . | . | . | . | . | . |
| Unknown ${ }^{\dagger}$ | . | . | . | . | . | . | . |
| Tenure-Track | $\begin{gathered} 0.47 * * \\ (0.12) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.44^{* *} \\ & (0.13) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.33^{*} \\ & (0.14) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \dot{0.42^{* *}} \\ (0.14) \end{gathered}$ | 0.35** (0.13) | $\begin{gathered} 0.36 * * \\ (0.14) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.47 * * \\ (0.14) \end{gathered}$ |
| Non-Ladder | $\begin{gathered} 0.15 \\ (0.11) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.15 \\ (0.11) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.13 \\ (0.13) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & -0.03 \\ & (0.12) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & -0.05 \\ & (0.11) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.06 \\ (0.11) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.09 \\ (0.11) \end{gathered}$ |
| International | $\begin{gathered} 0.20 \\ (0.17) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.12 \\ (0.17) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.08 \\ (0.20) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.14 \\ (0.20) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.10 \\ (0.17) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.10 \\ (0.18) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.08 \\ (0.19) \end{gathered}$ |
| Age | $\begin{gathered} -0.01 \\ (0.00) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.00 \\ (0.01) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.03^{* *} \\ (0.01) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.03^{* *} \\ (0.01) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.01^{* *} \\ (0.00) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} -0.02^{* *} \\ (0.00) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.00 \\ (0.01) \end{gathered}$ |
| School (8 dummy variables) | Controlled for but not reported | Controlled for but not reported | Controlled for but not reported | Controlled for but not reported | Controlled for but not reported | Controlled for but not reported | Controlled for but not reported |
| Managing Household Resp. | $\begin{gathered} 0.72^{* *} \\ (0.06) \end{gathered}$ |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{gathered} 0.28 * * \\ (0.09) \end{gathered}$ |
| Childcare |  | $\begin{gathered} 0.85 * * \\ (0.06) \end{gathered}$ |  |  |  |  | $\begin{gathered} 0.64 * * \\ (0.07) \end{gathered}$ |
| Reproductive <br> Decisions/Issues |  |  | $\begin{gathered} 0.10 \\ (0.09) \end{gathered}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Dependent Care |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & 0.30^{* *} \\ & (0.06) \end{aligned}$ |  |  | $\begin{gathered} 0.13 \\ (0.07) \end{gathered}$ |
| Cost of Living |  |  |  |  | $\begin{gathered} 0.44^{* *} \\ (0.06) \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} 0.24^{* *} \\ (0.07) \end{gathered}$ |
| One's Health |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{gathered} 0.22^{* *} \\ (0.07) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.06 \\ (0.08) \end{gathered}$ |
| Constant | $\begin{gathered} 1.20^{* *} \\ (0.33) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.15 * * \\ & (0.35) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3.56 * * \\ (0.36) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3.28^{* *} \\ (0.32) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2.33^{* *} \\ (0.32) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3.31^{* *} \\ (0.31) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 0.01 \\ (0.40) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| Observations | 1045 | 854 | 843 | 898 | 1029 | 1010 | 770 |
| R-squared | 0.261 | 0.342 | 0.168 | 0.175 | 0.189 | 0.160 | 0.379 |

Robust standard errors in parentheses

* significant at 5\%; ** significant at $1 \%$
${ }^{\dagger}$ This demographic group is controlled for in every model but its results are not reported because it contains less than 5 faculty.


## SumMARY STATISTICS

## Summary Statistics

This section provides summary statistics for the 2006/7 Harvard Faculty Climate Survey. The summary statistics include the mean, standard deviation, number of responses, and response distribution for each question on the survey. These statistics are provided for 12 cohorts of faculty.

## The 12 Faculty Cohorts:

1) All Faculty
2) All Men
3) All Women
4) All Senior Faculty
5) Senior Men
6) Senior Women
7) All Junior Faculty
8) Junior Men
9) Junior Women
10) All Non-Ladder Faculty
11) Non-Ladder Men
12) Non-Ladder Women

## Response Inclusions/Exclusions

Responses of "Not Applicable" and "Don't Know" have been excluded in order to calculate an appropriate mean.

## Response Aggregation

Some questions have a large or infinite number of possible responses, such as the question about "How many hours a week do you spend working?" These questions present a challenge to the construction of a user-friendly display of results. As a result, the responses to questions such as these questions have been aggregated into no more than seven categories. In cases where this aggregation occurs, it is documented in the question headings.

## Why Are Some Means Not Calculated?

Some sections of the surveys do not lend themselves to the calculation of means and standard deviations. Some examples are questions that ask the respondent to "check all that apply" and questions that have only yes/no responses. In these cases, the columns for mean and standard deviation are blank. Also, there are some cases where the number of responses for a given cohort is zero. In these case, the mean is blank. In cases where there the number of responses is one, the standard deviation column is blank.

| Specify the degree to which you are satisfied with each of the following: ( $1=$ Very dissatisfied, $5=$ Very Satisfied) | Cohort | Mean | Standard Deviation | Responses | Very dissatisfied | Somewhat dissatisfied | Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied | Somewhat satisfied | Very satisfied | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Overall, how satisfied are you being a faculty member at Harvard University? | All Faculty | 4.16 | 0.96 | 1293 | 2.1\% | 7.2\% | 5.4\% | 43.1\% | 42.2\% | 100\% |
| Overall, how satisfied are you being a faculty member at Harvard University? | All Men | 4.27 | 0.88 | 907 | 1.4\% | 5.3\% | 4.5\% | 42.2\% | 46.5\% | 100\% |
| Overall, how satisfied are you being a faculty member at Harvard University? | All Women | 3.90 | 1.09 | 386 | 3.6\% | 11.7\% | 7.5\% | 45.1\% | 32.1\% | 100\% |
| Overall, how satisfied are you being a faculty member at Harvard University? | All Ladder Faculty | 4.18 | 0.98 | 969 | 2.4\% | 6.9\% | 5.3\% | 41.5\% | 44.0\% | 100\% |
| Overall, how satisfied are you being a faculty member at Harvard University? | Ladder Men | 4.27 | 0.90 | 709 | 1.6\% | 5.5\% | 4.8\% | 40.8\% | 47.4\% | 100\% |
| Overall, how satisfied are you being a faculty member at Harvard University? | Ladder Women | 3.93 | 1.12 | 260 | 4.6\% | 10.8\% | 6.5\% | 43.5\% | 34.6\% | 100\% |
| Overall, how satisfied are you being a faculty member at Harvard University? | All Tenured Faculty | 4.31 | 0.93 | 625 | 2.1\% | 5.3\% | 3.8\% | 36.8\% | 52.0\% | 100\% |
| Overall, how satisfied are you being a faculty member at Harvard University? | Tenured Men | 4.36 | 0.88 | 496 | 1.6\% | 4.6\% | 3.8\% | 35.9\% | 54.0\% | 100\% |
| Overall, how satisfied are you being a faculty member at Harvard University? | Tenured Women | 4.13 | 1.06 | 129 | 3.9\% | 7.8\% | 3.9\% | 40.3\% | 44.2\% | 100\% |
| Overall, how satisfied are you being a faculty member at Harvard University? | All Tenure-Track Faculty | 3.93 | 1.01 | 344 | 2.9\% | 9.9\% | 7.8\% | 50.0\% | 29.4\% | 100\% |
| Overall, how satisfied are you being a faculty member at Harvard University? | Tenure-Track Men | 4.06 | 0.90 | 213 | 1.4\% | 7.5\% | 7.0\% | 52.1\% | 31.9\% | 100\% |
| Overall, how satisfied are you being a faculty member at Harvard University? | Tenure-Track Women | 3.73 | 1.14 | 131 | 5.3\% | 13.7\% | 9.2\% | 46.6\% | 25.2\% | 100\% |
| Overall, how satisfied are you being a faculty member at Harvard University? | All Non-Ladder Faculty | 4.11 | 0.92 | 323 | 1.2\% | 8.0\% | 5.9\% | 47.7\% | 37.2\% | 100\% |
| Overall, how satisfied are you being a faculty member at Harvard University? | Non-Ladder Men | 4.28 | 0.82 | 197 | 1.0\% | 4.6\% | 3.6\% | 47.2\% | 43.7\% | 100\% |
| Overall, how satisfied are you being a faculty member at Harvard University? | Non-Ladder Women | 3.86 | 1.02 | 126 | 1.6\% | 13.5\% | 9.5\% | 48.4\% | 27.0\% | 100\% |
| Overall, how satisfied are you with your particular School at Harvard? | All Faculty | 3.98 | 1.09 | 1292 | 4.0\% | 10.1\% | 6.0\% | 43.7\% | 36.1\% | 100\% |
| Overall, how satisfied are you with your particular School at Harvard? | All Men | 4.10 | 1.02 | 905 | 3.3\% | 7.5\% | 5.6\% | 43.2\% | 40.3\% | 100\% |
| Overall, how satisfied are you with your particular School at Harvard? | All Women | 3.70 | 1.19 | 387 | 5.7\% | 16.3\% | 6.7\% | 45.0\% | 26.4\% | 100\% |
| Overall, how satisfied are you with your particular School at Harvard? | All Ladder Faculty | 3.97 | 1.12 | 968 | 4.5\% | 10.4\% | 5.4\% | 42.6\% | 37.1\% | 100\% |
| Overall, how satisfied are you with your particular School at Harvard? | Ladder Men | 4.08 | 1.05 | 707 | 3.5\% | 8.3\% | 5.2\% | 42.7\% | 40.2\% | 100\% |
| Overall, how satisfied are you with your particular School at Harvard? | Ladder Women | 3.69 | 1.25 | 261 | 7.3\% | 16.1\% | 5.7\% | 42.1\% | 28.7\% | 100\% |
| Overall, how satisfied are you with your particular School at Harvard? | All Tenured Faculty | 4.08 | 1.11 | 624 | 4.3\% | 9.5\% | 3.4\% | 40.1\% | 42.8\% | 100\% |
| Overall, how satisfied are you with your particular School at Harvard? | Tenured Men | 4.15 | 1.05 | 495 | 3.6\% | 7.9\% | 3.4\% | 40.4\% | 44.6\% | 100\% |
| Overall, how satisfied are you with your particular School at Harvard? | Tenured Women | 3.81 | 1.27 | 129 | 7.0\% | 15.5\% | 3.1\% | 38.8\% | 35.7\% | 100\% |
| Overall, how satisfied are you with your particular School at Harvard? | All Tenure-Track Faculty | 3.78 | 1.12 | 344 | 4.9\% | 12.2\% | 9.0\% | 47.1\% | 26.7\% | 100\% |
| Overall, how satisfied are you with your particular School at Harvard? | Tenure-Track Men | 3.92 | 1.03 | 212 | 3.3\% | 9.4\% | 9.4\% | 48.1\% | 29.7\% | 100\% |
| Overall, how satisfied are you with your particular School at Harvard? | Tenure-Track Women | 3.58 | 1.22 | 132 | 7.6\% | 16.7\% | 8.3\% | 45.5\% | 22.0\% | 100\% |
| Overall, how satisfied are you with your particular School at Harvard? | All Non-Ladder Faculty | 4.00 | 1.00 | 323 | 2.5\% | 9.3\% | 7.7\% | 47.1\% | 33.4\% | 100\% |
| Overall, how satisfied are you with your particular School at Harvard? | Non-Ladder Men | 4.17 | 0.93 | 197 | 2.5\% | 4.6\% | 7.1\% | 44.7\% | 41.1\% | 100\% |
| Overall, how satisfied are you with your particular School at Harvard? | Non-Ladder Women | 3.72 | 1.06 | 126 | 2.4\% | 16.7\% | 8.7\% | 50.8\% | 21.4\% | 100\% |
| Monetary compensation | All Faculty | 3.73 | 1.23 | 1342 | 5.6\% | 16.5\% | 10.5\% | 34.4\% | 33.0\% | 100\% |
| Monetary compensation | All Men | 3.75 | 1.23 | 941 | 5.5\% | 15.9\% | 10.2\% | 34.8\% | 33.6\% | 100\% |
| Monetary compensation | All Women | 3.68 | 1.25 | 401 | 5.7\% | 17.7\% | 11.2\% | 33.7\% | 31.7\% | 100\% |
| Monetary compensation | All Ladder Faculty | 3.83 | 1.22 | 1014 | 5.3\% | 14.3\% | 10.0\% | 32.9\% | 37.5\% | 100\% |
| Monetary compensation | Ladder Men | 3.83 | 1.23 | 741 | 5.5\% | 14.2\% | 9.0\% | 34.0\% | 37.2\% | 100\% |
| Monetary compensation | Ladder Women | 3.82 | 1.22 | 273 | 4.8\% | 14.7\% | 12.5\% | 30.0\% | 38.1\% | 100\% |
| Monetary compensation | All Tenured Faculty | 3.92 | 1.20 | 663 | 4.7\% | 13.3\% | 8.3\% | 32.4\% | 41.3\% | 100\% |
| Monetary compensation | Tenured Men | 3.88 | 1.23 | 523 | 5.4\% | 13.\%\% | 8.4\% | 32.3\% | 40.2\% | 100\% |
| Monetary compensation | Tenured Women | 4.09 | 1.09 | 140 | 2.1\% | 11.4\% | 7.9\% | 32.9\% | 45.7\% | 100\% |
| Monetary compensation | All Tenure-Track Faculty | 3.65 | 1.25 | 351 | 6.6\% | 16.2\% | 13.1\% | 33.9\% | 30.2\% | 100\% |
| Monetary compensation | Tenure-Track Men | 3.72 | 1.22 | 218 | 6.0\% | 15.1\% | 10.6\% | 38.1\% | 30.3\% | 100\% |
| Monetary compensation | Tenure-Track Women | 3.54 | 1.29 | 133 | 7.5\% | 18.0\% | 17.3\% | 27.1\% | 30.1\% | 100\% |
| Monetary compensation | All Non-Ladder Faculty | 3.41 | 1.22 | 327 | 6.4\% | 23.2\% | 12.2\% | 38.8\% | 19.3\% | 100\% |
| Monetary compensation | Non-Ladder Men | 3.44 | 1.20 | 199 | 5.5\% | 22.6\% | 14.6\% | 37.2\% | 20.1\% | 100\% |
| Monetary compensation | Non-Ladder Women | 3.38 | 1.25 | 128 | 7.8\% | 24.2\% | 8.6\% | 41.4\% | 18.0\% | 100\% |
| Employee benefits | All Faculty | 4.06 | 1.12 | 1325 | 3.2\% | 10.5\% | 9.6\% | 31.0\% | 45.7\% | 100\% |
| Employee benefits | All Men | 4.06 | 1.11 | 930 | 3.4\% | 9.2\% | 10.6\% | 31.0\% | 45.7\% | 100\% |
| Employee benefits | All Women | 4.04 | 1.14 | 395 | 2.5\% | 13.4\% | 7.1\% | 31.1\% | 45.8\% | 100\% |
| Employee benefits | All Ladder Faculty | 3.99 | 1.15 | 1006 | 3.4\% | 11.8\% | 10.4\% | 30.7\% | $43.6 \%$ 44.80 | $100 \%$ $100 \%$ |
| Employee benefits | Ladder Men | 4.03 | 1.13 | 737 | 3.4\% | 10.3\% | 11.4\% | 30.1\% | 44.8\% | 100\% |
| Employee benefits | Ladder Women | 3.91 | 1.19 | 269 | 3.3\% | 16.0\% | 7.8\% | 32.3\% | 40.5\% | 100\% |
| Employee benefits | All Tenured Faculty | 4.09 | 1.14 | 658 | 4.0\% | 9.1\% | 9.3\% | 29.0\% | 48.6\% | 100\% |
| Employee benefits Employee benefits | Tenured Men | 4.08 | 1.15 | 519 | 4.2\% | 9.1\% | 9.6\% | 28.1\% | 48.9\% | 100\% |
| Employee benefits Employee benefits | Tenured Women All Tenure-Track Faculty | 4.12 3.81 | 1.09 1.15 | 139 348 | ${ }_{2}^{2.9 \%}$ | 9.4\% $17.0 \%$ | 7.9\% $12.6 \%$ | $32.4 \%$ $33.9 \%$ | 47.5\% $34.2 \%$ | $100 \%$ $100 \%$ |
| Employee benefits | Tenure-Track Men | 3.89 | 1.07 | 218 | 1.4\% | 13.3\% | 15.6\% | 34.9\% | 34.9\% | 100\% |
| Employee benefits | Tenure-Track Women | 3.68 | 1.26 | 130 | 3.8\% | 23.1\% | 7.7\% | 32.3\% | 33.1\% | 100\% |
| Employee benefits | All Non-Ladder Faculty | 4.25 | 1.00 | 318 | 2.5\% | ${ }^{6.3 \%}$ | 6.9\% | 32.1\% | 52.2\% | 100\% |
| Employee benefits | Non-Ladder Men | 4.20 | 1.03 | 192 | 3.6\% | 5.2\% | 7.8\% | 34.4\% | 49.0\% | 100\% |
| Employee benefits | Non-Ladder Women | 4.33 | 0.95 | 126 | 0.8\% | 7.9\% | 5.6\% | 28.6\% | 57.1\% | 100\% |


| Specify the degree to which you are satisfied with each of the following: ( $1=$ Very dissatisfied, $5=$ Very Satisfied) | Cohort | Mean | Standard Deviation | Responses | Very dissatisfied | Somewhat dissatisfied | Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied | Somewhat satisfied | Very satisfied | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Clerical and administrative staff | All Faculty | 3.80 | 1.26 | 1343 | 6.1\% | 14.3\% | 11.6\% | 29.2\% | 38.8\% | 100\% |
| Clerical and administrative staff | All Men | 3.83 | 1.25 | 945 | 6.2\% | 12.7\% | 12.5\% | 28.9\% | 39.7\% | 100\% |
| Clerical and administrative staff | All Women | 3.74 | 1.28 | 398 | 5.8\% | 18.1\% | 9.5\% | 29.9\% | 36.7\% | 100\% |
| Clerical and administrative staff | All Ladder Faculty | 3.78 | 1.28 | 1013 | 7.0\% | 13.9\% | 10.8\% | 30.3\% | 38.0\% | 100\% |
| Clerical and administrative staff | Ladder Men | 3.81 | 1.26 | 741 | 7.0\% | 12.0\% | 12.3\% | 30.1\% | 38.6\% | 100\% |
| Clerical and administrative staff | Ladder Women | 3.71 | 1.32 | 272 | 7.0\% | 19.1\% | 6.6\% | 30.9\% | 36.4\% | 100\% |
| Clerical and administrative staff | All Tenured Faculty | 3.84 | 1.26 | 663 | 6.8\% | 12.4\% | 10.1\% | 31.1\% | 39.7\% | 100\% |
| Clerical and administrative staff | Tenured Men | 3.88 | 1.24 | 523 | 6.7\% | 10.9\% | 11.3\% | 30.4\% | 40.7\% | 100\% |
| Clerical and administrative staff | Tenured Women | 3.73 | 1.31 | 140 | 7.1\% | 17.9\% | 5.7\% | 33.6\% | 35.7\% | 100\% |
| Clerical and administrative staff | All Tenure-Track Faculty | 3.67 | 1.31 | 350 | 7.4\% | 16.9\% | 12.0\% | 28.9\% | 34.9\% | 100\% |
| Clerical and administrative staff | Tenure-Track Men | 3.66 | 1.29 | 218 | 7.8\% | 14.7\% | 14.7\% | 29.4\% | 33.5\% | 100\% |
| Clerical and administrative staff | Tenure-Track Women | 3.68 | 1.34 | 132 | 6.8\% | 20.5\% | 7.6\% | 28.0\% | 37.1\% | 100\% |
| Clerical and administrative staff | All Non-Ladder Faculty | 3.86 | 1.21 | 329 | 3.3\% | 15.5\% | 14.3\% | 25.8\% | 41.0\% | 100\% |
| Clerical and administrative staff | Non-Ladder Men | 3.89 | 1.22 | 203 | 3.4\% | 15.3\% | 13.3\% | 24.6\% | 43.3\% | 100\% |
| Clerical and administrative staff | Non-Ladder Women | 3.80 | 1.19 | 126 | 3.2\% | 15.9\% | 15.9\% | 27.8\% | 37.3\% | 100\% |
| Technical and research staff | All Faculty | 3.98 | 1.13 | 1118 | 3.9\% | 8.9\% | 14.8\% | 30.2\% | 42.1\% | 100\% |
| Technical and research staff | All Men | 4.01 | 1.09 | 794 | 3.4\% | 7.7\% | 15.1\% | 32.6\% | 41.2\% | 100\% |
| Technical and research staff | All Women | 3.91 | 1.24 | 324 | 5.2\% | 12.0\% | 13.9\% | 24.4\% | 44.4\% | 100\% |
| Technical and research staff | All Ladder Faculty | 3.93 | 1.14 | 849 | 4.5\% | 9.3\% | 14.3\% | 32.4\% | 39.6\% | 100\% |
| Technical and research staff | Ladder Men | 3.96 | 1.10 | 621 | 3.9\% | 8.2\% | 14.5\% | 34.8\% | 38.6\% | 100\% |
| Technical and research staff | Ladder Women | 3.86 | 1.26 | 228 | 6.1\% | 12.3\% | 13.6\% | 25.9\% | 42.1\% | 100\% |
| Technical and research staff | All Tenured Faculty | 3.98 | 1.11 | 531 | 3.6\% | 9.4\% | 13.6\% | 32.8\% | 40.7\% | 100\% |
| Technical and research staff | Tenured Men | 4.03 | 1.06 | 417 | 2.9\% | 7.9\% | 13.7\% | 34.8\% | 40.8\% | 100\% |
| Technical and research staff | Tenured Women | 3.79 | 1.29 | 114 | 6.1\% | 14.9\% | 13.2\% | 25.4\% | 40.4\% | 100\% |
| Technical and research staff | All Tenure-Track Faculty | 3.86 | 1.19 | 318 | 6.0\% | 9.1\% | 15.4\% | 31.8\% | 37.7\% | 100\% |
| Technical and research staff | Tenure-Track Men | 3.83 | 1.17 | 204 | 5.9\% | 8.8\% | 16.2\% | 34.8\% | 34.3\% | 100\% |
| Technical and research staff | Tenure-Track Women | 3.92 | 1.23 | 114 | 6.1\% | 9.6\% | 14.0\% | 26.3\% | 43.9\% | 100\% |
| Technical and research staff | All Non-Ladder Faculty | 4.11 | 1.08 | 268 | 2.2\% | 7.8\% | 16.4\% | 23.5\% | 50.0\% | 100\% |
| Technical and research staff | Non-Ladder Men | 4.16 | 1.02 | 172 | 1.7\% | 5.8\% | 17.4\% | 25.0\% | 50.0\% | 100\% |
| Technical and research staff | Non-Ladder Women | 4.03 | 1.18 | 96 | 3.1\% | 11.5\% | 14.6\% | 20.8\% | 50.0\% | 100\% |
| Computing support staff | All Faculty | 3.67 | 1.29 | 1303 | 8.1\% | 14.5\% | 13.0\% | 31.4\% | 33.0\% | 100\% |
| Computing support staff | All Men | 3.70 | 1.26 | 921 | 6.9\% | 14.2\% | 13.9\% | 31.6\% | 33.3\% | 100\% |
| Computing support staff | All Women | 3.59 | 1.36 | 382 | 10.7\% | 15.2\% | 11.0\% | 30.9\% | 32.2\% | 100\% |
| Computing support staff | All Ladder Faculty | 3.59 | 1.32 | 993 | 9.1\% | 15.7\% | 14.0\% | 29.8\% | 31.4\% | 100\% |
| Computing support staff | Ladder Men | 3.61 | 1.29 | 726 | 8.1\% | 15.6\% | 14.7\% | 30.6\% | 31.0\% | 100\% |
| Computing support staff | Ladder Women | 3.54 | 1.39 | 267 | 11.6\% | 16.1\% | 12.0\% | 27.7\% | 32.6\% | 100\% |
| Computing support staff | All Tenured Faculty | 3.68 | 1.28 | 646 | 7.4\% | 14.7\% | 13.8\% | 30.8\% | 33.3\% | 100\% |
| Computing support staff | Tenured Men | 3.73 | 1.23 | 510 | 5.9\% | 14.3\% | 14.3\% | 32.4\% | 33.1\% | 100\% |
| Computing support staff | Tenured Women | 3.50 | 1.44 | 136 | 13.2\% | 16.2\% | 11.8\% | 25.0\% | 33.8\% | 100\% |
| Computing support staff | All Tenure-Track Faculty | 3.42 | 1.37 | 347 | 12.1\% | 17.6\% | 14.4\% | 28.0\% | 28.0\% | 100\% |
| Computing support staff | Tenure-Track Men | 3.33 | 1.39 | 216 | 13.4\% | 18.5\% | 15.7\% | 26.4\% | 25.9\% | 100\% |
| Computing support staff | Tenure-Track Women | 3.57 | 1.34 | 131 | 9.9\% | 16.0\% | 12.2\% | 30.5\% | 31.3\% | 100\% |
| Computing support staff | All Non-Ladder Faculty | 3.92 | 1.16 | 309 | 4.9\% | 10.7\% | 10.0\% | 36.6\% | 37.9\% | 100\% |
| Computing support staff | Non-Ladder Men | 4.05 | 1.06 | 194 | 2.6\% | 9.3\% | 10.8\% | 35.6\% | 41.8\% | 100\% |
| Computing support staff | Non-Ladder Women | 3.70 | 1.28 | 115 | 8.7\% | 13.0\% | 8.7\% | 38.3\% | 31.3\% | 100\% |
| Administrative support for grants | All Faculty | 3.48 | 1.33 | 941 | 9.8\% | 17.1\% | 17.7\% | 26.5\% | 28.9\% | 100\% |
| Administrative support for grants | All Men | 3.52 | 1.30 | 659 | 8.8\% | 15.8\% | 18.8\% | 27.5\% | 29.1\% | 100\% |
| Administrative support for grants | All Women | 3.37 | 1.39 | 282 | 12.1\% | 20.2\% | 15.2\% | 24.1\% | 28.4\% | 100\% |
| Administrative support for grants | All Ladder Faculty | 3.49 | 1.35 | 736 539 | 10.2\% | 16.8\% | 17.3\% | 25.3\% | 30.4\% | 100\% |
| Administrative support for grants | Ladder Men | 3.53 | 1.32 | 539 | 9.3\% | 15.8\% | 18.2\% | 26.0\% | 30.8\% | 100\% |
| Administrative support for grants | Ladder Women | 3.37 | 1.41 | 197 | 12.7\% | 19.8\% | 14.7\% | 23.4\% | 29.4\% | 100\% |
| Administrative support for grants | All Tenured Faculty | 3.54 | 1.32 | 474 | 8.4\% | 17.5\% | 17.5\% | 24.3\% | 32.3\% | 100\% |
| Administrative support for grants | Tenured Men | 3.58 | 1.30 | 376 | 7.7\% | 16.5\% | 18.4\% | 25.3\% | 32.2\% | 100\% |
| Administrative support for grants | Tenured Women | 3.42 | 1.42 | 98 | 11.2\% | 21.4\% | 14.3\% | 20.4\% | 32.7\% | 100\% |
| Administrative support for grants | All Tenure-Track Faculty | 3.39 | 1.38 | 262 | 13.4\% | 15.6\% | 16.8\% | 27.1\% | 27.1\% | 100\% |
| Administrative support for grants | Tenure-Track Men | 3.43 | 1.37 | 163 | 12.9\% | 14.1\% | 17.8\% | 27.6\% | 27.6\% | 100\% |
| Administrative support for grants | Tenure-Track Women | 3.32 3.43 | 1.41 1.26 | $\begin{array}{r}99 \\ 205 \\ \hline\end{array}$ | $14.1 \%$ $8.3 \%$ | $18.2 \%$ $18.0 \%$ | 15.2\% 19.5\% | 26.3\% $30.7 \%$ | $26.3 \%$ $23.4 \%$ | $100 \%$ $100 \%$ |
| Administrative support for grants Administrative support for grants | All Non-Ladder Faculty | 3.43 | 1.26 | 205 | 8.3\% | 18.0\% | 19.5\% | 30.7\% | 23.4\% | 100\% |
| Administrative support for grants Administrative support for grants | Non-Ladder Men | 3.48 | 1.19 | 120 | ${ }^{6.7 \%}$ | 15.8\% | 21.7\% | 34.2\% | 21.7\% | 100\% |
| Administrative support for grants Availabiity of nearby parking | Non-Ladder Women All Faculy | 3.35 3.50 | 1.35 1.52 | 85 1033 | 10.6\% $15.7 \%$ | 21.2\% $15.7 \%$ | $16.5 \%$ $11.8 \%$ | 25.9\% $16.4 \%$ | 25.9\% | $100 \%$ $100 \%$ |
| Availability of nearby parking | All Men | 3.60 | 1.49 | 729 | 13.3\% | 15.8\% | 11.2\% | 16.9\% | 42.8\% | 100\% |
| Availability of nearby parking | All Women | 3.27 | 1.58 | 304 | 21.4\% | 15.5\% | 13.2\% | 15.1\% | 34.9\% | 100\% |
| Availability of nearby parking | All Ladder Faculty | 3.66 | 1.47 | 783 | 12.6\% | 14.7\% | 11.4\% | 16.9\% | 44.4\% | 100\% |
| Availability of nearby parking | Ladder Men | 3.74 | 1.43 | 571 | 10.3\% | 15.1\% | 10.7\% | 17.7\% | 46.2\% | 100\% |
| Availability of nearby parking | Ladder Women | 3.42 3 | 1.57 | 212 | 18.9\% | 13.7\% | 13.2\% | 14.6\% | 39.6\% | 100\% |
| Availability of nearby parking | All Tenured Faculty | 3.97 | 1.29 | 521 | 6.0\% | 12.9\% | 10.7\% | 19.2\% | 51.2\% | 100\% |
| Availability of nearby parking | Tenured Men | 4.01 | 1.27 | 410 | 4.9\% | 13.4\% | 10.0\% | 19.5\% | 52.2\% | 100\% |
| Availability of nearby parking | Tenured Women | ${ }^{3.83}$ | 1.39 | 111 | 9.9\% | 10.8\% | 13.5\% | 18.0\% | 47.7\% | 100\% |
| Availability of nearby parking | All Tenure-Track Faculty | 3.04 | 1.61 | 262 | 26.0\% | 18.3\% | 12.6\% | 12.2\% | 30.9\% | 100\% |
| Availability of nearby parking Availability of nearby parking | Tenure-Track Men Tenure-Track Women | 3.07 2.98 | 1.60 1.64 | 161 101 | 24.2\% 28.7\% | 19.3\% $16.8 \%$ | $12.4 \%$ $12.9 \%$ | 13.0\% $10.9 \%$ | $31.1 \%$ $30.7 \%$ | $100 \%$ $100 \%$ |
| Availability of nearby parking | All Non-Ladder Faculty | 3.02 | 1.57 | 250 | 25.2\% | 18.8\% | 13.2\% | 14.8\% | 28.0\% | 100\% |
| Availability of nearby parking | Non-Ladder Men | 3.08 | 1.58 | 158 | 24.1\% | 18.4\% | 13.3\% | 13.9\% | 30.4\% | 100\% |
| Availability of nearby parking | Non-Ladder Women | 2.90 | 1.56 | 92 | 27.2\% | 19.6\% | 13.0\% | 16.3\% | 23.9\% | 100\% |
|  |  |  | 24 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Specify the degree to which you are satisfied with each of the following: ( $1=$ Very dissatisfied, $5=$ Very Satisfied) | Cohort | Mean | Standard Deviation | Responses | Very dissatisfied | Somewhat dissatisfied | Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied | Somewhat satisfied | Very satisfied | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Classroom and meeting space | All Faculty | 3.85 | 1.24 | 1335 | 5.5\% | 14.2\% | 9.8\% | 30.7\% | 39.9\% | 100\% |
| Classroom and meeting space | All Men | 3.88 | 1.22 | 938 | 4.8\% | 13.6\% | 11.2\% | 29.9\% | 40.5\% | 100\% |
| Classroom and meeting space | All Women | 3.80 | 1.29 | 397 | 7.1\% | 15.4\% | 6.5\% | 32.7\% | 38.3\% | 100\% |
| Classroom and meeting space | All Ladder Faculty | 3.90 | 1.21 | 1009 | 5.0\% | 12.7\% | 10.3\% | 31.2\% | 40.8\% | 100\% |
| Classroom and meeting space | Ladder Men | 3.91 | 1.20 | 738 | 4.6\% | 12.3\% | 11.9\% | 30.2\% | 40.9\% | 100\% |
| Classroom and meeting space | Ladder Women | 3.90 | 1.24 | 271 | 5.9\% | 13.7\% | 5.9\% | 33.9\% | 40.6\% | 100\% |
| Classroom and meeting space | All Tenured Faculty | 3.83 | 1.24 | 658 | 5.8\% | 14.0\% | 9.4\% | 32.7\% | 38.1\% | 100\% |
| Classroom and meeting space | Tenured Men | 3.87 | 1.21 | 518 | 5.2\% | 12.5\% | 11.0\% | 32.2\% | 39.0\% | 100\% |
| Classroom and meeting space | Tenured Women | 3.69 | 1.34 | 140 | 7.9\% | 19.3\% | 3.6\% | 34.3\% | 35.0\% | 100\% |
| Classroom and meeting space | All Tenure-Track Faculty | 4.03 | 1.14 | 351 | 3.4\% | 10.3\% | 12.0\% | 28.5\% | 45.9\% | 100\% |
| Classroom and meeting space | Tenure-Track Men | 3.98 | 1.17 | 220 | 3.2\% | 11.8\% | 14.1\% | 25.5\% | 45.5\% | 100\% |
| Classroom and meeting space | Tenure-Track Women | 4.11 | 1.09 | 131 | 3.8\% | 7.6\% | 8.4\% | 33.6\% | 46.6\% | 100\% |
| Classroom and meeting space | All Non-Ladder Faculty | 3.70 | 1.32 | 326 | 7.1\% | 18.7\% | 8.3\% | 29.1\% | 36.8\% | 100\% |
| Classroom and meeting space | Non-Ladder Men | 3.77 | 1.29 | 200 | 5.5\% | 18.5\% | 8.5\% | 28.5\% | 39.0\% | 100\% |
| Classroom and meeting space | Non-Ladder Women | 3.59 | 1.37 | 126 | 9.5\% | 19.0\% | 7.9\% | 30.2\% | 33.3\% | 100\% |
| Office space | All Faculty | 4.16 | 1.18 | 1329 | 5.1\% | 8.6\% | 6.8\% | 23.8\% | 55.7\% | 100\% |
| Office space | All Men | 4.19 | 1.17 | 934 | 4.8\% | 8.1\% | 7.1\% | 23.7\% | 56.3\% | 100\% |
| Office space | All Women | 4.11 | 1.23 | 395 | 5.8\% | 9.6\% | 6.3\% | 24.1\% | 54.2\% | 100\% |
| Office space | All Ladder Faculty | 4.30 | 1.08 | 1008 | 3.6\% | 6.7\% | 6.2\% | 22.9\% | 60.6\% | 100\% |
| Office space | Ladder Men | 4.31 | 1.09 | 737 | 3.7\% | 6.8\% | 6.1\% | 22.0\% | 61.5\% | 100\% |
| Office space | Ladder Women | 4.29 | 1.06 | 271 | 3.3\% | 6.6\% | 6.3\% | 25.5\% | 58.3\% | 100\% |
| Office space | All Tenured Faculty | 4.29 | 1.10 | 660 | 3.9\% | 6.8\% | 5.9\% | 23.2\% | 60.2\% | 100\% |
| Office space | Tenured Men | 4.31 | 1.09 | 520 | 4.0\% | 6.3\% | 5.8\% | 22.3\% | 61.5\% | 100\% |
| Office space | Tenured Women | 4.21 | 1.12 | 140 | 3.6\% | 8.6\% | 6.4\% | 26.4\% | 55.0\% | 100\% |
| Office space | All Tenure-Track Faculty | 4.33 | 1.05 | 348 | 2.9\% | 6.6\% | 6.6\% | 22.4\% | 61.5\% | 100\% |
| Office space | Tenure-Track Men | 4.30 | 1.08 | 217 | 2.8\% | 7.8\% | 6.9\% | 21.2\% | 61.3\% | 100\% |
| Office space | Tenure-Track Women | 4.37 | 1.00 | 131 | 3.1\% | 4.6\% | 6.1\% | 24.4\% | 61.8\% | 100\% |
| Office space | All Non-Ladder Faculty | 3.73 | 1.38 | 321 | 10.0\% | 14.3\% | 9.0\% | 26.5\% | 40.2\% | 100\% |
| Office space | Non-Ladder Men | 3.73 | 1.33 | 197 | 9.1\% | 13.2\% | 10.7\% | 29.9\% | 37.1\% | 100\% |
| Office space | Non-Ladder Women | 3.73 | 1.46 | 124 | 11.3\% | 16.1\% | 6.5\% | 21.0\% | 45.2\% | 100\% |
| Lab or research space | All Faculty | 3.77 | 1.28 | 566 | 7.4\% | 13.1\% | 12.9\% | 28.8\% | 37.8\% | 100\% |
| Lab or research space | All Men | 3.79 | 1.27 | 421 | 7.4\% | 11.9\% | 12.8\% | 30.4\% | 37.5\% | 100\% |
| Lab or research space | All Women | 3.70 | 1.34 | 145 | 7.6\% | 16.6\% | 13.1\% | 24.1\% | 38.6\% | 100\% |
| Lab or research space | All Ladder Faculty | 3.77 | 1.31 | 468 | 8.3\% | 13.0\% | 10.3\% | 29.9\% | 38.5\% | 100\% |
| Lab or research space | Ladder Men | 3.81 | 1.29 | 359 | 8.1\% | 11.7\% | 10.6\% | 30.9\% | 38.7\% | 100\% |
| Lab or research space | Ladder Women | 3.66 | 1.38 | 109 | 9.2\% | 17.4\% | 9.2\% | 26.6\% | 37.6\% | 100\% |
| Lab or research space | All Tenured Faculty | 3.87 | 1.27 | 319 | 7.5\% | 11.3\% | 8.8\% | 31.7\% | 40.8\% | 100\% |
| Lab or research space | Tenured Men | 3.90 | 1.23 | 258 | 7.0\% | 10.1\% | 9.3\% | 33.3\% | 40.3\% | 100\% |
| Lab or research space | Tenured Women | 3.74 | 1.41 | 61 | 9.8\% | 16.4\% | 6.6\% | 24.6\% | 42.6\% | 100\% |
| Lab or research space | All Tenure-Track Faculty | 3.56 | 1.37 | 149 | 10.1\% | 16.8\% | 13.4\% | 26.2\% | 33.6\% | 100\% |
| Lab or research space | Tenure-Track Men | 3.56 | 1.39 | 101 | 10.9\% | 15.8\% | 13.9\% | 24.8\% | 34.7\% | 100\% |
| Lab or research space | Tenure-Track Women | 3.56 | 1.34 | 48 | 8.3\% | 18.8\% | 12.5\% | 29.2\% | 31.3\% | 100\% |
| Lab or research space | All Non-Ladder Faculty Non-Ladder Men | 3.73 3.69 | 1.16 1.14 | 98 62 | $3.1 \%$ $3.2 \%$ | $13.3 \%$ $12.9 \%$ | 25.5\% | 23.5\% 27.4\% | $34.7 \%$ $30.6 \%$ | $100 \%$ $100 \%$ |
| Lab or research space | Non-Ladder Women | 3.81 | 1.21 | 36 | 2.8\% | 13.9\% | 25.0\% | 16.7\% | 41.7\% | 100\% |
| Special research facilities | All Faculty | 3.54 | 1.25 | 491 | 7.1\% | 15.5\% | 22.2\% | 26.7\% | 28.5\% | 100\% |
| Special research facilities | All Men | 3.56 | 1.22 | 365 | 6.3\% | 15.1\% | 23.6\% | 26.6\% | 28.5\% | 100\% |
| Special research facilities | All Women | 3.48 | 1.32 | 126 | 9.5\% | 16.7\% | 18.3\% | 27.0\% | 28.6\% | 100\% |
| Special research facilities | All Ladder Faculty | 3.51 | 1.27 | 401 | 8.2\% | 16.0\% | 20.7\% | 27.2\% | 27.9\% | 100\% |
| Special research facilities | Ladder Men | 3.53 | 1.25 | 309 | 7.4\% | 15.2\% | 22.0\% | 27.2\% | 28.2\% | 100\% |
| Special research facilities | Ladder Women | 3.41 | 1.35 | 92 | 10.9\% | 18.5\% | 16.3\% | 27.2\% | 27.2\% | 100\% |
| Special research facilities | All Tenured Faculty | 3.56 | 1.28 | 260 | 8.8\% | 13.1\% | 20.8\% | 27.7\% | 29.6\% | 100\% |
| Special research facilities | Tenured Men | 3.60 | 1.25 | 209 | 7.7\% | 12.4\% | 22.0\% | 27.8\% | 30.1\% | 100\% |
| Special research facilities | Tenured Women | 3.39 | 1.40 | 51 | 13.7\% | 15.7\% | 15.7\% | 27.5\% | 27.5\% | 100\% |
| Special research facilities | All Tenure-Track Faculty | 3.40 | 1.26 | 141 | 7.1\% | 21.3\% | 20.6\% | 26.2\% | 24.8\% | 100\% |
| Special research facilities | Tenure-Track Men | 3.39 | 1.25 | 100 | 7.0\% | 21.0\% | 22.0\% | 26.0\% | 24.0\% | 100\% |
| Special research facilities Special research facilities | Tenure-Track Women All Non-Ladder Faculty | 3.44 3.69 | 1.30 1.12 | 41 90 | $7.3 \%$ $2.2 \%$ | 22.0\% $13.3 \%$ | 17.1\% 28.9\% | $26.8 \%$ $24.4 \%$ | 26.8\% $31.1 \%$ | $100 \%$ $100 \%$ |
| Special research facilities | Non-Ladder Men | 3.70 | 1.06 | 56 | 0.0\% | 14.3\% | 32.1\% | 23.2\% | 30.4\% | 100\% |
| Special research facilities | Non-Ladder Women | 3.68 | 1.22 | 34 | 5.9\% | 11.8\% | 23.5\% | 26.5\% | 32.4\% | 100\% |


| Specify the degree to which you are satisfied with each of the following: ( $1=$ Very dissatisfied, $5=$ Very Satisfied) | Cohort | Mean | Standard Deviation | Responses | Very dissatisfied | Somewhat dissatisfied | Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied | Somewhat satisfied | Very satisfied | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Research equipment | All Faculty | 3.68 | 1.16 | 578 | 4.7\% | 13.3\% | 20.2\% | 32.5\% | 29.2\% | 100\% |
| Research equipment | All Men | 3.71 | 1.14 | 428 | 4.2\% | 12.4\% | 21.3\% | 32.2\% | 29.9\% | 100\% |
| Research equipment | All Women | 3.60 | 1.22 | 150 | 6.0\% | 16.0\% | 17.3\% | 33.3\% | 27.3\% | 100\% |
| Research equipment | All Ladder Faculty | 3.67 | 1.18 | 476 | 5.3\% | 13.4\% | 18.7\% | 33.8\% | 28.8\% | 100\% |
| Research equipment | Ladder Men | 3.71 | 1.16 | 361 | 4.7\% | 12.7\% | 19.7\% | 33.0\% | 29.9\% | 100\% |
| Research equipment | Ladder Women | 3.57 | 1.22 | 115 | 7.0\% | 15.7\% | 15.7\% | 36.5\% | 25.2\% | 100\% |
| Research equipment | All Tenured Faculty | 3.70 | 1.15 | 303 | 5.9\% | 10.6\% | 18.8\% | 37.3\% | 27.4\% | 100\% |
| Research equipment | Tenured Men | 3.74 | 1.14 | 241 | 5.4\% | 10.4\% | 18.3\% | 36.9\% | 29.0\% | 100\% |
| Research equipment | Tenured Women | 3.53 | 1.18 | 62 | 8.1\% | 11.3\% | 21.0\% | 38.7\% | 21.0\% | 100\% |
| Research equipment | All Tenure-Track Faculty | 3.64 | 1.22 | 173 | 4.0\% | 18.5\% | 18.5\% | 27.7\% | 31.2\% | 100\% |
| Research equipment | Tenure-Track Men | 3.64 | 1.19 | 120 | 3.3\% | 17.5\% | 22.5\% | 25.0\% | 31.7\% | 100\% |
| Research equipment | Tenure-Track Women | 3.62 | 1.27 | 53 | 5.7\% | 20.8\% | 9.4\% | 34.0\% | 30.2\% | 100\% |
| Research equipment | All Non-Ladder Faculty | 3.73 | 1.10 | 102 | 2.0\% | 12.7\% | 27.5\% | 26.5\% | 31.4\% | 100\% |
| Research equipment | Non-Ladder Men | 3.75 | 1.05 | 67 | 1.5\% | 10.4\% | 29.9\% | 28.4\% | 29.9\% | 100\% |
| Research equipment | Non-Ladder Women | 3.69 | 1.21 | 35 | 2.9\% | 17.1\% | 22.9\% | 22.9\% | 34.3\% | 100\% |
| Physical infrastructure | All Faculty | 3.92 | 1.12 | 1228 | 3.0\% | 10.5\% | 17.2\% | 30.5\% | 38.8\% | 100\% |
| Physical infrastructure | All Men | 3.93 | 1.10 | 867 | 2.9\% | 9.7\% | 17.2\% | 31.6\% | 38.6\% | 100\% |
| Physical infrastructure | All Women | 3.87 | 1.16 | 361 | 3.3\% | 12.5\% | 17.2\% | 27.7\% | 39.3\% | 100\% |
| Physical infrastructure | All Ladder Faculty | 3.91 | 1.12 | 946 | 3.1\% | 10.7\% | 16.9\% | 30.4\% | 38.9\% | 100\% |
| Physical infrastructure | Ladder Men | 3.91 | 1.11 | 693 | 3.2\% | 10.1\% | 17.3\% | 31.3\% | 38.1\% | 100\% |
| Physical infrastructure | Ladder Women | 3.92 | 1.14 | 253 | 2.8\% | 12.3\% | 15.8\% | 28.1\% | 41.1\% | 100\% |
| Physical infrastructure | All Tenured Faculty | 3.88 | 1.09 | 614 | 3.4\% | 9.1\% | 18.1\% | 34.9\% | 34.5\% | 100\% |
| Physical infrastructure | Tenured Men | 3.89 | 1.09 | 484 | 3.7\% | 8.5\% | 17.6\% | 35.3\% | 34.9\% | 100\% |
| Physical infrastructure | Tenured Women | 3.83 | 1.09 | 130 | 2.3\% | 11.5\% | 20.0\% | 33.1\% | 33.1\% | 100\% |
| Physical infrastructure | All Tenure-Track Faculty | 3.98 | 1.17 | 332 | 2.4\% | 13.6\% | 14.8\% | 22.3\% | 47.0\% | 100\% |
| Physical infrastructure | Tenure-Track Men | 3.95 | 1.16 | 209 | 1.9\% | 13.9\% | 16.7\% | 22.0\% | 45.5\% | 100\% |
| Physical infrastructure | Tenure-Track Women | 4.02 | 1.20 | 123 | 3.3\% | 13.0\% | 11.4\% | 22.8\% | 49.6\% | 100\% |
| Physical infrastructure | All Non-Ladder Faculty | 3.92 | 1.10 | 281 | 2.8\% | 10.0\% | 18.1\% | 30.6\% | 38.4\% | 100\% |
| Physical infrastructure | Non-Ladder Men | 4.02 | 1.03 | 173 | 1.7\% | 8.1\% | 16.8\% | 32.9\% | 40.5\% | 100\% |
| Physical infrastructure | Non-Ladder Women | 3.75 | 1.20 | 108 | 4.6\% | 13.0\% | 20.4\% | 26.9\% | 35.2\% | 100\% |
| Other resources to support professional duties, please specify | All Faculty | 3.28 | 1.60 | 297 | 21.2\% | 16.8\% | 12.1\% | 12.5\% | 37.4\% | 100\% |
| Other resources to support professional duties, please specify | All Men | 3.35 | 1.54 | 197 | 17.3\% | 18.3\% | 13.2\% | 15.2\% | 36.0\% | 100\% |
| Other resources to support professional duties, please specify | All Women | 3.15 | 1.73 | 100 | 29.0\% | 14.0\% | 10.0\% | 7.0\% | 40.0\% | 100\% |
| Other resources to support professional duties, please specify | All Ladder Faculty | 3.23 | 1.64 | 230 | 23.9\% | 15.7\% | 11.3\% | 12.2\% | 37.0\% | 100\% |
| Other resources to support professional duties, please specify | Ladder Men | 3.27 | 1.56 | 157 | 19.1\% | 19.1\% | 12.1\% | 15.3\% | 34.4\% | 100\% |
| Other resources to support professional duties, please specify | Ladder Women | 3.14 | 1.80 | 73 | 34.2\% | 8.2\% | 9.6\% | 5.5\% | 42.5\% | 100\% |
| Other resources to support professional duties, please specify | All Tenured Faculty | 3.14 | 1.60 | 147 | 23.8\% | 17.0\% | 13.6\% | 12.2\% | 33.3\% | 100\% |
| Other resources to support professional duties, please specify | Tenured Men | 3.17 | 1.56 | 110 | 20.9\% | 19.1\% | 13.6\% | 14.5\% | 31.8\% | 100\% |
| Other resources to support professional duties, please specify | Tenured Women | 3.05 | 1.75 | 37 | 32.4\% | 10.8\% | 13.5\% | 5.4\% | 37.8\% | 100\% |
| Other resources to support professional duties, please specify | All Tenure-Track Faculty | 3.37 | 1.69 | 83 | 24.1\% | 13.3\% | 7.2\% | 12.0\% | 43.4\% | 100\% |
| Other resources to support professional duties, please specify | Tenure-Track Men | 3.49 | 1.54 | 47 | 14.9\% | 19.1\% | 8.5\% | 17.0\% | 40.4\% | 100\% |
| Other resources to support professional duties, please specify | Tenure-Track Women | 3.22 | 1.87 | 36 | 36.1\% | 5.6\% | 5.6\% | 5.6\% | 47.2\% | 100\% |
| Other resources to support professional duties, please specify | All Non-Ladder Faculty | 3.46 | 1.48 | 67 | 11.9\% | 20.9\% | 14.9\% | 13.4\% | 38.8\% | 100\% |
| Other resources to support professional duties, please specify | Non-Ladder Men | 3.65 | 1.42 | 40 | 10.0\% | 15.0\% | 17.5\% | 15.0\% | 42.5\% | 100\% |
| Other resources to support professional duties, please specify | Non-Ladder Women | 3.19 | 1.55 | 27 | 14.8\% | 29.6\% | 11.1\% | 11.1\% | 33.3\% | 100\% |
| Quality of graduate/rofessional students (ladder survey only) | All Ladder Faculty | 4.44 | 0.86 | 868 | 1.2\% | 4.4\% | 4.8\% | 28.2\% | 61.4\% | 100\% |
| Quality of graduate/professional students (ladder survey only) | Ladder Men | 4.44 | 0.88 | 641 | 1.4\% | 4.5\% | 4.5\% | 27.6\% | 61.9\% | 100\% |
| Quality of graduate/rofessional students (ladder survey only) | Ladder Women | 4.45 | 0.81 | 227 | 0.4\% | 4.0\% | 5.7\% | 30.0\% | 59.9\% | 100\% |
| Quality of graduate/professional students (ladder survey only) | All Tenured Faculty | 4.52 | 0.82 | 595 | 1.2\% | 3.4\% | 3.9\% | 25.4\% | 66.2\% | 100\% |
| Quality of graduate/rofessional students (ladder survey only) | Tenured Men | 4.53 | 0.82 | 469 | 1.3\% | 3.2\% | 3.6\% | 24.7\% | 67.2\% | 100\% |
| Quality of graduate/professional students (ladder survey only) | Tenured Women | 4.48 | 0.83 | 126 | 0.8\% | 4.0\% | 4.8\% | 27.8\% | 62.7\% | 100\% |
| Quality of graduate/professional students (ladder survey only) | All Tenure-Track Faculty | 4.28 | 0.93 | 272 | 1.1\% | 6.6\% | 7.0\% | 34.2\% | 51.1\% | 100\% |
| Quality of graduate/professional students (ladder survey only) | Tenure-Track Men | 4.19 | 1.00 | 171 | 1.8\% | 8.2\% | 7.0\% | 35.1\% | 48.0\% | 100\% |
| Quality of graduate/rofessional students (ladder survey only) | Tenure-Track Women | 4.42 | 0.79 | 101 | 0.0\% | 4.0\% | 6.9\% | 32.7\% | 56.4\% | 100\% |
| Quality of students (non-ladder survey only) | All Non-Ladder Faculty | 4.65 | 0.69 | 295 | 0.7\% | 2.4\% | 1.4\% | 22.7\% | 72.9\% | 100\% |
| Quality of students (non-ladder survey only) | Non-Ladder Men | 4.60 | 0.77 | 173 | 1.2\% | 2.9\% | 1.7\% | 23.7\% | 70.5\% | 100\% |
| Quality of students (non-ladder survey only) | Non-Ladder Women | 4.72 | 0.56 | 122 | 0.0\% | 1.6\% | 0.8\% | 21.3\% | 76.2\% | 100\% |


| Specify the degree to which you are satisfied with each of the following: ( $1=$ Very dissatisfied, $5=$ Very Satisfied) | Cohort | Mean | Standard Deviation | Responses | Very dissatisfied | Somewhat dissatisfied | Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied | Somewhat satisfied | Very satisfied | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Access to teaching assistants | All Faculty | 3.99 | 1.17 | 1052 | 4.8\% | 10.0\% | 10.3\% | 31.3\% | 43.7\% | 100\% |
| Access to teaching assistants | All Men | 4.02 | 1.15 | 746 | 3.8\% | 10.3\% | 10.9\% | 29.9\% | 45.2\% | 100\% |
| Access to teaching assistants | All Women | 3.92 | 1.23 | 306 | 7.2\% | 9.2\% | 8.8\% | 34.6\% | 40.2\% | 100\% |
| Access to teaching assistants | All Ladder Faculty | 3.97 | 1.20 | 826 | 5.6\% | 10.2\% | 9.9\% | 30.5\% | 43.8\% | 100\% |
| Access to teaching assistants | Ladder Men | 4.02 | 1.17 | 604 | 4.5\% | 10.1\% | 10.3\% | 29.6\% | 45.5\% | 100\% |
| Access to teaching assistants | Ladder Women | 3.84 | 1.28 | 222 | 8.6\% | 10.4\% | 9.0\% | 32.9\% | 39.2\% | 100\% |
| Access to teaching assistants | All Tenured Faculty | 4.08 | 1.14 | 546 | 4.6\% | 8.2\% | 9.0\% | 30.8\% | 47.4\% | 100\% |
| Access to teaching assistants | Tenured Men | 4.09 | 1.13 | 428 | 4.0\% | 8.4\% | 10.0\% | 29.4\% | 48.1\% | 100\% |
| Access to teaching assistants | Tenured Women | 4.04 | 1.19 | 118 | 6.8\% | 7.6\% | 5.1\% | 35.6\% | 44.9\% | 100\% |
| Access to teaching assistants | All Tenure-Track Faculty | 3.75 | 1.29 | 280 | 7.5\% | 13.9\% | 11.8\% | 30.0\% | 36.8\% | 100\% |
| Access to teaching assistants | Tenure-Track Men | 3.83 | 1.25 | 176 | 5.7\% | 14.2\% | 10.8\% | 30.1\% | 39.2\% | 100\% |
| Access to teaching assistants | Tenure-Track Women | 3.61 | 1.35 | 104 | 10.6\% | 13.5\% | 13.5\% | 29.8\% | 32.7\% | 100\% |
| Access to teaching assistants | All Non-Ladder Faculty | 4.08 | 1.04 | 226 | 1.8\% | 9.3\% | 11.5\% | 34.1\% | 43.4\% | 100\% |
| Access to teaching assistants | Non-Ladder Men | 4.06 | 1.04 | 142 | 0.7\% | 11.3\% | 13.4\% | 31.0\% | 43.7\% | 100\% |
| Access to teaching assistants | Non-Ladder Women | 4.12 | 1.03 | 84 | 3.6\% | 6.0\% | 8.3\% | 39.3\% | 42.9\% | 100\% |
| Teaching resources | All Faculty | 4.09 | 1.03 | 1276 | 2.0\% | 8.1\% | 12.9\% | 33.6\% | 43.5\% | 100\% |
| Teaching resources | All Men | 4.13 | 0.99 | 904 | 1.7\% | 6.9\% | 12.8\% | 34.0\% | 44.7\% | 100\% |
| Teaching resources | All Women | 3.98 | 1.10 | 372 | 2.7\% | 11.0\% | 12.9\% | 32.8\% | 40.6\% | 100\% |
| Teaching resources | All Ladder Faculty | 4.06 | 1.04 | 966 | 2.2\% | 8.3\% | 13.5\% | 33.2\% | 42.9\% | 100\% |
| Teaching resources | Ladder Men | 4.11 | 1.01 | 712 | 2.0\% | 7.0\% | 13.2\% | 34.0\% | 43.8\% | 100\% |
| Teaching resources | Ladder Women | 3.94 | 1.12 | 254 | 2.8\% | 11.8\% | 14.2\% | 31.1\% | 40.2\% | 100\% |
| Teaching resources | All Tenured Faculty | 4.09 | 1.03 | 633 | 1.7\% | 8.4\% | 13.1\% | 33.0\% | 43.8\% | 100\% |
| Teaching resources | Tenured Men | 4.12 | 1.00 | 501 | 1.8\% | 6.8\% | 13.4\% | 33.9\% | 44.1\% | 100\% |
| Teaching resources | Tenured Women | 3.97 | 1.13 | 132 | 1.5\% | 14.4\% | 12.1\% | 29.5\% | 42.4\% | 100\% |
| Teaching resources | All Tenure-Track Faculty | 4.02 | 1.07 | 333 | 3.0\% | 8.1\% | 14.1\% | 33.6\% | 41.1\% | 100\% |
| Teaching resources | Tenure-Track Men | 4.08 | 1.04 | 211 | 2.4\% | 7.6\% | 12.8\% | 34.1\% | 43.1\% | 100\% |
| Teaching resources | Tenure-Track Women | 3.91 | 1.13 | 122 | 4.1\% | 9.0\% | 16.4\% | 32.8\% | 37.7\% | 100\% |
| Teaching resources | All Non-Ladder Faculty | 4.16 | 0.98 | 309 | 1.3\% | 7.4\% | 11.0\% | 35.0\% | 45.3\% | 100\% |
| Teaching resources | Non-Ladder Men | 4.22 | 0.92 | 191 | 0.5\% | 6.3\% | 11.5\% | 34.0\% | 47.6\% | 100\% |
| Teaching resources | Non-Ladder Women | 4.05 | 1.06 | 118 | 2.5\% | 9.3\% | 10.2\% | 36.4\% | 41.5\% | 100\% |
| Workload |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| How reasonable are the expectations for the following: ( $1=$ Much too low, $5=$ Much too high) | Cohort | Mean | Standard Deviation | Responses | Much too low | Too low | About right | Too high | Much too high | Total |
| Teaching | All Faculty | 2.95 | 0.60 | 1157 | 2.5\% | 12.1\% | 74.8\% | 9.3\% | 1.2\% | 100\% |
| Teaching | All Men | 2.93 | 0.58 | 813 | 2.8\% | 11.1\% | 77.1\% | 8.1\% | 0.9\% | 100\% |
| Teaching | All Women | 2.98 | 0.65 | 344 | 1.7\% | 14.5\% | 69.5\% | 12.2\% | 2.0\% | 100\% |
| Teaching | All Ladder Faculty | 2.97 | 0.60 | 866 | 2.3\% | 11.1\% | 75.1\% | 10.3\% | 1.3\% | 100\% |
| Teaching | Ladder Men | 2.94 | 0.58 | 638 | 2.8\% | 10.5\% | 77.1\% | 8.8\% | 0.8\% | 100\% |
| Teaching | Ladder Women | 3.05 | 0.64 | 228 | 0.9\% | 12.7\% | 69.3\% | 14.5\% | 2.6\% | 100\% |
| Teaching | All Tenured Faculty | 2.97 | 0.56 | 594 | 2.0\% | 10.4\% | 77.3\% | 9.4\% | 0.8\% | 100\% |
| Teaching | Tenured Men | 2.95 | 0.55 | 468 | 2.4\% | 9.8\% | 79.1\% | 8.1\% | 0.6\% | 100\% |
| Teaching | Tenured Women | 3.03 | 0.61 | 126 | 0.8\% | 12.7\% | 70.6\% | 14.3\% | 1.6\% | 100\% |
| Teaching | All Tenure-Track Faculty | 2.98 | 0.67 | 272 | 2.9\% | 12.5\% | 70.2\% | 12.1\% | 2.2\% | 100\% |
| Teaching | Tenure-Track Men | 2.92 | 0.66 | 170 | 4.1\% | 12.4\% | 71.8\% | 10.6\% | 1.2\% | 100\% |
| Teaching | Tenure-Track Women | 3.08 | 0.68 | 102 | 1.0\% | 12.7\% | 67.6\% | 14.7\% | 3.9\% | 100\% |
| Teaching | All Non-Ladder Faculty | 2.87 | 0.61 | 290 | 3.1\% | 15.2\% | 74.1\% | 6.6\% | 1.0\% | 100\% |
| Teaching | Non-Ladder Men | 2.89 | 0.58 | 174 | 2.9\% | 13.2\% | 77.0\% | 5.7\% | 1.1\% | 100\% |
| Teaching | Non-Ladder Women | 2.84 | 0.64 | 116 | 3.4\% | 18.1\% | 69.8\% | 7.8\% | 0.9\% | 100\% |
| Research | All Faculty | 3.21 | 0.62 | 1139 | 0.9\% | 3.5\% | 74.5\% | 16.2\% | 4.9\% | 100\% |
| Research | All Men | 3.15 | 0.57 | 805 | 0.7\% | 3.9\% | 78.6\% | 13.2\% | 3.6\% | 100\% |
| Research | All Women | 3.34 | 0.72 | 334 | 1.2\% | 2.7\% | 64.7\% | 23.4\% | 8.1\% | 100\% |
| Research | All Ladder Faculty | 3.20 | 0.62 | 861 | 0.7\% | 3.9\% | 75.1\% | 15.2\% | 5.0\% | 100\% |
| Research | Ladder Men | 3.14 | 0.57 | 636 | 0.8\% | 4.4\% | 78.9\% | 12.1\% | 3.8\% | 100\% |
| Research | Ladder Women | 3.37 | 0.70 | 225 | 0.4\% | 2.7\% | 64.4\% | 24.0\% | 8.4\% | 100\% |
| Research | All Tenured Faculty | 3.04 | 0.46 | 593 | 0.8\% | 5.4\% | 84.0\% | 8.8\% | 1.0\% | 100\% |
| Research | Tenured Men | 3.02 | 0.45 | 467 | 0.9\% | 5.6\% | 85.7\% | 6.9\% | 1.1\% | 100\% |
| Research | Tenured Women | ${ }^{3.11}$ | 0.51 | 126 | 0.8\% | 4.8\% | 77.8\% | 15.9\% | 0.8\% | 100\% |
| Research | All Tenure-Track Faculty | 3.56 | 0.75 | 268 | 0.4\% | 0.7\% | 55.6\% | 29.5\% | 13.8\% | 100\% |
| Research | Tenure-Track Men | 3.47 | 0.73 | 169 | ${ }^{0.6 \%}$ | 1.2\% | 60.4\% | 26.6\% | 11.2\% | 100\% |
| Research | Tenure-Track Women | 3.71 | 0.76 | 99 | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 47.5\% | 34.3\% | 18.2\% | 100\% |
| Research | All Non-Ladder Faculty | 3.23 | 0.64 | 277 | 1.4\% | 2.2\% | 72.6\% | 19.1\% | 4.7\% | 100\% |
| Research Research | Non-Ladder Men Non-Ladder Women | 3.20 3.28 | 0.54 0.76 | 168 109 | 0.6\% 2.8\% | 1.8\% ${ }^{1.8 \%}$ | $77.4 \%$ $65.1 \%$ | 22.0\% | 3.0\% 7 | 100\% 100\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 7.3\% | 100\% |

## Workload

| How reasonable are the expectations for the following: $\text { ( } 1 \text { = Much too low, } 5 \text { = Much too high } \text { ) }$ | Cohort | Mean | Standard Deviation | Responses | Much too low | Too low | About right | Too high | Much too high | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Service to your [unit] | All Faculty | 3.21 | 0.66 | 1307 | 0.9\% | 5.7\% | 70.2\% | 18.1\% | 5.1\% | 100\% |
| Service to your [unit] | All Men | 3.17 | 0.63 | 931 | 1.0\% | 5.9\% | 72.4\% | 16.8\% | 4.0\% | 100\% |
| Service to your [unit] | All Women | 3.31 | 0.72 | 376 | 0.8\% | 5.1\% | 64.9\% | 21.3\% | 8.0\% | 100\% |
| Service to your [unit] | All Ladder Faculty | 3.26 | 0.68 | 998 | 0.7\% | 5.2\% | 67.8\% | 19.9\% | 6.3\% | 100\% |
| Service to your [unit] | Ladder Men | 3.20 | 0.65 | 736 | 1.0\% | 5.4\% | 70.7\% | 18.2\% | 4.8\% | 100\% |
| Service to your [unit] | Ladder Women | 3.42 | 0.74 | 262 | 0.0\% | 4.6\% | 59.9\% | 24.8\% | 10.7\% | 100\% |
| Service to your [unit] | All Tenured Faculty | 3.30 | 0.73 | 659 | 0.9\% | 6.2\% | 62.2\% | 23.5\% | 7.1\% | 100\% |
| Service to your [unit] | Tenured Men | 3.23 | 0.70 | 522 | 1.1\% | 6.7\% | 65.5\% | 21.5\% | 5.2\% | 100\% |
| Service to your [unit] | Tenured Women | 3.56 | 0.79 | 137 | 0.0\% | 4.4\% | 49.6\% | 31.4\% | 14.6\% | 100\% |
| Service to your [unit] | All Tenure-Track Faculty | 3.19 | 0.57 | 339 | 0.3\% | 3.2\% | 78.8\% | 13.0\% | 4.7\% | 100\% |
| Service to your [unit] | Tenure-Track Men | 3.14 | 0.52 | 214 | 0.5\% | 2.3\% | 83.2\% | 10.3\% | 3.7\% | 100\% |
| Service to your [unit] | Tenure-Track Women | 3.26 | 0.65 | 125 | 0.0\% | 4.8\% | 71.2\% | 17.6\% | 6.4\% | 100\% |
| Service to your [unit] | All Non-Ladder Faculty | 3.04 | 0.55 | 308 | 1.6\% | 7.1\% | 77.9\% | 12.0\% | 1.3\% | 100\% |
| Service to your [unit] | Non-Ladder Men | 3.04 | 0.52 | 194 | 1.0\% | 7.7\% | 78.9\% | 11.3\% | 1.0\% | 100\% |
| Service to your [unit] | Non-Ladder Women | 3.05 | 0.61 | 114 | 2.6\% | 6.1\% | 76.3\% | 13.2\% | 1.8\% | 100\% |
| Service to your School | All Faculty | 3.15 | 0.64 | 1284 | 0.9\% | 7.4\% | 72.1\% | 15.5\% | 4.1\% | 100\% |
| Service to your School | All Men | 3.09 | 0.60 | 921 | 1.0\% | 8.4\% | 73.6\% | 14.7\% | 2.4\% | 100\% |
| Service to your School | All Women | 3.29 | 0.71 | 363 | 0.6\% | 5.0\% | 68.3\% | 17.6\% | 8.5\% | 100\% |
| Service to your School | All Ladder Faculty | 3.19 | 0.65 | 986 | 0.6\% | 6.7\% | 70.3\% | 17.4\% | 5.0\% | 100\% |
| Service to your School | Ladder Men | 3.12 | 0.61 | 731 | 0.8\% | 7.8\% | 72.5\% | 16.0\% | 2.9\% | 100\% |
| Service to your School | Ladder Women | 3.40 | 0.73 | 255 | 0.0\% | 3.5\% | 63.9\% | 21.6\% | 11.0\% | 100\% |
| Service to your School | All Tenured Faculty | 3.22 | 0.70 | 646 | 0.8\% | 7.7\% | 65.3\% | 20.6\% | 5.6\% | 100\% |
| Service to your School | Tenured Men | 3.13 | 0.64 | 517 | 1.0\% | 8.9\% | 68.9\% | 18.4\% | 2.9\% | 100\% |
| Service to your School | Tenured Women | 3.59 | 0.80 | 129 | 0.0\% | 3.1\% | 51.2\% | 29.5\% | 16.3\% | 100\% |
| Service to your School | All Tenure-Track Faculty | 3.14 | 0.56 | 340 | 0.3\% | 4.7\% | 79.7\% | 11.5\% | 3.8\% | 100\% |
| Service to your School | Tenure-Track Men | 3.10 | 0.53 | 214 | 0.5\% | 5.1\% | 81.3\% | 10.3\% | 2.8\% | 100\% |
| Service to your School | Tenure-Track Women | 3.21 | 0.60 | 126 | 0.0\% | 4.0\% | 77.0\% | 13.5\% | 5.6\% | 100\% |
| Service to your School | All Non-Ladder Faculty | 2.99 | 0.56 | 298 | 1.7\% | 9.7\% | 78.2\% | 9.1\% | 1.3\% | 100\% |
| Service to your School | Non-Ladder Men | 2.97 | 0.53 | 190 | 1.6\% | 10.5\% | 77.9\% | 9.5\% | 0.5\% | 100\% |
| Service to your School | Non-Ladder Women | 3.02 | 0.60 | 108 | 1.9\% | 8.3\% | 78.7\% | 8.3\% | 2.8\% | 100\% |
| Service to the University | All Faculty | 2.95 | 0.59 | ${ }_{915}^{1285}$ | 1.9\% | 12.3\% | 77.0\% | ${ }^{6.5 \%}$ | 2.3\% | 100\% |
| Service to the University | All Men | 2.89 | 0.56 | 915 | 2.3\% | 13.9\% | 77.5\% | 5.1\% | 1.2\% | 100\% |
| Service to the University | All Women | 3.10 | 0.63 | 370 | 0.8\% | 8.4\% | 75.9\% | 10.0\% | 4.9\% | 100\% |
| Service to the University | All Ladder Faculty | 2.98 | 0.61 | 988 | 1.8\% | 11.5\% | 76.5\% | 7.4\% | 2.7\% | 100\% |
| Service to the University | Ladder Men | 2.90 | 0.57 | 726 | 2.2\% | 13.4\% | 77.5\% | 5.5\% | 1.4\% $6.5 \%$ | $100 \%$ $100 \%$ |
| Service to the University | Ladder Women | 3.18 | 0.67 | 262 | 0.8\% | 6.5\% | 73.7\% | 12.6\% | 6.5\% | 100\% |
| Service to the University | All Tenured Faculty | 3.00 2 | 0.64 0.57 | 648 | 1.4\% | $13.1 \%$ $15.4 \%$ | $73.1 \%$ $75.0 \%$ | 9.1\% $6.8 \%$ 18.7 | 3.2\% ${ }^{3}$ | $100 \%$ $100 \%$ |
| Service to the University | Tenured Men | 2.91 | 0.57 | 513 | 1.6\% | 15.4\% | 75.0\% | 6.8\% | 1.2\% | 100\% |
| Service to the University | Tenured Women | 3.34 | 0.76 | 135 | 0.7\% | 4.4\% | 65.9\% | 17.8\% | 11.1\% | 100\% |
| Service to the University | All Tenure-Track Faculty | 2.94 2.90 | 0.55 0.57 | 340 213 | 2.6\% | 8.5\% | $82.9 \%$ $83.6 \%$ | ${ }^{4.1 \%}$ | 1.8\% | $100 \%$ $100 \%$ |
| Service to the University | Tenure-Track Women | 3.00 | 0.50 | 127 | 0.8\% | 8.7\% | 81.9\% | 7.1\% | 1.6\% | 100\% |
| Service to the University | All Non-Ladder Faculty | 2.86 | 0.52 | 297 | 2.0\% | 14.8\% | 78.8\% | 3.7\% | 0.7\% | 100\% |
| Service to the University | Non-Ladder Men | 2.84 | 0.55 | 189 | 2.6\% | 15.9\% | 77.2\% | 3.7\% | 0.5\% | 100\% |
| Service to the University | Non-Ladder Women | 2.91 | 0.48 | 108 | 0.9\% | 13.0\% | 81.5\% | 3.7\% | 0.9\% | 100\% |
| Recognition of Teaching |  |  | Standard |  |  |  |  |  | To a great |  |
| ( $1=$ Not at all, $5=$ To a great extent) | Cohort | Mean | Deviation | Responses | Not at all | Slightly | Somewhat | Moderately | extent | Total |
| To what extent does your School recognize and reward good teaching: | All Faculty | 3.22 | 1.22 | 1320 | 9.2\% | 21.7\% | 23.9\% | 28.5\% | 16.7\% | 100\% |
| To what extent does your School recognize and reward good teaching? | All Men | 3.29 | 1.20 | 934 | 8.1\% | 19.4\% | 25.5\% | 29.7\% | 17.3\% | 100\% |
| To what extent does your School recognize and reward good teaching: | All Women | ${ }^{3.05}$ | 1.27 | 386 | 11.9\% | 27.2\% | 20.2\% | 25.6\% | 15.0\% | 100\% |
| To what extent does your School recognize and reward good teaching? | All Ladder Faculty | 3.21 | 1.23 | 997 | 9.4\% | 22.1\% | 23.1\% | 28.9\% | 16.5\% | 100\% |
| To what extent does your School recognize and reward good teaching? | Ladder Men | 3.27 | 1.21 | 731 | 8.5\% | 20.1\% | 24.8\% | 29.4\% | 17.2\% | 100\% |
| To what extent does your School recognize and reward good teaching? | Ladder Women | 3.05 | 1.27 | 266 | 12.0\% | 27.4\% | 18.4\% | 27.4\% | 14.7\% | 100\% |
| To what extent does your School recognize and reward good teaching? | All Tenured Faculty | 3.34 | 1.18 | 658 | 7.1\% | 19.3\% | 23.7\% | 32.5\% | 17.3\% |  |
| To what extent does your School recognize and reward good teaching: | Tenured Men | 3.34 | 1.18 | 518 | 7.7\% | 18.0\% | 24.5\% | 32.2\% | 17.6\% | 100\% |
| To what extent does your School recognize and reward good teaching? | Tenured Women | 3.32 | 1.16 | 140 | 5.0\% | 24.3\% | 20.7\% | 33.6\% | 16.4\% | $100 \%$ $100 \%$ |
| To what extent does your School recognize and reward good teaching? | All Tenure-Track Faculty | 2.97 | 1.29 | 339 | 13.9\% | 27.4\% | 21.8\% | ${ }^{21.8 \%}$ | 15.0\% | 100\% |
| To what extent does your School recognize and reward good teaching: | Tenure-Track Men | 3.09 275 | 1.24 1.33 1. | 213 126 | 10.3\% $19.8 \%$ | 25.4\% $31.0 \%$ | 25.4\% 15.9\% | 22.5\% | 16.4\% $12.7 \%$ | $100 \%$ $100 \%$ |
| To what extent does your School recognize and reward good teaching? | Tenure-Track Women All | 2.75 3.23 | 1.33 1.20 | 126 322 | 19.8\% | 31.0\% | 15.9\% | 20.6\% | 12.7\% | $100 \%$ $100 \%$ |
| To what extent does your School recognize and reward good teaching: | Non-Ladder Men | 3.35 | 1.15 | 202 | 6.9\% | 16.8\% | 28.2\% | 30.7\% | 17.3\% | 100\% |
| To what extent does your School recognize and reward good teaching? | Non-Ladder Women | 3.03 | 1.26 | 120 | 11.7\% | 26.7\% | 24.2\% | 21.7\% | 15.8\% | 100\% |


| Workload (continued) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| How many of the following did you teach or co-teach during the previous academic year: (responses of 6 or more have been aggregated) | Cohort | Responses | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 or more | Total |
| Courses primarily for graduate / professional students (excluding independent studies) | All Faculty | 1261 | 13.2\% | 33.9\% | 33.6\% | 11.5\% | 5.6\% | 1.1\% | 1.1\% | 100\% |
| Courses primarily for graduate / professional students (excluding independent studies) | All Men | 898 | 11.6\% | 33.2\% | 35.4\% | 12.1\% | 5.6\% | 1.0\% | 1.1\% | 100\% |
| Courses primarily for graduate / professional students (excluding independent studies) | All Women | 363 | 17.4\% | 35.5\% | 29.2\% | 9.9\% | 5.5\% | 1.4\% | 1.1\% | 100\% |
| Courses primarily for graduate / professional students (excluding independent studies) | All Ladder Faculty | 977 | 9.2\% | 36.2\% | 35.4\% | 11.5\% | 5.4\% | 1.1\% | 1.1\% | 100\% |
| Courses primarily for graduate / professional students (excluding independent studies) | Ladder Men | 716 | 8.8\% | 35.1\% | 36.3\% | 12.2\% | 5.6\% | 1.0\% | 1.1\% | 100\% |
| Courses primarily for graduate / professional students (excluding independent studies) | Ladder Women | 261 | 10.3\% | 39.5\% | 33.0\% | 9.6\% | 5.0\% | 1.5\% | 1.1\% | 100\% |
| Courses primarily for graduate / professional students (excluding independent studies) | All Tenured Faculty | 649 | 8.5\% | 34.5\% | 36.2\% | 12.5\% | 5.9\% | 1.2\% | 1.2\% | 100\% |
| Courses primarily for graduate / professional students (excluding independent studies) | Tenured Men | 511 | 8.8\% | 34.8\% | 36.0\% | 12.9\% | 5.1\% | 1.2\% | 1.2\% | 100\% |
| Courses primarily for graduate / professional students (excluding independent studies) | Tenured Women | 138 | 7.2\% | 33.3\% | 37.0\% | 10.9\% | 8.7\% | 1.4\% | 1.4\% | 100\% |
| Courses primarily for graduate / professional students (excluding independent studies) | All Tenure-Track Faculty | 328 | 10.7\% | 39.6\% | 33.8\% | 9.5\% | 4.6\% | 0.9\% | 0.9\% | 100\% |
| Courses primarily for graduate / professional students (excluding independent studies) | Tenure-Track Men | 205 | 8.8\% | 35.6\% | 37.1\% | 10.2\% | 6.8\% | 0.5\% | 1.0\% | 100\% |
| Courses primarily for graduate / professional students (excluding independent studies) | Tenure-Track Women | 123 | 13.8\% | 46.3\% | 28.5\% | 8.1\% | 0.8\% | 1.6\% | 0.8\% | 100\% |
| Courses primarily for graduate / professional students (excluding independent studies) | All Non-Ladder Faculty | 283 | 26.9\% | 25.8\% | 27.6\% | 11.7\% | 6.0\% | 1.1\% | 1.1\% | 100\% |
| Courses primarily for graduate / professional students (excluding independent studies) | Non-Ladder Men | 181 | 22.1\% | 26.0\% | 32.0\% | 12.2\% | 5.5\% | 1.1\% | 1.1\% | 100\% |
| Courses primarily for graduate / professional students (excluding independent studies) | Non-Ladder Women | 102 | 35.3\% | 25.5\% | 19.6\% | 10.8\% | 6.9\% | 1.0\% | 1.0\% | 100\% |
| Courses primarily for undergraduates (excluding independent studies) | All Faculty | 992 | 36.8\% | 25.2\% | 22.4\% | 9.4\% | 4.8\% | 0.6\% | 0.8\% | 100\% |
| Courses primarily for undergraduates (excluding independent studies) | All Men | 689 | 38.3\% | 26.4\% | 21.9\% | 8.6\% | 3.9\% | 0.3\% | 0.6\% | 100\% |
| Courses primarily for undergraduates (excluding independent studies) | All Women | 303 | 33.3\% | 22.4\% | 23.4\% | 11.2\% | 6.9\% | 1.3\% | 1.3\% | 100\% |
| Courses primarily for undergraduates (excluding independent studies) | All Ladder Faculty | 748 | 36.1\% | 26.9\% | 24.2\% | 9.1\% | 3.1\% | 0.3\% | 0.4\% | 100\% |
| Courses primarily for undergraduates (excluding independent studies) | Ladder Men | 547 | 36.7\% | 28.9\% | 23.2\% | 8.2\% | 2.2\% | 0.4\% | 0.4\% | 100\% |
| Courses primarily for undergraduates (excluding independent studies) | Ladder Women | 201 | 34.3\% | 21.4\% | 26.9\% | 11.4\% | 5.5\% | 0.0\% | 0.5\% | 100\% |
| Courses primarily for undergraduates (excluding independent studies) | All Tenured Faculty | 510 | 32.5\% | 28.6\% | 27.6\% | 9.0\% | 1.4\% | 0.2\% | 0.6\% | 100\% |
| Courses primarily for undergraduates (excluding independent studies) | Tenured Men | 401 | 33.2\% | 30.4\% | 25.2\% | 9.2\% | 1.2\% | 0.2\% | 0.5\% | 100\% |
| Courses primarily for undergraduates (excluding independent studies) | Tenured Women | 109 | 30.3\% | 22.0\% | 36.7\% | 8.3\% | 1.8\% | 0.0\% | 0.9\% | 100\% |
| Courses primarily for undergraduates (excluding independent studies) | All Tenure-Track Faculty | 238 | 43.7\% | 23.1\% | 16.8\% | 9.2\% | 6.7\% | 0.4\% | 0.0\% | 100\% |
| Courses primarily for undergraduates (excluding independent studies) | Tenure-Track Men | 146 | 46.6\% | 24.7\% | 17.8\% | 5.5\% | 4.8\% | 0.7\% | 0.0\% | 100\% |
| Courses primarily for undergraduates (excluding independent studies) | Tenure-Track Women | 92 | 39.1\% | 20.7\% | 15.2\% | 15.2\% | 9.8\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 100\% |
| Courses primarily for undergraduates (excluding independent studies) | All Non-Ladder Faculty | 243 | 39.1\% | 19.8\% | 16.9\% | 10.3\% | 10.3\% | 1.6\% | 2.1\% | 100\% |
| Courses primarily for undergraduates (excluding independent studies) | Non-Ladder Men | 141 | 44.7\% | 16.3\% | 17.0\% | 9.9\% | 10.6\% | 0.0\% | 1.4\% | 100\% |
| Courses primarily for undergraduates (excluding independent studies) | Non-Ladder Women | 102 | 31.4\% | 24.5\% | 16.7\% | 10.8\% | 9.8\% | 3.9\% | 2.9\% | 100\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | more than |  |
| How many of the following did you teach or co-teach during the previous academic year: | Cohort | Responses | $1-10$ | 11-25 | 26-50 | 51-100 | 101-200 | 201-500 | 500 | Total |
| Students, total, in these graduate courses? | All Faculty | 1084 | 17.6\% | 26.4\% | 15.1\% | 18.5\% | 16.6\% | 5.3\% | 0.5\% | 100\% |
| Students, total, in these graduate courses? | All Men | 786 | 16.5\% | 25.7\% | 15.6\% | 18.1\% | 17.3\% | 6.1\% | 0.6\% | 100\% |
| Students, total, in these graduate courses? | All Women | 298 | 20.5\% | 28.2\% | 13.8\% | 19.8\% | 14.8\% | 3.0\% | 0.0\% | 100\% |
| Students, total, in these graduate courses? | All Ladder Faculty | 879 | 18.3\% | 28.1\% | 14.2\% | 17.9\% | 15.9\% | 5.0\% | 0.6\% | 100\% |
| Students, total, in these graduate courses? | Ladder Men | 647 | 17.3\% | 27.5\% | 15.0\% | 17.3\% | 16.4\% | 5.7\% | 0.8\% | 100\% |
| Students, total, in these graduate courses? | Ladder Women | 232 | 21.1\% | 29.7\% | 12.1\% | 19.4\% | 14.7\% | 3.0\% | 0.0\% | 100\% |
| Students, total, in these graduate courses? | All Tenured Faculty | 589 | 18.8\% | 29.7\% | 14.8\% | 15.1\% | 14.9\% | 6.1\% | 0.5\% | 100\% |
| Students, total, in these graduate courses? | Tenured Men | 462 | 18.0\% | 29.2\% | 15.8\% | 14.9\% | 14.9\% | 6.5\% | 0.6\% | 100\% |
| Students, total, in these graduate courses? | Tenured Women | 127 | 22.0\% | 31.5\% | 11.0\% | 15.7\% | 15.0\% | 4.7\% | 0.0\% | 100\% |
| Students, total, in these graduate courses? | All Tenure-Track Faculty | 290 | 17.2\% | 24.8\% | 13.1\% | 23.4\% | 17.9\% | 2.8\% | 0.7\% | 100\% |
| Students, total, in these graduate courses? | Tenure-Track Men | 185 | 15.7\% | 23.2\% | 13.0\% | 23.2\% | 20.0\% | 3.8\% | 1.1\% | 100\% |
| Students, total, in these graduate courses? | Tenure-Track Women | 105 | 20.0\% | 27.6\% | 13.3\% | 23.8\% | 14.3\% | 1.0\% | 0.0\% | 100\% |
| Students, total, in these graduate courses? | All Non-Ladder Faculty | 205 | 14.6\% | 19.0\% | 19.0\% | 21.5\% | 19.5\% | 6.3\% | 0.0\% | 100\% |
| Students, total, in these graduate courses? | Non-Ladder Men | 139 | 12.9\% | 17.3\% | 18.7\% | 21.6\% | 21.6\% | 7.9\% | 0.0\% | 100\% |
| Students, total, in these graduate courses? | Non-Ladder Women | 66 | 18.2\% | 22.7\% | 19.7\% | 21.2\% | 15.2\% | 3.0\% | 0.0\% | 100\% |
| Students, total, in these undergraduate courses? | All Faculty | 636 | 12.4\% | 21.4\% | 25.0\% | 18.7\% | 14.3\% | 7.1\% | 1.1\% | 100\% |
| Students, tota, in these undergraduate courses? | All Men | 435 | 12.9\% | 20.5\% | 23.7\% | 17.9\% | 14.9\% | 8.7\% | 1.4\% | 100\% |
| Students, total, in these undergraduate courses? | All Women | 201 | 11.4\% | 23.4\% | 27.9\% | 20.4\% | 12.9\% | 3.5\% | 0.5\% | 100\% |
| Students, total, in these undergraduate courses? | All Ladder Faculty | 485 | 9.9\% | 21.6\% | 25.2\% | 17.5\% | 16.7\% | 7.8\% | 1.2\% | 100\% |
| Students, total, in these undergraduate courses? | Ladder Men | 353 | 10.8\% | 21.0\% | 23.8\% | 16.1\% | 17.0\% | 9.9\% | 1.4\% | 100\% |
| Students, total, in these undergraduate courses? | Ladder Women | 132 | 7.6\% | 23.5\% | 28.8\% | 21.2\% | 15.9\% | 2.3\% | 0.8\% | 100\% |
| Students, total, in these undergraduate courses? | All Tenured Faculty | 350 | 8.9\% | 19.4\% | 25.1\% | 17.7\% | 18.0\% | ${ }^{9.1 \%}$ | 1.7\% | 100\% |
| Students, total, in these undergraduate courses? | Tenured Men | 274 | 9.1\% | 19.7\% | 24.5\% | 16.1\% | 17.9\% | 10.9\% | 1.8\% | 100\% |
| Students, total, in these undergraduate courses? | Tenured Women | 76 | 7.9\% | 18.4\% | 27.6\% | 23.7\% | 18.4\% | 2.6\% | 1.3\% | 100\% |
| Students, total, in these undergraduate courses? | All Tenure-Track Faculty | 135 | 12.6\% | 27.4\% | 25.2\% | 17.0\% | 13.3\% | 4.4\% | 0.0\% | 100\% |
| Students, total, in these undergraduate courses? | Tenure-Track Men | 79 | 16.5\% | 25.3\% | 21.5\% $30.4 \%$ | 16.5\% | 13.9\% | 6.3\% | 0.0\% | $100 \%$ $100 \%$ |
| Students, total in these undergraduate courses? Students, total, in these undergraduate courses? | Tenure-Track Women All Non-Ladder Faculty | 56 150 | $7.1 \%$ $20.7 \%$ | $30.4 \%$ 20.0\% | 30.4\% 24.7\% | ${ }^{17.9 \%}$ | 12.5\% | 1.8\% | 0.0\% | $100 \%$ $100 \%$ |
| Students, total, in these undergraduate courses? | Non-Ladder Men | 81 | 22.2\% | 17.3\% | 23.5\% | 25.9\% | 6.2\% | 3.7\% | 1.2\% | 100\% |
| Students, total, in these undergraduate courses? | Non-Ladder Women | 69 | 18.8\% | 23.2\% | 26.1\% | 18.8\% | 7.2\% | 5.8\% | 0.0\% | 100\% |

Workload (continued)

| Teaching and Research Interests (responses of 6 or more have been aggregated) | Cohort | Responses | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 or more | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| How many of the courses you taught were close to your research interests? | All Faculty | 1249 | 9.8\% | 34.7\% | 30.9\% | 14.1\% | 8.2\% | 1.4\% | 1.0\% | 100\% |
| How many of the courses you taught were close to your research interests? | All Men | 890 | 8.1\% | 36.6\% | 31.8\% | 13.5\% | 7.8\% | 1.6\% | 0.7\% | 100\% |
| How many of the courses you taught were close to your research interests: | All Women | 359 | 14.2\% | 29.8\% | 28.7\% | 15.6\% | 9.2\% | 0.8\% | 1.7\% | 100\% |
| How many of the courses you taught were close to your research interests: | All Ladder Faculty | 963 | 9.9\% | 35.8\% | 29.3\% | 15.0\% | 8.2\% | 1.2\% | 0.6\% | 100\% |
| How many of the courses you taught were close to your research interests? | Ladder Men | 712 | 7.6\% | 37.9\% | 30.9\% | 13.9\% | 7.9\% | 1.3\% | 0.6\% | 100\% |
| How many of the courses you taught were close to your research interests: | Ladder Women | 251 | 16.3\% | 29.9\% | 24.7\% | 17.9\% | 9.2\% | 1.2\% | 0.8\% | 100\% |
| How many of the courses you taught were close to your research interests? | All Tenured Faculty | 640 | 9.4\% | 34.2\% | 30.5\% | 15.2\% | 9.2\% | 1.1\% | 0.5\% | 100\% |
| How many of the courses you taught were close to your research interests? | Tenured Men | 508 | 8.3\% | 35.8\% | 31.1\% | 14.6\% | 8.9\% | 1.0\% | 0.4\% | 100\% |
| How many of the courses you taught were close to your research interests? | Tenured Women | 132 | 13.6\% | 28.0\% | 28.0\% | 17.4\% | 10.6\% | 1.5\% | 0.8\% | 100\% |
| How many of the courses you taught were close to your research interests? | All Tenure-Track Faculty | 323 | 10.8\% | 39.0\% | 26.9\% | 14.6\% | 6.2\% | 1.5\% | 0.9\% | 100\% |
| How many of the courses you taught were close to your research interests? | Tenure-Track Men | 204 | 5.9\% | 43.1\% | 30.4\% | 12.3\% | 5.4\% | 2.0\% | 1.0\% | 100\% |
| How many of the courses you taught were close to your research interests: | Tenure-Track Women | 119 | 19.3\% | 31.9\% | 21.0\% | 18.5\% | 7.6\% | 0.8\% | 0.8\% | 100\% |
| How many of the courses you taught were close to your research interests? | All Non-Ladder Faculty | 285 | 9.8\% | 30.5\% | 36.5\% | 11.2\% | 8.1\% | 1.8\% | 2.1\% | 100\% |
| How many of the courses you taught were close to your research interests? | Non-Ladder Men | 177 | 10.2\% | 31.1\% | 35.6\% | 11.9\% | 7.3\% | 2.8\% | 1.1\% | 100\% |
| How many of the courses you taught were close to your research interests? | Non-Ladder Women | 108 | 9.3\% | 29.6\% | 38.0\% | 10.2\% | 9.3\% | 0.0\% | 3.7\% | 100\% |
| Have you made use of any of the following teaching resources or programs offered by the Bok Center for Teaching and Learning (check all that apply): | Cohort | Affirmative Responses |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Not applicable | All Faculty | 340 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Not applicable | All Men | 251 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Not applicable | All Women | 89 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Not applicable | All Ladder Faculty | 235 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Not applicable | Ladder Men | 181 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Not applicable | Ladder Women | 54 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Not applicable | All Tenured Faculty | 138 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Not applicable | Tenured Men | 116 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Not applicable | Tenured Women | 22 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Not applicable | All Tenure-Track Faculty | 97 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Not applicable | Tenure-Track Men | 65 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Not applicable | Tenure-Track Women | $\begin{gathered} 32 \\ 105 \end{gathered}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Not applicable | Non-Ladder Men | 70 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Not applicable | Non-Ladder Women | 35 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Menschel Program for Humanities and Social Science Junior Faculty (ladder survey only) | All Ladder Faculty | 37 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Menschel Program for Humanities and Social Science Junior Faculty (ladder survey only) | Ladder Men | 19 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Menschel Program for Humanities and Social Science Junior Faculty (ladder survey only) | Ladder Women | 18 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Menschel Program for Humanities and Social Science Junior Faculty (ladder survey only) | All Tenured Faculty Tenured Men | 4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Menschel Program for Humanities and Social Science Junior Faculty (ladder survey only) Menschel Program for Humanities and Social Science Junior Faculty (ladder survey only) | Tenured Men Tenured Women | $\begin{aligned} & 3 \\ & 1 \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Menschel Program for Humanities and Social Science Junior Faculty (ladder survey only) | All Tenure-Track Faculty | 33 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Menschel Program for Humanities and Social Science Junior Faculty (ladder survey only) | Tenure-Track Men | 16 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Menschel Program for Humanities and Social Science Junior Faculty (ladder survey only) | Tenure-Track Women | 17 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Bok Center events | All Faculty | 173 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Bok Center events | All Men | 103 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Bok Center events Bok Center events | All Women All Ladder Faculty | 70 109 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Bok Center events | Ladder Men | 76 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Bok Center events | Ladder Women | 33 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Bok Center events | All Tenured Faculty | 76 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Bok Center events | Tenured Men | 61 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Bok Center events | Tenured Women | 15 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Bok Center events | All Tenure-Track Faculty | 33 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Bok Center events | Tenure-Track Men | 15 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Bok Center events | Tenure-Track Women | 18 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Bok Center events | All Non-Ladder Faculty | 63 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Bok Center events Bok Center events | Non-Ladder Men Non-Ladder Women | 26 37 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Bideotaped teaching with review | All Faculty | 135 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Videotaped teaching with review | All Men | 95 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Videotaped teaching with review | All Women | 40 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Videotaped teaching with review | All Ladder Faculty | 99 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Videotaped teaching with review | Ladder Men | 73 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Videotaped teaching with review | Ladder Women | 26 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Videotaped teaching with review | All Tenured Faculty | 71 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Videotaped teaching with review | Tenured Men | 57 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Videotaped teaching with review Videotaped teaching with review | Tenured Women All Tenure-Track Faculty | 14 28 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Videotaped teaching with review | Tenure-Track Men | 16 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Videotaped teaching with review | Tenure-Track Women | 12 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Videotaped teaching with review | All Non-Ladder Faculty | 36 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Videotaped teaching with review | Non-Ladder Men | 22 14 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Videotaped teaching with review | Non-Ladder Women | 14 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Workload (continued) |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Have you made use of any of the following teaching resources or programs offered by the Bok |  | Affirmative |
| Center for Teaching and Learning (check all that apply): | Cohort | Responses |
| Help with TF training | All Faculty | 210 |
| Help with TF training | All Men | 155 |
| Help with TF training | All Women | 55 |
| Help with TF training | All Ladder Faculty | 176 |
| Help with TF training | Ladder Men | 136 |
| Help with TF training | Ladder Women | 40 |
| Help with TF training | All Tenured Faculty | 147 |
| Help with TF training | Tenured Men | 118 |
| Help with TF training | Tenured Women | 29 |
| Help with TF training | All Tenure-Track Faculty | 29 |
| Help with TF training | Tenure-Track Men | 18 |
| Help with TF training | Tenure-Track Women | 11 |
| Help with TF training | All Non-Ladder Faculty | 34 |
| Help with TF training | Non-Ladder Men | 19 |
| Help with TF training | Non-Ladder Women | 15 |
| General Courselteaching consultation | All Faculty | 116 |
| General Course/teaching consultation | All Men | 70 |
| General Course/teaching consultation | All Women | 46 |
| General Course/teaching consultation | All Ladder Faculty | 78 |
| General Courselteaching consultation | Ladder Men | 53 |
| General Courselteaching consultation | Ladder Women | 25 |
| General Courselteaching consultation | All Tenured Faculty | 65 |
| General Courselteaching consultation | Tenured Men | 46 |
| General Course/teaching consultation | Tenured Women | 19 |
| General Courselteaching consultation | All Tenure-Track Faculty | 13 |
| General Course/teaching consultation | Tenure-Track Men | 6 |
| General Course/teaching consultation | Tenure-Track Women | 6 |
| General Course/teaching consultation | All Non-Ladder Faculty | 38 |
| General Course/teaching consultation | Non-Ladder Men | 17 |
| General Courselteaching consultation | Non-Ladder Women | 21 |
| Other | All Faculty | 41 |
| Other | All Men | 18 |
| Other | All Women | 23 |
| Other | All Ladder Faculty | 24 |
| Other | Ladder Men | 13 |
| Other | Ladder Women | 11 |
| Other | All Tenured Faculty | 16 |
| Other | Tenured Men | 10 |
| Other | Tenured Women | 6 |
| Other | All Tenure-Track Faculty | 8 |
| Other | Tenure-Track Men |  |
| Other | Tenure-Track Women | 5 |
| Other | All Non-Ladder Faculty | 17 |
| Other | Non-Ladder Men | 5 |
| Other | Non-Ladder Women | 12 |
| None | All Faculty | 282 |
| None | All Men | 203 |
| None | All Women | 79 |
| None | All Ladder Faculty | 226 |
| None | Ladder Men | 168 |
| None | Ladder Women | 58 |
| None | All Tenured Faculty | 169 |
| None | Tenured Men | 132 |
| None | Tenured Women | 37 |
| None | All Tenure-Track Faculty | 57 |
| None | Tenure-Track Men | 36 |
| None | Tenure-Track Women | 21 |
| None | All Non-Ladder Faculty | 56 |
| None | Non-Ladder Men | 35 |
| None | Non-Ladder Women | 21 |


| If you haven't made use of any of the Bok Center services, why not? | Cohort |  |  | Responses | Not enough time | Not interested Not needed $\begin{gathered}\text { Didn't know } \\ \text { about the } \\ \text { services }\end{gathered}$ |  |  |  | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| If you haven't made use of any of the Bok Center services, why not? | All Faculty |  |  | 258 | 36.8\% | 10.1\% | 34.9\% | 18.2\% |  | Total |
| If you haven't made use of any of the Bok Center services, why not? | All Men |  |  | 184 | 33.2\% | 12.0\% | 38.0\% | 16.8\% |  | 100\% |
| If you haven't made use of any of the Bok Center services, why not? | All Women |  |  | 74 | 45.9\% | 5.4\% | 27.0\% | 21.6\% |  | 100\% |
| If you haven't made use of any of the Bok Center services, why not? | All Ladder Faculty |  |  | 212 | 38.2\% | 10.4\% | 16.5\% | 34.9\% |  | 100\% |
| If you haven't made use of any of the Bok Center services, why not? | Ladder Men |  |  | 156 | 34.6\% | 11.5\% | 14.1\% | 39.7\% |  | 100\% |
| If you haven't made use of any of the Bok Center services, why not? | Ladder Women |  |  | 56 | 48.2\% | 7.1\% | 23.2\% | 21.4\% |  | 100\% |
| If you haven't made use of any of the Bok Center services, why not? | All Tenured Faculty |  |  | 160 | 37.5\% | 12.5\% | 37.5\% | 12.5\% |  | 100\% |
| If you haven't made use of any of the Bok Center services, why not? | Tenured Men |  |  | 125 | 34.4\% | 13.6\% | 40.8\% | 11.2\% |  | 100\% |
| If you haven't made use of any of the Bok Center services, why not? | Tenured Women |  |  | 35 | 48.6\% | 8.6\% | 25.7\% | 17.1\% |  | 100\% |
| If you haven't made use of any of the Bok Center services, why not? | All Tenure-Track Faculty |  |  | 52 | 40.4\% | 3.8\% | 26.9\% | 28.8\% |  | 100\% |
| If you haven't made use of any of the Bok Center services, why not? | Tenure-Track Men |  |  | 31 | 35.5\% | 3.2\% | 35.5\% | 25.8\% |  | 100\% |
| If you haven't made use of any of the Bok Center services, why not? | Tenure-Track Women |  |  | 21 | 47.6\% | 4.8\% | 14.3\% | 33.3\% |  | 100\% |
| If you haven't made use of any of the Bok Center services, why not? | All Non-Ladder Faculty |  |  | 46 | 30.4\% | 8.7\% | 34.8\% | 26.1\% |  | 100\% |
| If you haven't made use of any of the Bok Center services, why not? | Non-Ladder Men |  |  | 28 | 25.0\% | 14.3\% | 28.6\% | 32.1\% |  | 100\% |
| If you haven't made use of any of the Bok Center services, why not? | Non-Ladder Women |  |  | 18 | 38.9\% | 0.0\% | 44.4\% | 16.7\% |  | 100\% |
| How many of each of the following types of advisees do you have: |  |  | Standard |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| (responses of 4 or more have been aggregated) | Cohort | Mean | Deviation | Responses | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 or more | Total |
| Udergraduate thesis writers | All Faculty | 1.22 | 1.35 | 720 | 36.0\% | 31.4\% | 18.3\% | 8.3\% | 6.0\% | 100\% |
| Udergraduate thesis writers | All Men | 1.19 | 1.36 | 510 | 38.2\% | 29.4\% | 18.2\% | 8.0\% | 6.1\% | 100\% |
| Udergraduate thesis writers | All Women | 1.29 | 1.32 | 210 | 30.5\% | 36.2\% | 18.6\% | 9.0\% | 5.7\% | 100\% |
| Udergraduate thesis writers | All Ladder Faculty | 1.30 | 1.36 | 591 | 31.5\% | 33.\% | 20.0\% | 8.5\% | 6.3\% | 100\% |
| Udergraduate thesis writers | Ladder Men | 1.27 | 1.37 | 436 | 33.5\% | 32.3\% | 19.7\% | 8.3\% | 6.2\% | 100\% |
| Udergraduate thesis writers | Ladder Women | 1.38 | 1.34 | 155 | 25.8\% | 38.1\% | 20.6\% | 9.0\% | 6.5\% | 100\% |
| Udergraduate thesis writers | All Tenured Faculty | 1.36 | 1.39 | 404 | 30.0\% | 33.2\% | 20.8\% | 8.7\% | 7.4\% | 100\% |
| Udergraduate thesis writers | Tenured Men | 1.35 | 1.42 | 317 | 31.5\% | 31.2\% | 21.5\% | 8.5\% | 7.3\% | 100\% |
| Udergraduate thesis writers | Tenured Women | 1.40 | 1.28 | 87 | 24.1\% | 40.2\% | 18.4\% | 9.2\% | 8.0\% | 100\% |
| Udergraduate thesis writers | All Tenure-Track Faculty | 1.16 | 1.28 | 187 | 34.8\% | 35.3\% | 18.2\% | 8.0\% | 3.7\% | 100\% |
| Udergraduate thesis writers | Tenure-Track Men | 1.05 | 1.18 | 119 | 38.7\% | 35.3\% | 15.1\% | 7.6\% | 3.4\% | 100\% |
| Udergraduate thesis writers | Tenure-Track Women | 1.35 | 1.41 | 68 | 27.9\% | 35.3\% | 23.5\% | 8.8\% | 4.4\% | 100\% |
| Udergraduate thesis writers | All Non-Ladder Faculty | 0.86 | 1.25 | 129 | 56.6\% | 20.2\% | 10.9\% | 7.8\% | 4.7\% | 100\% |
| Udergraduate thesis writers | Non-Ladder Men | 0.74 | 1.25 | 74 | 66.2\% | 12.2\% | 9.5\% | 6.8\% | 5.4\% | 100\% |
| Udergraduate thesis writers | Non-Ladder Women | 1.02 | 1.24 | 55 | 43.6\% | 30.9\% | 12.7\% | 9.1\% | 3.6\% | 100\% |
| Undergraduate participants in your research group | All Faculty | 1.35 | 2.70 | 554 | 52.3\% | 17.5\% | 13.0\% | 6.5\% | 10.6\% | 100\% |
| Undergraduate participants in your research group | All Men | 1.36 | 2.53 | 412 | 50.2\% | 18.4\% | 13.1\% | 7.5\% | 10.7\% | 100\% |
| Undergraduate participants in your research group | All Women | 1.32 | 3.15 | 142 | 58.5\% | 14.8\% | 12.7\% | 3.5\% | 10.6\% | 100\% |
| Undergraduate participants in your research group | All Ladder Faculty | 1.51 | 2.83 | 449 | 45.9\% | 19.6\% | 15.6\% | 6.9\% | 12.0\% | 100\% |
| Undergraduate participants in your research group | Ladder Men | 1.44 | 2.56 | 345 | 45.5\% | 20.3\% | 15.1\% | 7.8\% | 11.3\% | 100\% |
| Undergraduate participants in your research group | Ladder Women | 1.75 | 3.58 | 104 | 47.1\% | 17.3\% | 17.3\% | 3.8\% | 14.4\% | 100\% |
| Undergraduate participants in your research group | All Tenured Faculty | 1.56 | 2.78 | 314 | 43.9\% | 21.0\% | 15.3\% | 7.0\% | 12.7\% | 100\% |
| Undergraduate participants in your research group | Tenured Men | 1.54 | 2.83 | 254 | 43.7\% | 21.7\% | 15.0\% | 7.5\% | 12.2\% | 100\% |
| Undergraduate participants in your research group | Tenured Women | 1.67 | 2.55 | 60 | 45.0\% | 18.3\% | 16.7\% | 5.0\% | 15.0\% | 100\% |
| Undergraduate participants in your research group | All Tenure-Track Faculty | 1.39 | 2.95 | 135 | 50.4\% | 16.3\% | 16.3\% | 6.7\% | 10.4\% | 100\% |
| Undergraduate participants in your research group | Tenure-Track Men | 1.16 | 1.54 | 91 | 50.5\% | 16.5\% | 15.4\% | 8.8\% | 8.8\% | 100\% |
| Undergraduate participants in your research group | Tenure-Track Women | 1.86 | 4.66 | 44 | 50.0\% | 15.9\% | 18.2\% | 2.3\% | 13.6\% | 100\% |
| Undergraduate participants in your research group | All Non-Ladder Faculty | 0.65 | 1.94 | 105 | 80.0\% | 8.6\% | 1.9\% | 4.8\% | 4.8\% | 100\% |
| Undergraduate participants in your research group | Non-Ladder Men | 0.93 | 2.36 | 67 | 74.6\% | 9.0\% | 3.0\% | 6.0\% | 7.5\% | 100\% |
| Undergraduate participants in your research group | Non-Ladder Women | 0.16 | 0.55 | 38 | 89.5\% | 7.9\% | 0.0\% | 2.6\% | 0.0\% | 100\% |
| Undergraduate first-year advisees | All Faculty | 1.11 | 2.82 | 576 | 66.8\% | 4.2\% | 6.3\% | 16.7\% | 6.1\% | 100\% |
| Undergraduate first-year advisees | All Men | 1.08 | 2.57 | 415 | 67.2\% | 4.3\% | 5.8\% | 16.1\% | 6.5\% | 100\% |
| Undergraduate first-year advisees | All Women | 1.17 | 3.39 | 161 | 65.8\% | 3.7\% | 7.5\% | 18.0\% | 5.0\% | 100\% |
| Undergraduate first-year advisees | All Ladder Faculty | 1.02 | 1.72 | 452 | 66.2\% | 4.6\% | ${ }^{6.4 \%}$ | 15.9\% | 6.9\% | 100\% |
| Undergraduate first-year advisees | Ladder Men | 1.05 | 1.80 | 340 | 66.2\% | 4.7\% | 5.6\% | 16.2\% | 7.4\% | 100\% |
| Undergraduate first-year advisees | Ladder Women | 0.93 | 1.46 | 112 | ${ }^{66.1 \%}$ | 4.5\% | 8.9\% | 15.2\% | 5.4\% | 100\% |
| Undergraduate first-year advisees | All Tenured Faculty | 1.19 | 1.82 | 317 | 61.8\% | 4.7\% | 5.7\% | 19.6\% | 8.2\% | 100\% |
| Undergraduate first-year advisees | Tenured Men | 1.19 | 1.88 | 254 | 63.0\% | 4.7\% | 4.3\% | 18.9\% | 9.1\% | 100\% |
| Undergraduate first-year advisees | Tenured Women | 1.17 | 1.54 | 63 | 57.1\% | 4.8\% | 11.1\% | 22.2\% | 4.8\% | 100\% |
| Undergraduate first-year advisees | All Tenure-Track Faculty | 0.64 | 1.41 | 135 | 76.3\% | 4.4\% | 8.1\% | 7.4\% | 3.7\% | 100\% |
| Undergraduate first-year advisees | Tenure-Track Men | 0.65 | 1.49 | 86 | 75.6\% | 4.7\% | 9.3\% | 8.1\% | 2.3\% | 100\% |
| Undergraduate first-year advisees | Tenure-Track Women | 0.61 | 1.29 | 49 | 77.6\% | 4.1\% | ${ }^{6.1 \%}$ | 6.1\% | 6.1\% | 100\% |
| Undergraduate first-year advisees Undergraduate first-year advisees | All Non-Ladder Faculty | 1.43 | 5.12 | 124 | 69.4\% | 2.4\% | 5.6\% | 19.4\% | 3.2\% | 100\% |
| Undergraduate first-year advisees | Non-Ladder Men | 1.23 | 4.70 | 75 | 72.0\% | 2.7\% | 6.7\% | 16.0\% | 2.7\% | 100\% |
| Undergraduate first-year advisees | Non-Ladder Women | 1.73 | 5.75 | 49 | 65.3\% | 2.0\% | 4.1\% | 24.5\% | 4.1\% | 100\% |


| Workload (continued) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| How many of each of the following types of advisees do you have: (responses of 4 or more have been aggregated) | Cohort | Mean | Standard Deviation | Responses | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 or more | Total |
| Other undergraduate student advisees | All Faculty | 4.14 | 10.56 | 605 | 47.9\% | 6.6\% | 9.4\% | 6.4\% | 29.6\% | 100\% |
| Other undergraduate student advisees | All Men | 4.08 | 10.71 | 440 | 48.4\% | 7.0\% | 9.8\% | 5.5\% | 29.3\% | 100\% |
| Other undergraduate student advisees | All Women | 4.28 | 10.20 | 165 | 46.7\% | 5.5\% | 8.5\% | 9.1\% | 30.3\% | 100\% |
| Other undergraduate student advisees | All Ladder Faculty | 3.60 | 7.83 | 482 | 42.9\% | 7.1\% | 11.4\% | 7.7\% | 30.9\% | 100\% |
| Other undergraduate student advisees | Ladder Men | 3.74 | 8.56 | 367 | 43.6\% | 7.6\% | 11.4\% | 6.3\% | 31.1\% | 100\% |
| Other undergraduate student advisees | Ladder Women | 3.17 | 4.79 | 115 | 40.9\% | 5.2\% | 11.3\% | 12.2\% | 30.4\% | 100\% |
| Other undergraduate student advisees | All Tenured Faculty | 3.76 | 7.50 | 338 | 40.8\% | 6.5\% | 12.4\% | 8.0\% | 32.2\% | 100\% |
| Other undergraduate student advisees | Tenured Men | 3.87 | 7.93 | 270 | 41.5\% | 6.7\% | 11.5\% | 6.3\% | 34.1\% | 100\% |
| Other undergraduate student advisees | Tenured Women | 3.34 | 5.48 | 68 | 38.2\% | 5.9\% | 16.2\% | 14.7\% | 25.0\% | 100\% |
| Other undergraduate student advisees | All Tenure-Track Faculty | 3.22 | 8.56 | 144 | 47.9\% | 8.3\% | 9.0\% | 6.9\% | 27.8\% | 100\% |
| Other undergraduate student advisees | Tenure-Track Men | 3.37 | 10.15 | 97 | 49.5\% | 10.3\% | 11.3\% | 6.2\% | 22.7\% | 100\% |
| Other undergraduate student advisees | Tenure-Track Women | 2.91 | 3.59 | 47 | 44.7\% | 4.3\% | 4.3\% | 8.5\% | 38.3\% | 100\% |
| Other undergraduate student advisees | All Non-Ladder Faculty | 6.24 | 17.47 | 123 | 67.5\% | 4.9\% | 1.6\% | 1.6\% | 24.4\% | 100\% |
| Other undergraduate student advisees | Non-Ladder Men | 5.81 | 17.96 | 73 | 72.6\% | 4.1\% | 1.4\% | 1.4\% | 20.5\% | 100\% |
| Other undergraduate student advisees | Non-Ladder Women | 6.86 | 16.88 | 50 | 60.0\% | 6.0\% | 2.0\% | 2.0\% | 30.0\% | 100\% |
| Graduate student dissertation writers for whom you have a major responsibility | All Faculty | 3.36 | 3.42 | 1013 | 19.3\% | 15.5\% | 14.6\% | 13.8\% | 36.7\% | 100\% |
| Graduate student dissertation writers for whom you have a major responsibility | All Men | 3.43 | 3.47 | 735 | 18.6\% | 15.4\% | 15.0\% | 14.0\% | 37.0\% | 100\% |
| Graduate student dissertation writers for whom you have a major responsibility | All Women | 3.18 | 3.30 | 278 | 21.2\% | 15.8\% | 13.7\% | 13.3\% | 36.0\% | 100\% |
| Graduate student dissertation writers for whom you have a major responsibility | All Ladder Faculty | 3.77 | 3.46 | 837 | 12.5\% | 15.1\% | 15.5\% | 15.4\% | 41.5\% | 100\% |
| Graduate student dissertation writers for whom you have a major responsibility | Ladder Men | 3.81 | 3.47 | 619 | 12.0\% | 14.9\% | 16.0\% | 15.7\% | 41.5\% | 100\% |
| Graduate student dissertation writers for whom you have a major responsibility | Ladder Women | 3.63 | 3.44 | 218 | 14.2\% | 15.6\% | 14.2\% | 14.7\% | 41.3\% | 100\% |
| Graduate student dissertation writers for whom you have a major responsibility | All Tenured Faculty | 4.40 | 3.69 | 553 | 9.6\% | 11.0\% | 14.1\% | 14.8\% | 50.5\% | 100\% |
| Graduate student dissertation writers for whom you have a major responsibility | Tenured Men | 4.36 | 3.73 | 439 | 9.8\% | 11.8\% | 14.8\% | 14.6\% | 49.0\% | 100\% |
| Graduate student dissertation writers for whom you have a major responsibility | Tenured Women | 4.54 | 3.56 | 114 | 8.8\% | 7.9\% | 11.4\% | 15.8\% | 56.1\% | 100\% |
| Graduate student dissertation writers for whom you have a major responsibility | All Tenure-Track Faculty | 2.53 | 2.54 | 284 | 18.3\% | 22.9\% | 18.3\% | 16.5\% | 23.9\% | 100\% |
| Graduate student dissertation writers for whom you have a major responsibility | Tenure-Track Men | 2.47 | 2.22 | 180 | 17.2\% | 22.2\% | 18.9\% | 18.3\% | 23.3\% | 100\% |
| Graduate student dissertation writers for whom you have a major responsibility | Tenure-Track Women | 2.63 | 3.02 | 104 | 20.2\% | 24.0\% | 17.3\% | 13.5\% | 25.0\% | 100\% |
| Graduate student dissertation writers for whom you have a major responsibility | All Non-Ladder Faculty | 1.44 | 2.47 | 176 | 51.7\% | 17.6\% | 10.2\% | ${ }^{6.3 \%}$ | 14.2\% | 100\% |
| Graduate student dissertation writers for whom you have a major responsibility | Non-Ladder Men | 1.39 | 2.68 | 116 | 54.3\% | 18.1\% | 9.5\% | 5.2\% | 12.9\% | 100\% |
| Graduate student dissertation writers for whom you have a major responsibility | Non-Ladder Women | 1.55 | 2.03 | 60 | 46.7\% | 16.7\% | 11.7\% | 8.3\% | 16.7\% | 100\% |
| Other graduate student advisees | All Faculty | 5.29 | 8.41 | 982 | 18.8\% | 12.5\% | 14.4\% | 11.6\% | 42.7\% | 100\% |
| Other graduate student advisees | All Men | 5.04 | 8.04 | 700 | 19.0\% | 13.7\% | 13.9\% | 11.7\% | 41.7\% | 100\% |
| Other graduate student advisees | All Women | 5.91 | 9.24 | 282 | 18.4\% | 9.6\% | 15.6\% | 11.3\% | 45.0\% | 100\% |
| Other graduate student advisees | All Ladder Faculty | 4.99 | 7.37 | 776 | 15.6\% | 13.8\% | 16.2\% | 12.4\% | 42.0\% | 100\% |
| Other graduate student advisees | Ladder Men | 4.88 | 7.76 | 564 | 16.0\% | 15.2\% | 16.3\% | 12.1\% | 40.4\% | 100\% |
| Other graduate student advisees | Ladder Women | 5.28 | 6.24 | 212 | 14.6\% | 9.9\% | 16.0\% | 13.2\% | 46.2\% | 100\% |
| Other graduate student advisees | All Tenured Faculty | 5.47 | 8.24 | 509 | 14.1\% | 12.4\% | 16.3\% | 12.4\% | 44.8\% | 100\% |
| Other graduate student advisees | Tenured Men | 5.22 | 8.59 | 397 | 15.4\% | 13.4\% | 16.1\% | 12.3\% | 42.8\% | 100\% |
| Other graduate student advisees | Tenured Women | 6.35 | 6.81 | 112 | 9.8\% | 8.9\% | 17.0\% | 12.5\% | 51.8\% | 100\% |
| Other graduate student advisees | All Tenure-Track Faculty | 4.06 | 5.24 | 267 | 18.4\% | 16.5\% | 16.1\% | 12.4\% | 36.7\% | 100\% |
| Other graduate student advisees | Tenure-Track Men | 4.05 | 5.21 | 167 | 17.4\% | 19.8\% | 16.8\% | 11.4\% | 34.7\% | 100\% |
| Other graduate student advisees | Tenure-Track Women | 4.08 | 5.31 | 100 | 20.0\% | 11.0\% | 15.0\% | 14.0\% | 40.0\% | 100\% |
| Other graduate student advisees | All Non-Ladder Faculty | 6.44 | 11.45 | 206 | 31.1\% | 7.8\% | 7.3\% | 8.7\% | 45.1\% | 100\% |
| Other graduate student advisees | Non-Ladder Men | 5.72 | 9.13 | 136 | 31.6\% | 7.4\% | 3.7\% | 10.3\% | 47.1\% | 100\% |
| Other graduate student advisees | Non-Ladder Women | 7.83 | 14.95 | 70 | 30.0\% | 8.6\% | 14.3\% | 5.7\% | 41.4\% | 100\% |
| Informal student advisees | All Faculty | 6.77 | 12.05 | 876 | 17.1\% | 8.3\% | 16.1\% | 9.7\% | 48.7\% | 100\% |
| Informal student advisees | All Men | 6.48 | 12.14 | 613 | 19.2\% | 9.0\% | 16.0\% | 10.0\% | 45.8\% | 100\% |
| Informal student advisees | All Women | 7.46 | 11.84 | 263 | 12.2\% | 6.8\% | 16.3\% | 9.1\% | 55.5\% | 100\% |
| Informal student advisees | All Ladder Faculty | 5.36 | 8.96 | 677 | 17.0\% | 9.5\% | 17.1\% | 10.3\% | 46.1\% | 100\% |
| Informal student advisees | Ladder Men | 5.23 | 9.68 | 485 | 19.4\% | ${ }^{9.7 \%}$ | 17.5\% | 10.5\% | 42.9\% | 100\% |
| Informal student advisees | Ladder Women | 5.70 | ${ }_{6}^{6.81}$ | 192 | 10.9\% | 8.9\% | 16.1\% | 9.9\% | 54.2\% | 100\% |
| Informal student advisees | All Tenured Faculty | ${ }_{5}^{6.14}$ | 10.38 | 428 | 16.8\% | 6.1\% | 14.0\% | 11.7\% | 51.4\% | 100\% |
| Informal student advisees Informal student advisees | Tenured Men | 5.95 | 11.12 | 334 | 19.2\% | 7.2\% | 14.4\% | 11.4\% | 47.9\% | 100\% |
| Informal student advisees Informal student advisees | Tenured Women All Tenure-Track Faculty | 6.83 4.03 | 7.12 5.53 | 94 249 | 8.5\% $17.3 \%$ | 2.1\% 15.3\% | 12.8\% | $12.8 \%$ $8.0 \%$ | 63.8\% $36.9 \%$ | 100\% |
| Informal student advisees | Tenure-Track Men | 3.64 | 4.91 | 151 | 19.9\% | 15.2\% | 24.5\% | 8.6\% | 31.8\% | 100\% |
| Informal student advisees | Tenure-Track Women | 4.62 | 6.34 | 98 | 13.3\% | 15.3\% | 19.4\% | 7.1\% | 44.9\% | 100\% |
| Informal student advisees | All Non-Ladder Faculty | 11.57 | 18.38 | 199 | 17.6\% | 4.5\% | 12.6\% | 7.5\% | 57.8\% | 100\% |
| Informal student advisees | Non-Ladder Men | 11.23 | 17.99 | 128 | 18.8\% | 6.3\% | 10.2\% | 7.8\% | 57.0\% | 100\% |
| Informal student advisees | Non-Ladder Women | 12.20 | 19.16 | 71 | 15.5\% | 1.4\% | 16.9\% | 7.0\% | 59.2\% | 100\% |
| Postdoctoral associates or fellows | All Faculty | 2.42 | 3.36 | 793 | 36.2\% | 14.6\% | 16.4\% | 9.2\% | 23.6\% | 100\% |
| Postdoctoral associates or fellows | All Men | 2.65 | 3.58 | 592 | 32.8\% | 15.5\% | 16.2\% | 9.6\% | 25.8\% |  |
| Postdoctoral associates or fellows | All Women | 1.75 | 2.53 | 201 | 46.3\% | 11.9\% | 16.9\% | 8.0\% | 16.9\% | 100\% |
| Postdoctoral associates or fellows | All Ladder Faculty | 2.70 | 3.43 | ${ }_{561}$ | 29.3\% | 15.7\% | 18.0\% | 10.3\% | 26.6\% |  |
| Postdoctoral associates or fellows | Ladder Men | 2.91 | 3.61 | 502 | 26.7\% | 15.9\% | 17.7\% | 10.8\% | 28.9\% | 100\% |
| Postdoctoral associates or fellows | Ladder Women | 2.04 | 2.69 | 159 | 37.7\% | 15.1\% | 18.9\% | 8.8\% | 19.5\% | 100\% |
| Postdoctoral associates or fellows | All Tenured Faculty | 3.21 | 3.84 3 | 446 | 23.3\% | 15.9\% | 18.6\% | 11.2\% | 30.9\% | 100\% |
| Postdoctoral associates or fellows Postdoctoral associates or fellows | Tenured Men | 3.34 | 3.97 | 364 | 22.0\% | 16.2\% | 18.7\% | 11.0\% | 32.1\% | 100\% |
| Postdoctoral associates or fellows Postdoctoral associates or fellows | Tenured Women All Tenure-Track Faculty | 2.66 1.65 | 3.15 1.99 | 82 215 | 29.3\% | $14.6 \%$ $15.3 \%$ | 18.3\% $16.7 \%$ | $12.2 \%$ $8.4 \%$ | 25.6\% $17.7 \%$ | 100\% 100\% |
| Postdoctoral associates or fellows | Tenure-Track Men | 1.80 | 2.04 | 138 | 39.1\% | 15.2\% | 15.2\% | 10.1\% | 20.3\% | 100\% |
| Postdoctoral associates or fellows | Tenure-Track Women | 1.39 | 1.89 | 77 | 46.8\% | 15.6\% | 19.5\% | 5.2\% | 13.0\% | 100\% |
| Postdoctoral associates or fellows | All Non-Ladder Faculty | 0.98 | 2.59 | 132 | 70.5\% | 9.1\% | 8.3\% | 3.8\% | 8.3\% | 100\% |
| Postdoctoral associates or fellows | Non-Ladder Men | 1.14 | 2.99 | 90 | 66.7\% | 13.3\% | 7.8\% | 3.3\% | 8.9\% | 100\% |
| Postdoctoral associates or fellows | Non-Ladder Women | 0.64 | 1.34 | 42 | 78.6\% | 0.0\% | 9.5\% | 4.8\% | 7.1\% | 100\% |
|  |  |  | 25 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Workload (continued) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Seminars and Workshops (responses of 4 or more have been aggregated) | Cohort | Mean | Standard Deviation | Responses | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 or more | Total |
| On average, how many seminars and/or workshops do you attend each week: | All Faculty | 1.65 | 1.02 | 1238 | 9.2\% | 40.3\% | 32.6\% | 13.2\% | 4.7\% | 100\% |
| On average, how many seminars and/or workshops do you attend each week: | All Men | 1.71 | 1.02 | 885 | 8.2\% | 37.9\% | 34.4\% | 14.7\% | 4.9\% | 100\% |
| On average, how many seminars and/or workshops do you attend each week: | All Women | 1.50 | 1.02 | 353 | 11.6\% | 46.5\% | 28.0\% | 9.6\% | 4.2\% | 100\% |
| On average, how many seminars and/or workshops do you attend each week: | All Ladder Faculty | 1.81 | 1.01 | 966 | 5.1\% | 37.9\% | 36.0\% | 15.3\% | 5.7\% | 100\% |
| On average, how many seminars and/or workshops do you attend each week: | Ladder Men | 1.86 | 1.00 | 710 | 4.1\% | 35.9\% | 37.3\% | 16.8\% | 5.9\% | 100\% |
| On average, how many seminars and/or workshops do you attend each week: | Ladder Women | 1.65 | 1.03 | 256 | 7.8\% | 43.4\% | 32.4\% | 11.3\% | 5.1\% | 100\% |
| On average, how many seminars and/or workshops do you attend each week: | All Tenured Faculty | 1.86 | 1.04 | 629 | 4.6\% | 37.2\% | 34.8\% | 17.0\% | 6.4\% | 100\% |
| On average, how many seminars and/or workshops do you attend each week: | Tenured Men | 1.91 | 1.03 | 498 | 3.6\% | 35.7\% | 35.7\% | 18.1\% | 6.8\% | 100\% |
| On average, how many seminars and/or workshops do you attend each week: | Tenured Women | 1.65 | 1.04 | 131 | 8.4\% | 42.7\% | 31.3\% | 13.0\% | 4.6\% | 100\% |
| On average, how many seminars and/or workshops do you attend each week: | All Tenure-Track Faculty | 1.71 | 0.95 | 337 | 5.9\% | 39.2\% | 38.3\% | 12.2\% | 4.5\% | 100\% |
| On average, how many seminars and/or workshops do you attend each week: | Tenure-Track Men | 1.75 | 0.91 | 212 | 5.2\% | 36.3\% | 41.0\% | 13.7\% | 3.8\% | 100\% |
| On average, how many seminars and/or workshops do you attend each week: | Tenure-Track Women | 1.65 | 1.03 | 125 | 7.2\% | 44.0\% | 33.6\% | 9.6\% | 5.6\% | 100\% |
| On average, how many seminars and/or workshops do you attend each week: | All Non-Ladder Faculty | 1.11 | 0.87 | 272 | 23.9\% | 48.9\% | 20.2\% | 5.9\% | 1.1\% | 100\% |
| On average, how many seminars and/or workshops do you attend each week: | Non-Ladder Men | 1.11 | 0.88 | 175 | 25.1\% | 45.7\% | 22.3\% | 6.3\% | 0.6\% | 100\% |
| On average, how many seminars and/or workshops do you attend each week: | Non-Ladder Women | 1.11 | 0.88 | 97 | 21.6\% | 54.6\% | 16.5\% | 5.2\% | 2.1\% | 100\% |
| Please indicate the number of committees (formal and informal) you served on and chaired |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| (responses of 4 or more have been aggregated) | Cohort | Mean | Deviation | Responses | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 or more | Total |
| Graduate dissertation committees served on | All Faculty | 3.26 | 3.80 | 1024 | 20.0\% | 16.6\% | 15.9\% | 13.5\% | 34.0\% | 100\% |
| Graduate dissertation committees served on | All Men | 3.23 | 3.55 | 741 | 19.7\% | 16.6\% | 16.1\% | 14.4\% | 33.2\% | 100\% |
| Graduate dissertation committees served on | All Women | 3.34 | 4.41 | 283 | 20.8\% | 16.6\% | 15.5\% | 11.0\% | 36.0\% | 100\% |
| Graduate dissertation committees served on | All Ladder Faculty | 3.72 | 3.98 | 844 | 12.9\% | 16.6\% | 16.5\% | 14.5\% | 39.6\% | 100\% |
| Graduate dissertation committees served on | Ladder Men | 3.65 | 3.67 | 622 | 12.7\% | 16.9\% | 16.7\% | 15.1\% | 38.6\% | 100\% |
| Graduate dissertation committees served on | Ladder Women | 3.90 | 4.74 | 222 | 13.5\% | 15.8\% | 15.8\% | 12.6\% | 42.3\% | 100\% |
| Graduate dissertation committees served on | All Tenured Faculty | 4.27 | 4.33 | 563 | 8.5\% | 13.3\% | 16.3\% | 16.2\% | 45.6\% | 100\% |
| Graduate dissertation committees served on | Tenured Men | 4.13 | 3.91 | 441 | 9.3\% | 14.1\% | 16.3\% | 16.1\% | 44.2\% | 100\% |
| Graduate dissertation committees served on | Tenured Women | 4.75 | 5.59 | 122 | 5.7\% | 10.7\% | 16.4\% | 16.4\% | 50.8\% | 100\% |
| Graduate dissertation committees served on | All Tenure-Track Faculty | 2.62 | 2.85 | 281 | 21.7\% | 23.1\% | 16.7\% | 11.0\% | 27.4\% | 100\% |
| Graduate dissertation committees served on | Tenure-Track Men | 2.49 | 2.68 | 181 | 21.0\% | 23.8\% | 17.7\% | 12.7\% | 24.9\% | 100\% |
| Graduate dissertation committees served on | Tenure-Track Women | 2.85 | 3.14 | 100 | 23.0\% | 22.0\% | 15.0\% | 8.0\% | 32.0\% | 100\% |
| Graduate dissertation committees served on | All Non-Ladder Faculty | 1.11 | 1.61 | 180 | 53.3\% | 16.7\% | 13.3\% | 8.9\% | 7.8\% | 100\% |
| Graduate dissertation committees served on | Non-Ladder Men | 1.00 | 1.48 | 119 | 56.3\% | 15.1\% | 12.6\% | 10.9\% | 5.0\% | 100\% |
| Graduate dissertation committees served on | Non-Ladder Women | 1.33 | 1.84 | 61 | 47.5\% | 19.7\% | 14.8\% | 4.9\% | 13.1\% | 100\% |
| Graduate dissertation committees chaired | All Faculty | 1.83 | 2.16 | 692 | 31.6\% | 24.4\% | 17.2\% | 10.3\% | 16.5\% | 100\% |
| Graduate dissertation committees chaired | All Men | 1.80 | 2.04 | 508 | 31.1\% | 24.2\% | 18.5\% | 9.6\% | 16.5\% | 100\% |
| Graduate dissertation committees chaired | All Women | 1.92 | 2.48 | 184 | 33.2\% | 25.0\% | 13.6\% | 12.0\% | 16.3\% | 100\% |
| Graduate dissertation committees chaired | All Ladder Faculty | 2.04 | 2.22 | 592 | 24.5\% | 27.0\% | 18.4\% | 11.8\% | 18.2\% | 100\% |
| Graduate dissertation committees chaired | Ladder Men | 2.00 | 2.08 | 439 | 24.1\% | 26.4\% | 20.0\% | 10.9\% | 18.5\% | 100\% |
| Graduate dissertation committees chaired | Ladder Women | 2.16 | 2.58 | 153 | 25.5\% | 28.8\% | 13.7\% | 14.4\% | 17.6\% | 100\% |
| Graduate dissertation committees chaired | All Tenured Faculty | 2.41 | 2.31 | 433 | 14.1\% | 28.4\% | 22.2\% | 13.6\% | 21.7\% | 100\% |
| Graduate dissertation committees chaired | Tenured Men | 2.30 | 2.15 | 339 | 15.3\% | 27.7\% | 23.3\% | 12.4\% | 21.2\% | 100\% |
| Graduate dissertation committees chaired | Tenured Women | 2.81 | 2.78 | 94 | 9.6\% | 30.9\% | 18.1\% | 18.1\% | 23.4\% | 100\% |
| Graduate dissertation committees chaired | All Tenure-Track Faculty | 1.03 | 1.56 | 159 | 52.8\% | 23.3\% | 8.2\% | 6.9\% | 8.8\% | 100\% |
| Graduate dissertation committees chaired | Tenure-Track Men | 0.97 | 1.39 | 100 | 54.0\% | 22.0\% | 9.0\% | 6.0\% | 9.0\% | 100\% |
| Graduate dissertation committees chaired | Tenure-Track Women | 1.14 | 1.82 | 59 | 50.8\% | 25.4\% | 6.8\% | 8.5\% | 8.5\% | 100\% |
| Graduate dissertation committees chaired | All Non-Ladder Faculty | 0.59 | 1.22 | 100 | 74.0\% | 9.0\% | 10.0\% | 1.0\% | 6.0\% | 100\% |
| Graduate dissertation committees chaired | Non-Ladder Men | 0.52 | 1.15 | 69 | 75.4\% | 10.1\% | 8.7\% | 1.4\% | 4.3\% | 100\% |
| Graduate dissertation committees chaired | Non-Ladder Women | 0.74 | 1.39 | 31 | 71.0\% | 6.5\% | 12.9\% | 0.0\% | 9.7\% | 100\% |
| [unit] committees served on | All Faculty | 2.10 | 1.77 | 1105 | 14.5\% | 28.6\% | 23.5\% | 16.5\% | 16.9\% | 100\% |
| [unit] committees served on | All Men | 2.07 | 1.77 | 798 | 14.0\% | 30.2\% | 23.8\% | 16.7\% | 15.3\% | 100\% |
| [unit] committees served on | All Women | 2.20 | 1.77 | 307 | 15.6\% | 24.4\% | 22.8\% | 16.0\% | 21.2\% |  |
| [unit] committees served on | All Ladder Faculty | 2.27 | 1.79 | 888 | 10.4\% | 27.8\% | 25.0\% | 17.7\% | 19.1\% | 100\% |
| [unit] committees served on | Ladder Men | 2.26 | 1.81 | 652 236 | 10.0\% | 29.0\% | 25.0\% | 18.3\% | $17.8 \%$ $22.9 \%$ | 100\% 100\% |
| [unit] committees served on [unit] committees served on | Ladder Women | 2.32 | 1.73 | 236 | 11.4\% | 24.6\% | 25.0\% | 16.1\% | 22.9\% | 100\% |
| [unit] committees served on [unit] committees served on | All Tenured Faculty | 2.51 | 1.89 | 582 | 6.7\% | 25.9\% | 24.9\% | 19.9\% | 22.5\% | 100\% |
| [unit] committees served on [unit] committees served on | Tenured Men Tenured Women | 2.43 2.81 | 1.90 1.83 | 456 126 | 7.5\% 4.0\% | 27.9\% 19.0\% | 24.1\% | 20.2\% | 20.4\% $30.2 \%$ | 100\% |
| [unit] committees served on | All Tenure-Track Faculty | 1.82 | 1.49 | 306 | 17.3\% | 31.4\% | 25.2\% | 13.4\% | 12.7\% | 100\% |
| [unit] committees served on | Tenure-Track Men | 1.86 | 1.53 | 196 | 15.8\% | 31.6\% | 27.0\% | 13.8\% | 11.7\% | 100\% |
| [unit] committees served on | Tenure-Track Women | 1.75 | 1.42 | 110 | 20.0\% | 30.9\% | 21.8\% | 12.7\% | 14.5\% | 100\% |
| [unit] committees served on | All Non-Ladder Faculty | 1.41 | 1.50 | 217 | 31.3\% | 31.8\% | 17.5\% | 11.5\% | 7.8\% | 100\% |
| [unit] committees served on | Non-Ladder Men | 1.22 | 1.25 | 146 | 32.2\% | 35.6\% | 18.5\% | 9.6\% | 4.1\% | 100\% |
| [unit] committees served on | Non-Ladder Women | 1.82 | 1.85 | 71 | 29.6\% | 23.9\% | 15.5\% | 15.5\% | 15.5\% | 100\% |

Workload (continued)
Please indicate the number of committees (formal and informal) you served on and chaired
during the previous academic year:
during the previous academic year:
(responses of 4 or more e have been aggregated)
[unit) committees chaired
[unit committees chaired
unitt committees chaired
unit] committees chaired
[unity committees chaired
[unit] committees chaired
unitit committees chaired
unitf committees chaired
unit] committees chaired
unitit committees chaired
unitt committees chaired
unitt commmittees chaired
unit] committees chaired
unit] committees chaired
niversity/School committees served on
University/School committees served o
University/School committees served on
University/School commititees served on University/School committees served o University/School committees served on University/School committeses served on Universityly/School commititees served on University/School committees served o University/School committees served on University/School committees served on University/School committees served o
Universitiy/School committees chaired
University/School committees chaire University/School committees chaire University/School committees chaired
University/School committees chaired
niversity/School committees chair University/School committees chaired
University/School committees chaired
University/School committees chaire
University/School committees chaire
University/School committees chaired
University/School committees chaired
Uxiversity/School committees chaired External professional committees/boards served o
External professional committess/boards served o External professional committees/boards served on External professional committes/boards served on
External professional committees/boards served on External professional committees/boards served on External professional committees/boards served on External professional committees/boards served on External professional committees/boards served o External professional committees/boards served on External professional committees/boards served on External professional committees/boards served on External professional committees/boards chaired External professional committees/boards chaired External professional committees/boards chaired External professional committees/boards chaired External professional committees/boards chaired xternal professional committees/boards chaired xternal professional commitees/boards chaired External professional committees/boards chaired External professional committees/booards chaired External professional committees/boards chaired
xternal professional committees/boards chaired External professional committees/boards chaired xternal professional committees/boards chaired
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| rkload (continued) |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Have you ever served in any of the following administrative capacities while at Harvard (check all that apply): | Cohor | Affirmative Responses |
| Director/Assistant Director of undergraduate study/Head tutor, Never | All Faculty | 869 |
| Director/Assistant Director of undergraduate study/Head tutor, Never | All Men | 598 |
| Director/Assistant Director of undergraduate study/Head tutor, Never | All Women | 271 |
| Director/Assistant Director of undergraduate study/Head tutor, Never | All Ladder Faculty | 640 |
| Director/Assistant Director of undergraduate study/Head tutor, Never | Ladder Men | 463 |
| Director/Assistant Director of undergraduate study/Head tutor, Never | Ladder Women | 177 |
| Director/Assistant Director of undergraduate study/Head tutor, Never | All Tenured Faculty | 404 |
| Director/Assistant Director of undergraduate study/Head tutor, Never | Tenured Men | 314 |
| Director/Assistant Director of undergraduate study/Head tutor, Never | Tenured Women | 90 |
| Director/Assistant Director of undergraduate study/Head tutor, Never | All Tenure-Track Faculty | 236 |
| Director/Assistant Director of undergraduate study/Head tutor, Never | Tenure-Track Men | 149 |
| Director/Assistant Director of undergraduate study/Head tutor, Never | Tenure-Track Women | 87 |
| Director/Assistant Director of undergraduate study/Head tutor, Never | All Non-Ladder Faculty | 229 |
| Director/Assistant Director of undergraduate study/Head tutor, Never | Non-Ladder Men | 135 |
| Director/Assistant Director of undergraduate study/Head tutor, Never | Non-Ladder Wome | 94 |
| Director/Assistant Director of undergraduate study/Head tutor, Currently or within the past five academic years | All Faculty | 111 |
| Director/Assistant Director of undergraduate study/Head tutor, Currently or within the past five academic years | All Men | 79 |
| Director/Assistant Director of undergraduate study/Head tutor, Currently or within the past five academic years | All Women | 32 |
| Director/Assistant Director of undergraduate study/Head tutor, Currently or within the past five academic years | All Ladder Faculty | 87 |
| Director/Assistant Director of undergraduate study/Head tutor, Currently or within the past five academic years | Ladder Men | 65 |
| Director/Assistant Director of undergraduate study/Head tutor, Currently or within the past five academic years | Ladder Women | 22 |
| Director/Assistant Director of undergraduate study/Head tutor, Currently or within the past five academic years | All Tenured Faculty | 63 |
| Director/Assistant Director of undergraduate study/Head tutor, Currently or within the past five academic years | Tenured Men | 49 |
| Director/Assistant Director of undergraduate study/Head tutor, Currently or within the past five academic years | Tenured Women | 14 |
| Director/Assistant Director of undergraduate study/Head tutor, Currently or within the past five academic years | All Tenure-Track Faculty | 24 |
| Director/Assistant Director of undergraduate study/Head tutor, Currently or within the past five academic years | Tenure-Track Men | 16 |
| Director/Assistant Director of undergraduate study/Head tutor, Currently or within the past five academic years | Tenure-Track Women | 8 |
| Director/Assistant Director of undergraduate study/Head tutor, Currently or within the past five academic years | All Non-Ladder Faculty | 24 |
| Director/Assistant Director of undergraduate study/Head tutor, Currently or within the past five academic years | Non-Ladder Men | 14 |
| Director/Assistant Director of undergraduate study/Head tutor, Currently or within the past five academic years | Non-Ladder Women | 10 |
| Director/Assistant Director of undergraduate study/Head tutor, Served prior to the past five academic years | All Faculty | 72 |
| Director/Assistant Director of undergraduate study/Head tutor, Served prior to the past five academic years | All Men | 56 |
| Director/Assistant Director of undergraduate study/Head tutor, Served prior to the past five academic |  |  |
|  | All Women | 16 |
| Director/Assistant Director of undergraduate study/Head tutor, Served prior to the past five academic years | All Ladder Faculty | 62 |
| Director/Assistant Director of undergraduate study/Head tutor, Served prior to the past five academic years | Ladder Men | 51 |
| Director/Assistant Director of undergraduate study/Head tutor, Served prior to the past five academic |  |  |
| years | Ladder Women | 11 |
| Director/Assistant Director of undergraduate study/Head tutor, Served prior to the past five academic years | All Tenured Faculty | 60 |
| Director/Assistant Director of undergraduate study/Head tutor, Served prior to the past five academic |  |  |
| years | Tenured Men | 50 |
| Director/Assistant Director of undergraduate study/Head tutor, Served prior to the past five academic |  |  |
| years | Tenured Women | 10 |
| Director/Assistant Director of undergraduate study/Head tutor, Served prior to the past five academic |  |  |
| years | All Tenure-Track Faculty | 2 |
| Director/Assistant Director of undergraduate study/Head tutor, Served prior to the past five academic |  |  |
| years | Tenure-Track Men | 1 |
| Director/Assistant Director of undergraduate study/Head tutor, Served prior to the past five academic years | Tenure-Track Women | 1 |
| Director/Assistant Director of undergraduate study/Head tutor, Served prior to the past five academic |  |  |
| years | All Non-Ladder Faculty | 10 |
| Director/Assistant Director of undergraduate study/Head tutor, Served prior to the past five academic years | Non-Ladder Men | 5 |
| Director/Assistant Director of undergraduate study/Head tutor, Served prior to the past five academic |  |  |
| years | Non-Ladder Women | 5 |


| orkload (continued) |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Have you ever served in any of the following administrative capacities while at Harvard (check all that apply): | Cohort | Affirmative Responses |
| Director of graduate study, Never (ladder survey only) | All Ladder Faculty | 590 |
| Director of graduate study, Never (ladder survey only) | Ladder Men | 422 |
| Director of graduate study, Never (ladder survey only) | Ladder Women | 168 |
| Director of graduate study, Never (ladder survey only) | All Tenured Faculty | 345 |
| Director of graduate study, Never (ladder survey only) | Tenured Men | 269 |
| Director of graduate study, Never (ladder survey only) | Tenured Women | 76 |
| Director of graduate study, Never (ladder survey only) | All Tenure-Track Faculty | 245 |
| Director of graduate study, Never (ladder survey only) | Tenure-Track Men | 153 |
| Director of graduate study, Never (ladder survey only) | Tenure-Track Women | 92 |
| Director of graduate study, Currently or within the past five academic years (ladder survey only) | All Ladder Faculty | 117 |
| Director of graduate study, Currently or within the past five academic years (ladder survey only) | Ladder Men | 86 |
| Director of graduate study, Currently or within the past five academic years (ladder survey only) | Ladder Women | 31 |
| Director of graduate study, Currently or within the past five academic years (ladder survey only) | All Tenured Faculty | 103 |
| Director of graduate study, Currently or within the past five academic years (ladder survey only) | Tenured Men | 78 |
| Director of graduate study, Currently or within the past five academic years (ladder survey only) | Tenured Women | 25 |
| Director of graduate study, Currently or within the past five academic years (ladder survey only) | All Tenure-Track Faculty | 14 |
| Director of graduate study, Currently or within the past five academic years (ladder survey only) | Tenure-Track Men | 8 |
| Director of graduate study, Currently or within the past five academic years (ladder survey only) | Tenure-Track Women | 6 |
| Director of graduate study, Served prior to the past five academic years (ladder survey only) | All Ladder Faculty | 88 |
| Director of graduate study, Served prior to the past five academic years (ladder survey only) | Ladder Men | 73 |
| Director of graduate study, Served prior to the past five academic years (ladder survey only) | Ladder Women | 15 |
| Director of graduate study, Served prior to the past five academic years (ladder survey only) | All Tenured Faculty | 85 |
| Director of graduate study, Served prior to the past five academic years (ladder survey only) | Tenured Men | 70 |
| Director of graduate study, Served prior to the past five academic years (ladder survey only) | Tenured Women | 15 |
| Director of graduate study, Served prior to the past five academic years (ladder survey only) | All Tenure-Track Faculty | 3 |
| Director of graduate study, Served prior to the past five academic years (ladder survey only) | Tenure-Track Men | 3 |
| Director of graduate study, Served prior to the past five academic years (ladder survey only) | Tenure-Track Women | 0 |
| Chair, Never (ladder survey only) | All Ladder Faculty | 486 |
| Chair, Never (ladder survey only) | Ladder Men | 337 |
| Chair, Never (ladder survey only) | Ladder Women | 149 |
| Chair, Never (ladder survey only) | All Tenured Faculty | 249 |
| Chair, Never (ladder survey only) | Tenured Men | 190 |
| Chair, Never (ladder survey only) | Tenured Women | 59 |
| Chair, Never (ladder survey only) | All Tenure-Track Faculty | 237 |
| Chair, Never (ladder survey only) | Tenure-Track Men | 147 |
| Chair, Never (ladder survey only) | Tenure-Track Women | 90 |
| Chair, Currently or within the past five academic years (ladder survey only) | All Ladder Faculty | 134 |
| Chair, Currently or within the past five academic years (ladder survey only) | Ladder Men | 102 |
| Chair, Currently or within the past five academic years (ladder survey only) | Ladder Women | 32 |
| Chair, Currently or within the past five academic years (ladder survey only) | All Tenured Faculty | 129 |
| Chair, Currently or within the past five academic years (ladder survey only) | Tenured Men | 99 |
| Chair, Currently or within the past five academic years (ladder survey only) | Tenured Women | 30 |
| Chair, Currently or within the past five academic years (ladder survey only) | All Tenure-Track Faculty | 5 |
| Chair, Currently or within the past five academic years (ladder survey only) | Tenure-Track Men | 3 |
| Chair, Currently or within the past five academic years (ladder survey only) | Tenure-Track Women | 2 |
| Chair, Served prior to the past five academic years (ladder survey only) | All Ladder Faculty | 116 |
| Chair, Served prior to the past five academic years (ladder survey only) | Ladder Men | 98 |
| Chair, Served prior to the past five academic years (ladder survey only) | Ladder Women | 18 |
| Chair, Served prior to the past five academic years (ladder survey only) | All Tenured Faculty | 116 |
| Chair, Served prior to the past five academic years (ladder survey only) | Tenured Men | 98 |
| Chair, Served prior to the past five academic years (ladder survey only) | Tenured Women | 18 |
| Chair, Served prior to the past five academic years (ladder survey only) | All Tenure-Track Faculty | 0 |
| Chair, Served prior to the past five academic years (ladder survey only) | Tenure-Track Men | 0 |
| Chair, Served prior to the past five academic years (ladder survey only) | Tenure-Track Women | 0 |
| Director of a center, program, or institute, Never | All Faculty | 769 |
| Director of a center, program, or institute, Never | All Men | 525 |
| Director of a center, program, or institute, Never | All Women | 244 |
| Director of a center, program, or institute, Never | All Ladder Faculty | 587 |
| Director of a center, program, or institute, Never | Ladder Men | 424 |
| Director of a center, program, or institute, Never | Ladder Women | 163 |
| Director of a center, program, or institute, Never | All Tenured Faculty | 348 |
| Director of a center, program, or institute, Never | Tenured Men | 271 |
| Director of a center, program, or institute, Never | Tenured Women | 77 |
| Director of a center, program, or institute, Never | All Tenure-Track Faculty | 239 |
| Director of a center, program, or institute, Never | Tenure-Track Men | 153 |
| Director of a center, program, or institute, Never | Tenure-Track Women | 86 |
| Director of a center, program, or institute, Never | All Non-Ladder Faculty | 182 |
| Director of a center, program, or institute, Never | Non-Ladder Men | 101 |
| Director of a center, program, or institute, Never | Non-Ladder Women | 81 |

Workload (continued)
Have you ever served in any of the following administrative capacities while at Harvard (check
Il that apply:


[^90]| Workload (continued) |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Have you ever served in any of the following administrative capacities while at Harvard (check all that apply): | Cohort | Affirmative Responses |  |  |  |
| Other administrative capacity, Never | All Faculty | 797 |  |  |  |
| Other administrative capacity, Never | All men | 555 |  |  |  |
| Other administrative capacity, Never | All Women | 242 |  |  |  |
| Other administrative capacity, Never | All Ladder Faculty | 632 |  |  |  |
| Other administrative capacity, Never | Ladder Men | 451 |  |  |  |
| Other administrative capacity, Never | Ladder Women | 181 |  |  |  |
| Other administrative capacity, Never | All Tenured Faculty | 346 |  |  |  |
| Other administrative capacity, Never | Tenured Men | 272 |  |  |  |
| Other administrative capacity, Never | Tenured Women | 74 |  |  |  |
| Other administrative capacity, Never | All Tenure-Track Faculty | 286 |  |  |  |
| Other administrative capacity, Never | Tenure-Track Men | 179 |  |  |  |
| Other administrative capacity, Never | Tenure-Track Women | 107 |  |  |  |
| Other administrative capacity, Never | All Non-Ladder Faculty | 165 |  |  |  |
| Other administrative capacity, Never | Non-Ladder Men | 104 |  |  |  |
| Other administrative capacity, Never | Non-Ladder Women | 61 |  |  |  |
| Other administrative capacity, Currently or within the past five academic years | All Faculty | 259 |  |  |  |
| Other administrative capacity, Currently or within the past five academic years | All Men | 177 |  |  |  |
| Other administrative capacity, Currently or within the past five academic years | All Women | 82 |  |  |  |
| Other administrative capacity, Currently or within the past five academic years | All Ladder Faculty | 172 |  |  |  |
| Other administrative capacity, Currently or within the past five academic years | Ladder Men | 127 |  |  |  |
| Other administrative capacity, Currently or within the past five academic years | Ladder Women | 45 |  |  |  |
| Other administrative capacity, Currently or within the past five academic years | All Tenured Faculty | 138 |  |  |  |
| Other administrative capacity, Currently or within the past five academic years | Tenured Men | 106 |  |  |  |
| Other administrative capacity, Currently or within the past five academic years | Tenured Women | 32 |  |  |  |
| Other administrative capacity, Currently or within the past five academic years | All Tenure-Track Faculty | 34 |  |  |  |
| Other administrative capacity, Currently or within the past five academic years | Tenure-Track Men | 21 |  |  |  |
| Other administrative capacity, Currently or within the past five academic years | Tenure-Track Women | 13 |  |  |  |
| Other administrative capacity, Currently or within the past five academic years | All Non-Ladder Faculty | 87 |  |  |  |
| Other administrative capacity, Currently or within the past five academic years | Non-Ladder Men | 50 |  |  |  |
| Other administrative capacity, Currently or within the past five academic years | Non-Ladder Women | 37 |  |  |  |
| Other administrative capacity, Served prior to the past five academic years | All Faculty | 102 |  |  |  |
| Other administrative capacity, Served prior to the past five academic years | All Men | 77 |  |  |  |
| Other administrative capacity, Served prior to the past five academic years | All Women | 25 |  |  |  |
| Other administrative capacity, Served prior to the past five academic years | All Ladder Faculty | 70 |  |  |  |
| Other administrative capacity, Served prior to the past five academic years | Ladder Men | 55 |  |  |  |
| Other administrative capacity, Served prior to the past five academic years | Ladder Women | 15 |  |  |  |
| Other administrative capacity, Served prior to the past five academic years | All Tenured Faculty | 65 |  |  |  |
| Other administrative capacity, Served prior to the past five academic years | Tenured Men | 52 |  |  |  |
| Other administrative capacity, Served prior to the past five academic years | Tenured Women | 13 |  |  |  |
| Other administrative capacity, Served prior to the past five academic years | All Tenure-Track Faculty |  |  |  |  |
| Other administrative capacity, Served prior to the past five academic years | Tenure-Track Men | 3 |  |  |  |
| Other administrative capacity, Served prior to the past five academic years Other administrative capacity, Served prior to the past five academic years | Tenure-Track Women All Non-Ladder Faculty | 2 32 |  |  |  |
| Other administrative capacity, Served prior to the past five academic years | Non-Ladder Men | 22 |  |  |  |
| Other administrative capacity, Served prior to the past five academic years | Non-Ladder Women | 10 |  |  |  |
| Received teaching relief: | Cohort | Responses | Yes | No | Total |
| Director/Assistant Director of undergraduate study/Head tutor | All Faculty | 169 | 33.7\% | 66.3\% | 100\% |
| Director/Assistant Director of undergraduate study/Head tutor | All Men | 129 | 28.7\% | 71.3\% | 100\% |
| Director/Assistant Director of undergraduate study/Head tutor | All Women | 40 | 50.0\% | 50.0\% | 100\% |
| Director/Assistant Director of undergraduate study/Head tutor | All Ladder Faculty | 142 | 33.1\% | 66.9\% | 100\% |
| Director/Assistant Director of undergraduate study/Head tutor | Ladder Men | 112 | 28.6\% | 71.4\% | 100\% |
| Director/Assistant Director of undergraduate study/Head tutor | Ladder Women | 30 | 50.0\% | 50.0\% | 100\% |
| Director/Assistant Director of undergraduate study/Head tutor | All Tenured Faculty | 116 | 31.0\% | 69.0\% | 100\% |
| Director/Assistant Director of undergraduate study/Head tutor | Tenured Men | 94 | 26.6\% | 73.4\% | 100\% |
| Director/Assistant Director of undergraduate study/Head tutor | Tenured Women | 22 | 50.0\% | 50.0\% | 100\% |
| Director/Assistant Director of undergraduate study/Head tutor | All Tenure-Track Faculty | 26 | 42.3\% | 57.7\% | 100\% |
| Director/Assistant Director of undergraduate study/Head tutor | Tenure-Track Men | 18 | 38.9\% | ${ }^{61.1 \%}$ | 100\% |
| Director/Assistant Director of undergraduate study/Head tutor | Tenure-Track Women | 8 | 50.0\% | 50.0\% | 100\% |
| Director/Assistant Director of undergraduate study/Head tutor | All Non-Ladder Faculty | 27 | 37.0\% | ${ }^{63.0 \%}$ | 100\% |
| Director//Assistant Director of undergraduate study/Head tutor | Non-Ladder Men | 17 | 29.4\% | 70.6\% | 100\% |
| Director/Assistant Director of undergraduate study/Head tutor | Non-Ladder Women | 10 | 50.0\% | 50.0\% | 100\% |
| Director of graduate study (ladder survey only) Director of graduate study (ladder survey only) | All Ladder Faculty Ladder Men | 183 144 | 30.6\% $27.8 \%$ | 69.4\% $72.2 \%$ | $100 \%$ $100 \%$ |
| Director of graduate study (ladder survey only) | Ladder Women | 39 | 41.0\% | 59.0\% | 100\% |
| Director of graduate study (ladder survey only) | All Tenured Faculty | 167 | 32.3\% | 67.7\% | 100\% |
| Director of graduate study (ladder survey only) | Tenured Men | 134 | 28.4\% | ${ }^{71.6 \%}$ | 100\% |
| Director of graduate study (ladder survey only) | Tenured Women | 33 | 48.5\% | 51.5\% | 100\% |
| Director of graduate study (ladder survey only) | All Tenure-Track Faculty | 16 | 12.5\% | 87.5\% | 100\% |
| Director of graduate study (ladder survey only) | Tenure-Track Men | 10 | 20.0\% | 80.0\% | 100\% |
| Director of graduate study (ladder survey only) | Tenure-Track Women | 6 | 0.0\% | 100.0\% | 100\% |


| Workload (continued) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Received teaching relief: | Cohort | Responses | Yes | No |  |  |  |  |  | Total |
| Chair (ladder survey only) | All Ladder Faculty | 205 | 45.9\% | 54.1\% |  |  |  |  |  | 100\% |
| Chair (ladder survey only) | Ladder Men | 163 | 43.6\% | 56.4\% |  |  |  |  |  | 100\% |
| Chair (ladder survey only) | Ladder Women | 42 | 54.8\% | 45.2\% |  |  |  |  |  | 100\% |
| Chair (ladder survey only) | All Tenured Faculty | 200 | 47.0\% | 53.0\% |  |  |  |  |  | 100\% |
| Chair (ladder survey only) | Tenured Men | 159 | 44.7\% | 55.3\% |  |  |  |  |  | 100\% |
| Chair (ladder survey only) | Tenured Women | 41 | 56.1\% | 43.9\% |  |  |  |  |  | 100\% |
| Chair (ladder survey only) | All Tenure-Track Faculty | 5 | 0.0\% | 100.0\% |  |  |  |  |  | 100\% |
| Chair (ladder survey only) | Tenure-Track Men | small sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 100\% |
| Chair (ladder survey only) | Tenure-Track Women | small sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 100\% |
| Director of a center, program, or institute | All Faculty | 280 | 33.2\% | 66.8\% |  |  |  |  |  | 100\% |
| Director of a center, program, or institute | All Men | 206 | 31.1\% | 68.9\% |  |  |  |  |  | 100\% |
| Director of a center, program, or institute | All Women | 74 | 39.2\% | 60.8\% |  |  |  |  |  | 100\% |
| Director of a center, program, or institute | All Ladder Faculty | 209 | 29.7\% | 70.3\% |  |  |  |  |  | 100\% |
| Director of a center, program, or institute | Ladder Men | 161 | 29.2\% | 70.8\% |  |  |  |  |  | 100\% |
| Director of a center, program, or institute | Ladder Women | 48 | 31.3\% | 68.8\% |  |  |  |  |  | 100\% |
| Director of a center, program, or institute | All Tenured Faculty | 191 | 31.9\% | 68.1\% |  |  |  |  |  | 100\% |
| Director of a center, program, or institute | Tenured Men | 153 | 30.1\% | 69.9\% |  |  |  |  |  | 100\% |
| Director of a center, program, or institute | Tenured Women | 38 | 39.5\% | 60.5\% |  |  |  |  |  | 100\% |
| Director of a center, program, or institute | All Tenure-Track Faculty | 18 | 5.6\% | 94.4\% |  |  |  |  |  | 100\% |
| Director of a center, program, or institute | Tenure-Track Men | 8 | 12.5\% | 87.5\% |  |  |  |  |  | 100\% |
| Director of a center, program, or institute | Tenure-Track Women | 10 | 0.0\% | 100.0\% |  |  |  |  |  | 100\% |
| Director of a center, program, or institute | All Non-Ladder Faculty | 71 | 43.7\% | 56.3\% |  |  |  |  |  | 100\% |
| Director of a center, program, or institute | Non-Ladder Men | 45 | 37.8\% | 62.2\% |  |  |  |  |  | 100\% |
| Director of a center, program, or institute | Non-Ladder Women | 26 | 53.8\% | 46.2\% |  |  |  |  |  | 100\% |
| Dean | All Faculty | 117 | 59.8\% | 40.2\% |  |  |  |  |  | 100\% |
| Dean | All Men | 91 | 56.0\% | 44.0\% |  |  |  |  |  | 100\% |
| Dean | All Women | 26 | 73.1\% | 26.9\% |  |  |  |  |  | 100\% |
| Dean | All Ladder Faculty | 96 | 60.4\% | 39.6\% |  |  |  |  |  | 100\% |
| Dean | Ladder Men | 76 | 55.3\% | 44.7\% |  |  |  |  |  | 100\% |
| Dean | Ladder Women | 20 | 80.0\% | 20.0\% |  |  |  |  |  | 100\% |
| Dean | All Tenured Faculty | 93 | 61.3\% | 38.7\% |  |  |  |  |  | 100\% |
| Dean | Tenured Men | 74 | 55.4\% | 44.6\% |  |  |  |  |  | 100\% |
| Dean | Tenured Women | 19 | 84.2\% | 15.8\% |  |  |  |  |  | 100\% |
| Dean | All Tenure-Track Faculty | small sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 100\% |
| Dean | Tenure-Track Men | small sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 100\% |
| Dean | Tenure-Track Women | small sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 100\% |
| Dean Dean | All Non-Ladder Faculty Non-Ladder Men | 21 15 | 57.1\% $60.0 \%$ | $42.9 \%$ $40.0 \%$ |  |  |  |  |  | 100\% 100\% |
| Dean | Non-Ladder Women | 6 | 50.0\% | 50.0\% |  |  |  |  |  | 100\% |
| Other administrative capacity | All Faculty | 259 | 23.2\% | 76.8\% |  |  |  |  |  | 100\% |
| Other administrative capacity | All Men | 175 | 22.9\% | 77.1\% |  |  |  |  |  | 100\% |
| Other administrative capacity | All Women | 84 | 23.8\% | 76.2\% |  |  |  |  |  | 100\% |
| Other administrative capacity | All Ladder Faculty | 182 | 19.2\% | 80.8\% |  |  |  |  |  | 100\% |
| Other administrative capacity | Ladder Men | 134 | 18.7\% | 81.3\% |  |  |  |  |  | 100\% |
| Other administrative capacity | Ladder Women | 48 | 20.8\% | 79.2\% |  |  |  |  |  | 100\% |
| Other administrative capacity | All Tenured Faculty | 149 | 20.8\% | 79.2\% |  |  |  |  |  | 100\% |
| Other administrative capacity | Tenured Men | 117 | 19.7\% | 80.3\% |  |  |  |  |  | 100\% |
| Other administrative capacity | Tenured Women | 32 | 25.0\% | 75.0\% |  |  |  |  |  | 100\% |
| Other administrative capacity | All Tenure-Track Faculty | 33 | 12.1\% | 87.9\% |  |  |  |  |  | 100\% |
| Other administrative capacity | Tenure-Track Men | 17 | 11.8\% | 88.2\% |  |  |  |  |  | 100\% |
| Other administrative capacity | Tenure-Track Women | 16 | 12.5\% | 87.5\% |  |  |  |  |  | 100\% |
| Other administrative capacity | All Non-Ladder Faculty | 77 | 32.5\% | 67.5\% |  |  |  |  |  | 100\% |
| Other administrative capacity Other administrative capacity | Non-Ladder Men Non-Ladder Women | 41 36 | 36.6\% $27.8 \%$ | $63.4 \%$ $72.2 \%$ |  |  |  |  |  | 100\% 100\% |
| In the past 12 months, how many of each of the following did you submit: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| (responses of 6 or more have been aggregated) | Cohort | Responses | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 or more | Total |
| Grant Proposals | All Faculty | 1071 | 29.4\% | 19.4\% | 16.2\% | 13.4\% | 8.8\% | 5.6\% | 7.2\% | 100\% |
| Grant Proposals | All Men | 748 | 27.9\% | 20.9\% | 16.2\% | 13.5\% | 9.4\% | 5.6\% | 6.6\% | 100\% |
| Grant Proposals | All Women | 323 | 32.8\% | 16.1\% | 16.4\% | 13.0\% | 7.4\% | 5.6\% | 8.7\% | 100\% |
| Grant Proposals | All Ladder Faculty | 811 | 24.9\% | 19.1\% | 16.8\% | 14.2\% | 10.4\% | 6.5\% | 8.1\% | 100\% |
| Grant Proposals | Ladder Men | 595 | 24.0\% | 20.7\% | 17.1\% | 14.3\% | 10.6\% | 6.6\% | 6.7\% | 100\% |
| Grant Proposals | Ladder Women | 216 | 27.3\% | 14.8\% | 15.7\% | 13.9\% | 9.7\% | 6.5\% | 12.0\% | 100\% |
| Grant Proposals | All Tenured Faculty | 554 | 30.3\% | 19.7\% | 15.7\% | 13.2\% | 9.7\% | 4.7\% | 6.7\% | 100\% |
| Grant Proposals | Tenured Men | 438 | 28.5\% | 21.2\% | 16.0\% | 13.9\% | 9.6\% | 4.8\% | 5.9\% | 100\% |
| Grant Proposals | Tenured Women | 116 | 37.1\% | 13.8\% | 14.7\% | 10.3\% | 10.3\% | 4.3\% | ${ }^{9.5 \%}$ | 100\% |
| Grant Proposals | All Tenure-Track Faculty | 257 | 13.2\% | 17.9\% | 19.1\% | 16.3\% | 11.7\% | 10.5\% | 11.3\% | 100\% |
| Grant Proposals | Tenure-Track Men | 157 | 11.5\% | 19.1\% | 20.4\% | 15.3\% | 13.4\% | 11.5\% | 8.9\% | 100\% |
| Grant Proposals | Tenure-Track Women | 100 | 16.0\% | 16.0\% | 17.0\% | 18.0\% | 9.0\% | 9.0\% | 15.0\% | 100\% |
| Grant Proposals Grant Proposals | All Non-Ladder Faculty Non-Ladder Men | 260 153 | 43.5\% $43.1 \%$ | 20.4\% $21.6 \%$ | $14.6 \%$ $12.4 \%$ | 10.8\% $10.5 \%$ | $3.8 \%$ $4.6 \%$ | 2.7\% | 4.2\% $5.9 \%$ | 100\% 100\% |
| Grant Proposals | Non-Ladder Women | 107 | 43.9\% | 18.7\% | 17.8\% | 11.2\% | 2.8\% | 3.7\% | 1.9\% | 100\% |


| orkload (continued) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| In the past 12 months, how many of each of the following did you submit: (responses of 6 or more have been aggregated) | Cohort | Responses | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 or more | Total |
| Papers for publication in peer- and student-reviewed journals | All Faculty | 1163 | 15.6\% | 16.3\% | 19.6\% | 12.8\% | 7.7\% | 6.7\% | 21.3\% | 100\% |
| Papers for publication in peer- and student-reviewed journals | All men | 821 | 13.2\% | 14.4\% | 20.1\% | 13.6\% | 7.6\% | 7.2\% | 24.0\% | 100\% |
| Papers for publication in peer-and student-reviewed journals | All Women | 342 | 21.6\% | 20.8\% | 18.4\% | 10.8\% | 7.9\% | 5.6\% | 14.9\% | 100\% |
| Papers for publication in peer- and student-reviewed journals | All Ladder Faculty | 880 | 8.4\% | 14.4\% | 18.4\% | 15.5\% | 9.3\% | 8.2\% | 25.8\% | 100\% |
| Papers for publication in peer- and student-reviewed journals | Ladder Men | 647 | 7.3\% | 12.7\% | 18.2\% | 16.1\% | 9.0\% | 8.7\% | 28.1\% | 100\% |
| Papers for publication in peer- and student-reviewed journals | Ladder Women | 233 | 11.6\% | 19.3\% | 18.9\% | 13.7\% | 10.3\% | 6.9\% | 19.3\% | 100\% |
| Papers for publication in peer-and student-reviewed journals | All Tenured Faculty | 565 | 9.9\% | 12.7\% | 17.9\% | 14.5\% | 8.5\% | 9.0\% | 27.4\% | 100\% |
| Papers for publication in peer- and student-reviewed journals | Tenured Men | 452 | 8.8\% | 11.9\% | 17.9\% | 14.2\% | 8.4\% | 9.3\% | 29.4\% | 100\% |
| Papers for publication in peer- and student-reviewed journals | Tenured Women | 113 | 14.2\% | 15.9\% | 17.7\% | 15.9\% | 8.8\% | 8.0\% | 19.5\% | 100\% |
| Papers for publication in peer-and student-reviewed journals | All Tenure-Track Faculty | 315 | 5.7\% | 17.5\% | 19.4\% | 17.1\% | 10.8\% | 6.7\% | 22.9\% | 100\% |
| Papers for publication in peer- and student-reviewed journals | Tenure-Track Men | 195 | 3.6\% | 14.4\% | 19.0\% | 20.5\% | 10.3\% | 7.2\% | 25.1\% | 100\% |
| Papers for publication in peer- and student-reviewed journals | Tenure-Track Women | 120 | 9.2\% | 22.5\% | 20.0\% | 11.7\% | 11.7\% | 5.8\% | 19.2\% | 100\% |
| Papers for publication in peer- and student-reviewed journals | All Non-Ladder Faculty | 283 | 38.2\% | 21.9\% | 23.3\% | 4.6\% | 2.5\% | 2.1\% | 7.4\% | 100\% |
| Papers for publication in peer-and student-reviewed journals | Non-Ladder Men | 174 | 35.1\% | 20.7\% | 27.0\% | 4.6\% | 2.3\% | 1.7\% | 8.6\% | 100\% |
| Papers for publication in peer-and student-reviewed journals | Non-Ladder Women | 109 | 43.1\% | 23.9\% | 17.4\% | 4.6\% | 2.8\% | 2.8\% | 5.5\% | 100\% |
| Papers for presentation at conferences | All Faculty | 1208 | 17.4\% | 13.7\% | 20.5\% | 17.1\% | 8.5\% | 8.4\% | 14.3\% | 100\% |
| Papers for presentation at conferences | All Men | 855 | 17.7\% | 14.3\% | 20.4\% | 15.9\% | 8.2\% | 8.9\% | 14.7\% | 100\% |
| Papers for presentation at conferences | All Women | 353 | 16.7\% | 12.5\% | 21.0\% | 20.1\% | 9.3\% | 7.1\% | 13.3\% | 100\% |
| Papers for presentation at conferences | All Ladder Faculty | 924 | 11.9\% | 12.1\% | 21.1\% | 18.5\% | 9.6\% | 10.2\% | 16.6\% | 100\% |
| Papers for presentation at conferences | Ladder Men | 680 | 12.6\% | 12.5\% | 21.2\% | 17.1\% | ${ }^{9.0 \%}$ | 10.7\% | 16.9\% | 100\% |
| Papers for presentation at conferences | Ladder Women | 244 | 9.8\% | 11.1\% | 20.9\% | 22.5\% | 11.5\% | 8.6\% | 15.6\% | 100\% |
| Papers for presentation at conferences | All Tenured Faculty | 608 | 13.8\% | 11.3\% | 21.7\% | 16.0\% | 9.9\% | 9.7\% | 17.6\% | 100\% |
| Papers for presentation at conferences | Tenured Men | 485 | 14.6\% | 11.5\% | 22.5\% | 14.2\% | 9.9\% | 9.9\% | 17.3\% | 100\% |
| Papers for presentation at conferences | Tenured Women | 123 | 10.6\% | 10.6\% | 18.7\% | 22.8\% | 9.8\% | 8.9\% | 18.7\% | 100\% |
| Papers for presentation at conferences | All Tenure-Track Faculty | 316 | 8.2\% | 13.6\% | 19.9\% | 23.4\% | 9.2\% | 11.1\% | 14.6\% | 100\% |
| Papers for presentation at conferences | Tenure-Track Men | 195 | 7.7\% | 14.9\% | 17.9\% | 24.1\% | 6.7\% | 12.8\% | 15.9\% | 100\% |
| Papers for presentation at conferences | Tenure-Track Women | 121 | 9.1\% | 11.6\% | 23.1\% | 22.3\% | 13.2\% | 8.3\% | 12.4\% | 100\% |
| Papers for presentation at conferences | All Non-Ladder Faculty | 284 | 35.2\% | 19.0\% | 18.7\% | 12.7\% | 4.9\% | 2.5\% | 7.0\% | 100\% |
| Papers for presentation at conferences | Non-Ladder Men | 175 | 37.1\% | 21.1\% | 17.1\% | 11.4\% | 5.1\% | 1.7\% | 6.3\% | 100\% |
| Papers for presentation at conferences | Non-Ladder Women | 109 | 32.1\% | 15.6\% | 21.1\% | 14.7\% | 4.6\% | 3.7\% | 8.3\% | 100\% |
| Books authored | All Faculty | 1114 | 73.9\% | 22.8\% | 2.4\% | 0.7\% | 0.0\% | 0.1\% | 0.1\% | 100\% |
| Books authored | All Men | 788 | 73.5\% | 22.6\% | 2.9\% | 0.9\% | 0.0\% | 0.1\% | 0.0\% | 100\% |
| Books authored | All Women | 326 | 74.8\% | 23.3\% | 1.2\% | 0.3\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.3\% | 100\% |
| Books authored | All Ladder Faculty | 858 | 73.7\% | 23.1\% | 2.3\% | 0.7\% | 0.0\% | 0.1\% | 0.1\% | 100\% |
| Books authored | Ladder Men | 627 | 73.0\% | 23.3\% | 2.7\% | 0.8\% | 0.0\% | 0.2\% | 0.0\% | 100\% |
| Books authored | Ladder Women | 231 | 75.3\% | 22.5\% | 1.3\% | 0.4\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.4\% | 100\% |
| Books authored | All Tenured Faculty | 563 | 70.5\% | 24.7\% | 3.4\% | 1.1\% | 0.0\% | 0.2\% | 0.2\% | 100\% |
| Books authored | Tenured Men | 446 | 70.4\% | 24.4\% | 3.8\% | 1.1\% | 0.0\% | 0.2\% | 0.0\% | 100\% |
| Books authored | Tenured Women | 117 | 70.9\% | 25.6\% | 1.7\% | 0.9\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.9\% | 100\% |
| Books authored | All Tenure-Track Faculty | 295 | 79.7\% | 20.0\% | 0.3\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 100\% |
| Books authored | Tenure-Track Men | 181 | 79.6\% | 20.4\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 100\% |
| Books authored | Tenure-Track Women | 114 | 79.8\% | 19.3\% | 0.9\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 100\% |
| Books authored | All Non-Ladder Faculty | 256 | 74.6\% | 21.9\% | 2.7\% | 0.8\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 100\% |
| Books authored | Non-Ladder Men | 161 | 75.2\% | 19.9\% | 3.7\% | 1.2\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 100\% |
| Books authored | Non-Ladder Women | 95 | 73.7\% | 25.3\% | 1.1\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 100\% |
| Books edited | All Faculty | 1084 | 77.8\% | 17.3\% | 3.7\% | 0.6\% | 0.4\% | 0.2\% | 0.0\% | 100\% |
| Books edited | All Men | 764 | 78.1\% | 16.1\% | 4.2\% | 0.8\% | 0.5\% | 0.3\% | ${ }^{0.0 \%}$ | 100\% |
| Books edited Books edited | All Women ${ }^{\text {All Ladder Faculty }}$ | 320 832 | 76.9\% $77.3 \%$ | 20.3\% | 2.5\% $4.2 \%$ | 0.3\% | 0.0\% | $0.0 \%$ $0.2 \%$ | 0.0\% | 100\% |
| Books edited | Ladder Men | 606 | 77.6\% | 16.0\% | 4.6\% | 1.0\% | 0.5\% | 0.3\% | 0.0\% | 100\% |
| Books edited | Ladder Women | 226 | 76.5\% | 19.9\% | 3.1\% | 0.4\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 100\% |
| Books edited | All Tenured Faculty | 543 | 72.6\% | 19.9\% | 5.3\% | 1.3\% | 0.6\% | 0.4\% | 0.0\% | 100\% |
| Books edited | Tenured Men | 428 | 73.6\% | 18.7\% | 5.1\% | 1.4\% | 0.7\% | 0.5\% | 0.0\% | 100\% |
| Books edited | Tenured Women | 115 | 68.7\% | 24.3\% | 6.1\% | 0.9\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 100\% |
| Books edited | All Tenure-Track Faculty | 289 | 86.2\% | 11.8\% | 2.1\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 100\% |
| Books edited | Tenure-Track Men | 178 | 87.1\% | ${ }^{9.6 \%}$ | 3.4\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 100\% |
| Books edited | Tenure-Track Women | 111 | 84.7\% | 15.3\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 100\% |
| Books edited | All Non-Ladder Faculty | 252 | 79.4\% | 18.3\% | 2.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.4\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 100\% |
| Books edited | Non-Ladder Men | 158 | 80.4\% | 16.5\% | 2.5\% | 0.0\% | 0.6\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 100\% |
| Books edited | Non-Ladder Women | 94 | 77.7\% | 21.3\% | 1.1\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 100\% |
| Chapters in books | All Faculty | 1149 | 44.8\% | 24.5\% | 18.0\% | 6.3\% | ${ }^{2.7 \%}$ | 1.8\% | 1.8\% | 100\% |
| Chapters in books | All Men | 806 | 45.9\% | 21.6\% | 18.7\% | ${ }^{6.6 \%}$ | 3.1\% | 2.0\% | 2.1\% | 100\% |
| Chapters in books Chapters in books | All Women All Ladder Faculty | 343 885 | $42.3 \%$ $39.2 \%$ | $31.5 \%$ $25.9 \%$ | 16.3\% 20.1\% | 5.5\% $7.1 \%$ | $1.7 \%$ $3.4 \%$ | 1.5\% | 1.2\% 2.0\% | 100\% 100\% |
| Chapters in books | Ladder Men | 643 | 41.2\% | 22.6\% | 20.2\% | 7.5\% | 3.7\% | 2.3\% | 2.5\% | 100\% |
| Chapters in books | Ladder Women | 242 | 33.9\% | 34.7\% | 19.8\% | 6.2\% | 2.5\% | 2.1\% | 0.8\% | 100\% |
| Chapters in books | All Tenured Faculty | 582 | 35.7\% | 23.5\% | 23.5\% | 7.9\% | 3.8\% | 2.9\% | 2.6\% | 100\% |
| Chapters in books | Tenured Men | 457 | 38.1\% | 20.8\% | 22.8\% | 7.9\% | 4.4\% | 3.3\% | 2.8\% | 100\% |
| Chapters in books | Tenured Women | 125 | 27.2\% | 33.6\% | 26.4\% | 8.0\% | 1.6\% | 1.6\% | 1.6\% | 100\% |
| Chapters in books | All Tenure-Track Faculty | 303 | 45.9\% | 30.4\% | 13.5\% | 5.6\% | 2.6\% | 1.0\% | 1.0\% | 100\% |
| Chapters in books | Tenure-Track Men | 186 | 48.9\% | 26.9\% | 14.0\% | 6.5\% | 2.2\% | 0.0\% | 1.6\% | 100\% |
| Chapters in books | Tenure-Track Women | 117 | 41.0\% | 35.9\% | 12.8\% | 4.3\% | 3.4\% | 2.6\% | 0.0\% | 100\% |
| Chapters in books | All Non-Ladder Faculty | 264 | 63.6\% | 20.1\% | 11.0\% | 3.4\% | 0.4\% | 0.4\% | 1.1\% | 100\% |
| Chapters in books | Non-Ladder Men | 163 | 64.4\% | 17.8\% | 12.9\% | 3.1\% | 0.6\% | 0.6\% | 0.6\% | 100\% |
| Chapters in books | Non-Ladder Women | 101 | 62.4\% | 23.8\% | 7.9\% | 4.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 2.0\% | 100\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Workload (continued) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| In the past 12 months, how many of each of the following did you submit: (responses of 6 or more have been aggregated) | Cohort |  |  | Responses | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 or more | Total |
| Other scholarly or creative works | All Faculty |  |  | 430 | 54.7\% | 14.4\% | 12.8\% | 5.3\% | 1.9\% | 2.8\% | 8.1\% | 100\% |
| Other scholarly or creative works | All Men |  |  | 296 | 56.1\% | 11.8\% | 12.2\% | 5.4\% | 2.4\% | 2.7\% | 9.5\% | 100\% |
| Other scholarly or creative works | All Women |  |  | 134 | 51.5\% | 20.1\% | 14.2\% | 5.2\% | 0.7\% | 3.0\% | 5.2\% | 100\% |
| Other scholarly or creative works | All Ladder Faculty |  |  | 294 | 53.4\% | 14.6\% | 12.2\% | 5.4\% | 2.0\% | 2.4\% | 9.9\% | 100\% |
| Other scholarly or creative works | Ladder Men |  |  | 217 | 56.7\% | 11.5\% | 11.1\% | 5.5\% | 2.3\% | 1.8\% | 11.1\% | 100\% |
| Other scholarly or creative works | Ladder Women |  |  | 77 | 44.2\% | 23.4\% | 15.6\% | 5.2\% | 1.3\% | 3.9\% | 6.5\% | 100\% |
| Other scholarly or creative works | All Tenured Faculty |  |  | 192 | 47.9\% | 16.7\% | 10.9\% | 6.3\% | 2.6\% | 2.6\% | 13.0\% | 100\% |
| Other scholarly or creative works | Tenured Men |  |  | 152 | 52.0\% | 13.2\% | 11.2\% | 5.9\% | 2.6\% | 2.0\% | 13.2\% | 100\% |
| Other scholarly or creative works | Tenured Women |  |  | 40 | 32.5\% | 30.0\% | 10.0\% | 7.5\% | 2.5\% | 5.0\% | 12.5\% | 100\% |
| Other scholarly or creative works | All Tenure-Track Faculty |  |  | 102 | 63.7\% | 10.8\% | 14.7\% | 3.9\% | 1.0\% | 2.0\% | 3.9\% | 100\% |
| Other scholarly or creative works | Tenure-Track Men |  |  | 65 | 67.7\% | 7.7\% | 10.8\% | 4.6\% | 1.5\% | 1.5\% | 6.2\% | 100\% |
| Other scholarly or creative works | Tenure-Track Women |  |  | 37 | 56.8\% | 16.2\% | 21.6\% | 2.7\% | 0.0\% | 2.7\% | 0.0\% | 100\% |
| Other scholarly or creative works | All Non-Ladder Faculty |  |  | 136 | 57.4\% | 14.0\% | 14.0\% | 5.1\% | 1.5\% | 3.7\% | 4.4\% | 100\% |
| Other scholarly or creative works | Non-Ladder Men |  |  | 79 | 54.4\% | 12.7\% | 15.2\% | 5.1\% | 2.5\% | 5.1\% | 5.1\% | 100\% |
| Other scholarly or creative works | Non-Ladder Women |  |  | 57 | 61.4\% | 15.8\% | 12.3\% | 5.3\% | 0.0\% | 1.8\% | 3.5\% | 100\% |
| Work Hours |  |  | Standard |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| (responses have been placed into ten-hour groupings to make display possible) | Cohort | Mean | Deviation | Responses | 44 or less | 45-54 | 55-64 | 65-74 | 75 or more |  |  | Total |
| How many hours a week do you spend working? | All Faculty | 59.08 | 13.14 | 1064 | 8.6\% | 24.8\% | 34.8\% | 19.2\% | 12.6\% |  |  | 100\% |
| How many hours a week do you spend working? | All Men | 59.34 | 12.81 | 760 | 7.5\% | 23.3\% | 37.1\% | 20.7\% | 11.4\% |  |  | 100\% |
| How many hours a week do you spend working? | All Women | 58.42 | 13.93 | 304 | 11.5\% | 28.6\% | 28.9\% | 15.5\% | 15.5\% |  |  | 100\% |
| How many hours a week do you spend working? | All Ladder Faculty | 61.00 | 12.17 | 800 | 4.8\% | 22.6\% | 36.5\% | 22.0\% | 14.1\% |  |  | 100\% |
| How many hours a week do you spend working? | Ladder Men | 61.08 | 11.98 | 594 | 4.5\% | 21.2\% | 38.2\% | 22.9\% | 13.1\% |  |  | 100\% |
| How many hours a week do you spend working? | Ladder Women | 60.78 | 12.72 | 206 | 5.3\% | 26.7\% | 31.6\% | 19.4\% | 17.0\% |  |  | 100\% |
| How many hours a week do you spend working? | All Tenured Faculty | 61.82 | 12.57 | 498 | 3.6\% | 21.9\% | 35.9\% | 22.3\% | 16.3\% |  |  | 100\% |
| How many hours a week do you spend working? | Tenured Men | 61.20 | 12.27 | 402 | 4.2\% | 21.9\% | 37.6\% | 22.6\% | 13.7\% |  |  | 100\% |
| How many hours a week do you spend working? | Tenured Women | 64.40 | 13.51 | 96 | 1.0\% | 21.9\% | 29.2\% | 20.8\% | 27.1\% |  |  | 100\% |
| How many hours a week do you spend working? | All Tenure-Track Faculty | 59.66 | 11.37 | 302 | 6.6\% | 23.8\% | 37.4\% | 21.5\% | 10.6\% |  |  | 100\% |
| How many hours a week do you spend working? | Tenure-Track Men | 60.82 | 11.38 | 192 | 5.2\% | 19.8\% | 39.6\% | 23.4\% | 12.0\% |  |  | 100\% |
| How many hours a week do you spend working? | Tenure-Track Women | 57.62 | 11.11 | 110 | 9.1\% | 30.9\% | 33.6\% | 18.2\% | 8.2\% |  |  | 100\% |
| How many hours a week do you spend working? | All Non-Ladder Faculty | 53.24 | 14.24 | 264 | 20.5\% | 31.4\% | 29.5\% | 10.6\% | 8.0\% |  |  | 100\% |
| How many hours a week do you spend working? | Non-Ladder Men | 53.10 | 13.76 | 166 | 18.1\% | 30.7\% | 33.1\% | 12.7\% | 5.4\% |  |  | 100\% |
| How many hours a week do you spend working? | Non-Ladder Women | 53.48 | 15.10 | 98 | 24.5\% | 32.7\% | 23.5\% | 7.1\% | 12.2\% |  |  | 100\% |
| To what extent have the following been a source of stress over the past twelve months: ( $1=$ Not at all, 3 = Extensive) | Cohort | Mean | Standard Deviation | Responses | Not at all | Somewhat | Extensive |  |  |  |  | Total |
| Scholarly productivity | All Faculty | 2.10 | 0.72 | 1214 | 21.3\% | 47.4\% | 31.2\% |  |  |  |  | 100\% |
| Scholarly productivity | All Men | 1.99 | 0.71 | 862 | 25.2\% | 50.3\% | 24.5\% |  |  |  |  | 100\% |
| Scholarly productivity | All Women | 2.36 | 0.69 | 352 | 11.9\% | 40.3\% | 47.7\% |  |  |  |  | 100\% |
| Scholarly productivity | All Ladder Faculty | 2.12 | 0.72 | 949 | 20.4\% | 47.3\% | 32.2\% |  |  |  |  | 100\% |
| Scholarly productivity | Ladder Men | 2.01 | 0.71 | 694 | 24.6\% | 50.0\% | 25.4\% |  |  |  |  | 100\% |
| Scholarly productivity | Ladder Women | 2.42 | 0.65 | 255 | 9.0\% | 40.0\% | 51.0\% |  |  |  |  | 100\% |
| Scholarly productivity | All Tenured Faculty | 1.92 | 0.68 | 623 | 27.4\% | 53.3\% | 19.3\% |  |  |  |  | 100\% |
| Scholarly productivity | Tenured Men | 1.84 | 0.66 | 493 | 30.8\% | 54.2\% | 15.0\% |  |  |  |  | 100\% |
| Scholarly productivity | Tenured Women | 2.21 | 0.68 | 130 | 14.6\% | 50.0\% | 35.4\% |  |  |  |  | 100\% |
| Scholarly productivity | All Tenure-Track Faculty | 2.50 | 0.63 | 326 | 7.1\% | 35.9\% | 57.1\% |  |  |  |  | 100\% |
| Scholarly productivity | Tenure-Track Men | 2.41 | 0.66 | 201 | 9.5\% | 39.8\% | 50.7\% |  |  |  |  | 100\% |
| Scholarly productivity | Tenure-Track Women | 2.64 | 0.54 | 125 | 3.2\% | 29.6\% | 67.2\% |  |  |  |  | 100\% |
| Scholarly productivity | All Non-Ladder Faculty | 2.03 | 0.72 | 265 | 24.5\% | 47.9\% | 27.5\% |  |  |  |  | 100\% |
| Scholarly productivity | Non-Ladder Men | 1.93 | 0.69 | 168 | 27.4\% | 51.8\% | 20.8\% |  |  |  |  | 100\% |
| Scholarly productivity | Non-Ladder Women | 2.20 | 0.74 | 97 | 19.6\% | 41.2\% | 39.2\% |  |  |  |  | 100\% |
| Teaching responsibilities | All Faculty | 1.95 | 0.66 | 1237 | 24.1\% | 56.5\% | 19.4\% |  |  |  |  | 100\% |
| Teaching responsibilities | All Men | 1.89 | 0.65 | 877 | 27.6\% | 56.2\% | 16.2\% |  |  |  |  | 100\% |
| Teaching responsibilities | All Women | 2.12 | 0.64 | 360 | 15.6\% | 57.2\% | 27.2\% |  |  |  |  | 100\% |
| Teaching responsibilities | All Ladder Faculty | 1.95 | 0.66 | 953 | 24.2\% | 56.2\% | 19.5\% |  |  |  |  | 100\% |
| Teaching responsibilities | Ladder Men | 1.89 | 0.66 | 700 | 27.7\% | 55.9\% | 16.4\% |  |  |  |  | 100\% |
| Teaching responsibilities | Ladder Women | 2.13 | 0.64 | 253 | 14.6\% | 57.3\% | 28.1\% |  |  |  |  | 100\% |
| Teaching responsibilities | All Tenured Faculty | 1.89 | 0.66 | 626 | 27.6\% | 55.9\% | 16.5\% |  |  |  |  | 100\% |
| Teaching responsibilities | Tenured Men | 1.84 | 0.65 | 497 | 30.8\% | 54.9\% | 14.3\% |  |  |  |  | 100\% |
| Teaching responsibilities | Tenured Women | 2.09 | 0.63 | 129 | 15.5\% | 59.7\% | 24.8\% |  |  |  |  | 100\% |
| Teaching responsibilities | All Tenure-Track Faculty | 2.08 | 0.65 | 327 | 17.7\% | 56.9\% | 25.4\% |  |  |  |  | 100\% |
| Teaching responsibilities | Tenure-Track Men | 2.01 | 0.65 | 203 | 20.2\% | 58.1\% | 21.7\% |  |  |  |  | 100\% |
| Teaching responsibilities | Tenure-Track Women | 2.18 | 0.65 | 124 | 13.7\% | 54.8\% | 31.5\% |  |  |  |  | 100\% |
| Teaching responsibilities | All Non-Ladder Faculty | 1.95 | 0.65 | 284 | 23.6\% | 57.4\% | 19.0\% |  |  |  |  | 100\% |
| Teaching responsibilities | Non-Ladder Men | 1.88 | 0.64 | 177 | 27.1\% | 57.6\% | 15.3\% |  |  |  |  | 100\% |
| Teaching responsibilities | Non-Ladder Women | 2.07 | 0.65 | 107 | 17.8\% | 57.0\% | 25.2\% |  |  |  |  | 100\% |


| Workload (continued) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| To what extent have the following been a source of stress over the past twelve months: (1=Not at all, $3=$ Extensive) | Cohort | Mean | Standard Deviation | Responses | Not at all | Somewhat | Extensive | Total |
| Advising responsibilities | All Faculty | 1.67 | 0.66 | 1195 | 44.2\% | 44.9\% | 11.0\% | 100\% |
| Advising responsibilities | All Men | 1.63 | 0.65 | 855 | 46.3\% | 44.6\% | 9.1\% | 100\% |
| Advising responsibilities | All Women | 1.77 | 0.70 | 340 | 38.8\% | 45.6\% | 15.6\% | 100\% |
| Advising responsibilities | All Ladder Faculty | 1.68 | 0.66 | 942 | 43.0\% | 45.8\% | 11.3\% | 100\% |
| Advising responsibilities | Ladder Men | 1.64 | 0.64 | 691 | 44.6\% | 46.5\% | 9.0\% | 100\% |
| Advising responsibilities | Ladder Women | 1.79 | 0.72 | 251 | 38.6\% | 43.8\% | 17.5\% | 100\% |
| Advising responsibilities | All Tenured Faculty | 1.68 | 0.66 | 621 | 42.8\% | 46.4\% | 10.8\% | 100\% |
| Advising responsibilities | Tenured Men | 1.63 | 0.63 | 490 | 45.1\% | 46.7\% | 8.2\% | 100\% |
| Advising responsibilities | Tenured Women | 1.86 | 0.73 | 131 | 34.4\% | 45.0\% | 20.6\% | 100\% |
| Advising responsibilities | All Tenure-Track Faculty | 1.69 | 0.68 | 321 | 43.3\% | 44.5\% | 12.1\% | 100\% |
| Advising responsibilities | Tenure-Track Men | 1.68 | 0.66 | 201 | 43.3\% | 45.8\% | 10.9\% | 100\% |
| Advising responsibilities | Tenure-Track Women | 1.71 | 0.70 | 120 | 43.3\% | 42.5\% | 14.2\% | 100\% |
| Advising responsibilities | All Non-Ladder Faculty | 1.61 | 0.66 | 253 | 48.6\% | 41.5\% | 9.9\% | 100\% |
| Advising responsibilities | Non-Ladder Men | 1.56 | 0.67 | 164 | 53.7\% | 36.6\% | 9.8\% | 100\% |
| Advising responsibilities | Non-Ladder Women | 1.71 | 0.64 | 89 | 39.3\% | 50.6\% | 10.1\% | 100\% |
| Administrative responsibilites to your [unit], School, or the University | All Faculty | 1.86 | 0.75 | 1174 | 36.1\% | 41.7\% | 22.2\% | 100\% |
| Administrative responsibilites to your [unit], School, or the University | All Men | 1.85 | 0.75 | 846 | 36.9\% | 41.7\% | 21.4\% | 100\% |
| Administrative responsibilites to your [unit], School, or the University | All Women | 1.90 | 0.76 | 328 | 34.1\% | 41.5\% | 24.4\% | 100\% |
| Administrative responsibilites to your [unit], School, or the University | All Ladder Faculty | 1.88 | 0.76 | 931 | 35.6\% | 41.2\% | 23.2\% | 100\% |
| Administrative responsibilites to your [unit], School, or the University | Ladder Men | 1.86 | 0.75 | 688 | 36.2\% | 41.3\% | 22.5\% | 100\% |
| Administrative responsibilites to your [unit], School, or the University | Ladder Women | 1.91 | 0.76 | 243 | 33.7\% | 41.2\% | 25.1\% | 100\% |
| Administrative responsibilites to your [unit], School, or the University | All Tenured Faculty | 2.01 | 0.77 | 613 | 28.9\% | 40.8\% | 30.3\% | 100\% |
| Administrative responsibilites to your [unit], School, or the University | Tenured Men | 1.98 | 0.77 | 488 | 30.3\% | 41.0\% | 28.7\% | 100\% |
| Administrative responsibilites to your [unit], School, or the University | Tenured Women | 2.14 | 0.77 | 125 | 23.2\% | 40.0\% | 36.8\% | 100\% |
| Administrative responsibilites to your [unit], School, or the University | All Tenure-Track Faculty | 1.61 | 0.65 | 318 | 48.4\% | 42.1\% | 9.4\% | 100\% |
| Administrative responsibilites to your [unit], School, or the University | Tenure-Track Men | 1.57 | 0.63 | 200 | 50.5\% | 42.0\% | 7.5\% | 100\% |
| Administrative responsibilites to your [unit], School, or the University | Tenure-Track Women | 1.68 | 0.69 | 118 | 44.9\% | 42.4\% | 12.7\% | 100\% |
| Administrative responsibilites to your [unit], School, or the University | All Non-Ladder Faculty | 1.80 | 0.73 | 243 | 38.3\% | 43.2\% | 18.5\% | 100\% |
| Administrative responsibilites to your [unit], School, or the University | Non-Ladder Men | 1.77 | 0.72 | 158 | 39.9\% | 43.7\% | 16.5\% | 100\% |
| Administrative responsibilites to your [unit], School, or the University | Non-Ladder Women | 1.87 | 0.75 | 85 | 35.3\% | 42.4\% | 22.4\% | 100\% |
| External service responsibilities | All Faculty | 1.54 | 0.65 | 1131 | 55.0\% | 36.3\% | 8.7\% | 100\% |
| External service responsibilities | All Men | 1.51 | 0.64 | 817 | 56.5\% | 35.6\% | 7.8\% | 100\% |
| External service responsibilities | All Women | 1.60 | 0.68 | 314 | 51.0\% | 38.2\% | 10.8\% | 100\% |
| External service responsibilities | All Ladder Faculty | 1.54 | 0.65 | 904 | 54.4\% | 37.2\% | 8.4\% | 100\% |
| External service responsibilities | Ladder Men | 1.52 | 0.64 | 666 | 55.7\% | 36.6\% | 7.7\% | 100\% |
| External service responsibilities | Ladder Women | 1.60 | 0.67 | 238 | 50.8\% | 38.7\% | 10.5\% | 100\% |
| External service responsibilities | All Tenured Faculty | 1.61 | 0.66 | 599 | 48.7\% | 41.2\% | 10.0\% | 100\% |
| External service responsibilities | Tenured Men | 1.57 | 0.65 | 475 | 51.6\% | 39.8\% | 8.6\% | 100\% |
| External service responsibilities | Tenured Women | 1.77 | 0.70 | 124 | 37.9\% | 46.8\% | 15.3\% | 100\% |
| External service responsibilities | All Tenure-Track Faculty | 1.40 | 0.59 | 305 | 65.6\% | 29.2\% | 5.2\% | 100\% |
| External service responsibilities | Tenure-Track Men | 1.39 | 0.59 | 191 | 66.0\% | 28.8\% | 5.2\% | 100\% |
| External service responsibilities | Tenure-Track Women | 1.40 | 0.59 | 114 | 64.9\% | 29.8\% | 5.3\% | 100\% |
| External service responsibilities | All Non-Ladder Faculty | 1.52 | 0.67 | 227 | 57.3\% | 33.0\% | 9.7\% | 100\% |
| External service responsibilities | Non-Ladder Men | 1.48 | 0.65 | 151 | 60.3\% | 31.1\% | 8.6\% | 100\% |
| External service responsibilities | Non-Ladder Women | 1.61 | 0.69 | 76 | 51.3\% | 36.8\% | 11.8\% | 100\% |
| Time for scholarly work | All Faculty | 2.37 | 0.68 | 1212 | 11.3\% | 40.8\% | 47.9\% | 100\% |
| Time for scholarly work | All Men | 2.28 | 0.69 | 862 | 13.6\% | 44.8\% | 41.6\% | 100\% |
| Time for scholarly work | All Women | 2.58 | 0.60 | 350 | 5.7\% | 30.9\% | 63.4\% | 100\% |
| Time for scholarly work | All Ladder Faculty | 2.39 | 0.67 | 945 | 10.4\% | 39.8\% | 49.8\% | 100\% |
| Time for scholarly work | Ladder Men | 2.31 | 0.68 | 692 | 12.6\% | 44.2\% | 43.2\% | 100\% |
| Time for scholarly work | Ladder Women | 2.64 | 0.57 | 253 | 4.3\% | 27.7\% | 68.0\% | 100\% |
| Time for scholarly work | All Tenured Faculty | 2.31 | 0.68 | 621 | 12.6\% | 44.0\% | 43.5\% | 100\% |
| Time for scholarly work | Tenured Men | 2.23 | 0.68 | 493 | 14.4\% | 48.1\% | 37.5\% | 100\% |
| Time for scholarly work | Tenured Women | 2.61 | 0.59 | 128 | 5.5\% | 28.1\% | 66.4\% | 100\% |
| Time for scholarly work | All Tenure-Track Faculty | 2.56 | 0.61 | 324 | 6.2\% | 31.8\% | 62.0\% | 100\% |
| Time for scholarly work | Tenure-Track Men | 2.49 | 0.64 | 199 | 8.0\% | 34.7\% | 57.3\% | 100\% |
| Time for scholarly work | Tenure-Track Women | 2.66 | 0.54 | 125 | ${ }^{3.2 \%}$ | 27.2\% | 69.6\% | 100\% |
| Time for scholarly work | All Non-Ladder Faculty | 2.27 | 0.70 | 267 | 14.6\% | 4.2\% | 41.2\% | 100\% |
| Time for scholarly work | Non-Ladder Men | 2.18 | 0.71 | 170 | 17.6\% | 47.1\% | 35.3\% | 100\% |
| Time for scholarly work | Non-Ladder Women | 2.42 | 0.66 | 97 | ${ }^{9.3 \%}$ | 39.2\% | 51.5\% | 100\% |
| Timing of [unit] meetings and functions | All Faculty | 1.66 | 0.65 | 1203 | 44.3\% | 45.8\% | 9.9\% | 100\% $100 \%$ |
| Timing of [unitl meetings and functions Timing of [unit) meetings and functions | All Men | 1.63 | 0.64 | 853 | 45.8\% | 45.4\% | 8.8\% | 100\% |
| Timing of [unitt meetings and functions Timing of [unit] meetings and functions | All Women | 1.72 | 0.67 | 350 | 40.6\% | 46.9\% | 12.6\% | 100\% |
| Timing of [unitt meetings and functions | All Ladder Faculty Ladder Men | 1.68 1.65 | 0.66 0.64 | 940 686 | $42.4 \%$ $43.9 \%$ | 46.8\% $46.9 \%$ | ${ }^{10.7 \%}$ | 100\% |
| Timing of [unit] meetings and functions | Ladder Women | 1.76 | 0.69 | 254 | 38.6\% | 46.5\% | 15.0\% | 100\% |
| Timing of [unit] meetings and functions | All Tenured Faculty | 1.74 | 0.67 | 616 | 38.6\% | 48.5\% | 12.8\% | 100\% |
| Timing of [unit] meetings and functions | Tenured M M | 1.71 | 0.66 | 486 | 40.5\% | 48.4\% | 11.1\% | 100\% |
| Timing of [unit] meetings and functions | Tenured Women | 1.88 | 0.70 | 130 | 31.5\% | 49.2\% | 19.2\% | 100\% |
| Timing of [unit) meetings and functions | All Tenure-Track Faculty | 1.57 | 0.62 | 324 | 49.7\% | 43.5\% | 6.8\% | 100\% |
| Timing of [unit] meetings and functions | Tenure-Track Men | 1.53 | 0.58 | 200 | 52.0\% | 43.5\% | 4.5\% | 100\% |
| Timing of [unit] meetings and functions | Tenure-Track Women | 1.65 | 0.66 | 124 | 46.0\% | 43.5\% | 10.5\% | 100\% |
| Timing of [unit] meetings and functions | All Non-Ladder Faculty | 1.56 | 0.62 | 263 | 51.0\% | 42.2\% | 6.8\% | 100\% |
| Timing of [unit) meetings and functions | Non-Ladder Men | 1.53 | 0.63 | 167 | 53.9\% | 38.9\% | 7.2\% | 100\% |
| Timing of [unit] meetings and functions | Non-Ladder Women | 1.60 | 0.61 | 96 | 45.8\% | 47.9\% | 6.3\% | 100\% |
|  |  |  | 26 |  |  |  |  |  |


| Workload (continued) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| To what extent have the following been a source of stress over the past twelve months: $(1=$ Not at all, $3=$ Extensive) | Cohort | Mean | Standard Deviation | Responses | Not at all | Somewhat | Extensive | Total |
| Timing of School-wide or Harvard-wide meetings and functions | All Faculty | 1.49 | 0.62 | 1167 | 57.2\% | 36.2\% | 6.6\% | 100\% |
| Timing of School-wide or Harvard-wide meetings and functions | All Men | 1.47 | 0.60 | 833 | 58.8\% | 35.5\% | 5.6\% | 100\% |
| Timing of School-wide or Harvard-wide meetings and functions | All Women | 1.56 | 0.65 | 334 | 53.3\% | 37.7\% | 9.0\% | 100\% |
| Timing of School-wide or Harvard-wide meetings and functions | All Ladder Faculty | 1.53 | 0.63 | 921 | 54.6\% | 37.9\% | 7.5\% | 100\% |
| Timing of School-wide or Harvard-wide meetings and functions | Ladder Men | 1.50 | 0.61 | 674 | 56.1\% | 37.5\% | 6.4\% | 100\% |
| Timing of School-wide or Harvard-wide meetings and functions | Ladder Women | 1.60 | 0.67 | 247 | 50.6\% | 38.9\% | 10.5\% | 100\% |
| Timing of School-wide or Harvard-wide meetings and functions | All Tenured Faculty | 1.61 | 0.66 | 605 | 48.6\% | 41.5\% | 9.9\% | 100\% |
| Timing of School-wide or Harvard-wide meetings and functions | Tenured Men | 1.57 | 0.64 | 479 | 51.6\% | 40.1\% | 8.4\% | 100\% |
| Timing of School-wide or Harvard-wide meetings and functions | Tenured Women | 1.79 | 0.70 | 126 | 37.3\% | 46.8\% | 15.9\% | 100\% |
| Timing of School-wide or Harvard-wide meetings and functions | All Tenure-Track Faculty | 1.37 | 0.54 | 316 | 66.1\% | 31.0\% | 2.8\% | 100\% |
| Timing of School-wide or Harvard-wide meetings and functions | Tenure-Track Men | 1.34 | 0.51 | 195 | 67.2\% | 31.3\% | 1.5\% | 100\% |
| Timing of School-wide or Harvard-wide meetings and functions | Tenure-Track Women | 1.40 | 0.59 | 121 | 64.5\% | 30.6\% | 5.0\% | 100\% |
| Timing of School-wide or Harvard-wide meetings and functions | All Non-Ladder Faculty | 1.36 | 0.55 | 246 | 67.1\% | 29.7\% | 3.3\% | 100\% |
| Timing of School-wide or Harvard-wide meetings and functions | Non-Ladder Men | 1.32 | 0.52 | 159 | 70.4\% | 27.0\% | 2.5\% | 100\% |
| Timing of School-wide or Harvard-wide meetings and functions | Non-Ladder Women | 1.44 | 0.58 | 87 | 60.9\% | 34.5\% | 4.6\% | 100\% |
| Commuting | All Faculty | 1.42 | 0.63 | 1176 | 65.9\% | 26.2\% | 7.9\% | 100\% |
| Commuting | All Men | 1.39 | 0.61 | 832 | 67.4\% | 26.0\% | 6.6\% | 100\% |
| Commuting | All Women | 1.49 | 0.69 | 344 | 62.2\% | 26.7\% | 11.0\% | 100\% |
| Commuting | All Ladder Faculty | 1.40 | 0.61 | 898 | 66.7\% | 26.5\% | 6.8\% | 100\% |
| Commuting | Ladder Men | 1.38 | 0.59 | 656 | 68.0\% | 26.2\% | 5.8\% | 100\% |
| Commuting | Ladder Women | 1.46 | 0.66 | 242 | 63.2\% | 27.3\% | 9.5\% | 100\% |
| Commuting | All Tenured Faculty | 1.39 | 0.60 | 583 | 67.2\% | 26.8\% | 6.0\% | 100\% |
| Commuting | Tenured Men | 1.37 | 0.57 | 464 | 67.5\% | 27.8\% | 4.7\% | 100\% |
| Commuting | Tenured Women | 1.45 | 0.69 | 119 | 66.4\% | 22.7\% | 10.9\% | 100\% |
| Commuting | All Tenure-Track Faculty | 1.43 | 0.64 | 315 | 65.7\% | 26.0\% | 8.3\% | 100\% |
| Commuting | Tenure-Track Men | 1.39 | 0.64 | 192 | 69.3\% | 22.4\% | 8.3\% | 100\% |
| Commuting | Tenure-Track Women | 1.48 | 0.64 | 123 | 60.2\% | 31.7\% | 8.1\% | 100\% |
| Commuting | All Non-Ladder Faculty | 1.48 | 0.69 | 278 | 63.3\% | 25.2\% | 11.5\% | 100\% |
| Commuting | Non-Ladder Men | 1.44 | 0.67 | 176 | 65.3\% | 25.0\% | 9.7\% | 100\% |
| Commuting | Non-Ladder Women | 1.55 | 0.74 | 102 | 59.8\% | 25.5\% | 14.7\% | 100\% |
| [unit] or campus politics | All Faculty | 1.81 | 0.79 | 1202 | 42.2\% | 34.3\% | 23.5\% | 100\% |
| [unit] or campus politics | All Men | 1.76 | 0.77 | 853 | 44.8\% | 34.5\% | 20.8\% | 100\% |
| [unit] or campus politics | All Women | 1.95 | 0.81 | 349 | 35.8\% | 33.8\% | 30.4\% | 100\% |
| [unit] or campus politics | All Ladder Faculty | 1.84 | 0.79 | 937 | 39.9\% | 35.8\% | 24.3\% | 100\% |
| [unit] or campus politics | Ladder Men | 1.79 | 0.78 | 684 | 42.7\% | 35.5\% | 21.8\% | 100\% |
| [unit] or campus politics | Ladder Women | 1.99 | 0.80 | 253 | 32.4\% | 36.4\% | 31.2\% | 100\% |
| [unit] or campus politics | All Tenured Faculty | 1.89 | 0.78 | 615 | 36.7\% | 37.4\% | 25.9\% | 100\% |
| [unit] or campus politics [unit] or campus politics | Tenured Men Tenured Women | 1.85 2.06 | 0.78 0.76 | 484 131 | $39.7 \%$ $26.0 \%$ | $36.2 \%$ $42.0 \%$ | $24.2 \%$ $32.1 \%$ | $100 \%$ $100 \%$ |
| [unit] or campus politics | Tenured Women | 2.06 | 0.76 | 131 | 26.0\% | 42.0\% | 32.1\% | 100\% |
| [unit] or campus politics | All Tenure-Track Faculty | 1.75 | 0.78 | 322 | 46.0\% | 32.6\% | 21.4\% | 100\% |
| [unit] or campus politics | Tenure-Track Men | 1.66 | 0.74 | 200 | 50.0\% | 34.0\% | 16.0\% | 100\% |
| [unit] or campus politics | Tenure-Track Women | 1.91 | 0.83 | 122 | 39.3\% | 30.3\% | 30.3\% | 100\% |
| [unit] or campus politics | All Non-Ladder Faculty | 1.71 | 0.79 | 265 | 50.2\% | 29.1\% | 20.8\% | 100\% |
| [unit] or campus politics [unit] or campus politics | Non-Ladder Men | 1.63 | 0.75 | 169 | 53.3\% | 30.2\% | 16.6\% | $\begin{aligned} & 100 \% \\ & 100 \% \end{aligned}$ |
| [unit] or campus politics Review/promotion process (ladder survey only) | Non-Ladder Women All Ladder Faculty | 1.83 1.84 | 0.84 0.82 | 96 886 | 44.8\% | 27.1\% | 28.1\% $27.0 \%$ | $100 \%$ $100 \%$ |
| Review/promotion process (ladder survey only) | Ladder Men | 1.79 | 0.80 | 649 | 45.0\% | 31.4\% | 23.6\% | 100\% |
| Review/promotion process (ladder survey only) | Ladder Women | 1.98 | 0.86 | 237 | 38.0\% | 25.7\% | 36.3\% | 100\% |
| Review/promotion process (ladder survey only) | All Tenured Faculty | 1.55 | 0.72 | 573 | 58.6\% | 27.7\% | 13.6\% | 100\% |
| Review/promotion process (ladder survey only) | Tenured Men | 1.56 | 0.71 | 459 | 57.3\% | 29.6\% | 13.1\% | 100\% |
| Review/promotion process (ladder survey only) | Tenured Women | 1.52 | 0.76 | 114 | 64.0\% | 20.2\% | 15.8\% | 100\% |
| Review/promotion process (ladder survey only) | All Tenure-Track Faculty | 2.37 | 0.73 | 313 | 14.7\% | 33.9\% | 51.4\% | 100\% |
| Review/promotion process (ladder survey only) | Tenure-Track Men | 2.34 | 0.73 | 190 | 15.3\% | 35.8\% | 48.9\% | 100\% |
| Review/promotion process (ladder survey only) | Tenure-Track Women | 2.41 | 0.72 | 123 | 13.8\% | 30.9\% | 55.3\% | 100\% |
| Hiring and managing employees | All Faculty | 1.67 | ${ }^{0.69}$ | 1070 | 46.1\% | 41.2\% | 12.7\% | 100\% |
| Hiring and managing employees | All Men | 1.65 | 0.69 | 789 | 47.9\% | 39.5\% | 12.5\% | 100\% |
| Hiring and managing employees | All Women | 1.72 | 0.68 | 281 | 40.9\% | 45.9\% | 13.2\% | 100\% |
| Hiring and managing employees | All Ladder Faculty | 1.66 | 0.69 | 852 | 46.6\% | 40.6\% | 12.8\% | 100\% |
| Hiring and managing employees | Ladder Men | 1.65 | 0.70 | 640 | 47.8\% | 39.2\% | 13.0\% | 100\% |
| Hiring and managing employees | Ladder Women | 1.69 | 0.68 | 212 | 42.9\% | 44.8\% | 12.3\% | 100\% |
| Hiring and managing employees | All Tenured Faculty | 1.68 | 0.70 | 570 | 45.6\% | 40.9\% | $13.5 \%$ $12.6 \%$ |  |
| Hiring and managing employees Hiring and managing employees | Tenured Men | 1.65 | 0.69 | 459 | 47.9\% | 39.4\% | 12.6\% | 100\% |
| Hiring and managing employees Hiring and managing employees | Tenured Women | 1.81 | 0.71 | 111 | 36.0\% | 46.8\% | 17.1\% |  |
| Hiring and managing employees Hiring and managing employees | All Tenure-Track Faculty | 1.63 1.66 | 0.68 0.71 | 282 181 | 48.6\% | 40.1\% $38.7 \%$ | $11.3 \%$ $13.8 \%$ | $100 \%$ $100 \%$ |
| Hiring and managing employees | Tenure-Track Women | 1.56 | 0.62 | 101 | 50.5\% | 42.6\% | 6.9\% | 100\% |
| Hiring and managing employees | All Non-Ladder Faculty | 1.68 | 0.68 | 218 | 44.0\% | 43.6\% | 12.4\% | 100\% |
| Hiring and managing employees | Non-Ladder Men | 1.62 | 0.67 | 149 | 48.3\% | 40.9\% | 10.7\% | 100\% |
| Hiring and managing employees | Non-Ladder Women | 1.81 | 0.69 | 69 | 34.8\% | 49.3\% | 15.9\% | 100\% |


| Orkload (continued) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| To what extent have the following been a source of stress over the past twelve months: ( $1=$ Not at all, 3 = Extensive) | Cohort | Mean | Standard Deviation | Responses | Not at all | Somewhat | Extensive | Total |
| Managing a research group or grant | All Faculty | 1.82 | 0.72 | 811 | 36.6\% | 44.5\% | 18.9\% | 100\% |
| Managing a research group or grant | All Men | 1.79 | 0.71 | 599 | 37.6\% | 45.4\% | 17.0\% | 100\% |
| Managing a research group or grant | All Women | 1.90 | 0.76 | 212 | 34.0\% | 42.0\% | 24.1\% | 100\% |
| Managing a research group or grant | All Ladder Faculty | 1.85 | 0.72 | 646 | 34.1\% | 46.4\% | 19.5\% | 100\% |
| Managing a research group or grant | Ladder Men | 1.84 | 0.71 | 491 | 34.6\% | 47.3\% | 18.1\% | 100\% |
| Managing a research group or grant | Ladder Women | 1.92 | 0.75 | 155 | 32.3\% | 43.9\% | 23.9\% | 100\% |
| Managing a research group or grant | All Tenured Faculty | 1.84 | 0.70 | 427 | 34.0\% | 48.2\% | 17.8\% | 100\% |
| Managing a research group or grant | Tenured Men | 1.83 | 0.69 | 350 | 34.3\% | 48.9\% | 16.9\% | 100\% |
| Managing a research group or grant | Tenured Women | 1.90 | 0.74 | 77 | 32.5\% | 45.5\% | 22.1\% | 100\% |
| Managing a research group or grant | All Tenure-Track Faculty | 1.89 | 0.75 | 219 | 34.2\% | 42.9\% | 22.8\% | 100\% |
| Managing a research group or grant | Tenure-Track Men | 1.86 | 0.74 | 141 | 35.5\% | 43.3\% | 21.3\% | 100\% |
| Managing a research group or grant | Tenure-Track Women | 1.94 | 0.76 | 78 | 32.1\% | 42.3\% | 25.6\% | 100\% |
| Managing a research group or grani | All Non-Ladder Faculty | 1.70 | 0.74 | 165 | 46.7\% | 37.0\% | 16.4\% | 100\% |
| Managing a research group or grant | Non-Ladder Men | 1.61 | 0.69 | 108 | 50.9\% | 37.0\% | 12.0\% | 100\% |
| Managing a research group or grant | Non-Ladder Women | 1.86 | 0.79 | 57 | 38.6\% | 36.8\% | 24.6\% | 100\% |
| Securing funding for research | All Faculty | 2.09 | 0.80 | 907 | 28.0\% | 34.8\% | 37.2\% | 100\% |
| Securing funding for research | All Men | 2.04 | 0.81 | 649 | 31.0\% | 34.4\% | 34.7\% | 100\% |
| Securing funding for research | All Women | 2.23 | 0.77 | 258 | 20.5\% | 36.0\% | 43.4\% | 100\% |
| Securing funding for research | All Ladder Faculty | 2.13 | 0.80 | 711 | 26.6\% | 33.8\% | 39.7\% | 100\% |
| Securing funding for research | Ladder Men | 2.10 | 0.81 | 526 | 27.9\% | 34.2\% | 37.8\% | 100\% |
| Securing funding for research | Ladder Women | 2.22 | 0.79 | 185 | 22.7\% | 32.4\% | 44.9\% | 100\% |
| Securing funding for research | All Tenured Faculty | 2.05 | 0.80 | 470 | 29.6\% | 36.0\% | 34.5\% | 100\% |
| Securing funding for research | Tenured Men | 2.04 | 0.79 | 378 | 29.1\% | 37.6\% | 33.3\% | 100\% |
| Securing funding for research | Tenured Women | 2.08 | 0.84 | 92 | 31.5\% | 29.3\% | 39.1\% | 100\% |
| Securing funding for research | All Tenure-Track Faculty | 2.29 | 0.79 | 241 | 20.7\% | 29.5\% | 49.8\% | 100\% |
| Securing funding for research | Tenure-Track Men | 2.24 | 0.83 | 148 | 25.0\% | 25.7\% | 49.3\% | 100\% |
| Securing funding for research | Tenure-Track Women | 2.37 | 0.72 | 93 | 14.0\% | 35.5\% | 50.5\% | 100\% |
| Securing funding for research | All Non-Ladder Faculty | 1.95 | 0.78 | 196 | 33.2\% | 38.8\% | 28.1\% | 100\% |
| Securing funding for research | Non-Ladder Men | 1.77 | 0.78 | 123 | 43.9\% | 35.0\% | 21.1\% | 100\% |
| Securing funding for research | Non-Ladder Women | 2.25 | 0.70 | 73 | 15.1\% | 45.2\% | 39.7\% | 100\% |
| Process of obtaining reimbursements for travel and research expenses | All Faculty | 1.47 | 0.67 | 1133 | 62.4\% | 27.7\% | 9.9\% | 100\% |
| Process of obtaining reimbursements for travel and research expenses | All Men | 1.45 | 0.67 | 803 | 64.3\% | 26.0\% | 9.7\% | 100\% |
| Process of obtaining reimbursements for travel and research expenses | All Women | 1.52 | 0.68 | 330 | 57.9\% | 31.8\% | 10.3\% | 100\% |
| Process of obtaining reimbursements for travel and research expenses | All Ladder Faculty | 1.50 | 0.69 | 887 | 61.2\% | 27.8\% | 10.9\% | 100\% |
| Process of obtaining reimbursements for travel and research expenses | Ladder Men | 1.48 | 0.69 | 648 | 63.1\% | 25.9\% | 11.0\% | 100\% |
| Process of obtaining reimbursements for travel and research expenses | Ladder Women | 1.55 | 0.68 | 239 | 56.1\% | 33.1\% | 10.9\% | 100\% |
| Process of obtaining reimbursements for travel and research expenses | All Tenured Faculty | 1.49 | 0.68 | 571 | 61.8\% | 27.8\% | 10.3\% | 100\% |
| Process of obtaining reimbursements for travel and research expenses | Tenured Men | 1.48 | 0.68 | 451 | 62.5\% | 27.1\% | 10.4\% | 100\% |
| Process of obtaining reimbursements for travel and research expenses | Tenured Women | 1.51 | 0.67 | 120 | 59.2\% | 30.8\% | 10.0\% | 100\% |
| Process of obtaining reimbursements for travel and research expenses | All Tenure-Track Faculty | 1.52 | 0.70 | 316 | 60.1\% | 27.8\% | 12.0\% | 100\% |
| Process of obtaining reimbursements for travel and research expenses | Tenure-Track Men | 1.48 | 0.70 | 197 | 64.5\% | 23.4\% | 12.2\% | 100\% |
| Process of obtaining reimbursements for travel and research expenses | Tenure-Track Women | 1.59 | 0.69 | 119 | 52.9\% | 35.3\% | 11.8\% | 100\% |
| Process of obtaining reimbursements for travel and research expenses | All Non-Ladder Faculty | 1.39 | 0.60 | 246 | 66.7\% | 27.2\% | 6.1\% | 100\% |
| Process of obtaining reimbursements for travel and research expenses | Non-Ladder Men | 1.35 | 0.57 | 155 | 69.0\% | 26.5\% | 4.5\% | 100\% |
| Process of obtaining reimbursements for travel and research expenses | Non-Ladder Women | 1.46 | 0.66 | 91 | 62.6\% | 28.6\% | 8.8\% | 100\% |
| Professional licensing | All Faculty | 1.08 | 0.31 | 691 | 93.3\% | 5.5\% | 1.2\% | 100\% |
| Professional licensing | All Men | 1.08 | 0.31 | 527 | ${ }^{93.5 \%}$ | 5.3\% | 1.1\% | 100\% |
| Professional licensing | All Women | 1.09 | 0.32 | 164 | 92.7\% | 6.1\% | 1.2\% | 100\% |
| Professional licensing | All Ladder Faculty | 1.07 | 0.29 | 535 | 93.6\% | 5.4\% | 0.9\% | 100\% |
| Professional licensing | Ladder Men | 1.07 | 0.30 | 417 | 93.5\% | 5.5\% | 1.0\% | 100\% |
| Professional licensing Professional liensing | Ladder Women All Tenured Faculty | 1.07 1.07 | 0.28 0.29 | 118 332 | $94.1 \%$ $94.0 \%$ | 5.1\% 5.1\% | 0.8\% | $100 \%$ $100 \%$ |
| Professional licensing | Tenured Men | 1.07 | 0.29 0.29 | 379 279 | 94.3\% | 5.7\% | 1.1\% | 100\% |
| Professional licensing | Tenured Women | 1.08 | 0.27 | 53 | 92.5\% | 7.5\% | 0.0\% | 100\% |
| Professional licensing | All Tenure-Track Faculty | 1.08 | 0.30 | 203 | 93.1\% | 5.9\% | 1.0\% | 100\% |
| Professional licensing | Tenure-Track Men | 1.09 | 0.31 | 138 | 92.0\% | 7.2\% | 0.7\% | 100\% |
| Professional licensing | Tenure-Track Women | 1.06 | 0.30 | 65 | 95.4\% | 3.1\% | 1.5\% | 100\% |
| Professional licensing | All Non-Ladder Faculty | 1.10 | 0.36 | 156 | 92.3\% | 5.8\% | 1.9\% | 100\% |
| Professional licensing | Non-Ladder Men | 1.08 | 0.34 | 110 | ${ }^{93.6 \%}$ | 4.5\% | 1.8\% | 100\% |
| Professional licensing | Non-Ladder Women | 1.13 | 0.40 | 46 | 89.1\% | 8.7\% | 2.2\% | 100\% |
| Review of employment contract (non-ladder survey only) | All Non-Ladder Faculty | 1.68 | 0.82 | 253 | 54.5\% | 22.9\% | 22.5\% | 100\% |
| Review of employment contract (non-ladder survey only) | Non-Ladder Men | 1.61 | 0.79 | 162 | 58.0\% | 22.8\% | 19.1\% | 100\% |
| Review of employment contract (non-ladder survey only) | Non-Ladder Women | 1.80 | ${ }^{0.86}$ | 91 | 48.4\% | 23.1\% | 28.6\% | 100\% |
| Finding a tenure-track position (non-ladder survey only) Finding a tenure-track position (non-ladder survey only) | All Non-Ladder Faculty Non-Ladder Men | 1.68 1.56 | 0.88 0.83 | 190 126 | $59.5 \%$ $65.9 \%$ | $13.2 \%$ $12.7 \%$ | $27.4 \%$ $21.4 \%$ | $100 \%$ $100 \%$ |
| Finding a tenure-track position (non-ladder survey only) | Non-Ladder Women | 1.92 | 0.93 | 64 | 46.9\% | 14.1\% | 39.1\% | 100\% |

## Atmosphere
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| Cohort | Mean | Standard Deviation |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| All Ladder Faculty | 3.93 | 1.10 |
| Ladder Men | 4.04 | 1.05 |
| Ladder Women | 3.65 | 1.19 |
| All Tenured Faculty | 4.04 | 1.06 |
| Tenured Men | 4.10 | 1.03 |
| Tenured Women | 3.83 | 1.15 |
| All Tenure-Track Faculy | 3.72 | 1.15 |
| Tenure-Track Men | 3.89 | 1.08 |
| Tenure-Track Women | 3.45 | 1.20 |
| All Faculty | 3.62 | 1.30 |
| All Men | 3.79 | 1.23 |
| All Women | 3.19 | 1.37 |
| All Ladder Faculty | 3.64 | 1.31 |
| Ladder Men | 3.81 | 1.25 |
| Ladder Women | 3.21 | 1.39 |
| All Tenured Faculty | 3.84 | 1.20 |
| Tenured Men | 3.94 | 1.17 |
| Tenured Women | 3.47 | 1.27 |
| All Tenure-Track Faculy | 3.25 | 1.43 |
| Tenure-Track Men | 3.46 | 1.38 |
| Tenure-Track Women | 2.92 | 1.46 |
| All Non-Ladder Faculty | 3.53 | 1.27 |
| Non-Ladder Men | 3.74 | 1.18 |
| Non-Ladder Women | 3.14 | 1.32 |
| All Faculty | 3.48 | 1.28 |
| All Men | 3.62 | 1.21 |
| All Women | 3.14 | 1.37 |
| All Ladder Faculty | 3.59 | 1.26 |
| Ladder Men | 3.70 | 1.20 |
| Ladder Women | 3.29 | 1.36 |
| All Tenured Faculty | 3.70 | 1.22 |
| Tenured Men | 3.79 | 1.17 |
| Tenured Women | 3.39 | 1.34 |
| All Tenure-Track Faculty | 3.36 | 1.30 |
| Tenure-Track Men | 3.48 | 1.24 |
| Tenure-Track Women | 3.17 | 1.38 |
| All Non-Ladder Faculty | 3.11 | 1.28 |
| Non-Ladder Men | 3.31 | 1.21 |
| Non-Ladder Women | 2.75 | 1.34 |
| All Faculty | 3.62 | 1.36 |
| All Men | 3.76 | 1.29 |
| All Women | 3.25 | 1.46 |
| All Ladder Faculty | 3.67 | 1.38 |
| Ladder Men | 3.79 | 1.31 |
| Ladder Women | 3.32 | 1.50 |
| All Tenured Faculty | 3.74 | 1.36 |
| Tenured Men | 3.81 | 1.31 |
| Tenured Women | 3.47 | 1.50 |
| All Tenure-Track Faculty | 3.52 | 1.41 |
| Tenure-Track Men | 3.74 | 1.31 |
| Tenure-Track Women | 3.16 | 1.49 |
| All Non-Ladder Faculty | 3.45 | 1.29 |
| Non-Ladder Men | 3.66 | 1.21 |
| Non-Ladder Women | 3.09 | 1.35 |
| All Faculty | 3.44 | 1.44 |
| All Men | 3.63 | 1.36 |
| All Women | 3.00 | 1.52 |
| All Ladder Faculty | 3.62 | 1.40 |
| Ladder Men | 3.77 | 1.31 |
| Ladder Women | 3.21 | 1.52 |
| All Tenured Faculty | 3.92 | 1.28 |
| Tenured Men | 3.97 | 1.24 |
| Tenured Women | 3.73 | 1.43 |
| All Tenure-Track Faculty | 3.03 | 1.42 |
| Tenure-Track Men | 3.27 | 1.37 |
| Tenure-Track Women | 2.66 | 1.43 |
| All Non-Ladder Faculty | 2.84 | 1.41 |
| Non-Ladder Men | 3.07 | 1.39 |



| osphere (continued) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Please indicate your agreement or disagreement with the following statements: ( $1=$ Strongly disagree, 5 = Strongly agree) | Cohort | Mean | Standard Deviation | Responses | Strongly disagree | Somewhat disagree | Neither agree nor disagree | Somewhat agree | Strongly agree | Total |
| My [unit) is a good fit for me. | All Faculty | 3.86 | 1.24 | 1251 | 6.5\% | 11.0\% | 12.7\% | 29.6\% | 40.3\% | 100\% |
| My [unit] is a good fit for me. | All men | 3.99 | 1.15 | 884 | 4.9\% | 8.7\% | 11.5\% | 31.9\% | 43.0\% | 100\% |
| My [unit) is a good fit for me. | All Women | 3.54 | 1.37 | 367 | 10.4\% | 16.3\% | 15.5\% | 24.0\% | 33.8\% | 100\% |
| My [unit) is a good fit for me. | All Ladder Faculty | 3.89 | 1.26 | 963 | 7.0\% | 10.9\% | 10.7\% | 28.7\% | 42.8\% | 100\% |
| My [unit) is a good fit for me. | Ladder Men | 4.01 | 1.18 | 703 | 5.4\% | 9.1\% | 9.8\% | 30.9\% | 44.8\% | 100\% |
| My [unit) is a good fit for me. | Ladder Women | 3.59 | 1.41 | 260 | 11.2\% | 15.8\% | 13.1\% | 22.7\% | 37.3\% | 100\% |
| My [unit) is a good fit for me. | All Tenured Faculty | 3.97 | 1.25 | 640 | 6.9\% | 10.2\% | 8.3\% | 28.3\% | 46.4\% | 100\% |
| My [unit] is a good fit for me. | Tenured Men | 4.03 | 1.19 | 505 | 5.3\% | 9.3\% | 8.9\% | 29.5\% | 46.9\% | 100\% |
| My [unit) is a good fit for me. | Tenured Women | 3.74 | 1.46 | 135 | 12.6\% | 13.3\% | 5.9\% | 23.7\% | 44.4\% | 100\% |
| My [unit] is a good fit for me. | All Tenure-Track Faculty | 3.74 | 1.26 | 323 | 7.1\% | 12.4\% | 15.5\% | 29.4\% | 35.6\% | 100\% |
| My [unit] is a good fit for me. | Tenure-Track Men | 3.93 | 1.17 | 198 | 5.6\% | 8.6\% | 12.1\% | 34.3\% | 39.4\% | 100\% |
| My [unit) is a good fit for me. | Tenure-Track Women | 3.43 | 1.34 | 125 | 9.6\% | 18.4\% | 20.8\% | 21.6\% | 29.6\% | 100\% |
| My [unit) is a good fit for me. | All Non-Ladder Faculty | 3.76 | 1.16 | 288 | 4.9\% | 11.1\% | 19.4\% | 32.6\% | 31.9\% | 100\% |
| My [unit] is a good fit for me. | Non-Ladder Men | 3.95 | 1.04 | 181 | 2.8\% | 7.2\% | 18.2\% | 35.9\% | 35.9\% | 100\% |
| My [unit] is a good fit for me. | Non-Ladder Women | 3.43 | 1.27 | 107 | 8.4\% | 17.8\% | 21.5\% | 27.1\% | 25.2\% | 100\% |
| Please indicate your agreement or disagreement with the following statements: ( $1=$ Strongly disagree, 5 = Strongly agree) | Cohort | Mean | Standard Deviation | Responses | Strongly disagree | Somewhat disagree | Neither agree nor disagree | Somewhat agree | Strongly agree | то |
| My [unit] is a place where individual faculty may comfortably raise personal and/or family |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| responsibilities when scheduling [unit] obligations. | All Faculty | 3.64 | 1.25 | 1176 | 8.2\% | 12.2\% | 17.9\% | 31.5\% | 30.3\% | 100\% |
| My [unit] is a place where individual faculty may comfortably raise personal and/or family |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| responsibilities when scheduling [unit] obligations. My [unit) is a place where individual faculty may comfortably raise personal and/or family | All Men | 3.76 | 1.18 | 823 | 6.6\% | 8.9\% | 19.0\% | 33.4\% | 32.2\% | 100\% |
| responsibilities when scheduling [unit] obligations. | All Women | 3.35 | 1.36 | 353 | 11.9\% | 19.8\% | 15.6\% | 26.9\% | 25.8\% | 100\% |
| My [unit] is a place where individual faculty may comfortably raise personal and/or family | All Ladder Faculty | 3.67 | 1.27 | 919 | 8.5\% | 11.8\% | 16.1\% | 31.3\% | 32.3\% | 100\% |
| My [unit] is a place where individual faculty may comfortably raise personal and/or family |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| responsibilities when scheduling [unitt obligations. | Ladder Men | 3.78 | 1.20 | 666 | 6.9\% | 8.6\% | 17.9\% | 32.7\% | 33.9\% | 100\% |
| My [unit] is a place where individual faculty may comfortably raise personal and/or family |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| responsibilities when scheduling [unitt obligations. | Ladder Women | 3.38 | 1.40 | 253 | 12.6\% | 20.2\% | 11.5\% | 27.7\% | 28.1\% | 100\% |
| My [unit] is a place where individual faculty may comfortably raise personal and/or family responsibilities when scheduling [unit] obligations. | All Tenured Faculty | 3.79 | 1.19 | 608 | 6.4\% | 8.9\% | 17.9\% | 32.4\% | 34.4\% | 100\% |
| My [unit] is a place where individual faculty may comfortably raise personal and/or family |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| responsibilities when scheduling [unit] obligations. | Tenured Men | 3.81 | 1.16 | 479 | 5.8\% | 7.7\% | 19.8\% | 32.6\% | 34.0\% | 100\% |
| My [unit] is a place where individual faculty may comfortably raise personal and/or family responsibilities when scheduling [unit] obligations. | Tenured Women | 3.73 | 1.30 | 129 | 8.5\% | 13.2\% | 10.9\% | 31.8\% | 35.7\% | 100\% |
| My [unit] is a place where individual faculty may comfortably raise personal and/or family |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| responsibilities when scheduling [unit] obligations. | All Tenure-Track Faculty | 3.43 | 1.38 | 311 | 12.5\% | 17.4\% | 12.5\% | 29.3\% | 28.3\% | 100\% |
| responsibilities when scheduling lunit] obligations. My [unit) is a place where individual faculty may comfortably raise personal and/or family | Tenure-Track Men | 3.71 | 1.30 | 187 | 9.6\% | 10.7\% | 12.8\% | 33.2\% | 33.7\% | 100\% |
| responsibilities when scheduling [unit] obligations. | Tenure-Track Women | 3.02 | 1.42 | 124 | 16.9\% | 27.4\% | 12.1\% | 23.4\% | 20.2\% | 100\% |
| My [unit] is a place where individual faculty may comfortably raise personal and/or family |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| responsibilities when scheduling [unit] obligations. | All Non-Ladder Faculty | 3.50 | 1.19 | 257 | 7.0\% | 13.6\% | 24.5\% | 31.9\% | 23.0\% | 100\% |
| My [unit] is a place where individual faculty may comfortably raise personal and/or family |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| responsibilities when scheduling [unit] obligations. | Non-Ladder Men | 3.66 | 1.11 | 157 | 5.1\% | 10.2\% | 23.6\% | 36.3\% | 24.8\% | 100\% |
| My [unit] is a place where individual faculty may comfortably raise personal and/or family |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| responsibilities when scheduling [unit] obligations. | Non-Ladder Women | 3.26 | 1.26 | 100 | 10.0\% | 19.0\% | 26.0\% | 25.0\% | 20.0\% | 100\% |
| I am satisfied with the amount of personal interaction I have with my colleagues. | All Faculty | 3.48 | 1.27 | 1244 | 7.8\% | 19.1\% | 15.8\% | 31.6\% | 25.6\% | 100\% |
| I am satisfied with the amount of personal interaction I have with my colleagues. | All Men | 3.60 | 1.22 | 885 | 6.0\% | 17.3\% | 14.9\% | 34.5\% | 27.3\% | 100\% |
| I am satisfied with the amount of personal interaction I have with my colleagues. | All Women | 3.19 | 1.34 | 359 | 12.3\% | 23.7\% | 18.1\% | 24.5\% | 21.4\% | 100\% |
| I am satisfied with the amount of personal interaction I have with my colleagues. | All Ladder Faculty | 3.51 | 1.29 | 956 | 8.1\% | 19.1\% | 14.7\% | 30.3\% | 27.7\% | 100\% |
| I am satisfied with the amount of personal interaction I have with my colleagues. | Ladder Men | 3.62 | 1.25 | 704 | 6.7\% | 16.9\% | 13.6\% | 33.8\% | 29.0\% | 100\% |
| I am satisfied with the amount of personal interaction I have with my colleagues. | Ladder Women | 3.20 | 1.37 | 252 | 11.9\% | 25.4\% | 17.9\% | 20.6\% | 24.2\% | 100\% |
| I am satisfied with the amount of personal interaction I have with my colleagues. | All Tenured Faculty | 3.61 | 1.26 | 633 | 6.0\% | 19.1\% | 12.6\% | 32.4\% | 29.9\% | 100\% |
| 1 am satisfied with the amount of personal interaction I have with my colleagues. | Tenured Men | 3.68 | 1.23 | 504 | 5.6\% | 16.9\% | 12.1\% | 34.7\% | 30.8\% | 100\% |
| 1 am satisfied with the amount of personal interaction I have with my colleagues. | Tenured Women | ${ }^{3.33}$ | 1.34 | 129 | 7.8\% | 27.9\% | 14.7\% | 23.3\% | 26.4\% | 100\% |
| I am satisfied with the amount of personal interaction I have with my colleagues. | All Tenure-Track Faculty | 3.30 | 1.34 | 323 | 12.1\% | 19.2\% | 18.9\% | 26.3\% | 23.5\% | 100\% |
| I am satisfied with the amount of personal interaction I have with my colleagues. | Tenure-Track Men | 3.45 | 1.29 | 200 | 9.5\% | 17.0\% | 17.5\% | 31.5\% | 24.5\% | 100\% |
| I am satisfied with the amount of personal interaction I have with my colleagues. | Tenure-Track Women | 3.07 | 1.40 | 123 | 16.3\% | 22.8\% | 21.1\% | 17.9\% | 22.0\% | 100\% |
| I am satisfied with the amount of personal interaction I have with my colleagues. | All Non-Ladder Faculty | 3.40 | 1.19 | 288 | 6.9\% | 19.1\% | 19.4\% | 35.8\% | 18.8\% | 100\% |
| I am satisfied with the amount of personal interaction I have with my colleagues. | Non-Ladder Men | 3.54 | 1.12 | 181 | 3.3\% | 18.8\% | 19.9\% | 37.0\% | 21.0\% | 100\% |
| I am satisfied with the amount of personal interaction I have with my colleagues. | Non-Ladder Women | 3.18 | 1.28 | 107 | 13.1\% | 19.6\% | 18.7\% | 33.6\% | 15.0\% | 100\% |
| 1 am respected by the other faculty in my [unit]. | All Faculty | 3.95 | 1.11 | 1257 | 3.9\% | 8.8\% | 14.7\% | 33.5\% | 39.1\% | 100\% |
| 1 am respected by the other faculty in my [unit]. | All Men | 4.06 | 1.05 | 885 | 3.2\% | 6.7\% | 13.2\% | 35.1\% | 41.8\% | 100\% |
| 1 am respected by the other faculty in my [unit]. | All Women | 3.69 | 1.22 | 372 | 5.6\% | 14.0\% | 18.3\% | 29.6\% | 32.5\% | 100\% |
| 1 am respected by the other faculty in my [unit]. | All Ladder Faculty | 4.04 | 1.10 | 964 | 3.6\% | 8.2\% | 12.7\% | 31.7\% | 43.8\% | 100\% |
| 1 am respected by the other faculty in my [unit]. | Ladder Men | 4.14 | 1.05 | 702 | 3.1\% | 6.3\% | 11.3\% | 32.5\% | 46.9\% | 100\% |
| 1 am respected by the other faculty in my [unit]. | Ladder Women | 3.77 | 1.21 | 262 | 5.0\% | 13.4\% | 16.4\% | 29.8\% | 35.5\% | 100\% |
| 1 am respected by the other faculty in my [unit]. | All Tenured Faculty | 4.19 | 1.04 | 639 | 2.7\% | 6.9\% | 9.2\% | 31.1\% | 50.1\% | 100\% |
| 1 am respected by the other faculty in my [unit]. | Tenured Men | 4.23 | 1.02 | 503 | 2.8\% | 5.6\% | 9.3\% | 30.8\% | 51.5\% | 100\% |
| 1 am respected by the other faculty in my [unit]. | Tenured Women | 4.06 | 1.10 | 136 | 2.2\% | 11.8\% | 8.8\% | 32.4\% | 44.9\% | 100\% |
| 1 am respected by the other faculty in my [unit]. | All Tenure-Track Faculty | 3.74 | 1.17 | 325 | 5.5\% | 10.8\% | 19.4\% | 32.9\% | 31.4\% | 100\% |
| 1 am respected by the other faculty in my [unit]. | Tenure-Track Men | 3.91 | 1.09 | 199 | 4.0\% | 8.0\% | 16.1\% | 36.7\% | 35.2\% | 100\% |
| 1 am respected by the other faculty in my [unit]. | Tenure-Track Women | 3.47 | 1.24 | 126 | 7.9\% | 15.1\% | 24.6\% | 27.0\% | 25.4\% | 100\% |
| 1 am respected by the other faculty in my [unit]. | All Non-Ladder Faculty | 3.66 | 1.10 | 293 | 4.8\% | 10.9\% | 21.5\% | 39.2\% | 23.5\% | 100\% |
| 1 am respected by the other faculty in my [unit]. | Non-Ladder Men | 3.75 | 1.00 | 183 | 3.3\% | 8.2\% | 20.8\% | 45.4\% | 22.4\% | 100\% |
| 1 am respected by the other faculty in my [unit]. | Non-Ladder Women | 3.50 | 1.23 | 110 | 7.3\% | 15.5\% | 22.7\% | 29.1\% | 25.5\% | 100\% |
| Prepared by Harvard Institutional Research |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 25 of 45 |


| Atmosphere (continued) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Please indicate your agreement or disagreement with the following statements: ( $1=$ Strongly disagree, $5=$ Strongly agree) | Cohort | Mean | Standard Deviation | Responses | Strongly disagree | Somewhat disagree | Neither agree nor disagree | Somewhat agree | Strongly agree | Total |
| 1 am respected by the students. | All Faculty | 4.49 | 0.71 | 1244 | 0.5\% | 1.4\% | 5.7\% | 33.0\% | 59.4\% | 100\% |
| 1 am respected by the students. | All Men | 4.51 | 0.68 | 877 | 0.3\% | 1.0\% | 5.7\% | 33.1\% | 59.9\% | 100\% |
| 1 am respected by the students. | All Women | 4.45 | 0.78 | 367 | 0.8\% | 2.5\% | 5.7\% | 32.7\% | 58.3\% | 100\% |
| 1 am respected by the students. | All Ladder Faculty | 4.49 | 0.71 | 956 | 0.3\% | 1.6\% | 6.0\% | 33.1\% | 59.1\% | 100\% |
| 1 am respected by the students. | Ladder Men | 4.51 | 0.69 | 696 | 0.3\% | 1.1\% | 6.3\% | 32.2\% | 60.1\% | 100\% |
| 1 am respected by the students. | Ladder Women | 4.45 | 0.75 | 260 | 0.4\% | 2.7\% | 5.0\% | 35.4\% | 56.5\% | 100\% |
| 1 am respected by the students. | All Tenured Faculty | 4.59 | 0.63 | 633 | 0.2\% | 0.8\% | 4.6\% | 28.4\% | 66.0\% | 100\% |
| 1 am respected by the students. | Tenured Men | 4.59 | 0.65 | 497 | 0.2\% | 1.0\% | 5.0\% | 27.6\% | 66.2\% | 100\% |
| 1 am respected by the students. | Tenured Women | 4.63 | 0.54 | 136 | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 2.9\% | 31.6\% | 65.4\% | 100\% |
| 1 am respected by the students. | All Tenure-Track Faculty | 4.29 | 0.80 | 323 | 0.6\% | 3.1\% | 8.7\% | 42.1\% | 45.5\% | 100\% |
| 1 am respected by the students. | Tenure-Track Men | 4.31 | 0.75 | 199 | 0.5\% | 1.5\% | 9.5\% | 43.7\% | 44.7\% | 100\% |
| 1 am respected by the students. | Tenure-Track Women | 4.26 | 0.88 | 124 | 0.8\% | 5.6\% | 7.3\% | 39.5\% | 46.8\% | 100\% |
| 1 am respected by the students. | All Non-Ladder Faculty | 4.50 | 0.73 | 288 | 1.0\% | 1.0\% | 4.9\% | 32.6\% | 60.4\% | 100\% |
| 1 am respected by the students. | Non-Ladder Men | 4.53 | 0.65 | 181 | 0.6\% | 0.6\% | 3.3\% | 36.5\% | 59.1\% | 100\% |
| 1 am respected by the students. | Non-Ladder Women | 4.46 | 0.86 | 107 | 1.9\% | 1.9\% | 7.5\% | 26.2\% | 62.6\% | 100\% |
| 1 am satisfied with opportunities to share scientific equipment and other resources. | All Faculty | 3.76 | 1.10 | 576 | 3.8\% | 9.9\% | 22.9\% | 33.0\% | 30.4\% | 100\% |
| 1 am satisfied with opportunities to share scientific equipment and other resources. | All Men | 3.88 | 1.05 | 422 | 2.8\% | 8.1\% | 20.9\% | 35.1\% | 33.2\% | 100\% |
| 1 am satisfied with opportunities to share scientific equipment and other resources. | All Women | 3.45 | 1.18 | 154 | 6.5\% | 14.9\% | 28.6\% | 27.3\% | 22.7\% | 100\% |
| 1 am satisfied with opportunities to share scientific equipment and other resources. | All Ladder Faculty | 3.84 | 1.11 | 476 | 3.8\% | 9.5\% | 19.1\% | 34.0\% | 33.6\% | 100\% |
| 1 am satisfied with opportunities to share scientific equipment and other resources. | Ladder Men | 3.93 | 1.06 | 359 | 3.1\% | 7.8\% | 17.8\% | 35.7\% | 35.7\% | 100\% |
| 1 am satisfied with opportunities to share scientific equipment and other resources. | Ladder Women | 3.57 | 1.21 | 117 | 6.0\% | 14.5\% | 23.1\% | 29.1\% | 27.4\% | 100\% |
| 1 am satisfied with opportunities to share scientific equipment and other resources. | All Tenured Faculty | 3.91 | 1.06 | 319 | 3.4\% | 7.5\% | 18.2\% | 36.4\% | 34.5\% | 100\% |
| 1 am satisfied with opportunities to share scientific equipment and other resources. | Tenured Men | 3.95 | 1.04 | 259 | 3.1\% | 6.9\% | 17.8\% | 36.7\% | 35.5\% | 100\% |
| 1 am satisfied with opportunities to share scientific equipment and other resources. | Tenured Women | 3.75 | 1.14 | 60 | 5.0\% | 10.0\% | 20.0\% | 35.0\% | 30.0\% | 100\% |
| 1 am satisfied with opportunities to share scientific equipment and other resources. | All Tenure-Track Faculty | 3.71 | 1.18 | 157 | 4.5\% | 13.4\% | 21.0\% | 29.3\% | 31.8\% | 100\% |
| 1 am satisfied with opportunities to share scientific equipment and other resources. | Tenure-Track Men | 3.89 | 1.10 | 100 | 3.0\% | 10.0\% | 18.0\% | 33.0\% | 36.0\% | 100\% |
| 1 am satisfied with opportunities to share scientific equipment and other resources. | Tenure-Track Women | 3.39 | 1.25 | 57 | 7.0\% | 19.3\% | 26.3\% | 22.8\% | 24.6\% | 100\% |
| 1 am satisfied with opportunities to share scientific equipment and other resources. | All Non-Ladder Faculty | 3.38 | 1.01 | 100 | 4.0\% | 12.0\% | 41.0\% | 28.0\% | 15.0\% | 100\% |
| 1 am satisfied with opportunities to share scientific equipment and other resources. | Non-Ladder Men | 3.57 | 0.96 | 63 | 1.6\% | 9.5\% | 38.1\% | 31.7\% | 19.0\% | 100\% |
| 1 am satisfied with opportunities to share scientific equipment and other resources. | Non-Ladder Women | 3.05 | 1.03 | 37 | 8.1\% | 16.2\% | 45.9\% | 21.6\% | 8.1\% | 100\% |
| My colleagues value my work/contributions to the [unit]. (non-ladder survey only) | All Non-Ladder Faculty | 3.78 | 1.17 | 291 | 6.2\% | 10.0\% | 15.1\% | 37.1\% | 31.6\% | 100\% |
| My colleagues value my work/contributions to the [unit]. (non-ladder survey only) | Non-Ladder Men | 3.92 | 1.05 | 182 | 2.7\% | 9.3\% | 14.8\% | 39.0\% | 34.1\% | 100\% |
| My colleagues value my work/contributions to the [unit]. (non-ladder survey only) | Non-Ladder Women | 3.54 | 1.32 | 109 | 11.9\% | 11.0\% | 15.6\% | 33.9\% | 27.5\% | 100\% |
| I feel excluded from an informal network in my [unit]. (non-ladder survey only) | All Non-Ladder Faculty | 2.78 | 1.38 | 275 | 25.1\% | 19.3\% | 21.1\% | 21.5\% | 13.1\% | 100\% |
| I feel excluded from an informal network in my [unit]. (non-ladder survey only) | Non-Ladder Men | 2.71 | 1.36 | 171 | 26.9\% | 18.7\% | 21.1\% | 22.8\% | 10.5\% | 100\% |
| I feel excluded from an informal network in my [unit]. (non-ladder survey only) | Non-Ladder Women | 2.89 | 1.41 | 104 | 22.1\% | 20.2\% | 21.2\% | 19.2\% | 17.3\% | 100\% |
| My [unit] is a forma/hierarchical place. (non-ladder survey only) | All Non-Ladder Faculty | 3.05 | 1.33 | 286 | 16.1\% | 20.6\% | 22.7\% | 23.4\% | 17.1\% | 100\% |
| My [unit] is a forma/hierarchical place. (non-ladder survey only) | Non-Ladder Men | 2.92 | 1.24 | 178 | 14.6\% | 25.3\% | 25.8\% | 22.5\% | 11.8\% | 100\% |
| My [unit] is a forma/hierarchical place. (non-ladder survey only) | Non-Ladder Women | 3.27 | 1.45 | 108 | 18.5\% | 13.0\% | 17.6\% | 25.0\% | 25.9\% | 100\% |
| My [leader] has helped me to understand my role in the [unit]. (non-ladder survey only) | All Non-Ladder Faculty | 3.16 | 1.31 | 265 | 14.7\% | 15.8\% | 27.2\% | 23.0\% | 19.2\% | 100\% |
| My [leader] has helped me to understand my role in the [unit]. (non-ladder survey only) | Non-Ladder Men | 3.31 | 1.25 | 165 | 10.3\% | 15.8\% | 26.7\% | 27.3\% | 20.0\% | 100\% |
| My [leader] has helped me to understand my role in the [unit]. (non-ladder survey only) | Non-Ladder Women | 2.92 | 1.39 | 100 | 22.0\% | 16.0\% | 28.0\% | 16.0\% | 18.0\% | 100\% |
| Nonladder Inclusion | Cohort |  |  | Responses | Yes | No |  |  |  | Total |
| Have you been invited to [unit] social events? (non-ladder survey only) | All Non-Ladder Faculty |  |  | 297 | 94.3\% | 5.7\% |  |  |  | 100\% |
| Have you been invited to [unit] social events? (non-ladder survey only) | Non-Ladder Men |  |  | 185 | 94.1\% | 5.9\% |  |  |  | 100\% |
| Have you been invited to [unit] social events? (non-ladder survey only) | Non-Ladder Women |  |  | 112 | 94.6\% | 5.4\% |  |  |  | 100\% |
| Have you been included on [unit] lists? (non-ladder survey only) | All Non-Ladder Faculty |  |  | 293 | 89.8\% | 10.2\% |  |  |  | 100\% |
| Have you been included on [unit) lists? (non-ladder survey only) | Non-Ladder Men |  |  | 182 | 90.1\% | 9.9\% |  |  |  | 100\% |
| Have you been included on [unit) lists? (non-ladder survey only) | Non-Ladder Women |  |  | 111 | 89.2\% | 10.8\% |  |  |  | 100\% |
| Have you been given an office? (non-ladder survey only) | All Non-Ladder Faculty |  |  | 297 | 92.6\% | 7.4\% |  |  |  | 100\% |
| Have you been given an office? (non-ladder survey only) | Non-Ladder Men |  |  | 186 | 93.5\% | 6.5\% |  |  |  | 100\% |
| Have you been given an office? (non-ladder survey only) | Non-Ladder Women |  |  | 111 | 91.0\% | 9.0\% |  |  |  | 100\% |
| Have you been given a mailbox? (non-ladder survey only) | All Non-Ladder Faculty |  |  | 295 | 96.9\% | 3.1\% |  |  |  | 100\% |
| Have you been given a mailbox? (non-ladder survey only) | Non-Ladder Men |  |  | 184 | 96.7\% | 3.3\% |  |  |  | 100\% |
| Have you been given a mailbox? (non-ladder survey only) | Non-Ladder Women |  |  | 111 | 97.3\% | 2.7\% |  |  |  | 100\% |
| Mentoring |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Overall: |  |  | Standard |  |  | Somewhat | $\begin{gathered} \text { Neither } \\ \text { effective nor } \end{gathered}$ | Somewhat |  |  |
| ( $1=$ Very ineffective, $5=$ Very effective) | Cohort | Mean | Deviation | Responses | Very ineffective | ineffective | ineffective | effective | Very effective | Total |
| Overall, how effective is your [unit] at mentoring its junior faculty? (ladder survey only) | All Ladder Faculty | 3.25 | 1.27 | 967 | 13.2\% | 17.3\% | 14.6\% | 40.8\% | 14.1\% | 100\% |
| Overall, how effective is your [unit] at mentoring its junior faculty? (ladder survey only) | Ladder Men | 3.37 | 1.21 | 709 | 10.3\% | 15.8\% | 15.7\% | 43.6\% | 14.7\% | 100\% |
| Overall, how effective is your [unit] at mentoring its junior faculty? (ladder survey only) | Ladder Women | 2.94 3 | 1.38 | 258 | 21.3\% | 21.3\% | 11.6\% | 33.3\% | 12.4\% | 100\% |
| Overall, how effective is your [unit] at mentoring its junior faculty? (ladder survey only) | All Tenured Faculty | 3.47 | 1.14 | 641 | 6.9\% | 16.8\% | 13.9\% | 47.1\% | 15.3\% | 100\% |
| Overall, how effective is your [unit] at mentoring its junior faculty? (ladder survey only) | Tenured Men | 3.52 | 1.12 | 506 | ${ }^{6.5 \%}$ | 14.8\% | 14.4\% | 49.0\% | 15.2\% | 100\% |
| Overall, how effective is your [unit] at mentoring its junior faculty? (ladder survey only) Overall, how effective is your [unit at mentoring its junior faculty (ladder suvey only) | Tenured Women | 3.30 | 1.23 | 135 | 8.1\% | 24.4\% | 11.9\% | 40.0\% | 15.6\% | 100\% |
| Overall, how effective is your [unit] at mentoring its junior faculty? (ladder survey only) | All Tenure-Track Faculty | 2.82 | 1.39 | 326 | 25.8\% | 18.1\% | 16.0\% | 28.5\% | 11.7\% | 100\% |
| Overall, how effective is your [unit] at mentoring its junior faculty? (ladder survey only) Overall, how effective is your [unit) at mentoring its junior faculty? (ladder suvvey only) | Tenure-Track Men | 2.99 | 1.35 | 203 | 19.7\% | 18.2\% | 18.7\% | 30.0\% | 13.3\% | 100\% |
| Overall, how effective is your [unit] at mentoring its junior faculty? (ladder survey only) | Tenure-Track Women | 2.54 | 1.43 | 123 | 35.8\% | 17.9\% | 11.4\% | 26.0\% | 8.9\% | 100\% |
| Overall, how effective is your [unit] at mentoring its non-tenure track faculty? (non-ladder survey only) | All Non-Ladder Faculty | 2.60 | 1.28 | 288 | 26.4\% | 25.0\% | 17.4\% | 25.0\% | 6.3\% | 100\% |
| Overall, how effective is your [unit] at mentoring its non-tenure track faculty? (non-ladder survey only) | Non-Ladder Men | 2.79 | 1.25 | 179 | 19.0\% | 26.8\% | 17.9\% | 29.1\% | 7.3\% | 100\% |
| Overall, how effective is your [unit] at mentoring its non-tenure track faculty? (non-ladder survey only) | Non-Ladder Women | 2.28 | ${ }^{1.28} 27$ | $0^{109}$ | 38.5\% | 22.0\% | 16.5\% | 18.3\% | 4.6\% | 100\% |


| Mentoring (continued) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| While a faculty member at Harvard University, have you served as a mentor for another faculty member (check all that apply): | Cohort |  |  | Affirmative Responses |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Yes, through a formal program (ladder survey only) | All Ladder Faculty |  |  | 166 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Yes, through a formal program (ladder survey only) | Ladder Men |  |  | 122 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Yes, through a formal program (ladder survey only) | Ladder Women |  |  | 44 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Yes, through a formal program (ladder survey only) | All Tenured Faculty |  |  | 162 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Yes, through a formal program (ladder survey only) | Tenured Men |  |  | 119 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Yes, through a formal program (ladder survey only) | Tenured Women |  |  | 43 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Yes, through a formal program (ladder survey only) | All Tenure-Track Faculty |  |  | 4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Yes, through a formal program (ladder survey only) | Tenure-Track Men |  |  | 3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Yes, through a formal program (ladder survey only) | Tenure-Track Women |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Yes, informally (ladder survey only) | All Ladder Faculty |  |  | 610 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Yes, informally (ladder survey only) | Ladder Men |  |  | 464 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Yes, informally (ladder survey only) | Ladder Women |  |  | 146 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Yes, informally (ladder survey only) | All Tenured Faculty |  |  | 501 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Yes, informally (ladder survey only) | Tenured Men |  |  | 397 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Yes, informally (ladder survey only) | Tenured Women |  |  | 104 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Yes, informally (ladder survey only) | All Tenure-Track Faculty |  |  | 109 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Yes, informally (ladder survey only) | Tenure-Track Men |  |  | 67 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Yes, informally (ladder survey only) | Tenure-Track Women |  |  | 42 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| No (ladder survey only) | All Ladder Faculty |  |  | 280 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| No (ladder survey only) | Ladder Men |  |  | 186 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| No (ladder survey only) | Ladder Women |  |  | 94 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| No (ladder survey only) | All Tenured Faculty |  |  | 66 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| No (ladder survey only) | Tenured Men |  |  | 52 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| No (ladder survey only) | Tenured Women |  |  | 14 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| No (ladder survey only) | All Tenure-Track Faculty |  |  | 214 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| No (ladder survey only) | Tenure-Track Men |  |  | 134 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| No (ladder survey only) | Tenure-Track Women |  |  | 80 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Had Formal Mentoring |  |  |  |  | Yes, one was assigned to me | Yes, one was chosen |  |  |  |  |
| Have you had a formal mentor(s) within your [unit]? (ladder survey only) | All Ladder Faculty |  |  | ${ }_{964}$ | assigned to me | by me | No |  |  | 100\% |
| Have you had a formal mentor(s) within your [unit]? (ladder survey only) | Ladder Men |  |  | 706 | 8.4\% | 10.3\% | 81.3\% |  |  | 100\% |
| Have you had a formal mentor(s) within your [unit]? (ladder survey only) | Ladder Women |  |  | 258 | 16.3\% | 7.4\% | 76.4\% |  |  | 100\% |
| Have you had a formal mentor(s) within your [unit]? (ladder survey only) | All Tenured Faculty |  |  | 636 | 4.1\% | 6.9\% | 89.0\% |  |  | 100\% |
| Have you had a formal mentor(s) within your [unit]? (ladder survey only) | Tenured Men |  |  | 503 | 3.4\% | 7.2\% | 89.5\% |  |  | 100\% |
| Have you had a formal mentors(s) within your [unit]? (ladder survey only) | Tenured Women |  |  | 133 | 6.8\% | 6.0\% | 87.2\% |  |  | 100\% |
| Have you had a formal mentor(s) within your [unit]? (ladder survey only) | All Tenure-Track Faculty |  |  | 328 | 22.9\% | 14.6\% | 62.5\% |  |  | 100\% |
| Have you had a formal mentor(s) within your [unit]? (ladder survey only) | Tenure-Track Men |  |  | 203 | 20.7\% | 18.2\% | 61.1\% |  |  | 100\% |
| Have you had a formal mentor(s) within your [unit]? (ladder survey only) | Tenure-Track Women |  |  | 125 | 26.4\% | 8.8\% | 64.8\% |  |  | 100\% |
| Had Informal Mentoring | Cohort |  |  | Responses | Yes | No |  |  |  | Total |
| While at Harvard University, have you had one or more informal mentors? (ladder survey only) | All Ladder Faculty |  |  | 965 | 62.8\% | 37.2\% |  |  |  | 100\% |
| While at Harvard University, have you had one or more informal mentors? (ladder survey only) | Ladder Men |  |  | 707 | 61.1\% | 38.9\% |  |  |  | 100\% |
| While at Harvard University, have you had one or more informal mentors? (ladder survey only) | Ladder Women |  |  | 258 | 67.4\% | 32.6\% |  |  |  | 100\% |
| While at Harvard University, have you had one or more informal mentors? (ladder survey only) | All Tenured Faculty |  |  | 638 | 53.9\% | 46.1\% |  |  |  | 100\% |
| While at Harvard University, have you had one or more informal mentors? (ladder survey only) | Tenured Men |  |  | 504 | 53.2\% | 46.8\% |  |  |  | 100\% |
| While at Harvard University, have you had one or more informal mentors? (ladder survey only) | Tenured Women |  |  | 134 | 56.7\% | 43.3\% |  |  |  | 100\% |
| While at Harvard University, have you had one or more informal mentors? (ladder survey only) | All Tenure-Track Faculty |  |  | 327 | 80.1\% | 19.9\% |  |  |  | 100\% |
| While at Harvard University, have you had one or more informal mentors? (ladder survey only) | Tenure-Track Men |  |  | 203 | 80.8\% | 19.2\% |  |  |  | 100\% |
| While at Harvard University, have you had one or more informal mentors? (ladder survey only) | Tenure-Track Women |  |  | 124 | 79.0\% | 21.0\% |  |  |  | 100\% |
| Helpfulness of Mentoring: |  |  | Standard |  |  |  | Neither helpful | Somewhat |  |  |
| ( 1 = Very unhelpful, $5=$ Very helpful) | Cohort | Mean | Deviation | Responses | Very unhelpful | Somewhat unhelpful | nor unhelpful | helpful | Very helpful | Total |
| How helpful have you found this formal mentoring? (ladder survey only) | All Ladder Faculty | 3.90 | 1.15 | 192 | 6.3\% | 6.8\% | 14.1\% | 37.0\% | 35.9\% | 100\% |
| How helpful have you found this formal mentoring? (ladder survey only) | Ladder Men | 4.01 | 1.05 | 132 | 3.0\% | 7.6\% | 13.6\% | 37.1\% | 38.6\% | 100\% |
| How helpful have you found this formal mentoring? (ladder survey only) | Ladder Women | 3.65 | 1.33 | 60 | 13.3\% | 5.0\% | 15.0\% | 36.7\% | 30.0\% | 100\% |
| How helpful have you found this formal mentoring? (ladder survey only) | All Tenured Faculty | 4.20 | 1.08 | 69 | 4.3\% | 4.3\% | 10.1\% | 29.0\% | 52.2\% | 100\% |
| How helpful have you found this formal mentoring? (ladder survey only) | Tenured Men | 4.23 | 1.07 | 53 | 3.8\% | 5.7\% | 7.5\% | 30.2\% | 52.8\% | 100\% |
| How helpful have you found this formal mentoring? (ladder survey only) | Tenured Women | 4.13 | 1.15 | 16 | 6.3\% | 0.0\% | 18.8\% | 25.0\% | 50.0\% | 100\% |
| How helpful have you found this formal mentoring? (ladder survey only) | All Tenure-Track Faculty | 3.72 | 1.16 | 123 | 7.3\% | 8.1\% | 16.3\% | 41.5\% | 26.8\% | 100\% |
| How helpful have you found this formal mentoring? (ladder survey only) | Tenure-Track Men | 3.86 | 1.02 | 79 | 2.5\% | 8.9\% | 17.7\% | 41.8\% | 29.1\% | 100\% |
| How helpful have you found this formal mentoring? (ladder survey only) | Tenure-Track Women | 3.48 | 1.36 | 44 | 15.9\% | 6.8\% | 13.6\% | 40.9\% | 22.7\% | 100\% |
| How helpful have you found this informal mentoring? (ladder survey only) | All Ladder Faculty | 4.59 | 0.60 | 606 | 0.5\% | 0.5\% | 1.5\% | 34.5\% | 63.0\% | 100\% |
| How helpful have you found this informal mentoring? (ladder survey only) | Ladder Men | 4.60 | 0.58 | 432 | 0.2\% | 0.5\% | 1.9\% | 34.3\% | 63.2\% | 100\% |
| How helpful have you found this informal mentoring? (ladder survey only) | Ladder Women | 4.57 | 0.66 | 174 | 1.1\% | 0.6\% | 0.6\% | 35.1\% | 62.6\% | 100\% |
| How helpful have you found this informal mentoring? (ladder survey only) | All Tenured Faculty | 4.67 | 0.52 | 344 | 0.3\% | 0.0\% | 0.6\% | 30.2\% | 68.9\% | 100\% |
| How helpful have you found this informal mentoring? (ladder survey only) | Tenured Men | 4.66 | 0.53 | 268 | 0.4\% | 0.0\% | 0.4\% | 31.3\% | 67.9\% | 100\% |
| How helpful have you found this informal mentoring? (ladder survey only) | Tenured Women | 4.71 | 0.48 | 76 | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 1.3\% | 26.3\% | 72.4\% | 100\% |
| How helpful have you found this informal mentoring? (ladder survey only) | All Tenure-Track Faculty | 4.48 | 0.68 | 262 | 0.8\% | 1.1\% | 2.7\% | 40.1\% | 55.3\% | 100\% |
| How helpful have you found this informal mentoring? (ladder survey only) | Tenure-Track Men | 4.49 | 0.64 | 164 | 0.0\% | 1.2\% | 4.3\% | 39.0\% | 55.5\% | 100\% |
| How helpful have you found this informal mentoring? (ladder survey only) | Tenure-Track Women | 4.47 | 0.75 | 98 | 2.0\% | 1.0\% | 0.0\% | 41.8\% | 55.1\% | 100\% |


| Mentoring (continued) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| While at Harvard University, do you feel as though you have received adequate mentoring regarding the following areas: |  |  | Standard |  |  |  | Mostly |  | More than |  |
| ( $1=$ Inadequate, $5=$ More than adequate) | Cohort | Mean | Deviation | Responses | Inadequate | Barely adequate | adequate | Adequate | adequate | Total |
| Your career (non-ladder survey only) | All Non-Ladder Faculty | 2.33 | 1.28 | 244 | 34.8\% | 27.5\% | 13.1\% | 19.3\% | 5.3\% | 100\% |
| Your career (non-ladder survey only) | Non-Ladder Men | 2.53 | 1.33 | 146 | 28.1\% | 30.1\% | 11.0\% | 22.6\% | 8.2\% | 100\% |
| Your career (non-ladder survey only) | Non-Ladder Women | 2.03 | 1.13 | 98 | 44.9\% | 23.5\% | 16.3\% | 14.3\% | 1.0\% | 100\% |
| Distribution of time among work-related activities (ladder survey only) | All Ladder Faculty | 2.64 | 1.28 | 569 | 26.4\% | 21.4\% | 19.9\% | 26.5\% | 5.8\% | 100\% |
| Distribution of time among work-related activities (ladder survey only) | Ladder Men | 2.77 | 1.29 | 399 | 23.8\% | 19.5\% | 19.3\% | 30.6\% | 6.8\% | 100\% |
| Distribution of time among work-related activities (ladder survey only) | Ladder Women | 2.34 | 1.20 | 170 | 32.4\% | 25.9\% | 21.2\% | 17.1\% | 3.5\% | 100\% |
| Distribution of time among work-related activities (ladder survey only) | All Tenured Faculty | 2.77 | 1.31 | 335 | 24.2\% | 19.7\% | 18.8\% | 29.9\% | 7.5\% | 100\% |
| Distribution of time among work-related activities (ladder survey only) | Tenured Men | 2.89 | 1.31 | 256 | 21.5\% | 18.4\% | 18.4\% | 33.2\% | 8.6\% | 100\% |
| Distribution of time among work-related activities (ladder survey only) | Tenured Women | 2.37 | 1.23 | 79 | 32.9\% | 24.1\% | 20.3\% | 19.0\% | 3.8\% | 100\% |
| Distribution of time among work-related activities (ladder survey only) | All Tenure-Track Faculty | 2.46 | 1.22 | 234 | 29.5\% | 23.9\% | 21.4\% | 21.8\% | 3.4\% | 100\% |
| Distribution of time among work-related activities (ladder survey only) | Tenure-Track Men | 2.55 | 1.24 | 143 | 28.0\% | 21.7\% | 21.0\% | 25.9\% | 3.5\% | 100\% |
| Distribution of time among work-related activities (ladder survey only) | Tenure-Track Women | 2.31 | 1.17 | 91 | 31.9\% | 27.5\% | 22.0\% | 15.4\% | 3.3\% | 100\% |
| Securing funds for research/course development (ladder survey only) | All Ladder Faculty | 2.64 | 1.27 | 587 | 26.1\% | 21.3\% | 21.1\% | 26.1\% | 5.5\% | 100\% |
| Securing funds for research/course development (ladder survey only) | Ladder Men | 2.71 | 1.26 | 413 | 23.7\% | 21.3\% | 21.3\% | 27.8\% | 5.8\% | 100\% |
| Securing funds for research/course development (ladder survey only) | Ladder Women | 2.47 | 1.27 | 174 | 31.6\% | 21.3\% | 20.7\% | 21.8\% | 4.6\% | 100\% |
| Securing funds for research/course development (ladder survey only) | All Tenured Faculty | 2.75 | 1.29 | 348 | 23.9\% | 20.1\% | 19.8\% | 29.3\% | 6.9\% | 100\% |
| Securing funds for research/course development (ladder survey only) | Tenured Men | 2.84 | 1.27 | 265 | 21.1\% | 19.6\% | 20.4\% | 32.1\% | 6.8\% | 100\% |
| Securing funds for research/course development (ladder survey only) | Tenured Women | 2.48 | 1.33 | 83 | 32.5\% | 21.7\% | 18.1\% | 20.5\% | 7.2\% | 100\% |
| Securing funds for research/course development (ladder survey only) | All Tenure-Track Faculty | 2.46 | 1.21 | 239 | 29.3\% | 23.0\% | 23.0\% | 21.3\% | 3.3\% | 100\% |
| Securing funds for research/course development (ladder survey only) | Tenure-Track Men | 2.47 | 1.21 | 148 | 28.4\% | 24.3\% | 23.0\% | 20.3\% | 4.1\% | 100\% |
| Securing funds for research/course development (ladder survey only) | Tenure-Track Women | 2.45 | 1.21 | 91 | 30.8\% | 20.9\% | 23.1\% | 23.1\% | 2.2\% | 100\% |
| Publishing scholarly work (ladder survey only) | All Ladder Faculty | 3.03 | 1.26 | 747 | 16.6\% | 17.1\% | 23.6\% | 31.7\% | 11.0\% | 100\% |
| Publishing scholarly work (ladder survey only) | Ladder Men | 3.18 | 1.22 | 533 | 12.9\% | 15.6\% | 24.4\% | 35.1\% | 12.0\% | 100\% |
| Publishing scholarly work (ladder survey only) | Ladder Women | 2.68 | 1.31 | 214 | 25.7\% | 21.0\% | 21.5\% | 23.4\% | 8.4\% | 100\% |
| Publishing scholarly work (ladder survey only) | All Tenured Faculty | 3.25 | 1.21 | 411 | 12.9\% | 11.9\% | 25.3\% | 36.7\% | 13.1\% | 100\% |
| Publishing scholarly work (ladder survey only) | Tenured Men | 3.33 | 1.18 | 319 | 11.0\% | 11.6\% | 24.8\% | 38.9\% | 13.8\% | 100\% |
| Publishing scholarly work (ladder survey only) | Tenured Women | 2.99 | 1.29 | 92 | 19.6\% | 13.0\% | 27.2\% | 29.3\% | 10.9\% | 100\% |
| Publishing scholarly work (ladder survey only) | All Tenure-Track Faculty | 2.73 | 1.28 | 313 | 22.4\% | 24.0\% | 20.1\% | 25.9\% | 7.7\% | 100\% |
| Publishing scholarly work (ladder survey only) | Tenure-Track Men | 2.92 | 1.25 | 193 | 17.1\% | 21.8\% | 22.3\% | 30.1\% | 8.8\% | 100\% |
| Publishing scholarly work (ladder survey only) | Tenure-Track Women | 2.42 | 1.27 | 120 | 30.8\% | 27.5\% | 16.7\% | 19.2\% | 5.8\% | 100\% |
| While at Harvard University, do you feel as though you have received adequate mentoring |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ( $1=$ Inadequate, 5 = More than adequate) | Cohort | Mean | Deviation | Responses | Inadequate | Barely adequate | adequate | Adequate | adequate | Total |
| Teaching | All Faculty | 3.10 | 1.29 | 1014 | 14.3\% | 20.3\% | 21.9\% | 28.0\% | 15.5\% | 100\% |
| Teaching | All Men | 3.19 | 1.29 | 699 | 12.7\% | 19.3\% | 21.0\% | 29.8\% | 17.2\% | 100\% |
| Teaching | All Women | 2.90 | 1.28 | 315 | 17.8\% | 22.5\% | 23.8\% | 24.1\% | 11.7\% | 100\% |
| Teaching | All Ladder Faculty | 3.13 | 1.26 | 757 | 13.3\% | 18.5\% | 24.0\% | 29.6\% | 14.5\% | 100\% |
| Teaching | Ladder Men | 3.24 | 1.26 | 541 | 12.0\% | 17.2\% | 22.4\% | 32.0\% | 16.5\% | 100\% |
| Teaching | Ladder Women | 2.88 | 1.23 | 216 | 16.7\% | 21.8\% | 28.2\% | 23.6\% | ${ }^{9.7 \%}$ | 100\% |
| Teaching | All Tenured Faculty | 3.20 | 1.23 | 448 | 11.8\% | 17.9\% | 23.4\% | 32.4\% | 14.5\% | 100\% |
| Teaching | Tenured Men | 3.29 | 1.24 | 347 | 11.2\% | 15.6\% | 22.8\% | 33.7\% | 16.7\% | 100\% |
| Teaching | Tenured Women | 2.88 | 1.17 | 101 | 13.9\% | 25.7\% | 25.7\% | 27.7\% | 6.9\% | 100\% |
| Teaching | All Tenure-Track Faculty | 3.04 | 1.29 | 309 | 15.5\% | 19.4\% | 24.9\% | 25.6\% | 14.6\% | 100\% |
| Teaching | Tenure-Track Men | 3.14 | 1.29 | 194 | 13.4\% | 20.1\% | 21.6\% | 28.9\% | 16.0\% | 100\% |
| Teaching | Tenure-Track Women | 2.88 | 1.28 | 115 | 19.1\% | 18.3\% | 30.4\% | 20.0\% | 12.2\% | 100\% |
| Teaching | All Non-Ladder Faculty | 3.00 | 1.38 | 257 | 17.1\% | 25.7\% | 15.6\% | 23.3\% | 18.3\% | 100\% |
| Teaching | Non-Ladder Men | 3.04 | 1.37 | 158 | 15.2\% | 26.6\% | 16.5\% | 22.2\% | 19.6\% | 100\% |
| Teaching | Non-Ladder Women | 2.93 | 1.40 | 99 | 20.2\% | 24.2\% | 14.1\% | 25.3\% | 16.2\% | 100\% |
| Advising Research Assistants (ladder survey only) | All Ladder Faculty | 2.70 | 1.20 | 560 | 22.0\% | 21.4\% | 25.7\% | 26.4\% | 4.5\% | 100\% |
| Advising Research Assistants (ladder survey only) | Ladder Men | 2.81 | 1.21 | 398 | 19.1\% | 20.9\% | 25.6\% | 28.6\% | 5.8\% | 100\% |
| Advising Research Assistants (ladder survey only) | Ladder Women | 2.43 | 1.15 | 162 | 29.0\% | 22.8\% | 25.9\% | 21.0\% | 1.2\% | 100\% |
| Advising Research Assistants (ladder survey only) | All Tenured Faculty | 2.91 | 1.19 | 334 | 16.8\% | 19.2\% | 27.2\% | 30.2\% | 6.6\% | 100\% |
| Advising Research Assistants (ladder survey only) | Tenured Men | 2.97 | 1.20 | 258 | 15.9\% | 17.8\% | 27.1\% | 31.4\% | 7.8\% | 100\% |
| Advising Research Assistants (ladder survey only) | Tenured Women | 2.68 | 1.15 | 76 | 19.7\% | 23.7\% | 27.6\% | 26.3\% | 2.6\% | 100\% |
| Advising Research Assistants (ladder survey only) | All Tenure-Track Faculty | 2.39 | 1.15 | 226 | 29.6\% | 24.8\% | 23.5\% | 20.8\% | 1.3\% | 100\% |
| Advising Research Assistants (ladder survey only) | Tenure-Track Men | 2.51 | 1.17 | 140 | 25.0\% | 26.4\% | 22.9\% | 23.6\% | 2.1\% | 100\% |
| Advising Research Assistants (ladder survey only) | Tenure-Track Women | 2.20 | 1.11 | 86 | 37.2\% | 22.1\% | 24.4\% | 16.3\% | 0.0\% | 100\% |
| Requirements for promotion and tenure (ladder survey only) | All Ladder Faculty | 3.11 | 1.30 | 673 | 16.9\% | 15.5\% | 20.8\% | 33.6\% | 13.2\% | 100\% |
| Requirements for promotion and tenure (ladder survey only) | Ladder Men | 3.24 | 1.26 | 482 | 14.3\% | 12.4\% | 22.6\% | 36.1\% | 14.5\% | 100\% |
| Requirements for promotion and tenure (ladder survey only) | Ladder Women | 2.77 | 1.34 | 191 | 23.6\% | 23.0\% | 16.2\% | 27.2\% | 9.9\% | 100\% |
| Requirements for promotion and tenure (ladder survey only) | All Tenured Faculty | 3.44 | 1.17 | 358 | 9.5\% | 11.5\% | 20.9\% | 41.9\% | 16.2\% | 100\% |
| Requirements for promotion and tenure (ladder survey only) | Tenured Men | 3.47 | 1.16 | 288 | 9.0\% | 10.8\% | 21.2\% | 42.4\% | 16.7\% | 100\% |
| Requirements for promotion and tenure (ladder survey only) | Tenured Women | 3.31 | 1.22 | 70 | 11.4\% | 14.3\% | 20.0\% | 40.0\% | 14.3\% | 100\% |
| Requirements for promotion and tenure (ladder survey only) | All Tenure-Track Faculty | 2.73 | 1.34 | 315 | 25.4\% | 20.0\% | 20.6\% | 24.1\% | 9.8\% | 100\% |
| Requirements for promotion and tenure (ladder survey only) | Tenure-Track Men | 2.90 | 1.33 | 194 | 22.2\% | 14.9\% | 24.7\% | 26.8\% | 11.3\% | 100\% |
| Requirements for promotion and tenure (ladder survey only) | Tenure-Track Women | 2.45 | 1.31 | 121 | 30.6\% | 28.1\% | 14.0\% | 19.8\% | 7.4\% | 100\% |


| Mentoring (continued) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| While at Harvard University, do you feel as though you have received adequate mentoring regarding the following areas: |  |  | Standard |  |  |  | Mostly |  | More than |  |
| ( $1=$ Inadequate, $5=$ More than adequate) | Cohort | Mean | Deviation | Responses | Inadequate | Barely adequate | adequate | Adequate | adequate | Total |
| Negotiating office politics | All Faculty | 2.59 | 1.30 | 907 | 29.0\% | 19.7\% | 21.1\% | 23.6\% | 6.6\% | 100\% |
| Negotiating office politics | All Men | 2.77 | 1.28 | 605 | 23.0\% | 19.3\% | 23.0\% | 26.8\% | 7.9\% | 100\% |
| Negotiating office politics | All Women | 2.23 | 1.26 | 302 | 41.1\% | 20.5\% | 17.2\% | 17.2\% | 4.0\% | 100\% |
| Negotiating office politics | All Ladder Faculty | 2.70 | 1.31 | 678 | 26.8\% | 17.8\% | 21.7\% | 26.1\% | 7.5\% | 100\% |
| Negotiating office politics | Ladder Men | 2.86 | 1.29 | 469 | 21.7\% | 17.3\% | 23.0\% | 29.4\% | 8.5\% | 100\% |
| Negotiating office politics | Ladder Women | 2.33 | 1.30 | 209 | 38.3\% | 19.1\% | 18.7\% | 18.7\% | 5.3\% | 100\% |
| Negotiating office politics | All Tenured Faculty | 2.88 | 1.27 | 403 | 20.1\% | 18.4\% | 22.6\% | 31.0\% | 7.9\% | 100\% |
| Negotiating office politics | Tenured Men | 2.99 | 1.25 | 304 | 17.4\% | 17.4\% | 23.0\% | 33.2\% | 8.9\% | 100\% |
| Negotiating office politics | Tenured Women | 2.57 | 1.27 | 99 | 28.3\% | 21.2\% | 21.2\% | 24.2\% | 5.1\% | 100\% |
| Negotiating office politics | All Tenure-Track Faculty | 2.42 | 1.33 | 275 | 36.7\% | 17.1\% | 20.4\% | 18.9\% | 6.9\% | 100\% |
| Negotiating office politics | Tenure-Track Men | 2.62 | 1.33 | 165 | 29.7\% | 17.0\% | 23.0\% | 22.4\% | 7.9\% | 100\% |
| Negotiating office politics | Tenure-Track Women | 2.13 | 1.29 | 110 | 47.3\% | 17.3\% | 16.4\% | 13.6\% | 5.5\% | 100\% |
| Negotiating office politics | All Non-Ladder Faculty | 2.28 | 1.21 | 229 | 35.4\% | 25.3\% | 19.2\% | 16.2\% | 3.9\% | 100\% |
| Negotiating office politics | Non-Ladder Men | 2.49 | 1.23 | 136 | 27.2\% | 26.5\% | 22.8\% | 17.6\% | 5.9\% | 100\% |
| Negotiating office politics | Non-Ladder Women | 1.98 | 1.13 | 93 | 47.3\% | 23.7\% | 14.0\% | 14.0\% | 1.1\% | 100\% |
| Work-life balance | All Faculty | 2.34 | 1.20 | 903 | 33.3\% | 23.5\% | 22.5\% | 17.4\% | 3.3\% | 100\% |
| Work-life balance | All Men | 2.51 | 1.21 | 607 | 27.3\% | 22.7\% | 25.2\% | 20.6\% | 4.1\% | 100\% |
| Work-life balance | All Women | 1.98 | 1.10 | 296 | 45.6\% | 25.0\% | 16.9\% | 10.8\% | 1.7\% | 100\% |
| Work-life balance | All Ladder Faculty | 2.37 | 1.21 | 684 | 32.3\% | 23.4\% | 22.5\% | 18.1\% | 3.7\% | 100\% |
| Work-life balance | Ladder Men | 2.53 | 1.22 | 472 | 27.5\% | 22.2\% | 24.6\% | 21.2\% | 4.4\% | 100\% |
| Work-life balance | Ladder Women | 2.03 | 1.11 | 212 | 42.9\% | 25.9\% | 17.9\% | 11.3\% | 1.9\% | 100\% |
| Work-life balance | All Tenured Faculty | 2.48 | 1.21 | 398 | 28.1\% | 23.9\% | 23.4\% | 20.6\% | 4.0\% | 100\% |
| Work-life balance | Tenured Men | 2.60 | 1.22 | 302 | 25.5\% | 21.2\% | 25.8\% | 22.8\% | 4.6\% | 100\% |
| Work-life balance | Tenured Women | 2.13 | 1.12 | 96 | 36.5\% | 32.3\% | 15.6\% | 13.5\% | 2.1\% | 100\% |
| Work-life balance | All Tenure-Track Faculty | 2.22 | 1.19 | 286 | 38.1\% | 22.7\% | 21.3\% | 14.7\% | 3.1\% | 100\% |
| Work-life balance | Tenure-Track Men | 2.40 | 1.22 | 170 | 31.2\% | 24.1\% | 22.4\% | 18.2\% | 4.1\% | 100\% |
| Work-life balance | Tenure-Track Women | 1.96 | 1.11 | 116 | 48.3\% | 20.7\% | 19.8\% | 9.5\% | 1.7\% | 100\% |
| Work-life balance | All Non-Ladder Faculty | 2.23 | 1.16 | 219 | 36.5\% | 23.7\% | 22.4\% | 15.1\% | 2.3\% | 100\% |
| Work-life balance | Non-Ladder Men | 2.47 | 1.16 | 135 | 26.7\% | 24.4\% | 27.4\% | 18.5\% | 3.0\% | 100\% |
| Work-life balance | Non-Ladder Women | 1.85 | 1.07 | 84 | 52.4\% | 22.6\% | 14.3\% | 9.5\% | 1.2\% | 100\% |
| Running a lab or research group (ladder survey only) | All Ladder Faculty | 2.50 | 1.16 | 359 | 26.7\% | 22.6\% | 26.7\% | 22.0\% | 1.9\% | 100\% |
| Running a lab or research group (ladder survey only) | Ladder Men | 2.58 | 1.15 | 274 | 24.1\% | 21.9\% | 28.1\% | 24.1\% | 1.8\% | 100\% |
| Running a lab or research group (ladder survey only) | Ladder Women | 2.25 | 1.16 | 85 | 35.3\% | 24.7\% | 22.4\% | 15.3\% | 2.4\% | 100\% |
| Running a lab or research group (ladder survey only) | All Tenured Faculty | 2.65 | 1.16 | 216 | 22.7\% | 19.9\% | 29.2\% | 25.9\% | 2.3\% | 100\% |
| Running a lab or research group (ladder survey only) | Tenured Men | 2.71 | 1.16 | 176 | 21.6\% | 18.2\% | 30.1\% | 27.8\% | 2.3\% | 100\% |
| Running a lab or research group (ladder survey only) | Tenured Women | 2.40 | 1.15 | 40 | 27.5\% | 27.5\% | 25.0\% | 17.5\% | 2.5\% | 100\% |
| Running a lab or research group (ladder survey only) | All Tenure-Track Faculty | 2.27 | 1.13 | 143 | 32.9\% | 26.6\% | 23.1\% | 16.1\% | 1.4\% | 100\% |
| Running a lab or research group (ladder survey only) | Tenure-Track Men | 2.34 | 1.10 | 98 | 28.6\% | 28.6\% | 24.5\% | 17.3\% | 1.0\% | 100\% |
| Running a lab or research group (ladder survey only) | Tenure-Track Women | 2.11 | 1.17 | 45 | 42.2\% | 22.2\% | 20.0\% | 13.3\% | 2.2\% | 100\% |
| Overall | All Faculty | 2.87 | 1.19 | 1015 | 16.3\% | 22.7\% | 26.1\% | 28.3\% | 6.7\% | 100\% |
| Overall | All Men | 3.04 | 1.15 | 701 | 11.7\% | 21.3\% | 26.1\% | 32.8\% | 8.1\% | 100\% |
| Overall | All Women | 2.46 | 1.16 | 314 | 26.4\% | 25.8\% | 26.1\% | 18.2\% | 3.5\% | 100\% |
| Overall | All Ladder Faculty | 2.96 | 1.17 | 756 | 14.4\% | 20.8\% | 26.9\% | 30.8\% | 7.1\% | 100\% |
| Overall | Ladder Men | 3.10 | 1.15 | 541 | 11.3\% | 19.0\% | 26.2\% | 35.3\% | 8.1\% | 100\% |
| Overall | Ladder Women | 2.59 | 1.17 | 215 | 22.3\% | 25.1\% | 28.4\% | 19.5\% | 4.7\% | 100\% |
| Overall | All Tenured Faculty | 3.14 | 1.12 | 445 | 10.1\% | 18.0\% | 28.1\% | 35.5\% | 8.3\% | 100\% |
| Overall | Tenured Men | 3.22 | 1.11 | 348 | 8.9\% | 17.0\% | 26.4\% | 38.8\% | 8.9\% | 100\% |
| Overall | Tenured Women | 2.86 | 1.13 | 97 | 14.4\% | 21.6\% | 34.0\% | 23.7\% | ${ }^{6.2 \%}$ | 100\% |
| Overall | All Tenure-Track Faculty | 2.69 | 1.20 | 311 | 20.6\% | 24.8\% | 25.1\% | 24.1\% | 5.5\% | 100\% |
| Overall | Tenure-Track Men | 2.89 | 1.18 | 193 | 15.5\% | 22.8\% | 25.9\% | 29.0\% | 6.7\% | 100\% |
| Overall | Tenure-Track Women | 2.37 | 1.16 | 118 | 28.8\% | 28.0\% | 23.7\% | 16.1\% | 3.4\% | 100\% |
| Overall | All Non-Ladder Faculty | 2.60 | 1.19 | 259 | 21.6\% | 28.2\% | 23.9\% | 20.8\% | 5.4\% | 100\% |
| Overall | Non-Ladder Men | 2.86 | 1.17 | 160 | 13.1\% | 28.8\% | 25.6\% | 24.4\% | 8.1\% | 100\% |
| Overall | Non-Ladder Women | 2.19 | 1.11 | 99 | 35.4\% | 27.3\% | 21.2\% | 15.2\% | 1.0\% | 100\% |

Promotion / Tenure

| To what extent do you agree ... ( 1 = Strongly disagree, 5 = Strongly agree) | Cohort | Mean | Standard Deviation | Responses | Strongly disagree | Somewhat disagree | Neither agree nor disagree | Somewhat agree | Strongly agree | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| that the criteria for tenure are clearly communicated? (ladder survey only) | All Ladder Faculty | 3.35 | 1.34 | 930 | 14.5\% | 14.8\% | 12.2\% | 38.6\% | 19.9\% | 100\% |
| that the criteria for tenure are clearly communicated? (ladder survey only) | Ladder Men | 3.49 | 1.29 | 678 | 12.4\% | 11.9\% | 11.8\% | 42.5\% | 21.4\% | 100\% |
| that the criteria for tenure are clearly communicated? (ladder survey only) | Ladder Women | 2.97 | 1.40 | 252 | 20.2\% | 22.6\% | 13.1\% | 28.2\% | 15.9\% | 100\% |
| that the criteria for tenure are clearly communicated? (ladder survey only) | All Tenured Faculty | 3.66 | 1.19 | 618 | 7.0\% | 13.1\% | 11.7\% | 43.2\% | 25.1\% | 100\% |
| that the criteria for tenure are clearly communicated? (ladder survey only) | Tenured Men | 3.75 | 1.14 | 485 | 6.2\% | 10.9\% | 10.9\% | 45.8\% | 26.2\% | 100\% |
| that the criteria for tenure are clearly communicated? (ladder survey only) | Tenured Women | 3.35 | 1.29 | 133 | 9.8\% | 21.1\% | 14.3\% | 33.8\% | 21.1\% | 100\% |
| that the criteria for tenure are clearly communicated? (ladder survey only) | All Tenure-Track Faculty | 2.71 | 1.40 | 312 | 29.5\% | 18.3\% | 13.1\% | 29.5\% | 9.6\% | 100\% |
| that the criteria for tenure are clearly communicated? (ladder survey only) | Tenure-Track Men | 2.82 | 1.40 | 193 | 28.0\% | 14.5\% | 14.0\% | 34.2\% | 9.3\% | 100\% |
| that the criteria for tenure are clearly communicated? (ladder survey only) that junior faculty in your (unit) receive clear feedback on their likelihood of getting tenure? (ladder | Tenure-Track Women | 2.54 | 1.39 | 119 | 31.9\% | 24.4\% | 11.8\% | 21.8\% | 10.1\% | 100\% |
| survey only) <br> that junior faculty in your [unit] receive clear feedback on their likelihood of getting tenure? (ladder | Ladder Men | 3.47 | 1.20 | 696 | 9.1\% | 12.6\% | 20.0\% | 38.6\% | 19.7\% | 100\% |
| survey only) <br> that junior faculty in your [unit] receive clear feedback on their likelihood of getting tenure? (ladder | Ladder Women | 2.93 | 1.36 | 256 | 20.3\% | 21.1\% | 17.6\% | 27.3\% | 13.7\% | 100\% |
| survey only) <br> that junior faculty in your [unit] receive clear feedback on their likelihood of getting tenure? (ladder | All Tenured Faculty | 3.68 | 1.12 | 631 | 5.5\% | 11.6\% | 15.8\% | 42.9\% | 24.1\% | 100\% |
| survey only) <br> that junior faculty in your [unit] receive clear feedback on their likelihood of getting tenure? (ladder | Tenured Men | 3.75 | 1.08 | 497 | 4.4\% | 10.5\% | 15.9\% | 44.1\% | 25.2\% | 100\% |
| survey only) <br> that junior faculty in your [unit] receive clear feedback on their likelihood of getting tenure? (ladder | Tenured Women | 3.44 | 1.25 | 134 | 9.7\% | 15.7\% | 15.7\% | 38.8\% | 20.1\% | 100\% |
| survey only) <br> that junior faculty in your [unit] receive clear feedback on their likelihood of getting tenure? (ladder | All Tenure-Track Faculty | 2.62 | 1.24 | 321 | 24.9\% | 21.5\% | 26.2\% | 21.2\% | 6.2\% | 100\% |
| survey only) <br> that junior faculty in your [unit] receive clear feedback on their likelihood of getting tenure? (ladder | Tenure-Track Men | 2.78 | 1.21 | 199 | 20.6\% | 18.1\% | 30.2\% | 25.1\% | 6.0\% | 100\% |
| survey only) <br> that junior faculty in your [unit] receive clear advice on how to use your school as a stepping stone for | Tenure-Track Women | 2.37 | 1.25 | 122 | 32.0\% | 27.0\% | 19.7\% | 14.8\% | 6.6\% | 100\% |
| future job opportunities? (ladder survey only) <br> that junior faculty in your [unit] receive clear advice on how to use your school as a stepping stone for | All Ladder Faculty | 2.95 | 1.24 | 897 | 17.6\% | 17.4\% | 27.1\% | 28.7\% | 9.3\% | 100\% |
| future job opportunities? (ladder survey only) <br> that junior faculty in your [unit] receive clear advice on how to use your school as a stepping stone for | Ladder Men | 3.09 | 1.19 | 653 | 13.5\% | 16.1\% | 29.1\% | 30.8\% | 10.6\% | 100\% |
| future job opportunities? (ladder survey only) <br> that junior faculty in your [unit] receive clear advice on how to use your school as a stepping stone for | Ladder Women | 2.56 | 1.28 | 244 | 28.7\% | 20.9\% | 21.7\% | 23.0\% | 5.7\% | 100\% |
| future job opportunities? (ladder survey only) <br> that junior faculty in your [unit] receive clear advice on how to use your school as a stepping stone for | All Tenured Faculty | 3.35 | 1.09 | 578 | 6.7\% | 14.7\% | 27.7\% | 38.1\% | 12.8\% | 100\% |
| future job opportunities? (ladder survey only) that junior faculty in your [unit] receive clear advice on how to use your school as a stepping stone for | Tenured Men | 3.41 | 1.06 | 456 | 5.7\% | 13.4\% | 28.7\% | 38.4\% | 13.8\% | 100\% |
| future job opportunities? (ladder survey only) <br> that junior faculty in your [unit] receive clear advice on how to use your school as a stepping stone for | Tenured Women | 3.14 | 1.16 | 122 | 10.7\% | 19.7\% | 23.8\% | 36.9\% | 9.0\% | 100\% |
| future job opportunities? (ladder survey only) that junior faculty in your [unit] receive clear advice on how to use your school as a stepping stone for | All Tenure-Track Faculty | 2.20 | 1.15 | 319 | 37.3\% | 22.3\% | 26.0\% | 11.6\% | 2.8\% | 100\% |
| future job opportunities? (ladder survey only) that junior faculty in your [unit] receive clear advice on how to use your school as a stepping stone for | Tenure-Track Men | 2.34 | 1.14 | 197 | 31.5\% | 22.3\% | 29.9\% | 13.2\% | 3.0\% | 100\% |
| future job opportunities? (ladder survey only) that non-tenure track faculty in your [unit] receive clear advice on how to use Harvard University as a | Tenure-Track Women | 1.98 | 1.12 | 122 | 46.7\% | 22.1\% | 19.7\% | 9.0\% | 2.5\% | 100\% |
| stepping stone for future job opportunities? (non-ladder survey only) that non-tenure track faculty in your [unit] receive clear advice on how to use Harvard University as a | All Non-Ladder Faculty | 2.34 | 1.10 | 279 | 29.4\% | 24.7\% | 30.8\% | 12.9\% | 2.2\% | 100\% |
| stepping stone for future job opportunities? (non-ladder survey only) that non-tenure track faculty in your [unit] receive clear advice on how to use Harvard University as a | Non-Ladder Men | 2.51 | 1.13 | 172 | 25.0\% | 21.5\% | 34.9\% | 15.1\% | 3.5\% | 100\% |
| stepping stone for future job opportunities? (non-ladder survey only) | Non-Ladder Women | 2.07 | 0.99 | 107 | 36.4\% | 29.9\% | 24.3\% | 9.3\% | 0.0\% | 100\% |
| In your experience, to what extent are the following items valued in the tenure process at your School: |  |  | Standard |  | Valued slightly or |  |  |  |  |  |
| ( $1=$ Valued slightly or not at all, $3=$ Highly valued) | Cohort | Mean | Deviation | Responses | not at all | Somewhat valued | Highly valued |  |  | Total |
| Research/scholarly work (ladder survey only) | All Ladder Faculty | 2.93 | 0.30 | 931 | 1.0\% | 5.4\% | 93.7\% |  |  | 100\% |
| Research/scholarly work (ladder survey only) | Ladder Men | 2.93 | 0.30 | 683 | 1.0\% | 5.3\% | 93.7\% |  |  | 100\% |
| Research/scholarly work (ladder survey only) | Ladder Women | 2.93 | 0.29 | 248 | 0.8\% | 5.6\% | 93.5\% |  |  | 100\% |
| Research/scholarly work (ladder survey only) | All Tenured Faculty | 2.94 | 0.25 | 635 | 0.6\% | 4.3\% | 95.1\% |  |  | 100\% |
| Research/scholarly work (ladder survey only) | Tenured Men | 2.94 | 0.25 | 501 | 0.6\% | 4.4\% | 95.0\% |  |  | 100\% |
| Research/scholarly work (ladder survey only) | Tenured Women | 2.95 | 0.25 | 134 | 0.7\% | 3.7\% | 95.5\% |  |  | 100\% |
| Research/scholarly work (ladder survey only) | All Tenure-Track Faculty | 2.89 | 0.37 0.39 | 296 | 1.7\% | 7.8\% | 90.5\% |  |  | 100\% |
| Research/scholarly work (ladder survey only) | Tenure-Track Men | 2.88 | 0.39 | 182 | 2.2\% | 7.7\% | 90.1\% |  |  | 100\% |
| Research/scholarly work (ladder survey only) | Tenure-Track Women | 2.90 | ${ }^{0.33}$ | 114 | 0.9\% | 7.9\% | 91.2\% |  |  | 100\% |
| Teaching contributions (ladder survey only) | All Ladder Faculty | 1.93 | 0.68 | 915 | 27.0\% | 52.8\% | 20.2\% |  |  | 100\% |
| Teaching contributions (ladder survey only) | Ladder Men | 1.95 | 0.68 | 672 | 25.9\% | 53.0\% | 21.1\% |  |  | 100\% |
| Teaching contributions (ladder survey only) | Ladder Women | 1.88 | 0.68 | 243 | 30.0\% | 52.3\% | 17.7\% |  |  | 100\% |
| Teaching contributions (ladder survey only) | All Tenured Faculty | 2.02 | 0.64 | 634 | 19.7\% | 58.7\% | 21.6\% |  |  | 100\% |
| Teaching contributions (ladder survey only) Teaching contributions (ladder survey only) | Tenured Men Tenured Women | 2.01 2.04 | 0.65 0.61 | 500 134 | 20.6\% $16.4 \%$ | $57.6 \%$ $62.7 \%$ | 21.8\% |  |  | $100 \%$ $100 \%$ |
| Teaching contributions (ladder survey only) | All Tenure-Track Faculty | 1.74 | 0.73 | 281 | 43.4\% | 39.5\% | 17.1\% |  |  | 100\% |
| Teaching contributions (ladder survey only) | Tenure-Track Men | 1.78 | 0.75 | 172 | 41.3\% | 39.5\% | 19.2\% |  |  | 100\% |
| Teaching contributions (ladder survey only) | Tenure-Track Women | 1.67 | 0.71 | 109 | 46.8\% | 39.4\% | 13.8\% |  |  | 100\% |


| Promotion / Tenure (continued) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| In your experience, to what extent are the following items valued in the tenure process at yourSchool: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ( $1=$ Valued slightly or not at all, 3 = Highly valued) | Cohort | Mean | Deviation | Responses | not at all | Somewhat valued | Highly valued |  |  | Total |
| Service (ladder survey only) | All Ladder Faculty | 1.65 | 0.64 | 877 | 43.7\% | 47.5\% | 8.8\% |  |  | 100\% |
| Service (ladder survey only) | Ladder Men | 1.67 | 0.63 | 646 | 41.5\% | 49.8\% | 8.7\% |  |  | 100\% |
| Service (ladder survey only) | Ladder Women | 1.59 | 0.65 | 231 | 49.8\% | 41.1\% | 9.1\% |  |  | 100\% |
| Service (ladder survey only) | All Tenured Faculty | 1.70 | 0.63 | 621 | 39.6\% | 51.0\% | 9.3\% |  |  | 100\% |
| Service (ladder survey only) | Tenured Men | 1.70 | 0.63 | 489 | 39.1\% | 51.5\% | 9.4\% |  |  | 100\% |
| Service (ladder survey only) | Tenured Women | 1.67 | 0.64 | 132 | 41.7\% | 49.2\% | 9.1\% |  |  | 100\% |
| Service (ladder survey only) | All Tenure-Track Faculty | 1.54 | 0.63 | 256 | 53.5\% | 39.1\% | 7.4\% |  |  | 100\% |
| Service (ladder survey only) | Tenure-Track Men | 1.57 | 0.61 | 157 | 49.0\% | 44.6\% | 6.4\% |  |  | 100\% |
| Service (ladder survey only) | Tenure-Track Women | 1.48 | 0.66 | 99 | 60.6\% | 30.3\% | 9.1\% |  |  | 100\% |
| How appropriately are these items valued in the tenure process at your School: ( $1=$ Very undervalued, $5=$ Very overvalued) | Cohort | Mean | Standard Deviation | Responses | Very undervalued | Somewhat undervalued | Valued appropriately | Somewhat overvalued | Very overvalued | Total |
| Research/scholarly work (ladder survey only) | All Ladder Faculty | 3.18 | 0.69 | 915 | 1.9\% | 5.6\% | 70.7\% | 16.4\% | 5.5\% | 100\% |
| Research/scholarly work (ladder survey only) | Ladder Men | 3.13 | 0.66 | 679 | 2.2\% | 5.4\% | 73.6\% | 14.9\% | 3.8\% | 100\% |
| Research/scholarly work (ladder survey only) | Ladder Women | 3.33 | 0.77 | 236 | 0.8\% | 5.9\% | 62.3\% | 20.8\% | 10.2\% | 100\% |
| Research/scholarly work (ladder survey only) | All Tenured Faculty | 3.14 | 0.61 | 634 | 1.3\% | 5.0\% | 75.7\% | 14.2\% | 3.8\% | 100\% |
| Research/scholarly work (ladder survey only) | Tenured Men | 3.13 | 0.61 | 501 | 1.6\% | 4.8\% | 76.4\% | 13.6\% | 3.6\% | 100\% |
| Research/scholarly work (ladder survey only) | Tenured Women | 3.20 | 0.61 | 133 | 0.0\% | 6.0\% | 72.9\% | 16.5\% | 4.5\% | 100\% |
| Research/scholarly work (ladder survey only) | All Tenure-Track Faculty | 3.27 | 0.84 | 281 | 3.2\% | 6.8\% | 59.4\% | 21.4\% | 9.3\% | 100\% |
| Research/scholarly work (ladder survey only) | Tenure-Track Men | 3.12 | 0.76 | 178 | 3.9\% | 7.3\% | 65.7\% | 18.5\% | 4.5\% | 100\% |
| Research/scholarly work (ladder survey only) | Tenure-Track Women | 3.51 | 0.92 | 103 | 1.9\% | 5.8\% | 48.5\% | 26.2\% | 17.5\% | 100\% |
| Teaching contributions (ladder survey only) | All Ladder Faculty | 2.37 | 0.85 | 904 | 15.5\% | 39.8\% | 37.8\% | 5.6\% | 1.2\% | 100\% |
| Teaching contributions (ladder survey only) | Ladder Men | 2.41 | 0.85 | 667 | 14.2\% | 38.2\% | 40.6\% | 5.7\% | 1.2\% | 100\% |
| Teaching contributions (ladder survey only) | Ladder Women | 2.26 | 0.87 | 237 | 19.0\% | 44.3\% | 30.0\% | 5.5\% | 1.3\% | 100\% |
| Teaching contributions (ladder survey only) | All Tenured Faculty | 2.44 | 0.79 | 631 | 11.6\% | 39.5\% | 43.3\% | 4.8\% | 1.0\% | 100\% |
| Teaching contributions (ladder survey only) | Tenured Men | 2.47 | 0.80 | 497 | 11.1\% | 37.8\% | 44.9\% | 5.0\% | 1.2\% | 100\% |
| Teaching contributions (ladder survey only) | Tenured Women | 2.31 | 0.75 | 134 | 13.4\% | 45.5\% | 37.3\% | 3.7\% | 0.0\% | 100\% |
| Teaching contributions (ladder survey only) | All Tenure-Track Faculty | 2.22 | 0.96 | 273 | 24.5\% | 40.7\% | 25.3\% | 7.7\% | 1.8\% | 100\% |
| Teaching contributions (ladder survey only) | Tenure-Track Men | 2.24 | 0.94 | 170 | 23.5\% | 39.4\% | 28.2\% | 7.6\% | 1.2\% | 100\% |
| Teaching contributions (ladder survey only) | Tenure-Track Women | 2.18 | 1.01 | 103 | 26.2\% | 42.7\% | 20.4\% | 7.8\% | 2.9\% | 100\% |
| Service (ladder survey only) | All Ladder Faculty | 2.52 | 0.85 | 861 | 13.6\% | 29.8\% | 49.6\% | 5.3\% | 1.6\% | 100\% |
| Service (ladder survey only) | Ladder Men | 2.58 | 0.83 | ${ }^{638}$ | 11.8\% | 27.6\% | 53.1\% | 6.0\% | 1.6\% | 100\% |
| Service (ladder survey only) | Ladder Women | 2.33 | 0.88 | ${ }^{223}$ | 18.8\% | 36.3\% | 39.5\% | 3.6\% | 1.8\% | 100\% |
| Service (ladder survey only) | All Tenured Faculty | 2.58 | 0.84 | 614 | 11.4\% | 28.2\% | 53.4\% | 4.9\% | 2.1\% | 100\% |
| Service (ladder survey only) | Tenured Men | 2.64 | 0.81 | 483 | 9.7\% | 26.3\% | 56.3\% | 5.6\% | 2.1\% | 100\% |
| Service (ladder survey only) | Tenured Women | 2.37 | 0.88 | 131 | 17.6\% | 35.1\% | 42.7\% | 2.3\% | 2.3\% | 100\% |
| Service (ladder survey only) | All Tenure-Track Faculty | 2.35 | 0.88 | 247 | 19.0\% | 34.0\% | 40.1\% | 6.5\% | 0.4\% | 100\% |
| Service (ladder survey only) | Tenure-Track Men | 2.39 | 0.86 | 155 | 18.1\% | 31.6\% | 43.2\% | 7.1\% | 0.0\% | 100\% |
| Service (ladder survey only) | Tenure-Track Women | 2.28 | 0.89 | 92 | 20.7\% | 38.0\% | 34.8\% | 5.4\% | 1.1\% | 100\% |
| To what extent are student evaluations of your courses valued in your promotion? ( $1=$ Very undervalued, $5=$ Very overvalued) | Cohort | Mean | Standard Deviation | Responses | Very undervalued | Somewhat undervalued | Valued appropriately | Somewhat |  | Total |
| Student evaluations of courses | All Faculty | 2.84 | 1.05 | ${ }_{6} 673$ | 13.7\% | 16.5\% | 49.3\% | 13.7\% | 6.8\% | 100\% |
| Student evaluations of courses | All Men | 2.88 | 1.02 | 474 | 11.8\% | 16.5\% | 50.6\% | 14.6\% | 6.5\% | 100\% |
| Student evaluations of courses | All Women | 2.74 | 1.12 | 199 | 18.1\% | 16.6\% | 46.2\% | 11.6\% | 7.5\% | 100\% |
| Student evaluations of courses | All Ladder Faculty | 2.80 | 1.03 | 505 | 13.9\% | 17.6\% | 47.7\% | 15.8\% | 5.0\% | 100\% |
| Student evaluations of courses | Ladder Men | 2.87 | 0.99 | 374 | 11.2\% | 17.6\% | 48.9\% | 17.1\% | 5.1\% | 100\% |
| Student evaluations of courses | Ladder Women | 2.61 | 1.09 | 131 | 21.4\% | 17.6\% | 44.3\% | 12.2\% | 4.6\% | 100\% |
| Student evaluations of courses | All Tenured Faculty | 2.93 | 0.93 | 369 | 8.9\% | 15.2\% | 54.5\% | 16.5\% | 4.9\% | 100\% |
| Student evaluations of courses | Tenured Men | 2.99 | 0.91 | 292 | 7.2\% | 15.4\% | 54.1\% | 18.2\% | 5.1\% | 100\% |
| Student evaluations of courses | Tenured Women | 2.73 | 0.98 | 77 | 15.6\% | 14.3\% | 55.8\% | 10.4\% | 3.9\% | 100\% |
| Student evaluations of courses | All Tenure-Track Faculty | 2.46 | 1.18 | 136 | 27.2\% | 24.3\% | 29.4\% | 14.0\% | 5.1\% | 100\% |
| Student evaluations of courses | Tenure-Track Men | 2.46 | 1.16 | 82 | 25.6\% | 25.6\% | 30.5\% | 13.4\% | 4.9\% | 100\% |
| Student evaluations of courses | Tenure-Track Women | 2.44 | 1.22 | 54 | 29.6\% | 22.2\% | 27.8\% | 14.8\% | 5.6\% | 100\% |
| Student evaluations of courses | All Non-Ladder Faculty | 2.93 | 1.11 | 168 | 13.1\% | 13.1\% | 54.2\% | 7.1\% | 12.5\% | 100\% |
| Student evaluations of courses | Non-Ladder Men | 2.89 | 1.10 | 100 | 14.0\% | 12.0\% | 57.0\% | 5.0\% | 12.0\% | 100\% |
| Student evaluations of courses | Non-Ladder Women | 2.99 | 1.13 | 68 | 11.8\% | 14.7\% | 50.0\% | 10.3\% | 13.2\% | 100\% |


| At any time since you started working at Harvard University, have you received relief from teaching or other workload duties for any of the following: | Cohort |  |  | Responses | Yes, within the past year | Yes, more than a year ago, but within the past five years | Yes, more than five years ago | No |  | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Caregiving for a child or parents | All Faculty |  |  | 1223 | 3.3\% | 4.3\% | 2.9\% | 89.6\% |  | 100\% |
| Caregiving for a child or parents | All Men |  |  | 864 | 2.1\% | 2.5\% | 0.9\% | 94.4\% |  | 100\% |
| Caregiving for a child or parents | All Women |  |  | 359 | 6.1\% | 8.4\% | 7.5\% | 78.0\% |  | 100\% |
| Caregiving for a child or parents | All Ladder Faculty |  |  | 937 | 3.7\% | 4.9\% | 2.8\% | 88.6\% |  | 100\% |
| Caregiving for a child or parents | Ladder Men |  |  | 685 | 2.2\% | 3.1\% | 0.7\% | 94.0\% |  | 100\% |
| Caregiving for a child or parents | Ladder Women |  |  | 252 | 7.9\% | 9.9\% | 8.3\% | 73.8\% |  | 100\% |
| Caregiving for a child or parents | All Tenured Faculty |  |  | 622 | 1.1\% | 3.4\% | 3.7\% | 91.8\% |  | 100\% |
| Caregiving for a child or parents | Tenured Men |  |  | 491 | 1.4\% | 3.1\% | 0.6\% | 94.9\% |  | 100\% |
| Caregiving for a child or parents | Tenured Women |  |  | 131 | 0.0\% | 4.6\% | 15.3\% | 80.2\% |  | 100\% |
| Caregiving for a child or parents | All Tenure-Track Faculty |  |  | 315 | 8.9\% | 7.9\% | 1.0\% | 82.2\% |  | 100\% |
| Caregiving for a child or parents | Tenure-Track Men |  |  | 194 | 4.1\% | 3.1\% | 1.0\% | 91.8\% |  | 100\% |
| Caregiving for a child or parents | Tenure-Track Women |  |  | 121 | 16.5\% | 15.7\% | 0.8\% | 66.9\% |  | 100\% |
| Caregiving for a child or parents | All Non-Ladder Faculty |  |  | 286 | 1.7\% | 2.1\% | 3.1\% | 93.0\% |  | 100\% |
| Caregiving for a child or parents | Non-Ladder Men |  |  | 179 | 1.7\% | 0.6\% | 1.7\% | 96.1\% |  | 100\% |
| Caregiving for a child or parents | Non-Ladder Women |  |  | 107 | 1.9\% | 4.7\% | 5.6\% | 87.9\% |  | 100\% |
| Your own health concerns | All Faculty |  |  | 1212 | 2.1\% | 2.5\% | 2.6\% | 92.7\% |  | 100\% |
| Your own health concerns | All Men |  |  | 862 | 1.7\% | 1.9\% | 2.7\% | 93.7\% |  | 100\% |
| Your own health concerns | All Women |  |  | 350 | 3.1\% | 4.0\% | 2.6\% | 90.3\% |  | 100\% |
| Your own health concerns | All Ladder Faculty |  |  | 924 | 1.9\% | 2.6\% | 2.5\% | 93.0\% |  | 100\% |
| Your own health concerns | Ladder Men |  |  | 682 | 1.6\% | 1.9\% | 2.8\% | 93.7\% |  | 100\% |
| Your own health concerns | Ladder Women |  |  | 242 | 2.9\% | 4.5\% | 1.7\% | 90.9\% |  | 100\% |
| Your own health concerns | All Tenured Faculty |  |  | 617 | 1.9\% | 2.8\% | 3.6\% | 91.7\% |  | 100\% |
| Your own health concerns | Tenured Men |  |  | 489 | 1.8\% | 2.2\% | 3.7\% | 92.2\% |  | 100\% |
| Your own health concerns | Tenured Women |  |  | 128 | 2.3\% | 4.7\% | 3.1\% | 89.8\% |  | 100\% |
| Your own health concerns | All Tenure-Track Faculty |  |  | 307 | 2.0\% | 2.3\% | 0.3\% | 95.4\% |  | 100\% |
| Your own health concerns | Tenure-Track Men |  |  | 193 | 1.0\% | 1.0\% | 0.5\% | 97.4\% |  | 100\% |
| Your own health concerns | Tenure-Track Women |  |  | 114 | 3.5\% | 4.4\% | 0.0\% | 92.1\% |  | 100\% |
| Your own health concerns | All Non-Ladder Faculty |  |  | 288 | 2.8\% | 2.1\% | 3.1\% | 92.0\% |  | 100\% |
| Your own health concerns | Non-Ladder Men |  |  | 180 | 2.2\% | 1.7\% | 2.2\% | 93.9\% |  | 100\% |
| Your own health concerns | Non-Ladder Women |  |  | 108 | 3.7\% | 2.8\% | 4.6\% | 88.9\% |  | 100\% |
| A family crisis | All Faculty |  |  | 1199 | 1.5\% | 1.6\% | 1.0\% | 95.9\% |  | 100\% |
| A family crisis | All Men |  |  | 851 | 1.2\% | 1.5\% | 1.2\% | 96.1\% |  | 100\% |
| A family crisis | All Women |  |  | 348 | 2.3\% | 1.7\% | 0.6\% | 95.4\% |  | 100\% |
| A family crisis | All Ladder Faculty |  |  | 919 | 1.1\% | 1.4\% | 1.1\% | 96.4\% |  | 100\% |
| A family crisis | Ladder Men |  |  | 676 | 0.7\% | 1.3\% | 1.2\% | 96.7\% |  | 100\% |
| A family crisis | Ladder Women |  |  | 243 | 2.1\% | 1.6\% | 0.8\% | 95.5\% |  | 100\% |
| A family crisis | All Tenured Faculty |  |  | 612 | 1.5\% | 1.5\% | 1.5\% | 95.6\% |  | 100\% |
| A family crisis | Tenured Men |  |  | 483 | 1.0\% | 1.2\% | 1.4\% | 96.3\% |  | 100\% |
| A family crisis | Tenured Women |  |  | 129 | 3.1\% | 2.3\% | 1.6\% | 93.0\% |  | 100\% |
| A family crisis | All Tenure-Track Faculty |  |  | 307 | 0.3\% | 1.3\% | 0.3\% | 98.0\% |  | 100\% |
| A family crisis | Tenure-Track Men |  |  | 193 | ${ }^{0.0 \%}$ | 1.6\% | ${ }^{0.5 \%}$ | 97.9\% |  | 100\% |
| A family crisis | Tenure-Track Women |  |  | 114 | 0.9\% | 0.9\% | 0.0\% | 98.2\% |  | 100\% |
| A family crisis | All Non-Ladder Faculty |  |  | 280 | 2.9\% | 2.1\% | 0.7\% | 94.3\% |  | 100\% |
| A family crisis | Non-Ladder Men |  |  | 175 | 2.9\% | 2.3\% | 1.1\% | 93.7\% |  | 100\% |
| A family crisis | Non-Ladder Women |  |  | 105 | 2.9\% | 1.9\% | 0.0\% | 95.2\% |  | 100\% |
| Relief Support | Cohort | Mean | Standard | Responses | Very unsupportive | Somewhat | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Neither } \\ & \text { suppportive } \\ & \text { nor } \end{aligned}$ | Somewhat | Very | Total |
| How supportive was your [unit] concerning your relief from teaching or other workload duties? | All Faculty | 4.42 | 0.95 | 226 | 1.3\% | 3.5\% | 13.7\% | 14.6\% | 66.8\% | 100\% |
| How supportive was your [unit] concerning your relief from teaching or other workload duties? | All Men | 4.63 | 0.73 | 111 | 0.0\% | 1.8\% | 9.0\% | 13.5\% | 75.7\% | 100\% |
| How supportive was your [unit] concerning your relief from teaching or other workload duties? | All Women | 4.22 | 1.08 | 115 | 2.6\% | 5.2\% | 18.3\% | 15.7\% | 58.3\% | 100\% |
| How supportive was your [unit] concerning your relief from teaching or other workload duties? | All Ladder Faculty | 4.38 | 0.99 | 175 | 1.7\% | 4.0\% | 14.9\% | 13.1\% | 66.3\% | 100\% |
| How supportive was your [unit] concerning your relief from teaching or other workload duties? | Ladder Men | 4.60 | 0.77 | 87 | 0.0\% | 2.3\% | 10.3\% | 12.6\% | 74.7\% | 100\% |
| How supportive was your [unit] concerning your relief from teaching or other workload duties? | Ladder Women | 4.17 | 1.14 | 88 | 3.4\% | 5.7\% | 19.3\% | 13.6\% | 58.0\% | 100\% |
| How supportive was your [unit] concerning your relief from teaching or other workload duties? | All Tenured Faculty | 4.49 | 0.92 | 104 | 1.9\% | 1.9\% | 12.5\% | 12.5\% | 71.2\% | 100\% |
| How supportive was your [unit] concerning your relief from teaching or other workload duties? | Tenured Men | 4.65 | 0.71 | 66 | 0.0\% | 1.5\% | 9.1\% | 12.1\% | 77.3\% | 100\% |
| How supportive was your [unit] concerning your relief from teaching or other workload duties? | Tenured Women | 4.21 | 1.17 | 38 | 5.3\% | 2.6\% | 18.4\% | 13.2\% | 60.5\% | 100\% |
| How supportive was your [unit] concerning your relief from teaching or other workload duties? | All Tenure-Track Faculty | 4.23 | 1.07 | 71 | 1.4\% | 7.0\% | 18.3\% | 14.1\% | 59.2\% | 100\% |
| How supportive was your [unit] concerning your relief from teaching or other workload duties? | Tenure-Track Men | 4.43 | 0.93 | 21 | 0.0\% | 4.8\% | 14.3\% | 14.3\% | 66.7\% | 100\% |
| How supportive was your [unit] concerning your relief from teaching or other workload duties? | Tenure-Track Women | 4.14 | 1.13 | 50 | 2.0\% | 8.0\% | 20.0\% | 14.0\% | 56.0\% | 100\% |
| How supportive was your [unit] concerrning your relief from teaching or other workload duties? | All Non-Ladder Faculty | 4.55 | ${ }^{0.76}$ | 51 | 0.0\% | 2.0\% | 9.8\% | 19.6\% | 68.6\% | 100\% |
| How supportive was your [unit] concerrning your relief from teaching or other workload duties? | Non-Ladder Men | 4.75 | 0.53 | 24 | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 4.2\% | 16.7\% | 79.2\% | 100\% |
| How supportive was your [unit] concerning your relief from teaching or other workload duties? | Non-Ladder Women | 4.37 | 0.88 | 27 | 0.0\% | 3.7\% | 14.8\% | 22.2\% | 59.3\% | 100\% |


| At any time since you started working at Harvard University, have you had your tenure clock slowed or stopped for: | Cohort |  |  | Responses | Yes, within the past year | Yes, more than a year ago, but within the past five years | Yes, more than five years ago | No |  | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Caregiving for a child or parent (ladder survey only) | All Ladder Faculty |  |  | 917 | 3.2\% | 3.2\% | 1.1\% | 92.6\% |  | 100\% |
| Caregiving for a child or parent (ladder survey only) | Ladder Men |  |  | 673 | 1.5\% | 0.7\% | 0.4\% | 97.3\% |  | 100\% |
| Caregiving for a child or parent (ladder survey only) | Ladder Women |  |  | 244 | 7.8\% | 9.8\% | 2.9\% | 79.5\% |  | 100\% |
| Caregiving for a child or parent (ladder survey only) | All Tenured Faculty |  |  | 603 | 0.2\% | 0.7\% | 0.7\% | 98.5\% |  | 100\% |
| Caregiving for a child or parent (ladder survey only) | Tenured Men |  |  | 480 | 0.2\% | 0.4\% | 0.2\% | 99.2\% |  | 100\% |
| Caregiving for a child or parent (ladder survey only) | Tenured Women |  |  | 123 | 0.0\% | 1.6\% | 2.4\% | 95.9\% |  | 100\% |
| Caregiving for a child or parent (ladder survey only) | All Tenure-Track Faculty |  |  | 314 | 8.9\% | 8.0\% | 1.9\% | 81.2\% |  | 100\% |
| Caregiving for a child or parent (ladder survey only) | Tenure-Track Men |  |  | 193 | 4.7\% | 1.6\% | 1.0\% | 92.7\% |  | 100\% |
| Caregiving for a child or parent (ladder survey only) | Tenure-Track Women |  |  | 121 | 15.7\% | 18.2\% | 3.3\% | 62.8\% |  | 100\% |
| Your own health concerns (ladder survey only) | All Ladder Faculty |  |  | 906 | 0.4\% | 1.0\% | 0.1\% | 98.5\% |  | 100\% |
| Your own health concerns (ladder survey only) | Ladder Men |  |  | 670 | 0.4\% | 0.3\% | 0.1\% | 99.1\% |  | 100\% |
| Your own heath concerns (ladder survey only) | Ladder Women |  |  | 236 | 0.4\% | 3.0\% | 0.0\% | 96.6\% |  | 100\% |
| Your own health concerns (ladder survey only) | All Tenured Faculty |  |  | 603 | 0.0\% | 0.3\% | 0.2\% | 99.5\% |  | 100\% |
| Your own heath concerns (ladder survey only) | Tenured Men |  |  | 480 | 0.0\% | 0.2\% | 0.2\% | 99.6\% |  | 100\% |
| Your own health concerns (ladder survey only) | Tenured Women |  |  | 123 | 0.0\% | 0.8\% | 0.0\% | 99.2\% |  | 100\% |
| Your own heath concerns (ladder survey only) | All Tenure-Track Faculty |  |  | 303 | 1.3\% | 2.3\% | 0.0\% | 96.4\% |  | 100\% |
| Your own heath concerns (ladder survey only) | Tenure-Track Men |  |  | 190 | 1.6\% | 0.5\% | 0.0\% | 97.9\% |  | 100\% |
| Your own heath concerns (ladder survey only) | Tenure-Track Women |  |  | 113 | 0.9\% | 5.3\% | 0.0\% | 93.8\% |  | 100\% |
| A family crisis (ladder survey only) | All Ladder Faculty |  |  | 897 | 0.2\% | 0.1\% | 0.2\% | 99.4\% |  | 100\% |
| A family crisis (ladder survey only) | Ladder Men |  |  | 661 | 0.2\% | 0.2\% | 0.2\% | 99.5\% |  | 100\% |
| A family crisis (ladder survey only) | Ladder Women |  |  | 236 | 0.4\% | 0.0\% | 0.4\% | 99.2\% |  | 100\% |
| A family crisis (ladder survey only) | All Tenured Faculty |  |  | 595 | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 100.0\% |  | 100\% |
| A family crisis (ladder survey only) | Tenured Men |  |  | 473 | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 100.0\% |  | 100\% |
| A family crisis (ladder survey only) | Tenured Women |  |  | 122 | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 100.0\% |  | 100\% |
| A family crisis (ladder survey only) | All Tenure-Track Faculty |  |  | 302 | 0.7\% | 0.3\% | 0.7\% | 98.3\% |  | 100\% |
| A family crisis (ladder survey only) | Tenure-Track Men |  |  | 188 | 0.5\% | 0.5\% | 0.5\% | 98.4\% |  | 100\% |
| A family crisis (ladder survey only) | Tenure-Track Women |  |  | 114 | 0.9\% | 0.0\% | 0.9\% | 98.2\% |  | 100\% |
| Tenure Clock Support <br> ( $1=$ Very unsupportive, $5=$ Very supportive) | Cohort | Mean | Standard Deviation | Responses | Very unsupportive | Somewhat unsupportive | $\begin{gathered} \text { Neither } \\ \text { suppportive } \\ \text { nor } \\ \text { unsupportive } \end{gathered}$ | Somewhat supportive | $\begin{gathered} \text { Very } \\ \text { supportive } \end{gathered}$ | Total |
| How supportive was your [unit] concerning your having your tenure clock stopped or slowed? (ladder survey only) <br> How supportive was your [unit] concerning your having your tenure clock stopped or slowed? (ladder | All Ladder Faculty | 4.24 | 1.05 | 78 | 2.6\% | 3.8\% | 17.9\% | 17.9\% | 57.7\% | 100\% |
| survey only) | Ladder Men | 4.50 | 0.83 | 24 | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 20.8\% | 8.3\% | 70.8\% | 100\% |
| How supportive was your [unit] concerning your having your tenure clock stopped or slowed? (ladder survey only) | Ladder Women | 4.13 | 1.12 | 54 | 3.7\% | 5.6\% | 16.7\% | 22.2\% | 51.9\% | 100\% |
| How supportive was your [unit] concerning your having your tenure clock stopped or slowed? (ladder survey only) | All Tenured Faculty | 4.64 | 0.67 | 11 | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 9.1\% | 18.2\% | 72.7\% | 100\% |
| How supportive was your [unit] concerning your having your tenure clock stopped or slowed? (ladder survey only) | Tenured Men | 4.67 | 0.82 | 6 | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 16.7\% | 0.0\% | 83.3\% | 100\% |
|  | Tenured Women | 4.60 | 0.55 | 5 | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 40.0\% | 60.0\% | 100\% |
| survey only) <br> How supportive was your [unit] concerning your having your tenure clock stopped or slowed? (ladder survey only) | All Tenure-Track Faculy | 4.18 | 1.09 | 67 | 3.0\% | 4.5\% | 19.4\% | 17.9\% | 55.2\% | 100\% |
| survey only) <br> How supportive was your [unit] concerning your having your tenure clock stopped or slowed? (ladder survey only) | Tenure-Track Men | 4.44 | 0.86 | 18 | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 22.2\% | 11.1\% | 66.7\% | 100\% |
|  | Tenure-Track Women | 4.08 | 1.15 | 49 | 4.1\% | 6.1\% | 18.4\% | 20.4\% | 51.0\% | 100\% |
| Hiring / Retention |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| In the last five years, while at Harvard University, have you....actively sought outside job offers or responded to job solicitations? (ladder survey only) | Cohort |  |  | Responses | Yes | No |  |  |  | Total |
|  | All Ladder FacultyLadder Men |  |  | 907 | 34.1\% | 65.9\% |  |  |  | 100\% |
| actively sought outside job offers or responded to job solicictations? (ladder survey only) |  |  |  | 661 | 30.7\% | 69.3\% |  |  |  | 100\% |
| actively sought outside job offers or responded to job solicitations? (ladder survey only) | Ladder MenLadder Women |  |  | 246 | 43.1\% | 56.9\% |  |  |  | 100\% |
| actively sought outside job offers or responded to job solicitations? (ladder survey only) | All Tenured Faculty |  |  | 589 | 30.9\% | 69.1\% |  |  |  | 100\% |
| actively sought outside job offers or responded to job solicictaions? (ladder survey only) | Tenured Men |  |  | 465 | 28.8\% | 71.2\% |  |  |  | 100\% |
| actively sought outside job offers or responded to job solicitations? (ladder survey only) | Tenured Women |  |  | 124 | 38.7\% | 61.3\% |  |  |  | 100\% |
| actively sought outside job offers or responded to job solicitations? (ladder survey only) | All Tenure-Track Faculty |  |  | 318 | 39.9\% | 60.1\% |  |  |  | 100\% |
| actively sought outside job offers or responded to job solicitations? (ladder survey only) |  |  |  | 196 | 35.2\% | 64.8\% |  |  |  | 100\% |
| actively sought outside job offers or responded to job solicitations? (ladder survey only) | Tenure-Track Women |  |  | 122 | 47.5\% | 52.5\% |  |  |  | 100\% |
| received a formal or informal outside job offer that you took to your [leader]? (ladder survey only) | All Ladder Faculty |  |  | 907 | 22.9\% | 77.1\% |  |  |  | 100\% |
| received a formal or informal outside job offer that you took to your [leader]? (ladder survey only) | Ladder Men |  |  | 661 | 21.5\% | 78.5\% |  |  |  | 100\% |
| received a formal or informal outside job offer that you took to your [leader]? (ladder survey only) | Ladder Women |  |  | 246 | 26.8\% | 73.2\% |  |  |  | 100\% |
| received a formal or informal outside job offer that you took to your [leader]? (ladder survey only) | All Tenured Faculty |  |  | 588 | 24.5\% | 75.5\% |  |  |  | 100\% |
| received a formal or informal outside job offer that you took to your [leader]? (ladder survey only) | Tenured MenTenured Women |  |  | 464 | 22.8\% | 77.2\% |  |  |  | 100\% |
| received a formal or informal outside job offer that you took to your [leader]? (ladder survey only) |  |  |  | 124 | 30.6\% | 69.4\% |  |  |  | 100\% |
| received a formal or informal outside job offer that you took to your [leader]? (ladder survey only) | All Tenure-Track Faculty |  |  | 319 | 20.1\% | 79.9\% |  |  |  | 100\% |
| received a formal or informal outside job offer that you took to your [leader]? (ladder survey only) | Tenure-Track Men Tenure-Track Women |  |  | 197 | 18.3\% | 81.7\% |  |  |  | 100\% |
| received a formal or informal outside job offer that you took to your [leader]? (ladder survey only) |  |  |  | 122 | 23.0\% | 77.0\% |  |  |  | 100\% |


| Hiring / Retention (continued) |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Has that formal or informal outside job offer(s) resulted in adjustments to any of the following (check all that apply): | Cohort | Affirmative Responses |
| Salary (ladder survey only) | All Ladder Faculty | 85 |
| Salary (ladder survey only) | Ladder Men | 59 |
| Salary (ladder survey only) | Ladder Women | 26 |
| Salary (ladder survey only) | All Tenured Faculty | 68 |
| Salary (ladder survey only) | Tenured Men | 48 |
| Salary (ladder survey only) | Tenured Women | 20 |
| Salary (ladder survey only) | All Tenure-Track Faculty | 17 |
| Salary (ladder survey only) | Tenure-Track Men | 11 |
| Salary (ladder survey only) | Tenure-Track Women | 6 |
| Course load (ladder survey only) | All Ladder Faculty | 9 |
| Course load (ladder survey only) | Ladder Men | 7 |
| Course load (ladder survey only) | Ladder Women | 2 |
| Course load (ladder survey only) | All Tenured Faculty | 6 |
| Course load (ladder survey only) | Tenured Men | 6 |
| Course load (ladder survey only) | Tenured Women | 0 |
| Course load (ladder survey only) | All Tenure-Track Faculty | 3 |
| Course load (ladder survey only) | Tenure-Track Men | 1 |
| Course load (ladder survey only) | Tenure-Track Women | 2 |
| Administrative responsibilities (ladder survey only) | All Ladder Faculty | 14 |
| Administrative responsibilities (ladder survey only) | Ladder Men | 10 |
| Administrative responsibilities (ladder survey only) | Ladder Women | 4 |
| Administrative responsibilities (ladder survey only) | All Tenured Faculty | 11 |
| Administrative responsibilities (ladder survey only) | Tenured Men | 9 |
| Administrative responsibilities (ladder survey only) | Tenured Women | 2 |
| Administrative responsibilities (ladder survey only) | All Tenure-Track Faculty | 3 |
| Administrative responsibilities (ladder survey only) | Tenure-Track Men | 1 |
| Administrative responsibilities (ladder survey only) | Tenure-Track Women | 2 |
| Leave time (ladder survey only) | All Ladder Faculty | 17 |
| Leave time (ladder survey only) | Ladder Men | 10 |
| Leave time (ladder survey only) | Ladder Women | 7 |
| Leave time (ladder survey only) | All Tenured Faculty | 14 |
| Leave time (ladder survey only) | Tenured Men | 9 |
| Leave time (ladder survey only) | Tenured Women | 5 |
| Leave time (ladder survey only) | All Tenure-Track Faculty | 3 |
| Leave time (ladder survey only) | Tenure-Track Men | 1 |
| Leave time (ladder survey only) | Tenure-Track Women | 2 |
| Summer salary (ladder survey only) | All Ladder Faculty | 33 |
| Summer salary (ladder survey only) | Ladder Men | 26 |
| Summer salary (ladder survey only) | Ladder Women | 7 |
| Summer salary (ladder survey only) | All Tenured Faculty | 24 |
| Summer salary (ladder survey only) | Tenured Men | 18 |
| Summer salary (ladder survey only) | Tenured Women | 6 |
| Summer salary (ladder survey only) | All Tenure-Track Faculty | 9 |
| Summer salary (ladder survey only) | Tenure-Track Men | 8 |
| Summer salary (ladder survey only) | Tenure-Track Women | 1 |
| Special timing of the tenure clock (ladder survey only) | All Ladder Faculty | 9 |
| Special timing of the tenure clock (ladder survey only) | Ladder Men | 5 |
| Special timing of the tenure clock (ladder survey only) | Ladder Women | 4 |
| Special timing of the tenure clock (ladder survey only) | All Tenured Faculty | 3 |
| Special timing of the tenure clock (ladder survey only) | Tenured Men | 2 |
| Special timing of the tenure clock (ladder survey only) | Tenured Women | 1 |
| Special timing of the tenure clock (ladder survey only) | All Tenure-Track Faculty | 6 |
| Special timing of the tenure clock (ladder survey only) | Tenure-Track Men | 3 |
| Special timing of the tenure clock (ladder survey only) | Tenure-Track Women | 3 |
| Promotion to a higher rank (ladder survey only) | All Ladder Faculty | 17 |
| Promotion to a higher rank (ladder survey only) | Ladder Men | 11 |
| Promotion to a higher rank (ladder survey only) | Ladder Women | 6 |
| Promotion to a higher rank (ladder survey only) | All Tenured Faculty | 13 |
| Promotion to a higher rank (ladder survey only) | Tenured Men | 7 |
| Promotion to a higher rank (ladder survey only) | Tenured Women | 6 |
| Promotion to a higher rank (ladder survey only) | All Tenure-Track Faculty | 4 |
| Promotion to a higher rank (ladder survey only) | Tenure-Track Men | 4 |
| Promotion to a higher rank (ladder survey only) | Tenure-Track Women | 0 |
| Equipmentlaboratory/research start-up (ladder survey only) | All Ladder Faculty | 27 |
| Equipmentlaboratory/research start-up (ladder survey only) | Ladder Men | 22 |
| Equipmentlaboratory/research start-up (ladder survey only) | Ladder Women | 5 |
| Equipmentlaboratory/research start-up (ladder survey only) | All Tenured Faculty | 24 |
| Equipmentl/aboratory/research start-up (ladder survey only) | Tenured Men | 19 |
| Equipmentlaboratory/research start-up (ladder survey only) | Tenured Women | 5 |
| Equipmentlaboratory/research start-up (ladder survey only) | All Tenure-Track Faculty | 3 |
| Equipmentlaboratory/research start-up (ladder survey only) | Tenure-Track Men | 3 |
| Equipmentlaboratory/research start-up (ladder survey only) | Tenure-Track Women | 0 |


| Hiring / Retention (continued) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Has that formal or informal outside job offer(s) resulted in adjustments to any of the following (check all that apply): | Cohort |  |  | Affirmative Responses |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Employment for spouse/partner (ladder survey only) | All Ladder Faculty |  |  | 8 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Employment for spouse/partner (ladder survey only) | Ladder Men |  |  | 6 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Employment for spouse/partner (ladder survey only) | Ladder Women |  |  | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Employment for spouse/partner (ladder survey only) | All Tenured Faculty |  |  | 8 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Employment for spouse/partner (ladder survey only) | Tenured Men |  |  | 6 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Employment for spouse/partner (ladder survey only) | Tenured Women |  |  | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Employment for spouse/partner (ladder survey only) | All Tenure-Track Faculty |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Employment for spouse/partner (ladder survey only) | Tenure-Track Men |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Employment for spouse/partner (ladder survey only) | Tenure-Track Women |  |  | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Other (ladder survey only) | All Ladder Faculty |  |  | 26 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Other (ladder survey only) | Ladder Men |  |  | 17 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Other (ladder survey only) | Ladder Women |  |  | 9 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Other (ladder survey only) | All Tenured Faculty |  |  | 21 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Other (ladder survey only) | Tenured Men |  |  | 17 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Other (ladder survey only) | Tenured Women |  |  | 4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Other (ladder survey only) | All Tenure-Track Faculty |  |  | 5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Other (ladder survey only) | Tenure-Track Men |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Other (ladder survey only) | Tenure-Track Women |  |  | 5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| No adjustments were made (ladder survey only) | All Ladder Faculty |  |  | 88 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| No adjustments were made (ladder survey only) | Ladder Men |  |  | 61 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| No adjustments were made (ladder survey only) | Ladder Women |  |  | 27 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| No adjustments were made (ladder survey only) | All Tenured Faculty |  |  | 52 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| No adjustments were made (ladder survey only) | Tenured Men |  |  | 42 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| No adjustments were made (ladder survey only) | Tenured Women |  |  | 10 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| No adjustments were made (ladder survey only) | All Tenure-Track Faculty |  |  | 36 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| No adjustments were made (ladder survey only) | Tenure-Track Men |  |  | 19 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| No adjustments were made (ladder survey only) | Tenure-Track Women |  |  | 17 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Likelihood of Leaving | Cohort | Mean | Standard | Responses | Very unlikely | Somewhat unlikely | Neither likely | Somewhat likely | Very likely | Total |
| In the next three years, how likely are you to leave Harvard University (including retirement)? (ladder |  |  |  | Responses | Very |  |  |  |  |  |
| survey only) | All Ladder Faculty | 2.54 | 1.43 | 945 | 34.2\% | 19.4\% | 17.7\% | 15.6\% | 13.2\% | 100\% |
| In the next three years, how likely are you to leave Harvard University (including retirement)? (ladder |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| survey only) <br> In the next three years, how likely are you to leave Harvard University (including retirement)? (ladder | Ladder Men | 2.47 | 1.40 | 691 | 35.0\% | 20.8\% | 18.1\% | 14.2\% | 11.9\% | 100\% |
| survey only) | Ladder Women | 2.74 | 1.50 | 254 | 31.9\% | 15.4\% | 16.5\% | 19.3\% | 16.9\% | 100\% |
| In the next three years, how likely are you to leave Harvard University (including retirement)? (ladder survey only) | All Tenured Faculty | 2.18 | 1.33 | 623 | 44.9\% | 20.4\% | 14.8\% | 11.9\% | 8.0\% | 100\% |
| In the next three years, how likely are you to leave Harvard University (including retirement)? (ladder |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| survey only) | Tenured Men | 2.21 | 1.35 | 491 | 43.8\% | 20.8\% | 15.1\% | 11.4\% | 9.0\% | 100\% |
| In the next three years, how likely are you to leave Harvard University (including retirement)? (ladder |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| survey only) <br> In the next three years, how likely are you to leave Harvard University (including retirement)? (ladder | Tenured Women | 2.05 | 1.26 | 132 | 49.2\% | 18.9\% | 13.6\% | 13.6\% | 4.5\% | 100\% |
| survey only) | All Tenure-Track Faculty | 3.25 | 1.34 | 322 | 13.4\% | 17.4\% | 23.3\% | 22.7\% | 23.3\% | 100\% |
| In the next three years, how likely are you to leave Harvard University (including retirement)? (ladder |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| survey only) | Tenure-Track Men | 3.11 | 1.31 | 200 | 13.5\% | 21.0\% | 25.5\% | 21.0\% | 19.0\% | 100\% |
| In the next three years, how likely are you to leave Harvard University (including retirement)? (ladder survey only) | Tenure-Track Women | 3.48 | 1.37 | 122 | 13.1\% | 11.5\% | 19.7\% | 25.4\% | 30.3\% | 100\% |
| To what extent, if at all, have you considered the following as reasons to leave: |  |  | Standard |  |  |  | To a great |  |  |  |
| ( $1=$ Not at all, $3=$ To a great extent) | Cohort | Mean | Deviation | Responses | Not at all | To some extent | extent |  |  | Total |
| To increase your salary | All Faculty | 1.62 | 0.73 | 1137 | 53.6\% | 31.3\% | 15.1\% |  |  | 100\% |
| To increase your salary | All Men | 1.58 | 0.72 | 795 | 55.2\% | 31.1\% | 13.7\% |  |  | 100\% |
| To increase your salary | All Women | 1.69 | 0.76 | 342 | 49.7\% | 31.9\% | 18.4\% |  |  | 100\% |
| To increase your salary | All Ladder Faculty | 1.54 | 0.70 | 857 | 58.0\% | 29.6\% | 12.4\% |  |  | 100\% |
| To increase your salary | Ladder Men | 1.56 | 0.70 | 622 | 56.8\% | 30.9\% | 12.4\% |  |  | 100\% |
| To increase your salary | Ladder Women | 1.51 | 0.71 | 235 | 61.3\% | 26.4\% | 12.3\% |  |  | 100\% |
| To increase your salary | All Tenured Faculty | 1.54 | 0.70 | 552 | 58.2\% | 29.5\% | 12.3\% |  |  | 100\% |
| To increase your salary | Tenured Men | 1.56 | 0.71 | 432 | 57.4\% | 29.6\% | 13.0\% |  |  | 100\% |
| To increase your salary | Tenured Women | 1.49 | 0.67 | 120 | 60.8\% | 29.2\% | 10.0\% |  |  | 100\% |
| To increase your salary | All Tenure-Track Faculty | 1.55 | 0.71 | 305 | 57.7\% | 29.8\% | 12.5\% |  |  | 100\% |
| To increase your salary | Tenure-Track Men | 1.56 | 0.69 | 190 | 55.3\% | 33.7\% | 11.1\% |  |  | 100\% |
| To increase your salary | Tenure-Track Women | 1.53 | 0.74 | 115 | 61.7\% | 23.5\% | 14.8\% |  |  | 100\% |
| To increase your salary | All Non-Ladder Faculty | 1.84 | 0.78 | 280 | 40.0\% | 36.4\% | 23.6\% |  |  | 100\% |
| To increase your salary | Non-Ladder Men | 1.69 | 0.77 | 173 | 49.7\% | 31.8\% | 18.5\% |  |  | 100\% |
| To increase your salary | Non-Ladder Women | 2.07 | 0.75 | 107 | 24.3\% | 43.9\% | 31.8\% |  |  | 100\% |
| To move to a tenure-track position (non-ladder survey only) | All Non-Ladder Faculty | 2.01 | 0.90 | 255 | 40.0\% | 19.2\% | 40.8\% |  |  | 100\% |
| To move to a tenure-track position (non-ladder survey only) | Non-Ladder Men | 1.90 2.19 | 0.88 0.92 | 158 | 43.7\% | 22.8\% | 33.5\% |  |  | 100\% |
| To move to a tenure-track position (non-ladder survey only) | Non-Ladder Women | 2.19 | 0.92 | 97 | 34.0\% | 13.4\% | 52.6\% |  |  | 100\% |

Hiring / Retention (continued)
To what extent, if at all, have you considered the following as reasons to leave:
$1=$ Not at all, $3=$ To a great extent)
$1=$ Not at all, $3=$ To a great extent)
To improve your prour prospectsts for tor tenure (ladder survey only

$$
\begin{array}{lcc}
\text { Cohort } & \text { Mean } & \begin{array}{c}
\text { Standard } \\
\text { Deviation }
\end{array} \\
\text { III Ladder Faculty } & 1.73 & 0.85 \\
\text { Iadder Men } & 1.61 & 0.81
\end{array}
$$

To improve your prospects for tenure (ladder survey only)
To improve your prospects for tenure (ladder suvvey only)
To improve oour prospects for tenure (ladder survey only)
To improve your prospects for tenure (ladder survey only)
To improve your prospects for tenure (ladder survey only)
To improve your prospects for tenure (ladder survey only)
To improve your prospects for tenure (ladder survey only)
俍
To improve your prospects for tenure (ladder survey only)
To enhance your career in other ways
To enhance your career in other way
To enhance your career in other way
To enhance your career in other ways
To enhance your career in other ways
To enhance your career in other ways
To enhance your career in other ways
To enhance your career in other ways
To enhance your career in other ways
o enhance your career in other way
To enhance your career in other ways
To enhance your career in other ways
To enhance your career in other ways
To find a more supportive work environmen
o find a more supportive work environmen
To find a more supportive work environmen
oo find a more supportive work environment To find a more supportive work environmen
To find a more supportive work environment
oo find a more supportive work environment
oo find a more supportive work environment To find a more supportive work environmen
To find a more supportive work environmen
oo find a more supportive work environment
of find a more supportive work environment
To increase your time to do research
To increase your time to do research
To increasese your time to do do research
To increase your time to do research
To increase your time to do research
oincrease your time to do research
o increase your time to do research
To increase your time to do research
To increase your time to do research
To increase your time to do research
To increase your time to do research
To increase your time to do research
To increase your time to do research
opursue a non-academic job
o pursue a non-academic jo
to pursue a non-academic job
o pursue a non-academic job
o pursue a non-academic job
to pursue a non-academic job
o pursue a non-academic job
oo pursue a non-academic iob
To pursue a non-academic job
oo pursue a non-academic job
To pursue a non-academic job

[^91]| Mean |
| :--- |
| 1.73 |
| 1.61 |
| 2.01 |
| 1.14 |
| 1.14 |
| 1.14 |
| 2.23 |
| 2.14 |
| 2.38 |
| 1.91 |
| 1.82 |
| 2.11 |
| 1.85 |
| 1.79 |
| 2.02 |
| 1.75 |
| 1.70 |
| 1.92 |
| 2.03 |
| 1.98 |
| 2.12 |
| 2.07 |
| 1.93 |
| 2.30 |
| 1.82 |
| 1.71 |
| 2.06 |
| 1.83 |
| 1.73 |
| 2.08 |
| 1.74 |
| 1.68 |
| 1.92 |
| 1.99 |
| 1.84 |
| 2.23 |
| 1.79 |
| 1.63 |
| 2.04 |
| 1.77 |
| 1.72 |
| 1.90 |
| 1.80 |
| 1.75 |
| 1.93 |
| 1.84 |
| 1.77 |
| 2.11 |
| 1.73 |
| 1.71 |
| 1.74 |
| 1.67 |
| 1.58 |
| 1.83 |
| 1.29 |
| 1.27 |
| 1.35 |
| 1.22 |
| 1.20 |
| 1.27 |
| 1.20 |
| 1.18 |
| 1.27 |
| 1.26 |
| 1.25 |
| 1.27 |
| 1.51 |
| 1.50 |
| 1.53 |
|  |


| Stan |
| :---: |
| Deviatio |
| 0.5 |
| 0.81 |
| 0.87 |
| 0.45 |
| 0.44 |
| 0.50 |
| 0.78 |
| 0.80 |
| 0.71 |
| 0.78 |
| 0.75 |
| 0.80 |
| 0.78 |
| 0.75 |
| 0.83 |
| 0.75 |
| 0.73 |
| 0.81 |
| 0.79 |
| 0.75 |
| 0.85 |
| 0.76 |
| 0.76 |
| 0.70 |
| 0.83 |
| 0.80 |
| 0.86 |
| 0.84 |
| 0.81 |
| 0.86 |
| 0.82 |
| 0.80 |
| 0.86 |
| 0.86 |
| 0.84 |
| 0.84 |
| 0.82 |
| 0.76 |
| 0.85 |
| 0.80 |
| 0.79 |
| 0.83 |
| 0.81 |
| 0.8 |
| 0.84 |
| 0.81 |
| 0.80 |
| 0.81 |
| 0.81 |
| 0.79 |
| 0.83 |
| 0.76 |
| 0.73 |
| 0.80 |
| 0.56 |
| 0.54 |
| 0.59 |
| 0.48 |
| 0.47 |
| 0.51 |
| 0.4 |
| 0.44 |
| 0.53 |
| 0.52 |
| 0.54 |
| 0.49 |
| 0.70 |
| 0.69 |
| 0.72 |
|  |


|  |
| :---: |


To so


| To a great extent |
| :---: |
| 25.8\% |
| 20.9\% |
| 37.6\% |
| 3.2\% |
| 6.0\% |
| 44.4\% |
| 40.2\% |
| 51.3\% |
| 26.2\% |
| 21.1\% |
| 38.1\% |
| 24.1\% |
| 19.8\% |
| 35.5\% |
| 19.1\% |
| 16.4\% |
| 28.7\% |
| 33.0\% |
| 42.5\% |
| 32.6\% |
| 25.7\% |
| 43.8\% |
| 27.4\% |
| 21.8\% |
| 40.1\% |
| 28.1\% |
| 23.2\% |
| 41.0\% |
| 23.5\% |
| 20.8\% |
| 33.1\% |
| $36.3 \%$ $28.4 \%$ |
| 28.4\% |
| 25.0\% |
| 17.1\% |
| 38.1\% |
| 23.4\% |
| 20.9\% |
| 29.6\% |
| 25.1\% |
| 22.5\% |
| 31.8\% |
| 26.4\% |
| 23.1\% |
| 38.7\% |
| 22.5\% |
| 21.2\% |
| 24.8\% |
| 18.1\% |
| 14.5\% |
| 24.2\% |
| 5.3\% |
| 4.9\% |
| 6.1\% |
| 3.0\% |
| 3.1\% |
| 2.8\% |
| 2.6\% |
| 2.3\% |
| 3.8\% |
| 3.8\% |
| 4.9\% |
| 1.9\% |
| 12.0\% |
| 11.0\% |

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \begin{array}{l}
\text { Cohort } \\
\text { All Ladder F }
\end{array} \\
& \text { Ladder Women } \\
& \text { All Tenured Faculy } \\
& \text { Tenured Men } \\
& \begin{array}{l}
\text { Tenured Women } \\
\text { All Tenure-Track }
\end{array} \\
& \begin{array}{l}
\text { All Tenure-Track Faculty } \\
\text { Tenure-Track Men }
\end{array} \\
& \text { Tenure-Track Women } \\
& \begin{array}{l}
\text { All Faculty } \\
\text { All Men }
\end{array} \\
& \begin{array}{l}
\text { All Men } \\
\text { All Women }
\end{array} \\
& \text { All Ladder Faculty } \\
& \text { Ladder Men } \\
& \text { Ladder Women } \\
& \begin{array}{l}
\text { All Tenured Faculit } \\
\text { Tenured Men }
\end{array} \\
& \text { Tenured Women } \\
& \begin{array}{l}
\text { All Tenure-Track Faculty } \\
\text { Tenure-Track Men }
\end{array} \\
& \begin{array}{l}
\text { Tenure-Track Men } \\
\text { Tenure-Track Women }
\end{array} \\
& \text { All Non-Ladder Faculty } \\
& \text { Non-Ladder Men } \\
& \begin{array}{l}
\text { All Faculty } \\
\text { All Men }
\end{array} \\
& \text { All Women } \\
& \text { All Ladder Faculty } \\
& \begin{array}{l}
\text { Ladder Men } \\
\text { Ladder Women }
\end{array} \\
& \text { All Tenured Faculty } \\
& \text { Tenured Men } \\
& \begin{array}{l}
\text { Tenured Women } \\
\text { All Tenure-Track }
\end{array} \\
& \begin{array}{l}
\text { All Tenure-Track Fac } \\
\text { Tenure-Track Men }
\end{array} \\
& \text { Tenure-Track Women } \\
& \text { All Non-Ladder Faculty } \\
& \text { Non-Ladder Men } \\
& \begin{array}{l}
\text { Non-Ladder } \\
\text { All Faculty }
\end{array} \\
& \text { All Men } \\
& \begin{array}{l}
\text { All Women } \\
\text { All Ladder Fa }
\end{array} \\
& \begin{array}{l}
\text { All Ladder Fac } \\
\text { Ladder Men } \\
\text { Ladder Women }
\end{array} \\
& \begin{array}{l}
\text { Ladder Women } \\
\text { All Tenured Faculty }
\end{array} \\
& \begin{array}{l}
\text { All Tenured Faculty } \\
\text { Tenured Men }
\end{array} \\
& \begin{array}{l}
\text { Tenured Men } \\
\text { Tenured Wom }
\end{array} \\
& \text { All Tenure-Track Faculty } \\
& \text { Tenure-Track Men } \\
& \text { Tenure-Track Women } \\
& \text { Non-Ladder Men } \\
& \text { Non-Ladder Women } \\
& \begin{array}{l}
\text { All Faculty } \\
\text { All Men }
\end{array} \\
& \begin{array}{l}
\text { All Men } \\
\text { All Women }
\end{array} \\
& \text { All Ladder Faculty } \\
& \text { Ladder Men } \\
& \begin{array}{l}
\text { Ladder Women } \\
\text { All Tenured Faculty }
\end{array} \\
& \text { Tenured Men } \\
& \text { Tenured Women } \\
& \text { All Tenure-Track Faculty } \\
& \begin{array}{l}
\text { Tenure-Track Men } \\
\text { Tenure-Track Wom }
\end{array} \\
& \text { All Non-Ladder Faculty } \\
& \begin{array}{l}
\text { Non-Ladder Men } \\
\text { Non-Ladder Woment }
\end{array}
\end{aligned}
$$

| Hiring / Retention (continued) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| To what extent, if at all, have you considered the following as reasons to leave: ( $1=$ Not at all, $3=$ To a great extent) | Cohort | Mean | Standard Deviation | Responses | Not at all | To some extent | To a great extent | Total |
| To reduce stress | All Faculty | 1.73 | 0.77 | 1122 | 46.6\% | 33.9\% | 19.5\% | 100\% |
| To reduce stress | All Men | 1.62 | 0.73 | 784 | 52.6\% | 32.7\% | 14.8\% | 100\% |
| To reduce stress | All Women | 1.98 | 0.80 | 338 | 32.8\% | 36.7\% | 30.5\% | 100\% |
| To reduce stress | All Ladder Faculty | 1.76 | 0.78 | 846 | 45.0\% | 33.9\% | 21.0\% | 100\% |
| To reduce stress | Ladder Men | 1.64 | 0.74 | 613 | 51.5\% | 32.6\% | 15.8\% | 100\% |
| To reduce stress | Ladder Women | 2.07 | 0.79 | 233 | 27.9\% | 37.3\% | 34.8\% | 100\% |
| To reduce stress | All Tenured Faculty | 1.62 | 0.74 | 543 | 53.2\% | 31.3\% | 15.5\% | 100\% |
| To reduce stress | Tenured Men | 1.53 | 0.69 | 424 | 58.7\% | 29.7\% | 11.6\% | 100\% |
| To reduce stress | Tenured Women | 1.96 | 0.80 | 119 | 33.6\% | 37.0\% | 29.4\% | 100\% |
| To reduce stress | All Tenure-Track Faculty | 2.01 | 0.78 | 303 | 30.4\% | 38.6\% | 31.0\% | 100\% |
| To reduce stress | Tenure-Track Men | 1.90 | 0.78 | 189 | 35.4\% | 39.2\% | 25.4\% | 100\% |
| To reduce stress | Tenure-Track Women | 2.18 | 0.77 | 114 | 21.9\% | 37.7\% | 40.4\% | 100\% |
| To reduce stress | All Non-Ladder Faculty | 1.63 | 0.73 | 276 | 51.4\% | 33.7\% | 14.9\% | 100\% |
| To reduce stress | Non-Ladder Men | 1.55 | 0.69 | 171 | 56.1\% | 32.7\% | 11.1\% | 100\% |
| To reduce stress | Non-Ladder Women | 1.77 | 0.78 | 105 | 43.8\% | 35.2\% | 21.0\% | 100\% |
| To address child-related issues | All Faculty | 1.33 | 0.64 | 976 | 75.8\% | 15.0\% | 9.2\% | 100\% |
| To address child-related issues | All Men | 1.25 | 0.55 | 695 | 81.2\% | 12.9\% | 5.9\% | 100\% |
| To address child-related issues | All Women | 1.55 | 0.77 | 281 | 62.6\% | 19.9\% | 17.4\% | 100\% |
| To address child-related issues | All Ladder Faculty | 1.35 | 0.66 | 741 | 74.8\% | 15.0\% | 10.3\% | 100\% |
| To address child-related issues | Ladder Men | 1.25 | 0.56 | 542 | 80.8\% | 13.1\% | ${ }^{6.1 \%}$ | 100\% |
| To address child-related issues | Ladder Women | 1.63 | 0.82 | 199 | 58.3\% | 20.1\% | 21.6\% | 100\% |
| To address child-related issues | All Tenured Faculty | 1.21 | 0.53 | 465 | 84.7\% | 9.7\% | 5.6\% | 100\% |
| To address child-related issues | Tenured Men | 1.16 | 0.45 | 373 | 88.2\% | 8.0\% | 3.8\% | 100\% |
| To address child-related issues | Tenured Women | 1.42 | 0.71 | 92 | 70.7\% | 16.3\% | 13.0\% | 100\% |
| To address child-related issues | All Tenure-Track Faculty | 1.60 | 0.78 | 276 | 58.0\% | 23.9\% | 18.1\% | 100\% |
| To address child-related issues | Tenure-Track Men | 1.47 | 0.69 | 169 | 64.5\% | 24.3\% | 11.2\% | 100\% |
| To address child-related issues | Tenure-Track Women | 1.81 | 0.86 | 107 | 47.7\% | 23.4\% | 29.0\% | 100\% |
| To address child-related issues | All Non-Ladder Faculty | 1.27 | 0.56 | 235 | 79.1\% | 14.9\% | 6.0\% | 100\% |
| To address child-related issues | Non-Ladder Men | 1.23 | 0.53 | 153 | 82.4\% | 12.4\% | 5.2\% | 100\% |
| To address child-related issues | Non-Ladder Women | 1.34 | 0.61 | 82 | 73.2\% | 19.5\% | 7.3\% | 100\% |
| To improve the employment situation of your spouse/partner | All Faculty | 1.44 | 0.71 | 1030 | 68.3\% | 19.1\% | 12.5\% | 100\% |
| To improve the employment situation of your spouse/partner | All Men | 1.40 | 0.68 | 730 | 71.2\% | 17.4\% | 11.4\% | 100\% |
| To improve the employment situation of your spouse/partner | All Women | 1.54 | 0.75 | 300 | 61.3\% | 23.3\% | 15.3\% | 100\% |
| To improve the employment situation of your spouse/partner | All Ladder Faculty | 1.47 | 0.73 | 784 | 67.7\% | 18.0\% | 14.3\% | 100\% |
| To improve the employment situation of your spouse/partner | Ladder Men | 1.42 | 0.71 | 572 | 70.6\% | 16.6\% | 12.8\% | 100\% |
| To improve the employment situation of your spouse/partner | Ladder Women | 1.58 | 0.78 | 212 | 59.9\% | 21.7\% | 18.4\% | 100\% |
| To improve the employment situation of your spouse/partner | All Tenured Faculty | 1.41 | 0.72 | 495 | 72.3\% | 14.1\% | 13.5\% | 100\% |
| To improve the employment situation of your spouse/partner | Tenured Men | 1.38 | 0.69 | 394 | 74.6\% | 13.2\% | 12.2\% | 100\% |
| To improve the employment situation of your spouse/partner | Tenured Women | 1.55 | 0.79 | 101 | 63.4\% | 17.8\% | 18.8\% | 100\% |
| To improve the employment situation of your spouse/partner | All Tenure-Track Faculty | 1.56 | 0.75 | 289 | 59.9\% | 24.6\% | 15.6\% | 100\% |
| To improve the employment situation of your spouse/partner | Tenure-Track Men | 1.52 | 0.73 | 178 | 61.8\% | 24.2\% | 14.0\% | 100\% |
| To improve the employment situation of your spouse/partner | Tenure-Track Women | 1.61 | 0.78 | 111 | 56.8\% | 25.2\% | 18.0\% | 100\% |
| To improve the employment situation of your spouse/partner | All Non-Ladder Faculty | 1.37 | ${ }^{0.61}$ | 246 | 70.3\% | 22.8\% | ${ }_{6}^{6.9 \%}$ | 100\% |
| To improve the employment situation of your spouse/partner To improve the employment situation of your spouse/partner | Non-Ladder Men Non-Ladder Women | 1.33 1.43 | 0.59 0.64 | 158 88 | 73.4\% $64.8 \%$ | 20.3\% 27.3\% | $6.3 \%$ $8.0 \%$ | 100\% |
| To lower your cost of living | All Faculty | 1.41 | 0.66 | 1092 | 69.0\% | 21.3\% | 9.7\% | 100\% |
| To lower your cost of living | All Men | 1.41 | 0.66 | 762 | 68.1\% | 22.3\% | 9.6\% | 100\% |
| To lower your cost of living | All Women | 1.39 | 0.66 | 330 | 70.9\% | 19.1\% | 10.0\% | 100\% |
| To lower your cost of living | All Ladder Faculty | 1.39 | 0.65 | 817 | 69.9\% | 21.1\% | 9.1\% | 100\% |
| To lower your cost of living | Ladder Men | 1.41 | 0.66 | 592 | 68.8\% | 21.8\% | 9.5\% | 100\% |
| To lower your cost of living | Ladder Women | 1.35 | 0.62 | 225 | 72.9\% | 19.1\% | 8.0\% | 100\% |
| To lower your cost of living | All Tenured Faculty | 1.28 | 0.55 | 520 | 77.5\% | 17.5\% | 5.0\% | 100\% |
| To lower your cost of living | Tenured Men | 1.27 | 0.54 | 406 | 77.1\% | 18.5\% | 4.4\% | 100\% |
| To lower your cost of living | Tenured Women | 1.28 | 0.59 | 114 | 78.9\% | 14.0\% | 7.0\% | 100\% |
| To lower your cost of living | All Tenure-Track Faculty | 1.60 | 0.75 | 297 | 56.6\% | 27.3\% | 16.2\% | 100\% |
| To lower your cost of living | Tenure-Track Men | 1.70 | 0.79 | 186 | 50.5\% | 29.0\% | 20.4\% | 100\% |
| To lower your cost of living | Tenure-Track Women | 1.42 | 0.65 | 111 | 66.7\% | 24.3\% | 9.0\% | 100\% |
| To lower your cost of living | All Non-Ladder Faculty | 1.45 | ${ }^{0.69}$ | 275 | ${ }^{66.2 \%}$ | 22.2\% | 11.6\% | 100\% |
| To lower your cost of living | Non-Ladder Men | 1.44 | 0.67 | 170 | 65.9\% | 24.1\% | 10.0\% | 100\% |
| To lower your cost of living | Non-Ladder Women | 1.48 | 0.74 | 105 | 66.7\% | 19.0\% | 14.3\% | 100\% |
| Retirement | All Faculty | 1.37 | 0.65 | 989 | 72.6\% | 18.2\% | 9.2\% | 100\% |
| Retirement | All Men | 1.40 | ${ }^{0.66}$ | 717 | 70.3\% | 19.7\% | 10.0\% | 100\% |
| Retirement Retirement | All Women All Ladder Faculty | 1.28 1.35 | 0.59 0.64 | 272 737 | 78.7\% $73.5 \%$ | 14.3\% | 7.0\% | 100\% 100\% |
| Retirement | Ladder Men | 1.38 | 0.66 | 553 | 71.6\% | 18.6\% | 9.8\% | 100\% |
| Retirement | Ladder Women | 1.27 | 0.56 | 184 | 79.3\% | 14.7\% | 6.0\% | 100\% |
| Retirement | All Tenured Faculty | 1.49 | 0.71 | 497 | 63.6\% | 23.9\% | 12.5\% | 100\% |
| Retirement | Tenured Men | 1.49 | 0.71 | 400 | 63.5\% | 23.8\% | 12.8\% | 100\% |
| Retirement | Tenured Women | 1.47 | 0.69 | 97 | 63.9\% | 24.7\% | 11.3\% | 100\% |
| Retirement | All Tenure-Track Faculty | 1.07 | 0.30 | 240 | 94.2\% | 4.6\% | 1.3\% | 100\% |
| Retirement | Tenure-Track Men | 1.09 | 0.35 | 153 | 92.8\% | 5.2\% | 2.0\% | 100\% |
| Retirement | Tenure-Track Women | 1.03 | 0.18 | 87 | 96.6\% | 3.4\% | 0.0\% | 100\% |
| Retirement | All Non-Ladder Faculty | 1.40 | 0.67 | 252 | 69.8\% | 19.8\% | 10.3\% | 100\% |
| Retirement Retirement | Non-Ladder Men Non-Ladder Women | 1.45 1.32 | 0.69 0.64 | 164 88 | 65.9\% $77.3 \%$ | 23.2\% $13.6 \%$ | ${ }_{\text {910 }}^{\text {910\% }}$ | 100\% 100\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | 28 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Prepared by Harvard Institutional Research |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 37 of 45 |


| Hiring / Retention (continued) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| To what extent, if at all, have you considered the following as reasons to leave: ( $1=$ Not at all, $3=$ To a great extent) | Cohort | Mean | Standard Deviation | Responses | Not at all | To some extent | To a great extent |  |  |  |  | Total |
| Other | All Faculty | 2.28 | 0.86 | 141 | 27.0\% | 17.7\% | 55.3\% |  |  |  |  | 100\% |
| Other | All Men | 2.16 | 0.89 | 91 | 31.9\% | 19.8\% | 48.4\% |  |  |  |  | 100\% |
| Other | All Women | 2.50 | 0.79 | 50 | 18.0\% | 14.0\% | 68.0\% |  |  |  |  | 100\% |
| Other | All Ladder Faculty | 2.25 | 0.87 | 114 | 28.1\% | 19.3\% | 52.6\% |  |  |  |  | 100\% |
| Other | Ladder Men | 2.20 | 0.88 | 79 | 30.4\% | 19.0\% | 50.6\% |  |  |  |  | 100\% |
| Other | Ladder Women | 2.34 | 0.84 | 35 | 22.9\% | 20.0\% | 57.1\% |  |  |  |  | 100\% |
| Other | All Tenured Faculty | 2.16 | 0.88 | 69 | 31.9\% | 20.3\% | 47.8\% |  |  |  |  | 100\% |
| Other | Tenured Men | 2.12 | 0.90 | 50 | 34.0\% | 20.0\% | 46.0\% |  |  |  |  | 100\% |
| Other | Tenured Women | 2.26 | 0.87 | 19 | 26.3\% | 21.1\% | 52.6\% |  |  |  |  | 100\% |
| Other | All Tenure-Track Faculty | 2.38 | 0.83 | 45 | 22.2\% | 17.8\% | 60.0\% |  |  |  |  | 100\% |
| Other | Tenure-Track Men | 2.34 | 0.86 | 29 | 24.1\% | 17.2\% | 58.6\% |  |  |  |  | 100\% |
| Other | Tenure-Track Women | 2.44 | 0.81 | 16 | 18.8\% | 18.8\% | 62.5\% |  |  |  |  | 100\% |
| Other | All Non-Ladder Faculty | 2.44 | 0.85 | 27 | 22.2\% | 11.1\% | 66.7\% |  |  |  |  | 100\% |
| Other | Non-Ladder Men | 1.92 | 0.90 | 12 | 41.7\% | 25.0\% | 33.3\% |  |  |  |  | 100\% |
| Other | Non-Ladder Women | 2.87 | 0.52 | 15 | 6.7\% | 0.0\% | 93.3\% |  |  |  |  | 100\% |
| Hiring / Renewal of Contract |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Current Position | Cohort |  |  | Responses | Job posting | Contacted by faculty member | Contacted by administrator | Contacted the Academic Unit | Asked Unit to create a job | Other |  | Total |
| Which statement best describes how you came into your current position? (non-ladder survey only) | All Non-Ladder Faculty |  |  | 292 | 22.9\% | 42.5\% | 10.3\% | 9.6\% | 6.2\% | 8.6\% |  | 100\% |
| Which statement best describes how you came into your current position? (non-ladder survey only) | Non-Ladder Men |  |  | 182 | 20.9\% | 47.8\% | 12.6\% | 6.0\% | 6.6\% | 6.0\% |  | 100\% |
| Which statement best describes how you came into your current position? (non-ladder survey only) | Non-Ladder Women |  |  | 110 | 26.4\% | 33.6\% | 6.4\% | 15.5\% | 5.5\% | 12.7\% |  | 100\% |
| Primary Role | Cohort |  |  | Responses | Teaching | Research | Advising | Other | Case Writing/ Course Development |  |  | Total |
| What is your primary role in your [unit]? (non-ladder survey only) | All Non-Ladder Faculty |  |  | 297 | 69.0\% | 15.5\% | 3.7\% | 11.4\% | 0.3\% |  |  | 100\% |
| What is your primary role in your [unit]? (non-ladder survey only) | Non-Ladder Men |  |  | 186 | 67.7\% | 16.1\% | 3.8\% | 11.8\% | 0.5\% |  |  | 100\% |
| What is your primary role in your [unit]? (non-ladder survey only) | Non-Ladder Women |  |  | 111 | 71.2\% | 14.4\% | 3.6\% | 10.8\% | 0.0\% |  |  | 100\% |
| Satisfaction with current job title ( $1=$ Very dissatisfied, $5=$ Very Satisfied) | Cohort | Mean | Standard Deviation | Responses | Very dissatisfied | Somewhat dissatisfied | Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied | Somewhat satisfied | Very satisfied |  |  | Total |
| How satisfied are you with your current title? (non-ladder survey only) | All Non-Ladder Faculty | 3.37 | 1.36 | 301 | 11.3\% | 20.9\% | 12.3\% | 30.2\% | 25.2\% |  |  | 100\% |
| How satisfied are you with your current title? (non-ladder survey only) | Non-Ladder Men | 3.46 | 1.35 | 188 | 10.1\% | 19.7\% | 11.7\% | 30.9\% | 27.7\% |  |  | 100\% |
| How satisfied are you with your current title? (non-ladder survey only) | Non-Ladder Women | 3.22 | 1.37 | 113 | 13.3\% | 23.0\% | 13.3\% | 29.2\% | 21.2\% |  |  | 100\% |
| Job Description (Yes / No Answers) | Cohort |  |  | Responses | Yes | No |  |  |  |  |  | Total |
| Do you have a formal job description? (non-ladder survey only) | All Non-Ladder Faculty |  |  | 297 | 53.5\% | 46.5\% |  |  |  |  |  | 100\% |
| Do you have a formal job description? (non-ladder survey only) | Non-Ladder Men |  |  | 186 | 51.1\% | 48.9\% |  |  |  |  |  | 100\% |
| Do you have a formal job description? (non-ladder survey only) | Non-Ladder Women |  |  | 111 | 57.7\% | 42.3\% |  |  |  |  |  | 100\% |
| Do your daily duties match that job description? (non-ladder survey only) | All Non-Ladder Faculty |  |  | 158 | 85.4\% | 14.6\% |  |  |  |  |  | 100\% |
| Do your daily duties match that job description? (non-ladder survey only) | Non-Ladder Men |  |  | 94 | 89.4\% | 10.6\% |  |  |  |  |  | 100\% |
| Do your daily duties match that job description? (non-ladder survey only) | Non-Ladder Women |  |  | 64 | 79.7\% | 20.3\% |  |  |  |  |  | 100\% |
| Formal Contract (Yes / No Answers) | Cohort |  |  | Responses | Yes | No |  |  |  |  |  | Total |
| Do you have a formal contract? (non-ladder survey only) | All Non-Ladder Faculty |  |  | 298 | 59.7\% | 40.3\% |  |  |  |  |  | 100\% |
| Do you have a formal contract? (non-ladder survey only) | Non-Ladder Men |  |  | 187 | 57.2\% | 42.8\% |  |  |  |  |  | 100\% |
| Do you have a formal contract? (non-ladder survey only) | Non-Ladder Women |  |  | 111 | 64.0\% | 36.0\% |  |  |  |  |  | 100\% |
| Contract Length | Cohort |  |  | Responses | 1 semester | 1 year |  |  | 4 years |  | more than | Total |
| What is the length of your contract? (non-ladder survey only) | All Non-Ladder Faculty |  |  | ${ }_{164}$ | 1 semester | 25.6\% | 2 8.5\% | 3 $17.7 \%$ | 4.8\% | 36.0\% | ${ }^{5}$ 9.1\% | 100\% |
| What is the length of your contract? (non-ladder survey only) | Non-Ladder Men |  |  | 98 | 1.0\% | 28.6\% | 7.1\% | 20.4\% | 2.0\% | 31.6\% | 9.2\% | 100\% |
| What is the length of your contract? (non-ladder survey only) | Non-Ladder Women |  |  | 66 | 1.5\% | 21.2\% | 10.6\% | 13.6\% | 1.5\% | 42.4\% | 9.1\% | 100\% |
| Contract Renewable? (Yes/No) | Cohort |  |  | Responses | Yes | No |  |  |  |  |  | Total |
| Is your contract renewable? (non-ladder survey only) | All Non-Ladder Faculty |  |  | 160 | 89.4\% | 10.6\% |  |  |  |  |  | 100\% |
| Is your contract renewable? (non-ladder survey only) | Non-Ladder Men |  |  | 98 | 94.9\% | 5.1\% |  |  |  |  |  | 100\% |
| Is your contract renewable? (non-ladder survey only) | Non-Ladder Women |  |  | 62 | 80.6\% | 19.4\% |  |  |  |  |  | 100\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Not yet up for |  |  |  |
| Number of Times Renewed | Cohort |  |  | Responses | Once | Twice | 3 times | 4 or more times | Renewal |  |  | Total |
| How many times has your contract been renewed? (non-ladder survey only) | All Non-Ladder Faculty |  |  | 107 | 30.8\% | 18.7\% | 17.8\% | 30.8\% | 1.9\% |  |  | 100\% |
| How many times has your contract been renewed? (non-ladder survey only) | Non-Ladder Men |  |  | 70 | 27.1\% | 24.3\% | 17.1\% | 28.6\% | 2.9\% |  |  | 100\% |
| How many times has your contract been renewed? (non-ladder survey only) | Non-Ladder Women |  |  | 37 | 37.8\% | 8.1\% | 18.9\% | 35.1\% | 0.0\% |  |  | 100\% |
| a imit |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 4 or more |  |  |  |
| What is the limit on the number of times you can renew your contract? (non-ladder survey only) | All Non-Ladder Faculty |  |  | ${ }_{88}$ | 64.8\% | 3.4\% | 9.1\% | 1.1\% | ${ }_{\text {times }}$ |  |  | Total |
| What is the limit on the number of times you can renew your contract? (non-ladder survey only) | Non-Ladder Men |  |  | 58 | 63.8\% | 5.2\% | 8.6\% | 1.7\% | 20.7\% |  |  | 100\% |
| What is the limit on the number of times you can renew your contract? (non-ladder survey only) | Non-Ladder Women |  |  | 30 | 66.7\% | 0.0\% | 10.0\% | 0.0\% | 23.3\% |  |  | 100\% |
|  |  |  | 28 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Hiring / Renewal of Contract (continued) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Likelihood of Renewal ( 1 = Very unlikely, 5 = Very likely) | Cohort | Mean | Standard Deviation | Responses | Very unlikely | Somewhat unlikely | Neither likely nor unlikely | Somewhat likely | Very likely | Total |
| Given the opportunity, how likely would you be to renew your contract? (non-ladder survey only) | All Non-Ladder Faculty | 4.27 | 1.10 | 136 | 5.1\% | 3.7\% | 8.1\% | 25.0\% | 58.1\% | 100\% |
| Given the opportunity, how likely would you be to renew your contract? (non-ladder survey only) | Non-Ladder Men | 4.24 | 1.16 | 91 | 6.6\% | 3.3\% | 7.7\% | 24.2\% | 58.2\% | 100\% |
| Given the opportunity, how likely would you be to renew your contract? (non-ladder survey only) | Non-Ladder Women | 4.33 | 0.98 | 45 | 2.2\% | 4.4\% | 8.9\% | 26.7\% | 57.8\% | 100\% |
| Renewal Process (Yes/№) | Cohort |  |  | Responses | Yes | No |  |  |  | Total |
| Does your [unit] have an established renewal of contract process for non-tenure track faculty? (nonladder survey only) | All Non-Ladder Faculty |  |  | 164 | 64.6\% | 35.4\% |  |  |  | 100\% |
| Does your [unit] have an established renewal of contract process for non-tenure track faculty? (nonladder survey only) | Non-Ladder Men |  |  | 94 | 67.0\% | 33.0\% |  |  |  | 100\% |
| Does your [unit] have an established renewal of contract process for non-tenure track faculty? (nonladder survey only) | Non-Ladder Women |  |  | 70 | 61.4\% | 38.6\% |  |  |  | 100\% |
| Criteria for Contract Renewal | Cohort | Mean | Standard | Responses | Strongly disagree | Somewhat disagree | Neither agree | Somewhat agree | Strongly agree | Total |
| To what extent do you agree that the criteria for renewal of contract are clearly communicated? (non- |  |  |  | , |  |  |  | Somewha | Srongly agre |  |
| ladder survey only) | All Non-Ladder Faculty | 3.21 | 1.32 | 106 | 15.1\% | 16.0\% | 18.9\% | 33.0\% | 17.0\% | 100\% |
| To what extent do you agree that the criteria for renewal of contract are clearly communicated? (nonladder survey only) | Non-Ladder Men | 3.33 | 1.20 | 63 | 7.9\% | 19.0\% | 22.2\% | 33.3\% | 17.5\% | 100\% |
| To what extent do you agree that the criteria for renewal of contract are clearly communicated? (non- |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ladder survey only) | Non-Ladder Women | 3.02 | 1.47 | 43 | 25.6\% | 11.6\% | 14.0\% | 32.6\% | 16.3\% | 100\% |
| In your experience, to what extent are the following items valued in the renewal of contract |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| process at your School: |  |  | Standard |  | Valued slightly or |  |  |  |  |  |
| ( $1=$ Valued slightly or not at all, $3=$ Highly valued) | Cohort | Mean | Deviation | Responses | not at all | Somewhat valued | Highly valued |  |  | Total |
| Research/scholarly work (non-ladder survey only) | All Non-Ladder Faculty | 2.46 | 0.68 | 89 | 10.1\% | 33.7\% | 56.2\% |  |  | 100\% |
| Research/scholarly work (non-ladder survey only) | Non-Ladder Men | 2.57 | 0.57 | 53 | 3.8\% | 35.8\% | 60.4\% |  |  | 100\% |
| Research/scholarly work (non-ladder survey only) | Non-Ladder Women | 2.31 | 0.79 | 36 | 19.4\% | 30.6\% | 50.0\% |  |  | 100\% |
| Teaching contributions (non-ladder survey only) | All Non-Ladder Faculty | 2.48 | 0.71 | 96 | 12.5\% | 27.1\% | 60.4\% |  |  | 100\% |
| Teaching contributions (non-ladder survey only) | Non-Ladder Men | 2.53 | 0.66 | 57 | 8.8\% | 29.8\% | 61.4\% |  |  | 100\% |
| Teaching contributions (non-ladder survey only) | Non-Ladder Women | 2.41 | 0.79 | 39 | 17.9\% | 23.1\% | 59.0\% |  |  | 100\% |
| Service (non-ladder survey only) | All Non-Ladder Faculty | 2.11 | 0.69 | 88 | 18.2\% | 52.3\% | 29.5\% |  |  | 100\% |
| Service (non-ladder survey only) | Non-Ladder Men | 2.17 | 0.68 | 52 | 15.4\% | 51.9\% | 32.7\% |  |  | 100\% |
| Service (non-ladder survey only) | Non-Ladder Women | 2.03 | 0.70 | 36 | 22.2\% | 52.8\% | 25.0\% |  |  | 100\% |
| How appropriately are these items valued in the renewal of contract process at your School: ( 1 - Very undervalued, $5=$ Very overvalued) | Cohort | Mean | Standard | Responses | Very undervalued | Somewhat | Valued | Somewhat | Very | Total |
| Research/scholarly work (non-ladder survey only) | All Non-Ladder Faculty | 3.11 | 0.92 | 89 | 7.9\% | 5.6\% | 61.8\% | 16.9\% | 7.9\% | 100\% |
| Research/scholarly work (non-ladder survey only) | Non-Ladder Men | 3.25 | 0.73 | 55 | 1.8\% | 5.5\% | 63.6\% | 23.6\% | 5.5\% | 100\% |
| Research/scholarly work (non-ladder survey only) | Non-Ladder Women | 2.88 | 1.15 | 34 | 17.6\% | 5.9\% | 58.8\% | 5.9\% | 11.8\% | 100\% |
| Teaching contributions (non-ladder survey only) | All Non-Ladder Faculty | 2.49 | 0.82 | 98 | 13.3\% | 29.6\% | 54.1\% | 1.0\% | 2.0\% | 100\% |
| Teaching contributions (non-ladder survey only) | Non-Ladder Men | 2.53 | 0.72 | 60 | 8.3\% | 33.3\% | 56.7\% | 0.0\% | 1.7\% | 100\% |
| Teaching contributions (non-ladder survey only) | Non-Ladder Women | 2.42 | 0.95 | 38 | 21.1\% | 23.7\% | 50.0\% | 2.6\% | 2.6\% | 100\% |
| Service (non-ladder survey only) | All Non-Ladder Faculty | 2.46 | 0.85 | 87 | 16.1\% | 27.6\% | 51.7\% | 3.4\% | 1.1\% | 100\% |
| Service (non-ladder survey only) | Non-Ladder Men | 2.52 | 0.75 | 52 | 11.5\% | 28.8\% | 55.8\% | 3.8\% | 0.0\% | 100\% |
| Service (non-ladder survey only) | Non-Ladder Women | 2.37 | 0.97 | 35 | 22.9\% | 25.7\% | 45.7\% | 2.9\% | 2.9\% | 100\% |
| Performace Review (Yes/No) | Cohort |  |  | Responses | Yes | No |  |  |  | Total |
| Do you have an annual performance review with your [leader]? (non-ladder survey only) | All Non-Ladder Faculty |  |  | 297 | 27.6\% | 72.4\% |  |  |  | 100\% |
| Do you have an annual performance review with your [leader]? (non-ladder survey only) | Non-Ladder Men |  |  | 185 | 29.7\% | 70.3\% |  |  |  | 100\% |
| Do you have an annual performance review with your [leader]? (non-ladder survey only) | Non-Ladder Women |  |  | 112 | 24.1\% | 75.9\% |  |  |  | 100\% |
| Have you ever been recognized by your Academic Unit or Unit Head for your contributions to: |  |  |  | Affirmative |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| (check all that apply) | Cohort |  |  | Responses |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Teaching (non-ladder survey only) | All Non-Ladder Faculty |  |  | 133 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Teaching (non-ladder survey only) | Non-Ladder Men |  |  | 86 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Teaching (non-ladder survey only) | Non-Ladder Women |  |  | 47 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Advising (non-ladder survey only) | All Non-Ladder Faculty |  |  | 51 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Advising (non-ladder survey only) | Non-Ladder Men |  |  | 34 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Advising (non-ladder survey only) | Non-Ladder Women |  |  | 17 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Research (non-ladder survey only) | All Non-Ladder Faculty |  |  | 36 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Research (non-ladder survey only) Research (non-ladder survey only) | Non-Ladder Men Non-Ladder Women |  |  | 29 7 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Non-Ladder Women |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Life Outside Harvard University |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| To what extent have the following been a source of stress over the past twelve months: ( $1=$ Not at all, 3 = Extensive) | Cohort | Mean | Standard Deviation | Responses | Not at all | Somewhat | Extensive | Total |
| Managing household responsibilities | All Faculty | 1.88 | 0.73 | 1199 | 33.3\% | 45.5\% | 21.2\% | 100\% |
| Managing household responsibilities | All Men | 1.80 | 0.71 | 842 | 37.4\% | 45.6\% | 17.0\% | 100\% |
| Managing household responsibilities | All Women | 2.08 | 0.74 | 357 | 23.5\% | 45.4\% | 31.1\% | 100\% |
| Managing household responsibilities | All Ladder Faculty | 1.91 | 0.73 | 921 | 31.7\% | 45.6\% | 22.7\% | 100\% |
| Managing household responsibilities | Ladder Men | 1.81 | 0.72 | 668 | 37.3\% | 44.9\% | 17.8\% | 100\% |
| Managing household responsibilities | Ladder Women | 2.19 | 0.70 | 253 | 17.0\% | 47.4\% | 35.6\% | 100\% |
| Managing household responsibilities | All Tenured Faculty | 1.84 | 0.72 | 609 | 35.3\% | 45.6\% | 19.0\% | 100\% |
| Managing household responsibilities | Tenured Men | 1.76 | 0.71 | 476 | 39.5\% | 44.5\% | 16.0\% | 100\% |
| Managing household responsibilities | Tenured Women | 2.10 | 0.71 | 133 | 20.3\% | 49.6\% | 30.1\% | 100\% |
| Managing household responsibilities | All Tenure-Track Faculty | 2.05 | 0.74 | 312 | 24.7\% | 45.5\% | 29.8\% | 100\% |
| Managing household responsibilities | Tenure-Track Men | 1.91 | 0.73 | 192 | 31.8\% | 45.8\% | 22.4\% | 100\% |
| Managing household responsibilities | Tenure-Track Women | 2.28 | 0.69 | 120 | 13.3\% | 45.0\% | 41.7\% | 100\% |
| Managing household responsibilities | All Non-Ladder Faculty | 1.78 | 0.71 | 278 | 38.5\% | 45.3\% | 16.2\% | 100\% |
| Managing household responsibilities | Non-Ladder Men | 1.76 | 0.68 | 174 | 37.9\% | 48.3\% | 13.8\% | 100\% |
| Managing household responsibilities | Non-Ladder Women | 1.81 | 0.75 | 104 | 39.4\% | 40.4\% | 20.2\% | 100\% |
| Childcare | All Faculty | 1.69 | 0.78 | 937 | 50.6\% | 29.7\% | 19.7\% | 100\% |
| Childcare | All Men | 1.61 | 0.74 | 676 | 54.4\% | 30.5\% | 15.1\% | 100\% |
| Childcare | All Women | 1.91 | 0.85 | 261 | 40.6\% | 27.6\% | 31.8\% | 100\% |
| Childcare | All Ladder Faculty | 1.71 | 0.79 | 743 | 50.1\% | 29.1\% | 20.9\% | 100\% |
| Childcare | Ladder Men | 1.61 | 0.74 | 547 | 54.3\% | 30.5\% | 15.2\% | 100\% |
| Childcare | Ladder Women | 1.98 | 0.87 | 196 | 38.3\% | 25.0\% | 36.7\% | 100\% |
| Childcare | All Tenured Faculty | 1.57 | 0.73 | 488 | 57.0\% | 28.9\% | 14.1\% | 100\% |
| Childcare | Tenured Men | 1.51 | 0.69 | 390 | 60.5\% | 28.5\% | 11.0\% | 100\% |
| Childcare | Tenured Women | 1.84 | 0.82 | 98 | 42.9\% | 30.6\% | 26.5\% | 100\% |
| Childcare | All Tenure-Track Faculty | 1.97 | 0.84 | 255 | 36.9\% | 29.4\% | 33.7\% | 100\% |
| Childcare | Tenure-Track Men | 1.87 | 0.79 | 157 | 38.9\% | 35.7\% | 25.5\% | 100\% |
| Childcare | Tenure-Track Women | 2.13 | 0.89 | 98 | 33.7\% | 19.4\% | 46.9\% | 100\% |
| Childcare | All Non-Ladder Faculty | 1.63 | 0.74 | 194 | 52.6\% | 32.0\% | 15.5\% | 100\% |
| Childcare | Non-Ladder Men | 1.60 | 0.73 | 129 | 55.0\% | 30.2\% | 14.7\% | $100 \%$ $100 \%$ |
| Childcare | Non-Ladder Women | 1.69 | 0.75 | 65 | 47.7\% | 35.4\% | 16.9\% | 100\% |
| Reproductive decisions/issues | All Faculty | 1.27 | 0.59 0.49 | 939 | 80.1\% | 12.5\% | 7.5\% | 100\% |
| Reproductive decisions/issues | All Men | 1.20 | 0.49 | 679 | 83.9\% | 11.9\% | 4.1\% | 100\% |
| Reproductive decisions/issues | All Women | 1.46 | 0.76 | 260 | 70.0\% | 13.8\% | 16.2\% | 100\% |
| Reproductive decisions/issues | All Ladder Faculty | 1.29 | 0.61 | 751 | 79.4\% | 12.4\% | 8.3\% | 100\% |
| Reproductive decisions/issues | Ladder Men | 1.21 | 0.51 | 558 | 83.2\% | 12.4\% | 4.5\% | 100\% |
| Reproductive decisions/issues | Ladder Women | 1.51 | 0.80 | 193 | 68.4\% | 12.4\% | 19.2\% | 100\% |
| Reproductive decisions/issues | All Tenured Faculty | 1.09 | 0.35 | 475 | 92.2\% | 6.1\% | 1.7\% | 100\% |
| Reproductive decisions/issues | Tenured Men | 1.08 | 0.31 | 390 | 92.3\% | 6.9\% | 0.8\% | 100\% |
| Reproductive decisions/issues | Tenured Women | 1.14 | 0.49 | 85 | 91.8\% | 2.4\% | 5.9\% | 100\% |
| Reproductive decisions/issues | All Tenure-Track Faculty | 1.62 | 0.79 | 276 | 57.2\% | 23.2\% | 19.6\% | 100\% |
| Reproductive decisions/issues | Tenure-Track Men | 1.51 | 0.72 | 168 | 61.9\% | 25.0\% | 13.1\% | 100\% |
| Reproductive decisions/issues | Tenure-Track Women | 1.80 | 0.87 | 108 | 50.0\% | 20.4\% | 29.6\% | 100\% |
| Reproductive decisions/issues | All Non-Ladder Faculty | 1.21 | 0.50 | 188 | 83.0\% | 12.8\% | 4.3\% | 100\% |
| Reproductive decisions/issues | Non-Ladder Men | 1.15 | 0.42 | 121 | 87.6\% | 9.9\% | 2.5\% | 100\% |
| Reproductive decisions/issues | Non-Ladder Women | 1.33 | 0.61 | 67 | 74.6\% | 17.9\% | 7.5\% | 100\% |
| Care of someone who is ill, disabled, aging, and/or in need of special services | All Faculty | 1.50 | 0.70 | 1000 | 61.8\% | 26.1\% | 12.1\% | 100\% |
| Care of someone who is ill, disabled, aging, and/or in need of special services | All Men | 1.46 | 0.67 | 727 | 64.4\% | 25.4\% | 10.2\% | 100\% |
| Care of someone who is ill, disabled, aging, and/or in need of special services | All Women | 1.62 | 0.76 | 273 | 54.9\% | 27.8\% | 17.2\% | 100\% |
| Care of someone who is ill, disabled, aging, and/or in need of special services | All Ladder Faculty | 1.48 | 0.69 | 784 | 63.6\% | 24.7\% | 11.6\% | 100\% |
| Care of someone who is ill, disabled, aging, and/or in need of special services | Ladder Men | 1.44 | 0.66 | 583 | 66.0\% | 24.4\% | 9.6\% | 100\% |
| Care of someone who is ill, disabled, aging, and/or in need of special services | Ladder Women | 1.61 | 0.77 | 201 | 56.7\% | 25.9\% | 17.4\% | 100\% |
| Care of someone who is ill, disabled, aging, and/or in need of special services | All Tenured Faculty | 1.56 | 0.71 | 530 | 56.8\% | 30.0\% | 13.2\% | 100\% |
| Care of someone who is ill, disabled, aging, and/or in need of special services | Tenured Men | 1.52 | 0.69 | 423 | 60.0\% | 28.4\% | 11.6\% | 100\% |
| Care of someone who is ill, disabled, aging, and/or in need of special services | Tenured Women | 1.76 | 0.76 | 107 | 43.9\% | 36.4\% | 19.6\% | 100\% |
| Care of someone who is ill, disabled, aging, and/or in need of special services | All Tenure-Track Faculty | 1.30 | 0.61 | 254 | 78.0\% | 13.8\% | 8.3\% | 100\% |
| Care of someone who is ill, disabled, aging, and/or in need of special services | Tenure-Track Men | 1.23 | 0.51 | 160 | 81.9\% | 13.8\% | 4.4\% | 100\% |
| Care of someone who is ill, disabled, aging, and/or in need of special services | Tenure-Track Women | 1.44 | 0.74 | 94 | ${ }^{71.3 \%}$ | 13.8\% | 14.9\% | 100\% |
| Care of someone who is ill, disabled, aging, and/or in need of special services | All Non-Ladder Faculty | 1.59 | 0.72 | 216 | 55.1\% | 31.0\% | 13.9\% | 100\% |
| Care of someone who is ill, disabled, aging, and/or in need of special services | Non-Ladder Men | 1.55 | 0.71 | 144 | $57.6 \%$ | 29.9\% | 12.5\% | 100\% |
| Care of someone who is ill, disabled, aging, and/or in need of special services | Non-Ladder Women | 1.67 | 0.75 | 72 | 50.0\% | 33.3\% | 16.7\% | 100\% |
| Your health | All Faculty | 1.42 | 0.60 | 1155 | 63.9\% | 30.6\% | 5.5\% | 100\% 1000 |
| Your health Your health | All Men All Women | 1.38 1.50 | 0.58 0.63 | 820 335 | $66.6 \%$ $57.3 \%$ | 28.5\% | 4.9\% | 100\% 100\% |
| Your health | All Ladder Faculty | 1.41 | 0.60 | 883 | 64.8\% | 29.4\% | 5.8\% | 100\% |
| Your heath | Ladder Men | 1.37 | 0.58 | 647 | 67.7\% | 27.2\% | 5.1\% | 100\% |
| Your heath | Ladder Women | 1.51 | 0.64 | 236 | 56.8\% | 35.6\% | 7.6\% | 100\% |
| Your health | All Tenured Faculty | 1.40 | 0.58 | 586 | 64.5\% | 30.7\% | 4.8\% | 100\% |
| Your heath | Tenured Men | 1.38 | 0.57 | 462 | 66.9\% | 28.6\% | 4.5\% | 100\% |
| Your heath | Tenured Women | 1.50 | 0.60 | 124 | 55.6\% | 38.7\% | 5.6\% | 100\% |
| Your health | All Tenure-Track Faculty | 1.42 | 0.63 | 297 | ${ }^{65.3 \%}$ | 26.9\% | 7.7\% | 100\% |
| Your health Your health | Tenure-Track Men | 1.37 1.52 | 0.60 0.67 | 185 | $69.7 \%$ $58.0 \%$ | 23.8\% | 6.5\% | 100\% 1000 |
| Your health | All Non-Ladder Faculty | 1.44 | 0.59 | 272 | 61.0\% | 34.2\% | 4.8\% | 100\% |
| Your heath | Non-Ladder Men | 1.42 | 0.57 | 173 | 62.4\% | 33.5\% | 4.0\% | 100\% |
| Your health | Non-Ladder Women | 1.47 | 0.61 | 99 | 58.6\% | 35.4\% | 6.1\% | 100\% |
|  |  |  | 28 |  |  |  |  |  |


| Life Outside Harvard University (continued) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| To what extent have the following been a source of stress over the past twelve months: ( $1=$ Not at all, $3=$ Extensive) | Cohort | Mean | Standard Deviation | Responses | Not at all | Somewhat | Extensive |  |  | Total |
| Cost of living | All Faculty | 1.64 | 0.74 | 1182 | 51.2\% | 33.2\% | 15.7\% |  |  | 100\% |
| Cost of living | All Men | 1.62 | 0.73 | 838 | 52.6\% | 32.3\% | 15.0\% |  |  | 100\% |
| Cost of living | All Women | 1.69 | 0.75 | 344 | 47.7\% | 35.2\% | 17.2\% |  |  | 100\% |
| Cost of living | All Ladder Faculty | 1.60 | 0.72 | 901 | 54.1\% | 31.9\% | 14.1\% |  |  | 100\% |
| Cost of living | Ladder Men | 1.59 | 0.72 | 661 | 54.8\% | 31.6\% | 13.6\% |  |  | 100\% |
| Cost of living | Ladder Women | 1.63 | 0.74 | 240 | 52.1\% | 32.5\% | 15.4\% |  |  | 100\% |
| Cost of living | All Tenured Faculty | 1.48 | 0.65 | 594 | 60.9\% | 30.1\% | 8.9\% |  |  | 100\% |
| Cost of living | Tenured Men | 1.47 | 0.65 | 470 | 61.5\% | 30.0\% | 8.5\% |  |  | 100\% |
| Cost of living | Tenured Women | 1.52 | 0.68 | 124 | 58.9\% | 30.6\% | 10.5\% |  |  | 100\% |
| Cost of living | All Tenure-Track Faculty | 1.83 | 0.79 | 307 | 40.7\% | 35.2\% | 24.1\% |  |  | 100\% |
| Cost of living | Tenure-Track Men | 1.88 | 0.80 | 191 | 38.2\% | 35.6\% | 26.2\% |  |  | 100\% |
| Cost of living | Tenure-Track Women | 1.76 | 0.78 | 116 | 44.8\% | 34.5\% | 20.7\% |  |  | 100\% |
| Cost of living | All Non-Ladder Faculty | 1.79 | 0.76 | 281 | 42.0\% | 37.4\% | 20.6\% |  |  | 100\% |
| Cost of living | Non-Ladder Men | 1.76 | 0.77 | 177 | 44.6\% | 35.0\% | 20.3\% |  |  | 100\% |
| Cost of living | Non-Ladder Women | 1.84 | 0.75 | 104 | 37.5\% | 41.3\% | 21.2\% |  |  | 100\% |
| Other | All Faculty | 2.04 | 0.92 | 117 | 40.2\% | 15.4\% | 44.4\% |  |  | 100\% |
| Other | All Men | 1.83 | 0.92 | 72 | 51.4\% | 13.9\% | 34.7\% |  |  | 100\% |
| Other | All Women | 2.38 | 0.83 | 45 | 22.2\% | 17.8\% | 60.0\% |  |  | 100\% |
| Other | All Ladder Faculty | 1.96 | 0.94 | 94 | 45.7\% | 12.8\% | 41.5\% |  |  | 100\% |
| Other | Ladder Men | 1.73 | 0.91 | 59 | 57.6\% | 11.9\% | 30.5\% |  |  | 100\% |
| Other | Ladder Women | 2.34 | 0.87 | 35 | 25.7\% | 14.3\% | 60.0\% |  |  | 100\% |
| Other | All Tenured Faculty | 1.87 | 0.94 | 67 | 50.7\% | 11.9\% | 37.3\% |  |  | 100\% |
| Other | Tenured Men | 1.60 | 0.86 | 45 | 64.4\% | 11.1\% | 24.4\% |  |  | 100\% |
| Other | Tenured Women | 2.41 | 0.85 | 22 | 22.7\% | 13.6\% | 63.6\% |  |  | 100\% |
| Other | All Tenure-Track Faculty | 2.19 | 0.92 | 27 | 33.3\% | 14.8\% | 51.9\% |  |  | 100\% |
| Other | Tenure-Track Men | 2.14 | 0.95 | 14 | 35.7\% | 14.3\% | 50.0\% |  |  | 100\% |
| Other | Tenure-Track Women | 2.23 | 0.93 | 13 | 30.8\% | 15.4\% | 53.8\% |  |  | 100\% |
| Other | All Non-Ladder Faculty | 2.39 | 0.78 | 23 | 17.4\% | 26.1\% | 56.5\% |  |  | 100\% |
| Other | Non-Ladder Men | 2.31 | 0.85 | 13 | 23.1\% | 23.1\% | 53.8\% |  |  | 100\% |
| Other | Non-Ladder Women | 2.50 | 0.71 | 10 | 10.0\% | 30.0\% | 60.0\% |  |  | 100\% |
| Domestic Responsibilities - Conflicts | Cohort |  |  | Responses | Never | Once or twice | Two or three times a semester | Once or twice a month | Once or twice a week | Total |
| In the last year, how often have you had to leave early from, arrive late to, or miss an important workrelated meeting or commitment because of care-giving and/or other domestic responsibilities? In the last year, how often have you had to leave early from, arrive late to, or miss an important work- | All Faculty |  |  | 1241 | 43.1\% | 30.3\% | 13.8\% | 9.5\% | 3.3\% | 100\% |
| related meeting or commitment because of care-giving and/or other domestic responsibilities? | All Men |  |  | 876 | 44.7\% | 30.5\% | 13.6\% | 8.3\% | 2.9\% | 100\% |
| In the last year, how often have you had to leave early from, arrive late to, or miss an important workrelated meeting or commitment because of care-giving and/or other domestic responsibilities? | All Women |  |  | 365 | 39.2\% | 29.9\% | 14.2\% | 12.3\% | 4.4\% | 100\% |
| In the last year, how often have you had to leave early from, arrive late to, or miss an important workrelated meeting or commitment because of care-giving and/or other domestic responsibilities? | All Ladder Faculty |  |  | 946 | 40.4\% | 31.0\% | 14.0\% | 10.7\% | 4.0\% | 100\% |
| In the last year, how often have you had to leave early from, arrive late to, or miss an important workrelated meeting or commitment because of care-giving and/or other domestic responsibilities? | Ladder Men |  |  | 691 | 42.7\% | 31.0\% | 13.6\% | 9.4\% | 3.3\% | 100\% |
| In the last year, how often have you had to leave early from, arrive late to, or miss an important work- |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| In the last year, how often have you had to leave early from, arrive late to, or miss an important workrelated meeting or commitment because of care-giving and/or other domestic responsibilities? | All Tenured Faculty |  |  | 627 | 41.6\% | 33.0\% | 13.4\% | 8.5\% | 3.5\% | 100\% |
| In the last year, how often have you had to leave early from, arrive late to, or miss an important work- |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| related meeting or commitment because of care-giving and/or other domestic responsibilities? | Tenured Men |  |  | 494 | 43.7\% | 32.6\% | 13.0\% | 7.7\% | 3.0\% | 100\% |
| In the last year, how often have you had to leave early from, arrive late to, or miss an important work- related meeting or commitment because of car--giving and/or other domestic responsibilities? |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| related meeting or commitment because of care-giving and/or other domestic responsibilities? | Tenured Women |  |  | 133 | 33.8\% | 34.6\% | 15.0\% | 11.3\% | 5.3\% | 100\% |
| In the last year, how often have you had to leave early from, arrive late to, or miss an important workrelated meeting or commitment because of care-giving and/or other domestic responsibilities? | All Tenure-Track Faculty |  |  | 319 | 37.9\% | 27.0\% | 15.0\% | 15.0\% | 5.0\% | 100\% |
| In the last year, how often have you had to leave early from, arrive late to, or miss an important work- | Tenure-Track Men |  |  | 197 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| In the last year, how often have you had to leave early from, arrive late to, or miss an important work- |  |  |  | 197 | 40.1\% | 26.9\% | 15.2\% | 13.7\% | 4.1\% | 100\% |
| related meeting or commitment because of care-giving and/or other domestic responsibilities? | Tenure-Track Women |  |  | 122 | 34.4\% | 27.0\% | 14.8\% | 17.2\% | 6.6\% | 100\% |
| In the last year, how often have you had to leave early from, arrive late to, or miss an important work- related meeting or commitment because of car--giving and/or other domestic responsibilities? |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| related meeting or commitment because of care-giving and/or other domestic responsibilities? | All Non-Ladder Faculty |  |  | 295 | 51.9\% | 28.1\% | 13.2\% | 5.8\% | 1.0\% | 100\% |
| In the last year, how often have you had to leave early from, arrive late to, or miss an important workrelated meeting or commitment because of care-giving and/or other domestic responsibilities? |  |  |  |  |  | 28.6\% | 13.5\% |  |  |  |
| In the last year, how often have you had to leave early from, arrive late to, or miss an important w | Non-Ladaer Men |  |  | 185 |  |  |  |  | 1.1\% | 100\% |
| related meeting or commitment because of care-giving and/or other domestic responsibilities? | Non-Ladder Women |  |  | 110 | 50.9\% | 27.3\% | 12.7\% | 8.2\% | 0.9\% | 100\% |

Life Outside Harvard University (continued)

## omestic Responsibilities - Impact

Please indicate your agreement or disagreement with the following statement: My care-giving and/ or
other domestic responsibilities have had a negative impact on my career. lease indicate your agreement or disagreement with the tollowing stater r domestic responsibilities have had a negative impact on my career. ther domestic responsibibities have had a negative inpact on tow ding state other domestic responsibilities have had a negative impact on my career.
Please indicate your agreement or disagreement with the following stater following statement My cor Pease indicate your agreement or disagreement with the following state other domestic responsibilities have had a negative impact on my career ther domestic responsibilities have had a negative impact on my career her domeste your agreement or disagreement with the following state Please indicate your agreement or disagreement with the following state hease indicate your agreement or disagreement with the following state other domestic responsibilities have had a negative impact on my career. ther domestic responsibilities have had a negative impact on my career. ther domestic responsibilities have had a negative impact on my career. Pease indicate your agreement or disagreement with the following statement: My care-giving and/ or other domestic responsibilities have had a negative impact on my career. ther domestic responsibilities have had a negative impact on my career. Please indicate your agreement or disagreement with the following statem other domestic responsibilitities have had a negative impact on my career
ease indicate your agreement or disagreement with the following statement: My care-giving and or ther domestic responsibilities have had a negative impact on my career.

## pouse I Domestic Partner

Do you have a spouse or domestic partner?
Do you have a spouse or domestic partner?
Do you have a spouse or domestic partner?
o you have a spouse or domestic partner?
Do you have a spouse or domestic partner?
Do you have a spouse or domestic partner?
Do you have a spouse or domestic partner?
Do you have a spouse or domestic partner?
Do you have a spouse or domestic partner?
Do you have a spouse or domestic partner?
Do you have a spouse or domestic partner?
Do you have a spouse or domestic partner?
Were you win your spouse/domestic pattner before you became employed at Harvard? Were you with your spouse/domestic partner before you became employed at Harvard Were you with your spouse/domestic partner before you became employed at Harvard Were you with your spouse/domestic partner before you became employed at Harvard Were you with your spouse/domestic partner before you became employed at Harvard? Were you with your spouse/domestic partner before you became employed at Harvard? Were you with your spouse/domestic partner before you became employed at Harvard Were you with your spouse/domestic partner before you became employed at Harvard Were you with your spouse/domestic partner before you became employed at Harvard? Were you with your spouse/domestic partner before you became employed at Harvard? Were you with your spouse/domestic partner before you became employed at Harvard? Were you with your spouse/domestic partner before you became employed at Harvard? Did your School help your spouse/domestic partner find employment locally?
Did your School help your spouse/domestic partner find employment locally? Did your School help your spouse/domestic partner find employment locally? Did your School help your spouse/domestic partner find employment locally? Did your School help your spouse/domestic partner find employment locally Did your School help your spouse/domestic partner find employment locally? Did your School help your spouse/domestic partner find employment locally? Did your School help your spouse/domestic partner find employment locally? Did your School help your spouse/domemestic partner find employment locally? Did your School help your spouse/domestic partner find employment locally? Did your School help your spouse/domestic partner find employment locally?
Did your School help your spouse/domestic partner find empoyment locally?

\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline Cohort \& Mean \& Standard Deviation \& Responses \& Strongly disagree \& Somewhat disagree \& Neither agree nor disagree \& Somewhat agree \& Strongly agree \& Total <br>
\hline All Faculty \& 2.55 \& 1.44 \& 1066 \& 37.9\% \& 12.9\% \& 16.9\% \& 21.6\% \& 10.8\% \& 100\% <br>
\hline All Men \& 2.31 \& 1.38 \& 745 \& 44.3\% \& 13.3\% \& 17.0\% \& 18.0\% \& 7.4\% \& 100\% <br>
\hline All Women \& 3.09 \& 1.44 \& 321 \& 23.1\% \& 11.8\% \& 16.5\% \& 29.9\% \& 18.7\% \& 100\% <br>
\hline All Ladder Faculty \& 2.56 \& 1.45 \& 826 \& 37.3\% \& 13.1\% \& 17.3\% \& 21.1\% \& 11.3\% \& 100\% <br>
\hline Ladder Men \& 2.34 \& 1.38 \& 594 \& 43.1\% \& 13.5\% \& 17.3\% \& 19.0\% \& 7.1\% \& 100\% <br>
\hline Ladder Women \& 3.13 \& 1.47 \& 232 \& 22.4\% \& 12.1\% \& 17.2\% \& 26.3\% \& 22.0\% \& 100\% <br>
\hline All Tenured Faculty \& 2.28 \& 1.37 \& 553 \& 45.2\% \& 13.4\% \& 15.7\% \& 19.2\% \& 6.5\% \& 100\% <br>
\hline Tenured Men \& 2.14 \& 1.33 \& 427 \& 50.1\% \& 12.6\% \& 15.7\% \& 16.2\% \& 5.4\% \& 100\% <br>
\hline Tenured Women \& 2.77 \& 1.40 \& 126 \& 28.6\% \& 15.9\% \& 15.9\% \& 29.4\% \& 10.3\% \& 100\% <br>
\hline All Tenure-Track Faculty \& 3.12 \& 1.43 \& 273 \& 21.2\% \& 12.5\% \& 20.5\% \& 24.9\% \& 20.9\% \& 100\% <br>
\hline Tenure-Track Men \& 2.83 \& 1.37 \& 167 \& 25.1\% \& 15.6\% \& 21.6\% \& 26.3\% \& 11.4\% \& 100\% <br>
\hline Tenure-Track Women \& 3.57 \& 1.43 \& 106 \& 15.1\% \& 7.5\% \& 18.9\% \& 22.6\% \& 35.8\% \& 100\% <br>
\hline All Non-Ladder Faculty \& 2.50 \& 1.44 \& 240 \& 40.0\% \& 12.1\% \& 15.4\% \& 23.3\% \& 9.2\% \& 100\% <br>
\hline Non-Ladder Men \& 2.21 \& 1.40 \& 151 \& 49.0\% \& 12.6\% \& 15.9\% \& 13.9\% \& 8.6\% \& 100\% <br>
\hline Non-Ladder Women \& 2.99 \& 1.39 \& 89 \& 24.7\% \& 11.2\% \& 14.6\% \& 39.3\% \& 10.1\% \& 100\% <br>
\hline Cohort \& \& \& Responses \& Yes \& No \& \& \& \& Total <br>
\hline All Faculty \& \& \& 1247 \& 88.8\% \& 11.2\% \& \& \& \& 100\% <br>
\hline All Men \& \& \& 881 \& 90.8\% \& 9.2\% \& \& \& \& 100\% <br>
\hline All Women \& \& \& 366 \& 83.9\% \& 16.1\% \& \& \& \& 100\% <br>
\hline All Ladder Faculty \& \& \& 951 \& 90.0\% \& 10.0\% \& \& \& \& 100\% <br>
\hline Ladder Men \& \& \& 695 \& 91.9\% \& 8.1\% \& \& \& \& 100\% <br>
\hline Ladder Women \& \& \& 256 \& 84.8\% \& 15.2\% \& \& \& \& 100\% <br>
\hline All Tenured Faculty \& \& \& 631 \& 90.3\% \& 9.7\% \& \& \& \& 100\% <br>
\hline Tenured Men \& \& \& 497 \& 93.2\% \& 6.8\% \& \& \& \& 100\% <br>
\hline Tenured Women \& \& \& 134 \& 79.9\% \& 20.1\% \& \& \& \& 100\% <br>
\hline All Tenure-Track Faculty \& \& \& 320 \& 89.4\% \& 10.6\% \& \& \& \& 100\% <br>
\hline Tenure-Track Men \& \& \& 198 \& 88.9\% \& 11.1\% \& \& \& \& 100\% <br>
\hline Tenure-Track Women
All
Non-Ladder Faculty \& \& \& 122
296 \& 90.2\%
84.80 \& ${ }^{9.8 \%}$ \& \& \& \& 100\%
100\% <br>
\hline Non-Ladder Men \& \& \& 186 \& 88.6\% \& 13.4\% \& \& \& \& 100\% <br>
\hline Non-Ladder Women \& \& \& 110 \& 81.8\% \& 18.2\% \& \& \& \& 100\% <br>
\hline All Faculty \& \& \& 1102 \& 78.8\% \& 21.2\% \& \& \& \& 100\% <br>
\hline All Men \& \& \& 795 \& 77.0\% \& 23.0\% \& \& \& \& 100\% <br>
\hline All Women \& \& \& 307 \& 83.4\% \& 16.6\% \& \& \& \& 100\% <br>
\hline All Ladder Faculty \& \& \& 851 \& 77.6\% \& 22.4\% \& \& \& \& 100\% <br>
\hline Ladder Men \& \& \& 634 \& 76.3\% \& 23.7\% \& \& \& \& 100\% <br>
\hline Ladder Women \& \& \& 217 \& 81.1\% \& 18.9\% \& \& \& \& 100\% <br>
\hline All Tenured Faculty \& \& \& 566 \& 74.7\% \& 25.3\% \& \& \& \& 100\% <br>
\hline Tenured Men \& \& \& 459 \& 73.6\% \& 26.4\% \& \& \& \& 100\% <br>
\hline Tenured Women \& \& \& 107 \& 79.4\% \& 20.6\% \& \& \& \& 100\% <br>
\hline All Tenure-Track Faculty \& \& \& 285 \& 83.2\% \& 16.8\% \& \& \& \& 100\% <br>
\hline Tenure-Track Men \& \& \& 175 \& 83.4\% \& 16.6\% \& \& \& \& 100\% <br>
\hline Tenure-Track Women \& \& \& 110 \& 82.7\% \& 17.3\% \& \& \& \& 100\% <br>
\hline Non-Ladder Men \& \& \& ${ }_{161}$ \& 79.5\% \& 20.5\% \& \& \& \& 100\% <br>
\hline Non-Ladder Women \& \& \& 90 \& 88.9\% \& 11.1\% \& \& \& \& 100\% <br>
\hline All Faculty \& \& \& 790 \& 15.6\% \& 84.4\% \& \& \& \& 100\% <br>
\hline All Men \& \& \& 593 \& 14.8\% \& 85.2\% \& \& \& \& 100\% <br>
\hline All Women \& \& \& 197 \& 17.8\% \& 82.2\% \& \& \& \& 100\% <br>
\hline All Ladder Faculty \& \& \& 648 \& 17.4\% \& 82.6\% \& \& \& \& 100\% <br>
\hline Ladder Men
Ladder Women \& \& \& 494 \& 16.6\% \& 83.4\% \& \& \& \& 100\% <br>
\hline Ladder Women
All Tenured Faculty \& \& \& 154
443 \& 20.1\% \& 79.9\%
$81.3 \%$ \& \& \& \& 100\% <br>
\hline Tenured Men \& \& \& 369 \& 17.3\% \& 82.7\% \& \& \& \& 100\% <br>
\hline Tenured Women \& \& \& 74 \& 25.7\% \& 74.3\% \& \& \& \& 100\% <br>
\hline All Tenure-Track Faculty \& \& \& 205 \& 14.6\% \& 85.4\% \& \& \& \& 100\% <br>
\hline Tenure-Track Men \& \& \& 125 \& 14.4\% \& 85.6\% \& \& \& \& 100\% <br>
\hline Tenure-Track Women
All Non-Ladder Faculty \& \& \& 80
142 \& 15.0\%
$7.0 \%$ \& 85.0\%

$93.0 \%$ \& \& \& \& 100\%
100\% <br>
\hline Non-Ladder Men \& \& \& 99 \& 6.1\% \& 93.9\% \& \& \& \& 100\% <br>
\hline Non-Ladder Women \& \& \& 43 \& 9.3\% \& 90.7\% \& \& \& \& 100\% <br>
\hline
\end{tabular}

Life Outside Harvard University (continued)

| Spouse / Domestic Partner | Cohort | Responses | Yes | No | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Has your spouse/ domestic partner had problems finding an appropriate job in this area? | All Faculty | 864 | 33.3\% | 66.7\% | 100\% |
| Has your spouse/ domestic partner had problems finding an appropriate job in this area? | All Men | 616 | 30.8\% | 69.2\% | 100\% |
| Has your spouse/ domestic partner had problems finding an appropriate job in this area? | All Women | 248 | 39.5\% | 60.5\% | 100\% |
| Has your spouse/ domestic partner had problems finding an appropriate job in this area? | All Ladder Faculty | 694 | 35.9\% | 64.1\% | 100\% |
| Has your spouse/ domestic partner had problems finding an appropriate job in this area? | Ladder Men | 510 | 31.6\% | 68.4\% | 100\% |
| Has your spouse/ domestic partner had problems finding an appropriate job in this area? | Ladder Women | 184 | 47.8\% | 52.2\% | 100\% |
| Has your spouse/ domestic partner had problems finding an appropriate job in this area? | All Tenured Faculty | 452 | 31.6\% | 68.4\% | 100\% |
| Has your spouse/ domestic partner had problems finding an appropriate job in this area? | Tenured Men | 367 | 28.9\% | 71.1\% | 100\% |
| Has your spouse/ domestic partner had problems finding an appropriate job in this area? | Tenured Women | 85 | 43.5\% | 56.5\% | 100\% |
| Has your spouse/ domestic partner had problems finding an appropriate job in this area? | All Tenure-Track Faculty | 242 | 43.8\% | 56.2\% | 100\% |
| Has your spouse/ domestic partner had problems finding an appropriate job in this area? | Tenure-Track Men | 143 | 38.5\% | 61.5\% | 100\% |
| Has your spouse/ domestic partner had problems finding an appropriate job in this area? | Tenure-Track Women | 99 | 51.5\% | 48.5\% | 100\% |
| Has your spouse/ domestic partner had problems finding an appropriate job in this area? | All Non-Ladder Faculty | 170 | 22.9\% | 77.1\% | 100\% |
| Has your spouse/ domestic partner had problems finding an appropriate job in this area? | Non-Ladder Men | 106 | 27.4\% | 72.6\% | 100\% |
| Has your spouse/ domestic partner had problems finding an appropriate job in this area? | Non-Ladder Women | 64 | 15.6\% | 84.4\% | 100\% |


| Spousal Employment | Cohort | Responses | Employed at Harvard (academic) | Employed at another university (academic) | Employed at Harvard (nonacademic) | Employed elsewhere in some other capacity | Not employed outside the home | Actively seeking employme nt | Other | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| What is your spouse's / domestic partner's employment status? | All Faculty | 1086 | 14.6\% | 14.4\% | 5.1\% | 40.5\% | 15.6\% | 3.1\% | 6.7\% | 100\% |
| What is your spouse's / domestic partner's employment status? | All Men | 783 | 11.6\% | 13.4\% | 5.7\% | 39.5\% | 19.8\% | 3.7\% | 6.3\% | 100\% |
| What is your spouse's / domestic partner's employment status? | All Women | 303 | 22.4\% | 16.8\% | 3.3\% | 43.2\% | 4.6\% | 1.7\% | 7.9\% | 100\% |
| What is your spouse's / domestic partner's employment status? | All Ladder Faculty | 841 | 15.3\% | 16.1\% | 5.2\% | 39.4\% | 15.1\% | 3.1\% | 5.8\% | 100\% |
| What is your spouse's / domestic partner's employment status? | Ladder Men | 627 | 13.1\% | 14.5\% | 5.7\% | 38.9\% | 18.7\% | 3.7\% | 5.4\% | 100\% |
| What is your spouse's / domestic partner's employment status? | Ladder Women | 214 | 22.0\% | 20.6\% | 3.7\% | 40.7\% | 4.7\% | 1.4\% | 7.0\% | 100\% |
| What is your spouse's / domestic partner's employment status? | All Tenured Faculty | 557 | 16.0\% | 14.2\% | 5.6\% | 36.4\% | 18.7\% | 2.5\% | 6.6\% | 100\% |
| What is your spouse's / domestic partner's employment status? | Tenured Men | 453 | 13.5\% | 12.8\% | 5.7\% | 38.2\% | 21.4\% | 2.9\% | 5.5\% | 100\% |
| What is your spouse's / domestic partner's employment status? | Tenured Women | 104 | 26.9\% | 20.2\% | 4.8\% | 28.8\% | 6.7\% | 1.0\% | 11.5\% | 100\% |
| What is your spouse's / domestic partner's employment status? | All Tenure-Track Faculty | 284 | 14.1\% | 19.7\% | 4.6\% | 45.1\% | 8.1\% | 4.2\% | 4.2\% | 100\% |
| What is your spouse's / domestic partner's employment status? | Tenure-Track Men | 174 | 12.1\% | 19.0\% | 5.7\% | 40.8\% | 11.5\% | 5.7\% | 5.2\% | 100\% |
| What is your spouse's / domestic partner's employment status? | Tenure-Track Women | 110 | 17.3\% | 20.9\% | 2.7\% | 51.8\% | 2.7\% | 1.8\% | 2.7\% | 100\% |
| What is your spouse's / domestic partner's employment status? | All Non-Ladder Faculty | 245 | 12.2\% | 8.6\% | 4.5\% | 44.5\% | 17.1\% | 3.3\% | 9.8\% | 100\% |
| What is your spouse's / domestic partner's employment status? | Non-Ladder Men | 156 | 5.8\% | 9.0\% | 5.8\% | 41.7\% | 24.4\% | 3.8\% | 9.6\% | 100\% |
| What is your spouse's / domestic partner's employment status? | Non-Ladder Women | 89 | 23.6\% | 7.9\% | 2.2\% | 49.4\% | 4.5\% | 2.2\% | 10.1\% | 100\% |


| Do you and your spousel domestic partner have a commuting relationship, where one or both of you commute to another community (more than an hour away) for work, or where you live in different communities (more than an hour away) from one another? | Cohort | Responses | No, same community | Yes, where one travels | Yes, live in separate communities | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Commuting | All Faculty | 1011 | 78.8\% | 11.5\% | 9.7\% | 100\% |
| Commuting | All Men | 714 | 81.9\% | 10.4\% | 7.7\% | 100\% |
| Commuting | All Women | 297 | 71.4\% | 14.1\% | 14.5\% | 100\% |
| Commuting | All Ladder Faculty | 791 | 79.6\% | 10.0\% | 10.4\% | 100\% |
| Commuting | Ladder Men | 581 | 83.3\% | 9.0\% | 7.7\% | 100\% |
| Commuting | Ladder Women | 210 | 69.5\% | 12.9\% | 17.6\% | 100\% |
| Commuting | All Tenured Faculty | 521 | 82.7\% | 8.3\% | 9.0\% | 100\% |
| Commuting | Tenured Men | 420 | 85.0\% | 7.9\% | 7.1\% | 100\% |
| Commuting | Tenured Women | 101 | 73.3\% | 9.9\% | 16.8\% | 100\% |
| Commuting | All Tenure-Track Faculty | 270 | 73.7\% | 13.3\% | 13.0\% | 100\% |
| Commuting | Tenure-Track Men | 161 | 78.9\% | 11.8\% | 9.3\% | 100\% |
| Commuting | Tenure-Track Women | 109 | 66.1\% | 15.6\% | 18.3\% | 100\% |
| Commuting | All Non-Ladder Faculty | 220 | 75.9\% | 16.8\% | 7.3\% | 100\% |
| Commuting | Non-Ladder Men | 133 | 75.9\% | 16.5\% | 7.5\% | 100\% |
| Commuting | Non-Ladder Women | 87 | 75.9\% | 17.2\% | 6.9\% | 100\% |


| Spouse / Domestic Partner Benefits ( $1=$ Very dissatisfied, $5=$ Very Satisfied) | Cohort | Mean | Standard Deviation | Responses | Very dissatisfied | Somewhat dissatisfied | Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied | Somewhat satisfied | Very satisfied | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| How satisfied are you with Harvard University's spouse / domestic partner benefits? | All Faculty | 3.79 | 1.16 | 943 | 5.2\% | 8.1\% | 24.6\% | 26.4\% | 35.7\% | 100\% |
| How satisfied are you with Harvard University's spouse / domestic partner benefits? | All Men | 3.80 | 1.15 | 684 | 5.1\% | 7.9\% | 24.3\% | 27.5\% | 35.2\% | 100\% |
| How satisfied are you with Harvard University's spouse / domestic partner benefits? | All Women | 3.78 | 1.19 | 259 | 5.4\% | 8.5\% | 25.5\% | 23.6\% | 37.1\% | 100\% |
| How satisfied are you with Harvard University's spouse / domestic partner benefits? | All Ladder Faculty | 3.75 | 1.17 | 748 | 5.7\% | 8.2\% | 25.8\% | 26.3\% | 34.0\% | 100\% |
| How satisfied are you with Harvard University's spouse / domestic partner benefits? | Ladder Men | 3.78 | 1.16 | 560 | 5.4\% | 7.9\% | 25.0\% | 27.1\% | 34.6\% | 100\% |
| How satisfied are you with Harvard University's spouse / domestic partner benefits? | Ladder Women | 3.65 | 1.21 | 188 | 6.9\% | 9.0\% | 28.2\% | 23.9\% | 31.9\% | 100\% |
| How satisfied are you with Harvard University's spouse / domestic partner benefits? | All Tenured Faculty | 3.86 | 1.12 | 491 | 4.7\% | 5.9\% | 25.5\% | 27.1\% | 36.9\% | 100\% |
| How satisfied are you with Harvard University's spouse / domestic partner benefits? | Tenured Men | 3.88 | 1.11 | 400 | 4.3\% | 6.0\% | 25.0\% | 26.8\% | 38.0\% | 100\% |
| How satisfied are you with Harvard University's spouse / domestic partner benefits? | Tenured Women | 3.74 | 1.16 | 91 | 6.6\% | 5.5\% | 27.5\% | 28.6\% | 31.9\% | 100\% |
| How satisfied are you with Harvard University's spouse / domestic partner benefits? | All Tenure-Track Faculty | 3.54 | 1.24 | 257 | 7.8\% | 12.5\% | 26.5\% | 24.9\% | 28.4\% | 100\% |
| How satisfied are you with Harvard University's spouse / domestic partner benefits? | Tenure-Track Men | 3.52 | 1.23 | 160 | 8.1\% | 12.5\% | 25.0\% | 28.1\% | 26.3\% | 100\% |
| How satisfied are you with Harvard University's spouse / domestic partner benefits? | Tenure-Track Women | 3.57 | 1.26 | 97 | 7.2\% | 12.4\% | 28.9\% | 19.6\% | 32.0\% | 100\% |
| How satisfied are you with Harvard University's spouse / domestic partner benefits? | All Non-Ladder Faculty | 3.98 | 1.10 | 195 | 3.1\% | 7.7\% | 20.0\% | 26.7\% | 42.6\% | 100\% |
| How satisfied are you with Harvard University's spouse / domestic partner benefits? | Non-Ladder Men | 3.89 | 1.13 | 124 | 4.0\% | 8.1\% | 21.0\% | 29.0\% | 37.9\% | 100\% |
| How satisfied are you with Harvard University's spouse / domestic partner benefits? | Non-Ladder Women | 4.14 | 1.05 | 71 | 1.4\% | 7.0\% | 18.3\% | 22.5\% | 50.7\% | 100\% |


| Life Outside Harvard University (continued) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| How many children do you have in the following age ranges: | Cohort | Responses | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 or More | Total |
| $0-4$ years | All Faculty | 594 | 64.8\% | 26.1\% | 8.6\% | 0.2\% | 0.3\% | 0.0\% | 100\% |
| $0-4$ years | All Men | 386 | 64.0\% | 26.4\% | 9.1\% | 0.0\% | 0.5\% | 0.0\% | 100\% |
| $0-4$ years | All Women | 208 | 66.3\% | 25.5\% | 7.7\% | 0.5\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 100\% |
| $0-4$ years | All Ladder Faculty | 468 | 62.0\% | 28.0\% | 9.4\% | 0.2\% | 0.4\% | 0.0\% | 100\% |
| $0-4$ years | Ladder Men | 308 | 61.0\% | 28.9\% | 9.4\% | 0.0\% | 0.6\% | 0.0\% | 100\% |
| $0-4$ years | Ladder Women | 160 | 63.8\% | 26.3\% | 9.4\% | 0.6\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 100\% |
| $0-4$ years | All Tenured Faculty | 203 | 72.9\% | 21.7\% | 4.4\% | 0.0\% | 1.0\% | 0.0\% | 100\% |
| $0-4$ years | Tenured Men | 146 | 66.4\% | 26.0\% | 6.2\% | 0.0\% | 1.4\% | 0.0\% | 100\% |
| $0-4$ years | Tenured Women | 57 | 89.5\% | 10.5\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 100\% |
| $0-4$ years | All Tenure-Track Faculty | 265 | 53.6\% | 32.8\% | 13.2\% | 0.4\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 100\% |
| $0-4$ years | Tenure-Track Men | 162 | 56.2\% | 31.5\% | 12.3\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 100\% |
| $0-4$ years | Tenure-Track Women | 103 | 49.5\% | 35.0\% | 14.6\% | 1.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 100\% |
| $0-4$ years | All Non-Ladder Faculty | 126 | 75.4\% | 19.0\% | 5.6\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 100\% |
| $0-4$ years | Non-Ladder Men | 78 | 75.6\% | 16.7\% | 7.7\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 100\% |
| $0-4$ years | Non-Ladder Women | 48 | 75.0\% | 22.9\% | 2.1\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 100\% |
| $5-12$ years | All Faculty | 687 | 56.3\% | 28.2\% | 13.8\% | 1.3\% | 0.3\% | 0.0\% | 100\% |
| $5-12$ years | All Men | 458 | 54.4\% | 29.3\% | 15.1\% | 1.1\% | 0.2\% | 0.0\% | 100\% |
| 5-12 years | All Women | 229 | 60.3\% | 26.2\% | 11.4\% | 1.7\% | 0.4\% | 0.0\% | 100\% |
| 5-12 years | All Ladder Faculty | 526 | 55.9\% | 28.7\% | 13.5\% | 1.7\% | 0.2\% | 0.0\% | 100\% |
| 5-12 years | Ladder Men | 358 | 53.4\% | 29.9\% | 15.1\% | 1.4\% | 0.3\% | 0.0\% | 100\% |
| $5-12$ years | Ladder Women | 168 | 61.3\% | 26.2\% | 10.1\% | 2.4\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 100\% |
| $5-12$ years | All Tenured Faculty | 284 | 48.6\% | 33.5\% | 15.5\% | 2.1\% | 0.4\% | 0.0\% | 100\% |
| 5-12 years | Tenured Men | 205 | 44.9\% | 36.1\% | 16.6\% | 2.0\% | 0.5\% | 0.0\% | 100\% |
| $5-12$ years | Tenured Women | 79 | 58.2\% | 26.6\% | 12.7\% | 2.5\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 100\% |
| $5-12$ years | All Tenure-Track Faculty | 242 | 64.5\% | 23.1\% | 11.2\% | 1.2\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 100\% |
| $5-12$ years | Tenure-Track Men | 153 | 64.7\% | 21.6\% | 13.1\% | 0.7\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 100\% |
| $5-12$ years | Tenure-Track Women | 89 | 64.0\% | 25.8\% | 7.9\% | 2.2\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 100\% |
| $5-12$ years | All Non-Ladder Faculty | 161 | 57.8\% | 26.7\% | 14.9\% | 0.0\% | 0.6\% | 0.0\% | 100\% |
| $5-12$ years | Non-Ladder Men | 100 | 58.0\% | 27.0\% | 15.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 100\% |
| 5-12 years | Non-Ladder Women | 61 | 57.4\% | 26.2\% | 14.8\% | 0.0\% | 1.6\% | 0.0\% | 100\% |
| 13-17 years | All Faculty | 603 | 65.5\% | 27.2\% | 6.3\% | 0.5\% | 0.3\% | 0.2\% | 100\% |
| 13-17 years | All Men | 416 | 61.8\% | 29.1\% | 7.7\% | 0.7\% | 0.5\% | 0.2\% | 100\% |
| 13-17 years | All Women | 187 | 73.8\% | 23.0\% | 3.2\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 100\% |
| 13-17 years | All Ladder Faculty | 459 | 66.0\% | 26.8\% | 6.5\% | 0.2\% | 0.4\% | 0.0\% | 100\% |
| $13-17$ years | Ladder Men | 317 | 62.8\% | 28.4\% | 7.9\% | 0.3\% | 0.6\% | 0.0\% | 100\% |
| $13-17$ years | Ladder Women | 142 | 73.2\% | 23.2\% | 3.5\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 100\% |
| $13-17$ years | All Tenured Faculty | 273 | 51.6\% | 37.7\% | 9.5\% | 0.4\% | 0.7\% | 0.0\% | 100\% |
| 13-17 years | Tenured Men | 204 | 47.5\% | 40.2\% | 10.8\% | 0.5\% | 1.0\% | 0.0\% | 100\% |
| 13-17 years | Tenured Women | 69 | 63.8\% | 30.4\% | 5.8\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 100\% |
| 13-17 years | All Tenure-Track Faculty | 186 | 87.1\% | 10.8\% | 2.2\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 100\% |
| 13-17 years | Tenure-Track Men | 113 | 90.3\% | 7.1\% | 2.7\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 100\% |
| 13-17 years | Tenure-Track Women | 73 | 82.2\% | 16.4\% | 1.4\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 100\% |
| 13-17 years | All Non-Ladder Faculty | 144 | 63.9\% | 28.5\% | 5.6\% | 1.4\% | 0.0\% | 0.7\% | 100\% |
| 13-17 years | Non-Ladder Men | 99 | 58.6\% | 31.3\% | 7.1\% | 2.0\% | 0.0\% | 1.0\% | 100\% |
| 13-17 years | Non-Ladder Women | 45 | 75.6\% | 22.2\% | 2.2\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 100\% |
| $18-23$ years | All Faculty | 608 | 65.6\% | 24.7\% | 8.7\% | 0.8\% | 0.2\% | 0.0\% | 100\% |
| $18-23$ years | All Men | 422 | 60.9\% | 27.5\% | 10.4\% | 0.9\% | 0.2\% | 0.0\% | 100\% |
| $18-23$ years | All Women | 186 | 76.3\% | 18.3\% | 4.8\% | 0.5\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 100\% |
| $18-23$ years | All Ladder Faculty | 462 | 66.9\% | 23.4\% | 9.1\% | 0.4\% | 0.2\% | 0.0\% | 100\% |
| 18-23 years | Ladder Men | 325 | 61.2\% | 27.4\% | 10.8\% | 0.3\% | 0.3\% | 0.0\% | 100\% |
| 18-23 years | Ladder Women | 137 | 80.3\% | 13.9\% | 5.1\% | 0.7\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 100\% |
| 18-23 years | All Tenured Faculty | 287 | 49.5\% | 35.9\% | 13.6\% | 0.7\% | ${ }^{0.3 \%}$ | ${ }^{0.0 \%}$ | 100\% |
| $18-23$ years | Tenured Men | 218 | 43.6\% | 40.4\% | 15.1\% | 0.5\% | 0.5\% | 0.0\% | 100\% |
| 18-23 years | Tenured Women | 69 | 68.1\% | 21.7\% | 8.7\% | 1.4\% | 0.0\% | ${ }^{0.0 \%}$ | 100\% |
| 18-23 years | All Tenure-Track Faculty | 175 | 95.4\% | 2.9\% | ${ }^{1.7 \%}$ | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 100\% |
| 18-23 years | Tenure-Track Men | 107 | 97.2\% | 0.9\% 5 9\% | 1.9\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | ${ }_{0}^{0.0 \%}$ | 100\% |
| $18-23$ years $18-23$ years | Tenure-Track Women | 68 | 92.6\% | 5.9\% | 1.5\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 100\% |
| $18-23$ years $18-23$ years | All Non-Ladder Faculty | 146 | 61.6\% | 28.8\% | 7.5\% | 2.1\% | 0.0\% | ${ }^{0.0 \%}$ | 100\% |
| $18-23$ years $18-23$ years | Non-Ladder Men | 97 | 59.8\% | 27.8\% | 9.3\% | 3.1\% | 0.0\% | ${ }^{0.0 \%}$ | 100\% |
| 24 or older | All Faculty | 759 | 51.1\% | 15.9\% | 20.6\% | 8.3\% | 2.9\% | 1.2\% | 100\% |
| 24 or older | All Men | 551 | 45.7\% | 15.6\% | 23.2\% | 10.3\% | 3.6\% | 1.5\% | 100\% |
| 24 or older | All Women | 208 | 65.4\% | 16.8\% | 13.5\% | 2.9\% | 1.0\% | 0.5\% | 100\% |
| 24 or older | All Ladder Faculty | 574 | 52.4\% | 15.0\% | 21.3\% | 7.1\% | 3.1\% | 1.0\% | 100\% |
| 24 or older | Ladder Men | 429 | 45.5\% | 15.6\% | ${ }^{25.2 \%}$ | ${ }^{8.6 \%}$ | 4.0\% | 1.2\% | 100\% |
| 24 or older | Ladder Women | 145 | 73.1\% | 13.1\% | 9.7\% | 2.8\% | 0.7\% | 0.7\% | 100\% |
| 24 or older | All Tenured Faculty | 402 | 33.8\% | 20.1\% | 30.1\% | 10.0\% | 4.5\% | 1.5\% | 100\% |
| 24 or older | Tenured Men | 324 | 29.0\% | 20.1\% | 33.0\% | 11.1\% | 5.2\% | 1.5\% | 100\% |
| 24 or older | Tenured Women | 78 | 53.8\% | 20.5\% | 17.9\% | 5.1\% | 1.3\% | 1.3\% | 100\% |
| 24 or older 24 or older | All Tenure-Track Faculty | 172 | 95.9\% | 2.9\% | 0.6\% | 0.6\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 100\% |
| 24 or older 24 or older | Tenure-Track Men | 105 | 96.2\% | 1.9\% | 1.0\% | 1.0\% | 0.0\% | ${ }^{0.0 \%}$ | 100\% |
| 24 or older 24 or older | Tenure-Track Women | 67 | 95.5\% | 4.5\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 100\% |
| 24 or older 24 or older | All Non-Ladder Faculty | 185 | 47.0\% | 18.9\% | 18.4\% | 11.9\% | 2.2\% | 1.6\% | 100\% |
| 24 or older | Non-Ladder Men Non-Ladder Women | 122 63 | 46.7\% | 15.6\% 25.4\% | 22.2\% 26.4\% | $16.4 \%$ $3.2 \%$ | 2.5\% | 2.5\% | 100\% |

Life Outside Harvard University (continued)

| Harvard Child Care | Cohort | Responses | Yes | No, I wanted to but I was unable to get in | No, I chose to make other child care arrangments | No, I do not have children in need of child care | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Do you currently use Harvard-affiliated child care centers? | All Faculty | 1219 | 5.3\% | 4.8\% | 15.3\% | 74.5\% | 100\% |
| Do you currently use Harvard-affiliated child care centers? | All Men | 865 | 4.2\% | 4.4\% | 15.0\% | 76.4\% | 100\% |
| Do you currently use Harvard-affiliated child care centers? | All Women | 354 | 8.2\% | 5.9\% | 16.1\% | 69.8\% | 100\% |
| Do you currently use Harvard-affiliated child care centers? | All Ladder Faculty | 930 | 5.8\% | 5.5\% | 15.7\% | 73.0\% | 100\% |
| Do you currently use Harvard-affiliated child care centers? | Ladder Men | 683 | 4.7\% | 5.1\% | 14.9\% | 75.3\% | 100\% |
| Do you currently use Harvard-affiliated child care centers? | Ladder Women | 247 | 8.9\% | 6.5\% | 17.8\% | 66.8\% | 100\% |
| Do you currently use Harvard-affiliated child care centers? | All Tenured Faculty | 622 | 3.4\% | 3.4\% | 11.1\% | 82.2\% | 100\% |
| Do you currently use Harvard-affiliated child care centers? | Tenured Men | 491 | 3.7\% | 3.3\% | 10.6\% | 82.5\% | 100\% |
| Do you currently use Harvard-affiliated child care centers? | Tenured Women | 131 | 2.3\% | 3.8\% | 13.0\% | 80.9\% | 100\% |
| Do you currently use Harvard-affiliated child care centers? | All Tenure-Track Faculty | 308 | 10.7\% | 9.7\% | 25.0\% | 54.5\% | 100\% |
| Do you currently use Harvard-affiliated child care centers? | Tenure-Track Men | 192 | 7.3\% | 9.9\% | 26.0\% | 56.8\% | 100\% |
| Do you currently use Harvard-affiliated child care centers? | Tenure-Track Women | 116 | 16.4\% | 9.5\% | 23.3\% | 50.9\% | 100\% |
| Do you currently use Harvard-affiliated child care centers? | All Non-Ladder Faculty | 289 | 3.8\% | 2.8\% | 14.2\% | 79.2\% | 100\% |
| Do you currently use Harvard-affiliated child care centers? | Non-Ladder Men | 182 | 2.2\% | 1.6\% | 15.4\% | 80.8\% | 100\% |
| Do you currently use Harvard-affiliated child care centers? | Non-Ladder Women | 107 | 6.5\% | 4.7\% | 12.1\% | 76.6\% | 100\% |

Non-Ladder Women

Responses
All Men
All Women
All Women
All Ladder Faculty
Ladder Men
Ladder Men
Ladder Wome
All Tenured Faculty
Tenured Men
Tenured Wome
Tenured Women
All Tenure-Track Faculty
Tenure-Track Men
Tenure-Track Women
All Non-Ladder Faculty
All Non-Ladder Faculy
Non-Ladder Men
Non-Ladder Men
Non-Ladder Wome
(Yes/No)
Are yourrently caring for or managing care for an aging/ill parent, spouse, or other relative?
Are you currently caring for or managing care for an aging/ill parent. spouse or other relative? Are you currently caring for or managing carently caring for ar ag managing corif porarent, spouse, ar agingill parent, spouse, or other relative? Are you currently caring for or managing care for an aginggiil parent, spouse, or other realative? Are you currently caring for or managing care for an aging lil parent, spouse, or other reatitive? Are you currently caring for or managing care for an aging/ill parent, spouse, or other relative? Are you currently caring for or managing care for an aging iill parent, spouse, or orher relative? Are you currently caring for or managing care for an aging/ill parent, spouse, or other relative?
Are you currently caring for or managing care for an aging/ill parent, spouse, or other relative? Are you currentiy caring for or managing care for an agingili parent, spouse, or other relative?
Are you currently caring for or managing care for an aginglill parent, spouse, or other relative? Are you currently caring for or managing care for an agingilil parent, spouse, or other relative? Are you currently caring for or managing care for an aging/ill parent, spouse, or other relative?
Are you currently caring for or managing care for an aging/ill parent, spouse, or other relative? Are you currently caring for or managing care for an agingliil parent, spouse, or orher realitive?

Overall Assessment
Please indicate your agreement or disagreement with the following statement
$(1=$ Strongly disagree, $5=$ Strongly agree $)$
( $1=$ Strongly disagree, $5=$ Strongly agree)
If $/$ had to do it over again, I would accept $m y$ current position.
If I had to do it over again, I would accept my current position.
If $I$ had to do it over again, I would accept my current position.
If $I$ had to do it over again, I would accept my current position.
If I had to do it over again, I would accept my current position.
If had to do it over again, would accept my current position. If I had to do oit over again, would accept my current position. If I had to do it over again, I would accept my current position,
I I had to do it over again, I would accept my current position. If I had to do it over again, I would accept my current position.
If had to do it over again, would accept my current position. If had to do it over again, I would accept my current position. If I had to do o ot over again, would accept my current position. If I had to do it over again, I would accept my current position.
If had to do it over again, I would accept my current position.
If I had to do it over again, I would accept my current position.
If $I$ had to do it over again, would accept my current position.
had to do it over again, would accept my current position
I had to do it over again, I would accept my current position.
If had to do it over again, I would accept my current position.

| Cohort | Mean | Standard <br> Deviation |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| All Faculty | 4.34 | 1.02 |
| All Men | 4.41 | 0.97 |
| All Women | 4.15 | 1.13 |
| All Ladder Faculty | 4.35 | 1.04 |
| Ladder Men | 4.42 | 0.98 |
| Laddder Women | 4.17 | 1.16 |
| All Tenured Faculty | 4.49 | 0.91 |
| Tenured Men | 4.52 | 0.86 |
| Tenured Women | 4.38 | 1.08 |
| All Tenure-Track Faculty | 4.10 | 1.20 |
| Tenure--Track Men | 4.19 | 1.19 |
| Tenure-Track Women | 3.94 | 1.20 |
| All Non-Lacdele Faculty | 4.28 | 0.98 |
| Non-Ladder Men | 4.38 | 0.91 |
| Non-Ladder Women | 4.12 | 1.06 |


|  |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| Responses | Strongly disagree |
| 1230 | $2.3 \%$ |
| 871 | $2.0 \%$ |
| 359 | $3.1 \%$ |
| 941 | $2.3 \%$ |
| 690 | $2.2 \%$ |
| 251 | $2.8 \%$ |
| 620 | $1.5 \%$ |
| 491 | $1.0 \%$ |
| 491 | 3.10 |
| 129 | $4.0 \%$ |
| 321 | $5.0 \%$ |
| 199 | $2.5 \%$ |
| 122 | 2.10 |
| 289 | 2.10 |
| 181 | $1.1 \%$ |
| 108 | $3.7 \%$ |

Somewhat disagree
$7.0 \%$
$5.5 \%$
$10.6 \%$
$7.3 \%$
$5.5 \%$
$12.4 \%$
$5.3 \%$
$4.7 \%$
$7.8 \%$
$11.2 \%$
$7.5 \%$
$17.2 \%$
$5.9 \%$
$5.5 \%$
$6.5 \%$

Neither agree

| r disagree | Somewhat agree | Strongly agree |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 6.3\% | 23.5\% | 60.9\% |
| 6.2\% | 21.9\% | 64.4\% |
| 6.7\% | 27.3\% | 52.4\% |
| 6.1\% | 21.0\% | 63.2\% |
| 6.1\% | 20.3\% | 65.9\% |
| 6.0\% | 23.1\% | 55.8\% |
| 4.5\% | 20.3\% | 68.4\% |
| 4.7\% | 20.8\% | 68.8\% |
| 3.9\% | 18.6\% | 66.7\% |
| 9.0\% | 22.4\% | 53.3\% |
| 9.5\% | 19.1\% | 58.8\% |
| 8.2\% | 27.9\% | 44.3\% |
| 7.3\% | 31.5\% | 53.3\% |
| 6.6\% | 28.2\% | 58.6\% |
| 8.3\% | 37.0\% | 44.4\% |

## ETHNICITY ApPENDIX

## Ethnicity Appendix

This section provides the same summary statistics for the 2006/7 Harvard Faculty Climate Survey as mentioned in the previous section, by ethnicity. They include the mean, standard deviation, number of responses, and response distribution for each question on the survey. The ethnic groups include the following 6 mutually exclusive categories (i.e., each faculty member has been categorized by only one ethnic group):

1) American Indian/Alaskan Native
2) Asian/Pacific Islander
3) Black
4) Hispanic
5) Unknown Ethnicity
6) White

Satisfaction

| Specify the degree to which you are satisfied with each of the following: ( $1=$ Very dissatisfied, $5=$ Very Satisfied) | Cohort | Mean | Standard Deviation | Responses | Very dissatisfied | Somewhat dissatisfied | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Neither } \\ & \text { satisfied nor } \\ & \text { dissatisfied } \end{aligned}$ | Somewhat satisfied | Very satisfied | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Overall, how satisfied are you being a faculty member at Harvard University? | All Faculty | 4.16 | 0.96 | 1293 | 2.1\% | 7.2\% | 5.4\% | 43.1\% | 42.2\% | 100\% |
| Overall, how satisfied are you being a faculty member at Harvard University? | Amer. Ind./Alaskan Nat. |  |  | small sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Overall, how satisfied are you being a faculty member at Harvard University? | Asian or Pacific Islander | 4.02 | 1.07 | 115 | 4.3\% | 7.0\% | 8.7\% | 42.6\% | 37.4\% | 100\% |
| Overall, how satisfied are you being a faculty member at Harvard University? | Black | 4.13 | 0.92 | 39 | 0.0\% | 10.3\% | 5.1\% | 46.2\% | 38.5\% | 100\% |
| Overall, how satisfied are you being a faculty member at Harvard University? | Hispanic | 4.34 | 0.83 | 32 | 0.0\% | 6.3\% | 3.1\% | 40.6\% | 50.0\% | 100\% |
| Overall, how satisfied are you being a faculty member at Harvard University? | White | 4.17 | 0.95 | 1100 | 2.0\% | 7.0\% | 5.2\% | 43.2\% | 42.6\% | 100\% |
| Overall, how satisfied are you being a faculty member at Harvard University? | Unknown Ethnicity |  |  | small sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Overall, how satisfied are you with your particular School at Harvard? | All Faculty | 3.98 | 1.09 | 1292 | 4.0\% | 10.1\% | 6.0\% | 43.7\% | 36.1\% | 100\% |
| Overall, how satisfied are you with your particular School at Harvard? | Amer. Ind./Alaskan Nat. |  |  | small sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Overall, how satisfied are you with your particular School at Harvard? | Asian or Pacific Islander | 3.89 | 1.15 | 115 | 4.3\% | 13.9\% | 4.3\% | 43.5\% | 33.9\% | 100\% |
| Overall, how satisfied are you with your particular School at Harvard? | Black | 4.00 | 1.12 | 38 | 5.3\% | 7.9\% | 5.3\% | 44.7\% | 36.8\% | 100\% |
| Overall, how satisfied are you with your particular School at Harvard? | Hispanic | 4.03 | 1.12 | 32 | 3.1\% | 9.4\% | 12.5\% | 31.3\% | 43.8\% | 100\% |
| Overall, how satisfied are you with your particular School at Harvard? | White | 3.99 | 1.09 | 1100 | 4.0\% | 9.9\% | 5.9\% | 43.9\% | 36.3\% | 100\% |
| Overall, how satisfied are you with your particular School at Harvard? | Unknown Ethnicity |  |  | small sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Monetary compensation | All Faculty | 3.73 | 1.23 | 1342 | 5.6\% | 16.5\% | 10.5\% | 34.4\% | 33.0\% | 100\% |
| Monetary compensation | Amer. Ind./Alaskan Nat. |  |  | small sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Monetary compensation | Asian or Pacific Islander | 3.46 | 1.27 | 119 | 6.7\% | 21.0\% | 18.5\% | 26.9\% | 26.9\% | 100\% |
| Monetary compensation | Black | 3.79 | 1.17 | 39 | 2.6\% | 17.9\% | 10.3\% | 35.9\% | 33.3\% | 100\% |
| Monetary compensation | Hispanic | 3.56 | 1.27 | 32 | 9.4\% | 15.6\% | 6.3\% | 46.9\% | 21.9\% | 100\% |
| Monetary compensation | White | 3.76 | 1.23 | 1146 | 5.5\% | 16.1\% | 9.7\% | 34.8\% | 33.9\% | 100\% |
| Monetary compensation | Unknown Ethnicity |  |  | small sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Employee benefits | All Faculty | 4.06 | 1.12 | 1325 | 3.2\% | 10.5\% | 9.6\% | 31.0\% | 45.7\% | 100\% |
| Employee benefits | Amer. Ind./Alaskan Nat. |  |  | small sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Employee benefits | Asian or Pacific Islander | 3.78 | 1.13 | 118 | 1.7\% | 16.1\% | 17.8\% | 31.4\% | 33.1\% | 100\% |
| Employee benefits | Black | 4.18 | 0.90 | 38 | 0.0\% | 7.9\% | 7.9\% | 42.1\% | 42.1\% | 100\% |
| Employee benefits | Hispanic | 3.56 | 1.27 | 32 | 6.3\% | 18.8\% | 15.6\% | 31.3\% | 28.1\% | 100\% |
| Employee benefits | White | 4.09 | 1.12 | 1131 | 3.4\% | 9.8\% | 8.6\% | 30.7\% | 47.6\% | 100\% |
| Employee benefits | Unknown Ethnicity |  |  | small sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Clerical and administrative staff | All Faculty | 3.80 | 1.26 | 1343 | 6.1\% | 14.3\% | 11.6\% | 29.2\% | 38.8\% | 100\% |
| Clerical and administrative staff | Amer. Ind./Alaskan Nat. |  |  | small sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Clerical and administrative staff | Asian or Pacific Islander | 3.78 | 1.23 | 118 | 6.8\% | 13.6\% | 6.8\% | 40.7\% | 32.2\% | 100\% |
| Clerical and administrative staff | Black | 3.95 | 1.10 | 39 | 0.0\% | 15.4\% | 15.4\% | 28.2\% | 41.0\% | 100\% |
| Clerical and administrative staff | Hispanic | 3.41 | 1.48 | 32 | 15.6\% | 15.6\% | 12.5\% | 25.0\% | 31.3\% | 100\% |
| Clerical and administrative staff | White | 3.81 | 1.26 | 1147 | 6.0\% | 14.3\% | 11.9\% | 28.1\% | 39.7\% | 100\% |
| Clerical and administrative staff | Unknown Ethnicity |  |  | small sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Technical and research staff | All Faculty | 3.98 | 1.13 | 1118 | 3.9\% | 8.9\% | 14.8\% | 30.2\% | 42.1\% | 100\% |
| Technical and research staff | Amer. Ind./Alaskan Nat. |  |  | small sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Technical and research staff | Asian or Pacific Islander | 3.92 | 1.09 | 109 | 3.7\% | 7.3\% | 19.3\% | 33.0\% | 36.7\% | 100\% |
| Technical and research staff | Black | 4.19 | 0.87 | 31 | 0.0\% | 6.5\% | 9.7\% | 41.9\% | 41.9\% | 100\% |
| Technical and research staff | Hispanic | 3.48 | 1.42 | 27 | 14.8\% | 11.1\% | 14.8\% | 29.6\% | 29.6\% | 100\% |
| Technical and research staff | White | 3.99 | 1.13 | 946 | 3.8\% | 9.1\% | 14.5\% | 29.6\% | 43.0\% | 100\% |
| Technical and research staff | Unknown Ethnicity |  |  | small sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Computing support staff | All Faculty | 3.67 | 1.29 | 1303 | 8.1\% | 14.5\% | 13.0\% | 31.4\% | 33.0\% | 100\% |
| Computing support staff | Amer. Ind./Alaskan Nat. |  |  | small sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Computing support staff | Asian or Pacific Islander | 3.47 | 1.37 | 115 | 9.6\% | 21.7\% | 10.4\% | 28.7\% | 29.6\% | 100\% |
| Computing support staff | Black | 3.84 | 1.15 | 38 | 5.3\% | 10.5\% | 10.5\% | 42.1\% | 31.6\% | 100\% |
| Computing support staff | Hispanic | 3.13 | 1.38 | 31 | 16.1\% | 22.6\% | 9.7\% | 35.5\% | 16.1\% | 100\% |
| Computing support staff | White | 3.69 | 1.28 | 1113 | 7.8\% | 13.7\% | 13.6\% | 31.2\% | 33.8\% | 100\% |
| Computing support staff | Unknown Ethnicity |  |  | small sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Administrative support for grants | All Faculty | 3.48 | 1.33 | 941 | 9.8\% | 17.1\% | 17.7\% | 26.5\% | 28.9\% | 100\% |
| Administrative support for grants | Amer. Ind./Alaskan Nat. |  |  | small sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Administrative support for grants | Asian or Pacific Islander | 3.69 | 1.27 | 86 | 5.8\% | 16.3\% | 16.3\% | 26.7\% | 34.9\% | 100\% |
| Administrative support for grants | Black | 3.48 | 1.23 | 31 | 6.5\% | 22.6\% | 6.5\% | 45.2\% | 19.4\% | 100\% |
| Administrative support for grants | Hispanic | 2.94 | 1.47 | 18 | 16.7\% | 33.3\% | 11.1\% | 16.7\% | 22.2\% | 100\% |
| Administrative support for grants | White | 3.46 | 1.33 | 802 | 10.2\% | 16.6\% | 18.6\% | 26.1\% | 28.6\% | 100\% |
| Administrative support for grants | Unknown Ethnicity |  |  | small sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Availability of nearby parking | All Faculty | 3.50 | 1.52 | 1033 | 15.7\% | 15.7\% | 11.8\% | 16.4\% | 40.5\% | 100\% |
| Availability of nearby parking | Amer. Ind./Alaskan Nat. |  |  | small sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Availability of nearby parking | Asian or Pacific Islander | 3.21 | 1.54 | 94 | 20.2\% | 17.0\% | 16.0\% | 14.9\% | 31.9\% | 100\% |
| Availability of nearby parking | Black | 3.13 | 1.60 | 32 | 21.9\% | 21.9\% | 9.4\% | 15.6\% | 31.3\% | 100\% |
| Availability of nearby parking | Hispanic | 3.74 | 1.48 | 23 | 13.0\% | 8.7\% | 17.4\% | 13.0\% | 47.8\% | 100\% |
| Availability of nearby parking | White | 3.55 | 1.51 | 880 | 14.9\% | 15.6\% | 11.3\% | 16.7\% | 41.6\% | 100\% |
| Availability of nearby parking | Unknown Ethnicity |  |  | small sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Specify the degree to which you are satisfied with each of the following: ( $1=$ Very dissatisfied, $5=$ Very Satisfied) | Cohort | Mean | Standard Deviation | Responses | Very dissatisfied | Somewhat dissatisfied | Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied | Somewhat satisfied | Very satisfied | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Classroom and meeting space | All Faculty | 3.85 | 1.24 | 1335 | 5.5\% | 14.2\% | 9.8\% | 30.7\% | 39.9\% | 100\% |
| Classroom and meeting space | Amer. Ind./Alaskan Nat. |  |  | small sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Classroom and meeting space | Asian or Pacific Islander | 3.92 | 1.18 | 115 | 5.2\% | 8.7\% | 15.7\% | 29.6\% | 40.9\% | 100\% |
| Classroom and meeting space | Black | 3.92 | 1.26 | 37 | 8.1\% | 8.1\% | 8.1\% | 35.1\% | 40.5\% | 100\% |
| Classroom and meeting space | Hispanic | 3.84 | 1.32 | 31 | 6.5\% | 12.9\% | 16.1\% | 19.4\% | 45.2\% | 100\% |
| Classroom and meeting space | White | 3.84 | 1.24 | 1145 | 5.4\% | 14.9\% | 9.2\% | 31.0\% | 39.5\% | 100\% |
| Classroom and meeting space | Unknown Ethnicity |  |  | small sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Office space | All Faculty | 4.16 | 1.18 | 1329 | 5.1\% | 8.6\% | 6.8\% | 23.8\% | 55.7\% | 100\% |
| Office space | Amer. Ind./Alaskan Nat. |  |  | small sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Office space | Asian or Paciific Islander | 4.17 | 1.06 | 112 | 3.6\% | 6.3\% | 8.9\% | 32.1\% | 49.1\% | 100\% |
| Office space | Black | 4.18 | 1.06 | 38 | 2.6\% | 7.9\% | 7.9\% | 31.6\% | 50.0\% | 100\% |
| Office space | Hispanic | 3.88 | 1.50 | 32 | 12.5\% | 12.5\% | 3.1\% | 18.8\% | 53.1\% | 100\% |
| Office space | White | 4.17 | 1.19 | 1140 | 5.2\% | 8.8\% | 6.7\% | 22.7\% | 56.7\% | 100\% |
| Office space | Unknown Ethnicity |  |  | small sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lab or research space | All Faculty | 3.77 | 1.28 | 566 | 7.4\% | 13.1\% | 12.9\% | 28.8\% | 37.8\% | 100\% |
| Lab or research space | Amer. Ind./Alaskan Nat. |  |  | small sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lab or research space | Asian or Pacific Islander | 3.67 | 1.18 | 61 | 3.3\% | 18.0\% | 16.4\% | 32.8\% | 29.5\% | 100\% |
| Lab or research space | Black | 3.80 | 0.92 | 10 | 0.0\% | 10.0\% | 20.0\% | 50.0\% | 20.0\% | 100\% |
| Lab or research space | Hispanic | 3.43 | 1.51 | 7 | 14.3\% | 14.3\% | 14.3\% | 28.6\% | 28.6\% | 100\% |
| Lab or research space | White | 3.78 | 1.30 | 486 | 8.0\% | 12.6\% | 12.3\% | 27.8\% | 39.3\% | 100\% |
| Lab or research space | Unknown Ethnicity |  |  | small sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Special research facilities | All Faculty | 3.54 | 1.25 | 491 | 7.1\% | 15.5\% | 22.2\% | 26.7\% | 28.5\% | 100\% |
| Special research facilities | Amer. Ind./Alaskan Nat. |  |  | small sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Special research facilities | Asian or Paciific Islander | 3.64 | 1.16 | 55 | 1.8\% | 18.2\% | 25.5\% | 23.6\% | 30.9\% | 100\% |
| Special research facilities | Black | 4.08 | 0.79 | 12 | 0.0\% | 8.3\% | 0.0\% | 66.7\% | 25.0\% | 100\% |
| Special research facilities | Hispanic | 4.00 | 1.26 | 6 | 0.0\% | 16.7\% | 16.7\% | 16.7\% | 50.0\% | 100\% |
| Special research facilities | White | 3.50 | 1.27 | 417 | 8.2\% | 15.3\% | 22.5\% | 26.1\% | 27.8\% | 100\% |
| Special research facilities | Unknown Ethnicity |  |  | small sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Research equipment | All Faculy | 3.68 | 1.16 | 578 | 4.7\% | 13.3\% | 20.2\% | 32.5\% | 29.2\% | 100\% |
| Research equipment | Amer. Ind./Alaskan Nat. |  |  | small sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Research equipment | Asian or Paciific Islander | 3.82 | 0.92 | 65 | 0.0\% | 9.2\% | 24.6\% | 41.5\% | 24.6\% | 100\% |
| Research equipment | Black | 3.93 | 1.10 | 15 | 0.0\% | 20.0\% | 0.0\% | 46.7\% | 33.3\% | 100\% |
| Research equipment | Hispanic | 3.75 | 1.04 | 8 | 0.0\% | 12.5\% | 25.0\% | 37.5\% | 25.0\% | 100\% |
| Research equipment | White | 3.65 | 1.20 | 487 | 5.5\% | 13.8\% | 20.3\% | 30.8\% | 29.6\% | 100\% |
| Research equipment | Unknown Ethnicity |  |  | small sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Physical infrastructure Physical infrastucture | All Faculty ${ }_{\text {Amer }}$ | 3.92 | 1.12 | 1228 small sample | 3.0\% | 10.5\% | 17.2\% | 30.5\% | 38.8\% | 100\% |
| Physical infrastructure Physical infrastucture | Amer. Ind./Alaskan Nat. Asian or. Pacific Islander | 4.01 | 1.04 | small sample | 0.9\% | 11.0\% | 14.7\% | 33.0\% | 40.4\% | 100\% |
| Physical infrastructure | Black | 4.25 | ${ }_{0}^{1.87}$ | 36 | 0.0\% | 5.6\% | 11.1\% | 36.1\% | 47.2\% | 100\% |
| Physical infrastructure | Hispanic | 3.82 | 1.33 | 28 | 3.6\% | 21.4\% | 10.7\% | 17.9\% | 46.4\% | 100\% |
| Physical infrastructure | White | 3.89 | 1.13 | 1048 | 3.3\% | 10.4\% | 17.8\% | 30.3\% | 38.1\% | 100\% |
| Physical infrastructure | Unknown Ethnicity |  |  | small sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Other resources to support professional duties, please specity | All Faculty | 3.28 | 1.60 | 297 | 21.2\% | 16.8\% | 12.1\% | 12.5\% | 37.4\% | 100\% |
| Other resources to support professional duties, please specify Other resources to support professional duties, please specify | Amer. Ind./Alaskan Nat. |  |  | small sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Other resources to support professional duties, please specify Other resources to support professional duties, please specify | Asian or Pacific Islander Black | 3.68 3.42 | 1.60 1.38 | 31 12 | 19.4\% 8.3\% | ${ }^{6.5 \%}$ 16.7\% | 9.7\% ${ }^{\text {33.3\% }}$ | 16.1\% | 48.4\% $33.3 \%$ | 100\% |
| Other resources to support professional duties, please specify | Hispanic | 2.30 | 1.57 | 10 | 40.0\% | 30.0\% | 10.0\% | 0.0\% | 20.0\% | 100\% |
| Other resources to support professional duties, please specify | White | 3.25 | 1.60 | 242 | 21.5\% | 17.8\% | 11.6\% | 12.8\% | 36.4\% | 100\% |
| Other resources to support professional duties, please specify | Unknown Ethnicity |  |  | small sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Quality of graduate/professional students (ladder survey only) | All Faculty | 4.44 | 0.86 | 868 | 1.2\% | 4.4\% | 4.8\% | 28.2\% | 61.4\% | 100\% |
| Quality of graduate/professional students (ladder survey only) | Amer. Ind./Alaskan Nat. |  |  | small sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Quality of graduate/professional students (ladder survey only) | Asian or Pacific Islander | 4.20 | 0.90 | 69 | 1.4\% | 4.3\% | 10.1\% | 40.6\% | 43.5\% | 100\% |
| Quality of graduate/professional students (ladder survey only) | Black | 4.38 | 0.92 | 24 | 0.0\% | 8.3\% | 4.2\% | 29.2\% | 58.3\% | 100\% |
| Quality of graduate/professional students (ladder survey only) | Hispanic | 4.50 | 0.82 | 16 | 0.0\% | 6.3\% | 0.0\% | 31.3\% | 62.5\% | 100\% |
| Quality of graduate/professional students (ladder survey only) | White | 4.46 | 0.86 | 754 | 1.2\% | 4.2\% | 4.5\% | 27.2\% | 62.9\% | 100\% |
| Quality of graduate/professional students (ladder survey only) | Unknown Ethnicity |  |  | small sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Quality of students (non-ladder survey only) | All Faculty | 4.65 | 0.69 | $\stackrel{295}{ }$ | 0.7\% | 2.4\% | 1.4\% | 22.7\% | 72.9\% | 100\% |
| Quality of students (non-ladder survey only) | Amer. Ind./Alaskan Nat. |  |  | small sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Quality of students (non-ladder survey only) | Asian or Paciific Islander | 4.52 | 0.79 | 23 | 0.0\% | 4.3\% | 4.3\% | 26.1\% | 65.2\% |  |
| Quality of students (non-ladder survey only) Quality of students (no-ladder survey only) | Black Hispanic | 4.60 4.71 | 0.70 0.49 | 10 7 | ${ }^{0.0 \%}$ | 0.0\% | 10.0\% | 20.0\% | $70.0 \%$ $71.4 \%$ | 100\% 100\% |
| Quality of students (non-ladder survey only) | White | 4.66 | 0.69 | 253 | 0.8\% | 2.4\% | 0.8\% | 22.1\% | 73.9\% | 100\% |
| Quality of students (non-ladder survey only) | Unknown Ethnicity |  |  | small sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Satisfaction (continued) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Specify the degree to which you are satisfied with each of the following: ( $1=$ Very dissatisfied, $5=$ Very Satisfied) | Cohort | Mean | Standard Deviation | Responses | Very dissatisfied | Somewhat dissatisfied | Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied | Somewhat satisfied | Very satisfied | Total |
| Access to teaching assistants | All Faculty | 3.99 | 1.17 | 1052 | 4.8\% | 10.0\% | 10.3\% | 31.3\% | 43.7\% | 100\% |
| Access to teaching assistants | Amer. Ind./Alaskan Nat. |  |  | small sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Access to teaching assistants | Asian or Pacific Islander | 3.63 | 1.29 | 98 | 9.2\% | 14.3\% | 9.2\% | 38.8\% | 28.6\% | 100\% |
| Access to teaching assistants | Black | 3.84 | 1.32 | 31 | 6.5\% | 16.1\% | 6.5\% | 29.0\% | 41.9\% | 100\% |
| Access to teaching assistants | Hispanic | 3.48 | 1.47 | 23 | 13.0\% | 17.4\% | 13.0\% | 21.7\% | 34.8\% | 100\% |
| Access to teaching assistants | White | 4.05 | 1.13 | 895 | 4.0\% | 9.1\% | 10.5\% | 30.7\% | 45.7\% | 100\% |
| Access to teaching assistants | Unknown Ethnicity |  |  | small sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Teaching resources | All Faculty | 4.09 | 1.03 | 1276 | 2.0\% | 8.1\% | 12.9\% | 33.6\% | 43.5\% | 100\% |
| Teaching resources | Amer. Ind./Alaskan Nat. |  |  | small sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Teaching resources | Asian or Pacific Islander | 3.99 | 1.00 | 112 | 1.8\% | 8.0\% | 15.2\% | 39.3\% | 35.7\% | 100\% |
| Teaching resources | Black | 4.08 | 1.12 | 38 | 2.6\% | 10.5\% | 10.5\% | 28.9\% | 47.4\% | 100\% |
| Teaching resources | Hispanic | 4.00 | 1.07 | 29 | 3.4\% | 6.9\% | 13.8\% | 37.9\% | 37.9\% | 100\% |
| Teaching resources | White | 4.10 | 1.03 | 1090 | 1.9\% | 8.1\% | 12.8\% | 33.0\% | 44.2\% | 100\% |
| Teaching resources | Unknown Ethnicity |  |  | small sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Workload |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| How reasonable are the expectations for the following: |  |  | Standard |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ( $1=$ Much too low, $5=$ Much too high) | Cohort | Mean | Deviation | Responses | Much too low | Too low | About right | Too high | Much too high | Total |
| Teaching | All Faculty | 2.95 | 0.60 | 1157 | 2.5\% | 12.1\% | 74.8\% | 9.3\% | 1.2\% | 100\% |
| Teaching | Amer. Ind./Alaskan Nat. |  |  | small sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Teaching | Asian or Pacific Islander | 3.02 | 0.63 | 93 | 2.2\% | 9.7\% | 74.2\% | 11.8\% | 2.2\% | 100\% |
| Teaching | Black | 3.03 | 0.53 | 33 | 3.0\% | 3.0\% | 81.8\% | 12.1\% | 0.0\% | 100\% |
| Teaching | Hispanic | 3.09 | 0.73 | 23 | 0.0\% | 13.0\% | 73.9\% | 4.3\% | 8.7\% | 100\% |
| Teaching | White | 2.93 | 0.60 | 1002 | 2.6\% | 12.7\% | 74.7\% | 9.1\% | 1.0\% | 100\% |
| Teaching | Unknown Ethnicity |  |  | small sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Research | All Faculty | 3.21 | 0.62 | 1139 | 0.9\% | 3.5\% | 74.5\% | 16.2\% | 4.9\% | 100\% |
| Research | Amer. Ind./Alaskan Nat. |  |  | small sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Research | Asian or Pacific Islander | 3.20 | 0.73 | 93 | 2.2\% | 5.4\% | 68.8\% | 17.2\% | 6.5\% | 100\% |
| Research | Black | 3.36 | 0.74 | 33 | 3.0\% | 0.0\% | 60.6\% | 30.3\% | 6.1\% | 100\% |
| Research | Hispanic | 3.57 | 0.95 | 23 | 0.0\% | 8.7\% | 47.8\% | 21.7\% | 21.7\% | 100\% |
| Research | White | 3.20 | 0.60 | 984 | 0.7\% | 3.4\% | 76.0\% | 15.5\% | 4.4\% | 100\% |
| Research | Unknown Ethnicity |  |  | small sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Service to your [unit] | All Faculty | 3.21 | 0.66 | 1307 | 0.9\% | 5.7\% | 70.2\% | 18.1\% | 5.1\% | 100\% |
| Service to your [unit] | Amer. Ind./Alaskan Nat. Asian or Pacific Islander | 3.23 | 0.64 | small sample | 0.9\% | 5.3\% | 67.3\% | 23.0\% | 3.5\% | 100\% |
| Service to your [unit] | Black | 3.20 | 0.87 | 35 | 5.7\% | 5.7\% | 57.1\% | 25.7\% | 5.7\% | 100\% |
| Service to your [unit] | Hispanic | 3.34 | 0.86 | 29 | 0.0\% | 6.9\% | 69.0\% | 6.9\% | 17.2\% | 100\% |
| Service to your [unit] | White | 3.20 | 0.65 | 1124 | 0.8\% | 5.7\% | 71.0\% | 17.5\% | 5.0\% | 100\% |
| Service to your [unit] | Unknown Ethnicity |  |  | small sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Service to your School | All Faculty | 3.15 | 0.64 | 1284 | 0.9\% | 7.4\% | 72.1\% | 15.5\% | 4.1\% | 100\% |
| Service to your School | Amer. Ind./Alaskan Nat. |  |  | small sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Service to your School | Asian or Pacific Islander | 3.12 | 0.58 | 111 | 0.9\% | 7.2\% | 73.0\% | 17.1\% | 1.8\% | 100\% |
| Service to your School | Black | 3.17 | 0.70 | 36 | 2.8\% | 5.6\% | 66.7\% | 22.2\% | 2.8\% | 100\% |
| Service to your School | Hispanic | 3.34 | 0.86 | 29 | 0.0\% | 10.3\% | 58.6\% | 17.2\% | 13.8\% | 100\% |
| Service to your School | White | 3.14 | 0.64 | 1102 | 0.8\% | 7.4\% | 72.5\% | 15.1\% | 4.2\% | 100\% |
| Service to your School | Unknown Ethnicity |  |  | small sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Service to the University | All Faculty | 2.95 | 0.59 | 1285 | 1.9\% | 12.3\% | 77.0\% | 6.5\% | 2.3\% | 100\% |
| Service to the University | Amer. Ind./Alaskan Nat. |  |  | small sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Service to the University | Asian or Pacific Islander | 2.97 | 0.63 | 110 | 3.6\% | 7.3\% | 80.0\% | 6.4\% | 2.7\% | 100\% |
| Service to the University | Black | 3.03 | 0.61 | ${ }^{36}$ | 0.0\% | 13.9\% | 72.2\% | 11.1\% | 2.8\% | 100\% |
| Service to the University | Hispanic | 3.00 | 0.80 | 29 | 3.4\% | 13.8\% | 69.0\% | 6.9\% | 6.9\% | 100\% |
| Service to the University | White | 2.94 | 0.58 | 1104 | 1.7\% | 12.8\% | 77.1\% | 6.3\% | 2.1\% | 100\% |
| Service to the University | Unknown Ethnicity |  |  | small sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Recognition of Teaching ( $1=$ Not at all, $5=$ To a great extent) | Cohort | Mean | Standard Deviation | Responses | Not at all | Slightly | Somewhat | Moderately | To a great extent | Total |
| To what extent does your School recognize and reward good teaching? | All Faculty | 3.22 | 1.22 | 1320 | 9.2\% | 21.7\% | 23.9\% | 28.5\% | 16.7\% | 100\% |
| To what extent does your School recognize and reward good teaching? | Amer. Ind./Alaskan Nat. |  |  | small sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| To what extent does your School recognize and reward good teaching: | Asian or Pacific Islander | 3.22 | 1.16 | 115 | 7.0\% | 22.6\% | 27.0\% | 28.7\% | 14.8\% | 100\% |
| To what extent does your School recognize and reward good teaching? | Black | 3.43 | 1.19 | 37 | 2.7\% | 24.3\% | 24.3\% | 24.3\% | 24.3\% | 100\% |
| To what extent does your School recognize and reward good teaching? | Hispanic | 3.13 | 1.41 | 30 | 20.0\% | 10.0\% | 26.7\% | 23.3\% | 20.0\% | 100\% |
| To what extent does your School recognize and reward good teaching: | White | 3.21 | 1.23 | 1132 | 9.5\% | 21.7\% | 23.6\% | 28.6\% | 16.6\% | 100\% |
| To what extent does your School recognize and reward good teaching? | Unknown Ethnicity |  |  | small sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Workload (continued) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| How many of the following did you teach or co-teach during the previous academic year: (responses of 6 or more have been aggregated) | Cohort | Responses | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 or more | Total |
| Courses primarily for graduate / professional students (excluding independent studies) | All Faculty | 1261 | 13.2\% | 33.9\% | 33.6\% | 11.5\% | 5.6\% | 1.1\% | 1.1\% | 100\% |
| Courses primarily for graduate / professional students (excluding independent studies) | Amer. Ind./Alaskan Nat. | small sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Courses primarily for graduate / professional students (excluding independent studies) | Asian or Pacific Islander | 104 | 9.6\% | 38.5\% | 33.7\% | 9.6\% | 5.8\% | 1.0\% | 1.9\% | 100\% |
| Courses primarily for graduate / professional students (excluding independent studies) | Black | 34 | 17.6\% | 23.5\% | 23.5\% | 23.5\% | 11.8\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 100\% |
| Courses primarily for graduate / professional students (excluding independent studies) | Hispanic | 30 | 10.0\% | 20.0\% | 56.7\% | 10.0\% | 0.0\% | 3.3\% | 0.0\% | 100\% |
| Courses primarily for graduate / professional students (excluding independent studies) | White | 1087 | 13.3\% | 34.1\% | 33.5\% | 11.3\% | 5.5\% | 1.1\% | 1.1\% | 100\% |
| Courses primarily for graduate / professional students (excluding independent studies) | Unknown Ethnicity | small sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Courses primarily for undergraduates (excluding independent studies) | All Faculy | 992 | 36.8\% | 25.2\% | 22.4\% | 9.4\% | 4.8\% | 0.6\% | 0.8\% | 100\% |
| Courses primarily for undergraduates (excluding independent studies) | Amer. Ind./Alaskan Nat. | small sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Courses primarily for undergraduates (excluding independent studies) | Asian or Pacific Islander | 77 | 36.4\% | 26.0\% | 27.3\% | 6.5\% | 2.6\% | 1.3\% | 0.0\% | 100\% |
| Courses primarily for undergraduates (excluding independent studies) | Black | 28 | 42.9\% | 21.4\% | 14.3\% | 7.1\% | 14.3\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 100\% |
| Courses primarily for undergraduates (excluding independent studies) | Hispanic | 16 | 43.8\% | 25.0\% | 12.5\% | 18.8\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 100\% |
| Courses primarily for undergraduates (excluding independent studies) | White | 866 | 36.6\% | 25.3\% | 22.5\% | 9.4\% | 4.7\% | 0.6\% | 0.9\% | 100\% |
| Courses primarily for undergraduates (excluding independent studies) | Unknown Ethnicity | small sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| How many of the following did you teach or co-teach during the previous academic year: | Cohort | Responses | 1-10 | 11-25 | 26-50 | 51-100 | 101-200 | 201-500 | more than 500 | Total |
| Students, tota, in these graduate courses? | All Faculty | 1084 | 17.6\% | 26.4\% | 15.1\% | 18.5\% | 16.6\% | 5.3\% | 0.5\% | 100\% |
| Students, total, in these graduate courses? | Amer. Ind./Alaskan Nat. | small sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Students, total, in these graduate courses? | Asian or Pacific Islander | 93 | 17.2\% | 29.0\% | 18.3\% | 12.9\% | 16.1\% | 4.3\% | 2.2\% | 100\% |
| Students, total, in these graduate courses? | Black | 26 | 3.8\% | 23.1\% | 26.9\% | 19.2\% | 19.2\% | 7.7\% | 0.0\% | 100\% |
| Students, total, in these graduate courses? | Hispanic | 27 | 7.4\% | 33.3\% | 14.8\% | 18.5\% | 22.2\% | 3.7\% | 0.0\% | 100\% |
| Students, total, in these graduate courses? | White | 935 | 18.3\% | 26.1\% | 14.4\% | 19.1\% | 16.5\% | 5.2\% | 0.3\% | 100\% |
| Students, total, in these graduate courses? | Unknown Ethnicity | small sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Students, total, in these undergraduate courses? | All Faculty | 636 | 12.4\% | 21.4\% | 25.0\% | 18.7\% | 14.3\% | 7.1\% | 1.1\% | 100\% |
| Students, total, in these undergraduate courses? | Amer. Ind./Alaskan Nat. | small sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Students, tota, in these undergraduate courses? | Asian or Pacific Islander | 51 | 9.8\% | 31.4\% | 23.5\% | 19.6\% | 5.9\% | 7.8\% | 2.0\% | 100\% |
| Students, total, in these undergraduate courses? | Black | 15 | 6.7\% | 26.7\% | 20.0\% | 26.7\% | 20.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 100\% |
| Students, tota, in these undergraduate courses? | Hispanic | 9 | 11.1\% | 22.2\% | 33.3\% | 11.1\% | 22.2\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 100\% |
| Students, total, in these undergraduate courses? | White | 557 | 12.7\% | 20.5\% | 25.0\% | 18.7\% | 14.7\% | 7.4\% | 1.1\% | 100\% |
| Students, tota, in these undergraduate courses? | Unknown Ethnicity | small sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Teaching and Research Interests (responses of 6 or more have been aggregated) | Cohort | Responses | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 or more | Total |
| How many of the courses you taught were close to your research interests? | All Faculty | 1249 | 9.8\% | 34.7\% | 30.9\% | 14.1\% | 8.2\% | 1.4\% | 1.0\% | 100\% |
| How many of the courses you taught were close to your research interests? | Amer. Ind./Alaskan Nat. | small sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| How many of the courses you taught were close to your research interests? | Asian or Pacific Islander | 106 | 9.4\% | 42.5\% | 27.4\% | 14.2\% | 5.7\% | 0.0\% | 0.9\% | 100\% |
| How many of the courses you taught were close to your research interests? | Black | 36 | 2.8\% | 22.2\% | 38.9\% | 19.4\% | 16.7\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 100\% |
| How many of the courses you taught were close to your research interests: | Hispanic | 29 | 10.3\% | 31.0\% | 34.5\% | 17.2\% | 6.9\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 100\% |
| How many of the courses you taught were close to your research interests? | White | 1072 | 10.2\% | 34.5\% | 30.8\% | 13.7\% | 8.2\% | 1.6\% | 1.0\% | 100\% |
| How many of the courses you taught were close to your research interests? | Unknown Ethnicity | small sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Have you made use of any of the following teaching resources or programs offered by the Bok |  | Affirmative |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Center for Teaching and Learning (check all that apply): | Cohort | Responses |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Not applicable | All Faculty | 340 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Not applicable | Amer. Ind.//laskan Nat. | small sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Not applicable | Asian or Pacific Islander | 33 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Not applicable Not applicable | Black | 12 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Not applicable Not applicable | Hispanic White | ${ }_{28}^{88}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Not applicable | Unknown Ethnicity | small sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Menschel Program for Humanities and Social Science Junior Faculty (ladder survey only) | All Faculty | 37 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Menschel Program for Humanities and Social Science Junior Faculty (ladder survey only) | Amer. Ind./Alaskan Nat. | small sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Menschel Program for Humanities and Social Science Junior Faculty (ladder survey only) | Asian or Pacific Islander | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Menschel Program for Humanities and Social Science Junior Faculty (ladder survey only) | Black | 3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Menschel Program for Humanities and Social Science Junior Faculty (ladder survey only) | Hispanic | 11 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Menschel Program for Humanities and Social Science Junior Faculty (ladder survey only) | White | 31 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Menschel Program for Humanities and Social Science Junior Faculty (ladder survey only) | Unknown Ethnicity | small sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Bok Center events | All Faculty | 173 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Bok Center events Bok Center events | Amer. Ind./Alaskan Nat. Asian or. Pacific Islander | small sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Bok Center events | Black | 18 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Bok Center events | Hispanic | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Bok Center events | White | 150 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Bok Center events | Unknown Ethnicity | small sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Videotaped teaching with review | All Faculty | 135 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Videotaped teaching with review | Amer. Ind./Alaskan Nat. | small sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Videotaped teaching with review | Asian or Pacific Islander | 13 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Videotaped teaching with review | Black Hispanic | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Videotaped teaching with review Videotaped teaching with review | Hispanic White | $\stackrel{2}{116}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Videotaped teaching with review | Unknown Ethnicity | small sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |




## Faculty Climate Survey | Ethnicity Appendix

| Workload (continued) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Please indicate the number of committees (formal and informal) you served on and chaired during the previous academic year: |  |  | Standard |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| (responses of 4 or more have been aggregated) | Cohort | Mean | Deviation | Responses | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 or more | Total |
| [unit] committees chaired | All Faculty | 0.88 | 1.03 | 634 | 41.5\% | 37.4\% | 16.4\% | 3.2\% | 1.6\% | 100\% |
| [unit] committees chaired | Amer. Ind./Alaskan Nat. |  |  | small sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| [unit] committees chaired | Asian or Pacific Islander | 0.83 | 0.89 | 47 | 42.6\% | 38.3\% | 12.8\% | 6.4\% | 0.0\% | 100\% |
| [unit] committees chaired | Black | 0.47 | 0.62 | 17 | 58.8\% | 35.3\% | 5.9\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 100\% |
| [unit] committees chaired | Hispanic | 0.79 | 0.97 | 14 | 50.0\% | 28.6\% | 14.3\% | 7.1\% | 0.0\% | 100\% |
| [unit] committees chaired | White | 0.90 | 1.05 | 552 | 40.6\% | 37.7\% | 17.0\% | 2.9\% | 1.8\% | 100\% |
| [unit] committees chaired | Unknown Ethnicity |  |  | small sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| University/School committees served on | All Faculty | 1.84 | 1.87 | 1064 | 27.0\% | 24.4\% | 20.6\% | 13.3\% | 14.7\% | 100\% |
| University/School committees served on | Amer. Ind./Alaskan Nat. |  |  | small sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Universit//School committees served on | Asian or Pacific Islander | 1.56 | 1.55 | 84 | 32.1\% | 23.8\% | 17.9\% | 16.7\% | 9.5\% | 100\% |
| University/School committees served on | Black | 1.79 | 1.93 | 34 | 26.5\% | 35.3\% | 11.8\% | 8.8\% | 17.6\% | 100\% |
| Universit//School committees served on | Hispanic | 2.28 | 1.90 | 25 | 20.0\% | 24.0\% | 12.0\% | 20.0\% | 24.0\% | 100\% |
| University/School committees served on | White | 1.86 | 1.89 | 916 | 26.7\% | 24.0\% | 21.4\% | 13.1\% | 14.7\% | 100\% |
| University/School committees served on | Unknown Ethnicity |  |  | small sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| University/School committees chaired | All Faculty | 0.51 | 0.90 | 556 | 66.9\% | 20.9\% | 8.6\% | 1.8\% | 1.8\% | 100\% |
| University/School committees chaired | Amer. Ind./Alaskan Nat. |  |  | small sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| University/School committees chaired | Asian or Pacific Islander | 0.27 | 0.58 | 30 | 80.0\% | 13.3\% | 6.7\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 100\% |
| University/School committees chaired | Black | 0.37 | 0.60 | 19 | 68.4\% | 26.3\% | 5.3\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 100\% |
| University/School committees chaired | Hispanic | 1.27 | 1.27 | 11 | 36.4\% | 27.3\% | 9.1\% | 27.3\% | 0.0\% | 100\% |
| University/School committees chaired | White | 0.52 | 0.91 | 492 | 66.7\% | 20.9\% | 8.9\% | 1.4\% | 2.0\% | 100\% |
| University/School committees chaired | Unknown Ethnicity |  |  | small sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| External professional committees/boards served on | All Faculty | 2.31 | 2.23 | 1009 | 22.5\% | 17.2\% | 22.8\% | 15.5\% | 22.0\% | 100\% |
| External professional committees/boards served on | Amer. Ind./Alaskan Nat. |  |  | small sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| External professional committees/boards served on | Asian or Pacific Islander | 2.16 | 2.76 | 80 | 30.0\% | 18.8\% | 15.0\% | 18.8\% | 17.5\% | 100\% |
| External professional committees/boards served on | Black | 3.07 | 2.91 | 30 | 13.3\% | 13.3\% | 23.3\% | 20.0\% | 30.0\% | 100\% |
| External professional committees/boards served on | Hispanic | 1.67 | 2.50 | 24 | 33.3\% | 29.2\% | 16.7\% | 12.5\% | 8.3\% | 100\% |
| External professional committees/boards served on | White | 2.31 | 2.14 | 871 | 21.9\% | 16.9\% | 23.7\% | 14.9\% | 22.6\% | 100\% |
| External professional committees/boards served on | Unknown Ethnicity |  |  | small sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| External professional committees/boards chaired | All Faculty | 0.55 | 0.91 | 509 | 63.5\% | 24.0\% | 9.4\% | 1.8\% | 1.4\% | 100\% |
| External professional committees/boards chaired | Amer. Ind./Alaskan Nat. |  |  | small sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| External professional committees/boards chaired | Asian or Pacific Islander | 0.42 | 0.66 | 33 | 66.7\% | 24.2\% | 9.1\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 100\% |
| External professional committees/boards chaired | Black | 0.63 | 2.00 | 16 | 81.3\% | 12.5\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 6.3\% | 100\% |
| External professional committees/boards chaired | Hispanic | 0.56 | 1.13 | 9 | 77.8\% | 0.0\% | 11.1\% | 11.1\% | 0.0\% | 100\% |
| External professional committees/boards chaired | White | 0.55 | 0.86 | 448 | 62.5\% | 24.8\% | 9.6\% | 1.8\% | 1.3\% | 100\% |
| External professional committees/boards chaired | Unknown Ethnicity |  |  | small sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Have you ever served in any of the following administrative capacities while at Harvard (check |  |  |  | Affirmative |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| all that apply): | Cohort |  |  | Responses |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Director/Assistant Director of undergraduate study/Head tutor, Never | All Faculty |  |  | 869 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Director/Assistant Director of undergraduate study/Head tutor, Never | Amer. Ind./Alaskan Nat. |  |  | small sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Director/Assistant Director of undergraduate study/Head tutor, Never | Asian or Pacific Islander |  |  | 69 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Director/Assistant Director of undergraduate study/Head tutor, Never | Black Hispanic |  |  | 20 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Director/Assistant Director of undergraduate study/Head tutor, Never | Hispanic |  |  | 17 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Director/Assistant Director of undergraduate study/Head tutor, Never | White |  |  | 758 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Director/Assistant Director of undergraduate study/Head tutor, Never <br> Director/Assistant Director of undergraduate study/Head tutor, Currently or within the past five | Unknown Ethnicity |  |  | small sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| academic years | All Faculty |  |  | 111 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Director/Assistant Director of undergraduate study/Head tutor, Currently or within the past five academic years | Amer. Ind./Alaskan Nat. |  |  | small sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Director/Assistant Director of undergraduate study/Head tutor, Currently or within the past five academic years | Asian or Pacific Islander |  |  | 8 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Director/Assistant Director of undergraduate study/Head tutor, Currently or within the past five academic years | Black |  |  | 5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Director/Assistant Director of undergraduate study/Head tutor, Currently or within the past five academic years | Hispanic |  |  | 4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Director/Assistant Director of undergraduate study/Head tutor, Currently or within the past five academic years | White |  |  | 94 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Director/Assistant Director of undergraduate study/Head tutor, Currently or within the past five academic years | Unknown Ethnicity |  |  | small sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Director/Assistant Director of undergraduate study/Head tutor, Served prior to the past five academic years | All Faculy |  |  | 72 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Director/Assistant Director of undergraduate study/Head tutor, Served prior to the past five academic |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| years | Amer. Ind./Alaskan Nat. |  |  | small sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Director/Assistant Director of undergraduate study/Head tutor, Served prior to the past five academic |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| years <br> Director/Assistant Director of undergraduate study/Head tutor, Served prior to the past five academic | Asian or Pacific Islander |  |  | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| years | Black |  |  | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Director/Assistant Director of undergraduate study/Head tutor, Served prior to the past five academic years | Hispanic |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Director/Assistant Director of undergraduate study/Head tutor, Served prior to the past five academic |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| years | White |  |  | 68 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Director/Assistant Director of undergraduate study/Head tutor, Served prior to the past five academic years | Unknown Ethnicity |  |  | small sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Vorkload (continued)
Workload (continued)
Have you ever served in any of the following administrative capacities while at Harvard (check
all that apply):
Director of graduate study, Never (ladder survey only)
Director of graduate study, Never (ladder survey only)
Director of graduate study, Never (ladder survey only)

Director of graduate study, Never (ladder survey only)
Director of graduate study, Never (ladder survey only)
Director of graduate study, Never (ladder survey only)
Director of of graduatuate studydy, Currently or within the past five academic years (ladder survey only) Director of graduate study, Currently or within the past five academic years (ladder survey only) Director of graduate study, Currently or within the past five academic years (ladder survey only Director of graduate study, Currently or within the past five academic years (ladder survey only) irector of graduate study, Currently or within the past five academic years (ladder survey only
Director of graduate study, Currently or within the past five academic years (ladder survey only) Director of graduate study, Currently or within the past five academic years (ladder survey only) Director of graduate study, Served prior to the past five academic years (ladder survey only)
Director of graduate study, Served prior to the past five academic years (ladder survey only) irector of graduate study, Served prior to the past five academic years (ladder survey only Director of graduate study, Served prior to the past five academic years (ladder survey only) Director of graduate study, Served prior to the past five academic years (ladder survey only) Director of graauate stuay, Served prior to the past five academic years (ladder survey only)
Director of graduate study, Served prior to the past five academic years (ladder survey only) Chair, Never (ladder survey only)
hair, Never (ladder survey only)
Chair, Never (ladder survey only
Chair, Never (ladder survey only)
Chair, Never (ladder survey only
Chair, Never (ladder survey only
five academic years (ladder survey only) Chair, Currently or within the past five academic years (ladder survey only)
Charently or within the past five academic years (ladder survey onlly hair, Currenty or within the past five academic years (ladder survey only) hair, Currently or within the past five academic years (ladder survey onl)
Chair, Currently or within the past five academic years (ladder survey only) Chair, Currently or within the past five academic years (ladder survey only)
hair, Served prior to the past five academic years (ladder survey only)
Chair, Served prior to the past five academic years (ladder survey only)

Chair, Served prior to the past five academic years (ladder survey only)
Chair, Served prior to the past five academic years (ladder survey only)
Chair, Served prior to the past five academic years (ladder survey only)
Director of a center, program, or institute, Never
Director of a center, program, or institute, Neve
Director of a center, program, or institute, Never
Director of a center, program, or istitute, Nev
Director of a center, program, or institute, Neve
Director of a center, program, or institute, Currently or within the past five academic years Director of a center, program, or institute, Currently or within the past five academic years Director of a center, program, or institute, Currently or within the past five academic years Director of a center, program, or institute, Currently or within the past five academic years drector of a center, program, or isitite, Cureny or within the past five academic years Drector of a center, program, or institute, Currenty or within the past five academic yeas Director of a center, program, or institute, Served prior to the past five academic years Director of a center, program, or institute, Served prior to the past five academic years Director of a center, program, or institute, Served prior to the past five academic years Director of a center, program, or institute, Served prior to the past five academic years Director of a center, program, or institute, Served prior to the past five academic years Dean, Never
Dean, Never
Dean, Never
Dean, Never
Dean, Never
Dean, Never


All Faculty
Amer. Ind./Alaskan Nat
Amer. Ind./Alaskan Nat.
Asian or Pacific Islander
Black
Black
Hispanic
White
Unknown Ethnicity
Unknown Ethn
All Faculty
Amer. Ind.IAlaskan Nat
Asian or Pacific Islander
Black
Hispanic
Hispanic
White
Unknown Ethnicity
All Faculty
Amer. Ind.IAlaskan Nat.
Asian or Pacific Islander
Asian or Pacific Islander
Black
Hispanic
White
White
All Faculty
Amer. Ind./Alaskan Nat.
Black
${ }^{\text {Hispanic }}$
White
All Faculty
Amer. Ind./Alaskan Nat.
Asian or Pacific Islande
Asian or
Black
Hispanic
White
White
Unknown Ethnicity
All Faculty
Amer. Ind./Alaskan Nat.
Asian or Pacific Islander
Black
Hispanic
Hispanic
White
Unknown Ethnicity
All Faculty
Amer. Ind.I/
Asian or Pacific Islander
Black
Hispanic
Hispanic
White
Unknown Ethnicity
All Faculty
Amer. Ind./Alaskan Nat.
Asian or Pacific Islander
Amer.
Asian or Pacificic Islander
Black
Hispanic
White
All Faculty
Amer. Ind./Alaskan Nat.
Black
Hispanic
Unknown Ethnicity
All Faculty
Amer. Ind./Alaskan Nat.
Asian or Pacific Islande
Asian or
Black
Hispanic
White
Unknown Ethnicity
Affirmative
Responses
590
small sample
52
16
12
506
small sample
117
small sample
8
0
2
107
small sample
88
small sample
1
2
3
82
small sample
486
small sample
47
12
13
411
small sample
134
small sample
5
4
3
121
small sample
116
small sample
1
2
2
111
small sample
769
small
72
18
16
658
sample
small sample
252
small s sample
8
11
6
226
small sample
77
small sample
1
3
0
73
small sample
1107
small sample
96
30
25
950
small sample

Vorkload (continued)
Have you ever served in any of the following administrative capacities while at Harvard (check

|  | ean, Currently or within the past five academic years |
| :---: | :---: |
|  | Dean, Currently or within the past five academic years |
|  | Dean, Currently or within the past five academic years |
|  | Dean, Currently or within the past five academic years |
|  | Dean, Currently or within the past five academic years |
|  | Dean, Currently or within the past five academic years |
|  | Dean, Currently or within the past five academic years |
|  | Dean, Served prior to the past five academic years |
|  | Dean, Served prior to the past five academic years |
|  | Dean, Served prior to the past five academic years |
|  | Dean, Served prior to the past five academic years |
|  | Dean, Served prior to the past five academic years |
|  | Dean, Served prior to the past five academic years |
|  | Dean, Served prior to the past five academic years |
|  | Other administrative capacity, Never |
|  | Other administrative capacity, Never |
|  | Other administrative capacity, Never |
|  | Other administrative capacity, Never |
|  | Other administrative capacity, Never |
|  | Other administrative capacity, Never |
|  | Other administrative capacity, Never |
|  | Other administrative capacity, Currently or within the past five academic y |
|  | Other administrative capacity, Currently or within the past five academic years |
|  | Other administrative capacity, Currently or within the past five academic years |
|  | Other administrative capacity, Currently or within the past five academic years |
|  | Other administrative capacity, Currently or within the past five academic years |
|  | Other administrative capacity, Currently or within the past five academic years |
|  | Other administrative capacity, Currently or within the past five ac |
|  | Other administrative capacity, Served prior to the past five academic years |
|  | Other administrative capacity, Served prior to the past five academic |
|  | Other administrative capacity, Served prior to the past five academic years |
|  | Other administrative capacity, Served prior to the past five academic years |
|  | Other administrative capacity, Served prior to the past five academic years |
|  | her administrative capacity, Served prior to the past five |
|  | Other administrative capacity, Served prior to the past five academic years |

Received teaching relief:
Director/ssistant Director of undergraduate study/Head tutor
Director/Assistant Director of undergadauate stuyl/Head tuto
. Director/Assistant Director of undergraduate study/Head tutor Director/Assistant Director of undergraduate study/Head tuto Director/Assistant Director of undergraduate study/Head tuto Director/Assistant Director of undergraduate study/Head tutor Director of graduate study (ladder survey only)
Director of graduate study (ladder survey only)
Director of graduate study (ladder survey only)
Director of graduate study (ladder survey only)
Director of graduate study (ladder survey only)
(ladder survey only)
Chair (ladder survey only)
Chair (ladder survey only)
Chair (ladder survey only)
hair (ladder survey onl)
Chair (ladder survey only)
Chair (ladder survey only)
Director of a center, program, or institut Director of a center, program, or institute
Director of a center, program, or institut Director of a center, program, or institute Director of a center, program, or institut Director of a center, program, or institut

| Cohort | Affirmative Responses |
| :---: | :---: |
| All Faculty | 70 |
| Amer. Ind./Alaskan Nat. | small sample |
| Asian or Pacific Islander | 4 |
| Black | 3 |
| Hispanic | 1 |
| White | 62 |
| Unknown Ethnicity | small sample |
| All Faculty | 45 |
| Amer. Ind./Alaskan Nat. | small sample |
| Asian or Pacific Islander | 0 |
| Black | 0 |
| Hispanic | 0 |
| White | 45 |
| Unknown Ethnicity | small sample |
| All Facult | 797 |
| Amer. Ind./Alaskan Nat. | small sample |
| Asian or Pacific Islander | 80 |
| Black | 21 |
| Hispanic | 19 |
| White | 672 |
| Unknown Ethnicity | small sample |
| All Faculty | 259 |
| Amer. Ind./Alaskan Nat. | small sample |
| Asian or Pacific Islander | 14 |
| Black | 7 |
| Hispanic | 5 |
| White | 233 |
| Unknown Ethnicity | small sample |
| All Faculty | 102 |
| Amer. Ind./Alaskan Nat. | small sample |
| Asian or Pacific Islander | ${ }^{2}$ |
| Black | 3 |
| Hispanic | 1 |
| White | 96 |
| Unknown Ethnicity | small sample |

Uniow

Amer. Ind.IAlaskan Nat.
Asian or Pacific slande
Black
Hispanic
White
Unknown Ethnicity
All Faculty
Amer. Ind./Alaskan Na
Black
Hispanic
Unknown Ethnicity
All Faculty
Amer. Ind.IAlaskan Nat.
Asian or
Black
Hispanic
White
Unknown Ethnicity
All Faculty
Amer. Ind./Alaskan Nat.
Black
Hispanic
White
Unknown Ethnicity

## Responses 169

| Responses | Yes | No | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 169 | 33.7\% | 66.3\% | 100\% |
| small sample |  |  |  |
| 12 | 33.3\% | 66.7\% | 100\% |
| 5 | 60.0\% | 40.0\% | 100\% |
| small sample |  |  |  |
| 150 smal sampe | 32.7\% | 67.3\% | 100\% |
| ${ }_{183}$ | 30.6\% | 69.4\% | 100\% |
| small sample |  |  |  |
| 13 | 7.7\% | 92.3\% | 100\% |
| small sample small sample |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| 165 | 30.9\% | 69.1\% | 100\% |
| small sample |  |  |  |
| small sample |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| 8 | 25.0\% | 75.0\% | 100\% |
| 5 | 40.0\% | 60.0\% | 100\% |
| small sample |  |  |  |
| 189 | 46.6\% | 53.4\% | 100\% |
| small sample |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| 12 | 16.7\% | 83.3\% | 100\% |
| 8 | 25.0\% | 75.0\% | 100\% |
| 5 | 40.0\% | 60.0\% | 100\% |
| 254 | 34.3\% | 65.7\% | 100\% |


| Workload (continued) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Received teaching relief: | Cohort |  |  | Responses | Yes | No |  |  |  |  |  | Total |
| Dean | All Faculty |  |  | 117 | 59.8\% | 40.2\% |  |  |  |  |  | 100\% |
| Dean | Amer. Ind./Alaskan Nat. |  |  | small sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Dean | Asian or Pacific Islander |  |  | 7 | 28.6\% | 71.4\% |  |  |  |  |  | 100\% |
| Dean | Black |  |  | small sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Dean | Hispanic |  |  | small sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Dean | White |  |  | 105 | 61.9\% | 38.1\% |  |  |  |  |  | 100\% |
| Dean | Unknown Ethnicity |  |  | small sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Other administrative capacity | All Faculty |  |  | 259 | 23.2\% | 76.8\% |  |  |  |  |  | 100\% |
| Other administrative capacity | Amer. Ind./Alaskan Nat. |  |  | small sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Other administrative capacity | Asian or Pacific Islander |  |  | 18 | 11.1\% | 88.9\% |  |  |  |  |  | 100\% |
| Other administrative capacity | Black |  |  | 7 | 42.9\% | 57.1\% |  |  |  |  |  | 100\% |
| Other administrative capacity | Hispanic |  |  | 6 | 33.3\% | 66.7\% |  |  |  |  |  | 100\% |
| Other administrative capacity | White |  |  | 228 | 23.2\% | 76.8\% |  |  |  |  |  | 100\% |
| Other administrative capacity | Unknown Ethnicity |  |  | small sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| In the past 12 months, how many of each of the following did you submit: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| (responses of 6 or more have been aggregated) | Cohort |  |  | Responses | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 or more | Total |
| Grant Proposals | All Faculty |  |  | 1071 | 29.4\% | 19.4\% | 16.2\% | 13.4\% | 8.8\% | 5.6\% | 7.2\% | 100\% |
| Grant Proposals | Amer. Ind./Alaskan Nat. |  |  | small sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Grant Proposals | Asian or Pacific Islander |  |  | 83 | 24.1\% | 20.5\% | 18.1\% | 12.0\% | 10.8\% | 8.4\% | 6.0\% | 100\% |
| Grant Proposals | Black |  |  | 30 | 16.7\% | 23.3\% | 23.3\% | 13.3\% | 3.3\% | 3.3\% | 16.7\% | 100\% |
| Grant Proposals | Hispanic |  |  | 23 | 26.1\% | 21.7\% | 21.7\% | 17.4\% | 8.7\% | 0.0\% | 4.3\% | 100\% |
| Grant Proposals | White |  |  | 929 | 30.6\% | 19.3\% | 15.8\% | 13.2\% | 8.7\% | 5.6\% | 6.8\% | 100\% |
| Grant Proposals | Unknown Ethnicity |  |  | small sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Papers for publication in peer- and student-reviewed journals | All Faculty |  |  | 1163 | 15.6\% | 16.3\% | 19.6\% | 12.8\% | 7.7\% | 6.7\% | 21.3\% | 100\% |
| Papers for publication in peer- and student-reviewed journals | Amer. Ind./Alaskan Nat. |  |  | small sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Papers for publication in peer- and student-reviewed journals | Asian or Pacific Islander |  |  | 102 | 7.8\% | 15.7\% | 16.7\% | 16.7\% | 5.9\% | 7.8\% | 29.4\% | 100\% |
| Papers for publication in peer- and student-reviewed journals | Black |  |  | 31 | 19.4\% | 29.0\% | 25.8\% | 12.9\% | 6.5\% | 3.2\% | 3.2\% | 100\% |
| Papers for publication in peer- and student-reviewed journals | Hispanic |  |  | 27 | 7.4\% | 11.1\% | 22.2\% | 14.8\% | 11.1\% | 14.8\% | 18.5\% | 100\% |
| Papers for publication in peer- and student-reviewed journals | White |  |  | 998 | 16.5\% | 15.9\% | 19.7\% | 12.3\% | 7.8\% | 6.5\% | 21.1\% | 100\% |
| Papers for publication in peer- and student-reviewed journals | Unknown Ethnicity |  |  | small sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Papers for presentation at conferences | All Faculty |  |  | 1208 | 17.4\% | 13.7\% | 20.5\% | 17.1\% | 8.5\% | 8.4\% | 14.3\% | 100\% |
| Papers for presentation at conferences | Amer. Ind./Alaskan Nat. |  |  | small sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Papers for presentation at conferences | Asian or Pacific Islander |  |  | 100 | 12.0\% | 18.0\% | 16.0\% | 20.0\% | 7.0\% | 9.0\% | 18.0\% | 100\% |
| Papers for presentation at conferences | Black |  |  | 34 | 11.8\% | 5.9\% | 32.4\% | 17.6\% | 17.6\% | 8.8\% | 5.9\% | 100\% |
| Papers for presentation at conferences | Hispanic |  |  | 29 | 3.4\% | 13.8\% | 27.6\% | 6.9\% | 13.8\% | 24.1\% | 10.3\% | 100\% |
| Papers for presentation at conferences | White |  |  | 1039 | 18.5\% | 13.6\% | 20.5\% | 17.0\% | 8.3\% | 7.8\% | 14.3\% | 100\% |
| Papers for presentation at conferences | Unknown Ethnicity |  |  | small sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Books authored | All Faculty |  |  | 1114 | 73.9\% | 22.8\% | 2.4\% | 0.7\% | 0.0\% | 0.1\% | 0.1\% | 100\% |
| Books authored | Amer. Ind./Alaskan Nat. |  |  | small sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Books authored | Asian or Pacific Islander |  |  | 93 | 69.9\% | 24.7\% | 3.2\% | 1.1\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 1.1\% | 100\% |
| Books authored | Black |  |  | 29 | 62.1\% | 31.0\% | 6.9\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 100\% |
| Books authored | Hispanic |  |  | 24 | 58.3\% | 29.2\% | 0.0\% | 8.3\% | 0.0\% | 4.2\% | 0.0\% | 100\% |
| Books authored | White |  |  | 963 | 75.0\% | 22.2\% | 2.3\% | 0.5\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 100\% |
| Books authored | Unknown Ethnicity |  |  | small sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Books edited | All Faculty |  |  | 1084 | 77.8\% | 17.3\% | 3.7\% | 0.6\% | 0.4\% | 0.2\% | 0.0\% | 100\% |
| Books edited | Amer. Ind./Alaskan Nat. |  |  | small sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Books edited | Asian or Pacific Islander |  |  | 90 | 81.1\% | 16.7\% | 1.1\% | 1.1\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 100\% |
| Books edited | Black |  |  | 30 | 70.0\% | 23.3\% | 3.3\% | 3.3\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 100\% |
| Books edited | Hispanic |  |  | 25 | 60.0\% | 32.0\% | 4.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 4.0\% | 0.0\% | 100\% |
| Books edited | White |  |  | 933 | 78.3\% | 16.7\% | 4.0\% | 0.4\% | 0.4\% | 0.1\% | 0.0\% | 100\% |
| Books edited Chapters in books | Unknown Ethnicity All Faculty |  |  | ${ }_{\text {small sample }}^{1149}$ | 44.8\% | 24.5\% | 18.0\% | 6.3\% | 2.7\% | 1.8\% | 1.8\% | 100\% |
| Chapters in books | Amer. Ind./Alaskan Nat. |  |  | small sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Chapters in books | Asian or Pacific Islander |  |  | 95 | 50.5\% | 23.2\% | 14.7\% | 5.3\% | 3.2\% | 0.0\% | 3.2\% | 100\% |
| Chapters in books | Black |  |  | 32 | 15.6\% | 40.6\% | 21.9\% | 12.5\% | 0.0\% | 3.1\% | 6.3\% | 100\% |
| Chapters in books | Hispanic |  |  | 27 | 37.0\% | 18.5\% | 25.9\% | 7.4\% | 7.4\% | 3.7\% | 0.0\% | 100\% |
| Chapters in books | White |  |  | 991 | 45.5\% | 24.2\% | 18.1\% | 6.2\% | 2.5\% | 1.9\% | 1.6\% | 100\% |
| Chapters in books | Unknown Ethnicity |  |  | small sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Other scholarly or creative works | All Faculty |  |  | 430 | 54.7\% | 14.4\% | 12.8\% | 5.3\% | 1.9\% | 2.8\% | 8.1\% | 100\% |
| Other scholarly or creative works | Amer. Ind./Alaskan Nat. Asian or Pacific Islander |  |  | small sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Other scholarly or creative works Other scholarly or creative works | Asian or Pacific Islander Black |  |  | 29 14 | 65.5\% | 10.3\% | ${ }^{6.9 \%}$ | ${ }^{3.4 \%} 14.3 \%$ | 0.0\% | 3.4\% ${ }^{3.0 \%}$ | 10.3\% | 100\% |
| Other scholarly or creative works | Hispanic |  |  | 9 | 44.4\% | 0.0\% | 33.3\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 11.1\% | 11.1\% | 100\% |
| Other scholarly or creative works | White |  |  | 375 | 55.7\% | 14.7\% | 11.7\% | 5.3\% | 2.1\% | 2.4\% | 8.0\% | 100\% |
| Other scholarly or creative works | Unknown Ethnicity |  |  | small sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Work Hours |  |  | Standard |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| (responses have been placed into ten-hour groupings to make display possible) | Cohort | Mean | Deviation | Responses | 44 or less | 45-54 | 55-64 | 65-74 | 75 or more |  |  | Total |
| How many hours a week do you spend working? | All Faculty | 59.08 | 13.14 | 1064 | 8.6\% | 24.8\% | 34.8\% | 19.2\% | 12.6\% |  |  | 100\% |
| How many hours a week do you spend working? | Amer. Ind./Alaskan Nat. |  |  | small sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| How many hours a week do you spend working? | Asian or Pacific Islander | 60.61 | 14.67 | 93 | 9.7\% | 18.3\% | 30.1\% | 26.9\% | 15.1\% |  |  | 100\% |
| How many hours a week do you spend working? | Black | 60.60 | 11.30 | 25 | 8.0\% | 20.0\% | 36.0\% | 24.0\% | 12.0\% |  |  | 100\% |
| How many hours a week do you spend working? | Hispanic | 58.19 | 13.62 | 27 | 7.4\% | 22.2\% | 40.7\% | 22.2\% | 7.4\% |  |  | 100\% |
| How many hours a week do you spend working? | White | 58.87 | 13.04 | 914 | 8.6\% | 25.8\% | 35.0\% | 17.9\% | 12.6\% |  |  | 100\% |
| How many hours a week do you spend working? | Unknown Ethnicity |  |  | small sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| rkload (continued) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| To what extent have the following been a source of stress over the past twelve months: $(1=$ Not at all, $3=$ Extensive) | Cohort | Mean | Standard Deviation | Responses | Not at all | Somewhat | Extensive | Total |
| Scholarly productivity | All Faculty | 2.10 | 0.72 | 1214 | 21.3\% | 47.4\% | 31.2\% | 100\% |
| Scholarly productivity | Amer. Ind./Alaskan Nat. |  |  | small sample |  |  |  |  |
| Scholarly productivity | Asian or Pacific Islander | 2.18 | 0.74 | 103 | 19.4\% | 42.7\% | 37.9\% | 100\% |
| Scholarly productivity | Black | 2.24 | 0.71 | 33 | 15.2\% | 45.5\% | 39.4\% | 100\% |
| Scholarly productivity | Hispanic | 2.17 | 0.79 | 30 | 23.3\% | 36.7\% | 40.0\% | 100\% |
| Scholarly productivity | White | 2.09 | 0.72 | 1042 | 21.7\% | 48.1\% | 30.2\% | 100\% |
| Scholarly productivity | Unknown Ethnicity |  |  | small sample |  |  |  |  |
| Teaching responsibilities | All Faculty | 1.95 | 0.66 | 1237 | 24.1\% | 56.5\% | 19.4\% | 100\% |
| Teaching responsibilities | Amer. Ind./Alaskan Nat. |  |  | small sample |  |  |  |  |
| Teaching responsibilities | Asian or Pacific Islander | 2.07 | 0.66 | 100 | 18.0\% | 57.0\% | 25.0\% | 100\% |
| Teaching responsibilities | Black | 1.91 | 0.71 | 34 | 29.4\% | 50.0\% | 20.6\% | 100\% |
| Teaching responsibibilites | Hispanic | 1.89 | 0.69 | 28 | 28.6\% | 53.6\% | 17.9\% | 100\% |
| Teaching responsibilities | White | 1.94 | 0.66 | 1069 | 24.5\% | 56.8\% | 18.7\% | 100\% |
| Teaching responsibilities | Unknown Ethnicity |  |  | small sample |  |  |  |  |
| Advising responsibilities | All Faculty | 1.67 | 0.66 | 1195 | 44.2\% | 44.9\% | 11.0\% | 100\% |
| Advising responsibilities | Amer. Ind./Alaskan Nat. |  |  | small sample |  |  |  |  |
| Advising responsibilities | Asian or Pacific Islander | 1.76 | 0.63 | 95 | 34.7\% | 54.7\% | 10.5\% | 100\% |
| Advising responsibilities | Black | 1.91 | 0.79 | 34 | 35.3\% | 38.2\% | 26.5\% | 100\% |
| Advising responsibilities | Hispanic | 1.78 | 0.75 | 27 | 40.7\% | 40.7\% | 18.5\% | 100\% |
| Advising responsibilities | White | 1.65 | 0.66 | 1033 | 45.7\% | 44.0\% | 10.3\% | 100\% |
| Advising responsibilities | Unknown Ethnicity |  |  | small sample |  |  |  |  |
| Administrative responsibilites to your [unit], School, or the University | All Faculty | 1.86 | 0.75 | 1174 | 36.1\% | 41.7\% | 22.2\% | 100\% |
| Administrative responsibilites to your [unit], School, or the University | Amer. Ind./Alaskan Nat. |  |  | small sample |  |  |  |  |
| Administrative responsibilites to your [unit], School, or the University | Asian or Pacific Islander | 1.88 | 0.71 | 96 | 32.3\% | 47.9\% | 19.8\% | 100\% |
| Administrative responsibilites to your [unit], School, or the University | Black | 1.91 | 0.72 | 33 | 30.3\% | 48.5\% | 21.2\% | 100\% |
| Administrative responsibilites to your [unit], School, or the University | Hispanic | 2.04 | 0.72 | 26 | 23.1\% | 50.0\% | 26.9\% | 100\% |
| Administrative responsibilites to your [unit], School, or the University | White | 1.85 | 0.76 | 1014 | 37.2\% | 40.4\% | 22.4\% | 100\% |
| Administrative responsibilites to your [unit], School, or the University | Unknown Ethnicity |  |  | small sample |  |  |  |  |
| External service responsibilities | All Faculty | 1.54 | 0.65 | 1131 | 55.0\% | 36.3\% | 8.7\% | 100\% |
| External service responsibilities | Amer. Ind./Alaskan Nat. |  |  | small sample |  |  |  |  |
| External service responsibilities | Asian or Pacific Islander | 1.60 | 0.65 | 88 | 48.9\% | 42.0\% | 9.1\% | 100\% |
| External service responsibilities | Black | 1.76 | 0.75 | 33 | 42.4\% | 39.4\% | 18.2\% | 100\% |
| External service responsibilities | Hispanic | 1.48 | 0.68 | 21 | 61.9\% | 28.6\% | 9.5\% | 100\% |
| External service responsibilities | White | 1.52 | 0.64 | 984 | 56.0\% | 35.9\% | 8.1\% | 100\% |
| External service responsibilities | Unknown Ethnicity |  |  | small sample |  |  |  |  |
| Time for scholarly work | All Faculty | 2.37 | 0.68 | 1212 | 11.3\% | 40.8\% | 47.9\% | 100\% |
| Time for scholarly work | Amer. Ind./Alaskan Nat. |  |  | small sample |  |  |  |  |
| Time for scholarly work | Asian or Pacific Islander | 2.39 | 0.62 | 101 | 6.9\% | 47.5\% | 45.5\% | 100\% |
| Time for scholarly work | Black | 2.47 | 0.61 | 34 | 5.9\% | 41.2\% | 52.9\% | 100\% |
| Time for scholarly work | Hispanic | 2.50 | 0.63 | 30 | 6.7\% | 36.7\% | 56.7\% | 100\% |
| Time for scholarly work | White | 2.36 | 0.69 | 1041 | 12.1\% | 40.2\% | 47.7\% | 100\% |
| Time for scholarly work | Unknown Ethnicity |  |  | small sample |  |  |  |  |
| Timing of [unit] meetings and functions | All Faculty | 1.66 | 0.65 | 1203 | 44.3\% | 45.8\% | 9.9\% | 100\% |
| Timing of [unit] meetings and functions | Amer. Ind./Alaskan Nat. Asian or Pacific Islander | 1.67 | 0.62 | small sample | 40.8\% | 51.0\% | 8.2\% | 100\% |
| Timing of [unit] meetings and functions | Black | 2.00 | 0.65 | 34 | 20.6\% | 58.8\% | 20.6\% | 100\% |
| Timing of [unit] meetings and functions | Hispanic | 2.00 | 0.71 | 29 | 24.1\% | 51.7\% | 24.1\% | 100\% |
| Timing of [unit] meetings and functions | White | 1.63 | 0.65 | 1036 | 46.1\% | 44.6\% | 9.3\% | 100\% |
| Timing of [unit] meetings and functions | Unknown Ethnicity |  |  | small sample |  |  |  |  |
| Timing of Schoo-wide or Harvard-wide meetings and functions | All Faculty | 1.49 | 0.62 | 1167 | 57.2\% | 36.2\% | 6.6\% | 100\% |
| Timing of School-wide or Harvard-wide meetings and functions | Amer. Ind./Alaskan Nat. |  |  | small sample |  |  |  |  |
| Timing of School-wide or Harvard-wide meetings and functions | Asian or Pacific Islander | 1.43 | 0.62 | 92 | 63.0\% | 30.4\% | 6.5\% | 100\% |
| Timing of School-wide or Harvard-wide meetings and functions | Black | 1.75 | 0.51 | 32 | 28.1\% | 68.8\% | 3.1\% | 100\% |
| Timing of School-wide or Harvard-wide meetings and functions | Hispanic | 1.74 | 0.71 | 27 | 40.7\% | 44.4\% | 14.8\% | 100\% |
| Timing of Schoo-wide or Harvard-wide meetings and functions | White | 1.48 | 0.62 | 1010 | 58.2\% | 35.2\% | 6.5\% | 100\% |
| Timing of School-wide or Harvard-wide meetings and functions | Unknown Ethnicity |  |  | small sample |  |  |  |  |
| Commuting | All Faculty | 1.42 | 0.63 | 1176 | 65.9\% | 26.2\% | 7.9\% | 100\% |
| Commuting | Amer. Ind./Alaskan Nat. |  |  | small sample |  |  |  |  |
| Commuting | Asian or Pacific Islander | 1.49 | 0.64 | 100 | 59.0\% | 33.0\% | 8.0\% | 100\% |
| Commuting | ${ }^{\text {Black }}$ | 1.62 | 0.78 | 34 | 55.9\% | 26.5\% | 17.6\% | 100\% |
| Commuting | Hispanic | 1.26 | ${ }^{0.53}$ | 27 | 77.8\% | 18.5\% | 3.7\% | 100\% |
| Commuting Commuting | White | 1.41 | 0.63 | 1009 small sample | 66.6\% | 25.7\% | 7.7\% | 100\% |
| [unit] or campus politics | All Faculty | 1.81 | 0.79 | 1202 | 42.2\% | 34.3\% | 23.5\% | 100\% |
| [unit] or campus politics | Amer. Ind./Alaskan Nat. |  |  | small sample |  |  |  |  |
| [unit] or campus politics | Asian or Pacific Islander | 1.81 | 0.76 | 96 | 39.6\% | 39.6\% | 20.8\% | 100\% |
| [unit] or campus politics | Black | 1.97 | 0.74 | 32 | 28.1\% | 46.9\% | 25.0\% | 100\% |
| [unit] or campus politics | Hispanic | 1.81 | 0.79 | 27 | 40.7\% | 37.0\% | 22.2\% | 100\% |
| [unit] or campus politics | White | 1.81 | 0.79 | 1042 | 43.0\% | 33.2\% | 23.8\% | 100\% |
| [unit] or campus politics | Unknown Ethnicity |  |  | small sample |  |  |  |  |
| Review/promotion process (ladder survey only) | All Faculty | 1.84 | 0.82 | 886 | 43.1\% | 29.9\% | 27.0\% | 100\% |
| Review/promotion process (ladder survey only) Review/promotion process (ladder survey only) | Amer. Ind./Alaskan Nat. Asian or Pacific islander | 2.05 | 0.77 | small sample | 27.2\% | 40.7\% | 321\% | 100\% |
| Review/promotion process (ladder survey only) | Black | 2.09 | 0.85 | 23 | 30.4\% | 30.4\% | 39.1\% | 100\% |
| Review/promotion process (ladder survey only) | Hispanic | 2.08 | 0.83 | 24 | 29.2\% | 33.3\% | 37.5\% | 100\% |
| Review/promotion process (ladder survey only) | White | 1.80 | 0.82 | 753 | 45.7\% | 28.4\% | 25.9\% | 100\% |
| Review/promotion process (ladder survey only) | Unknown Ethnicity |  |  | small sample |  |  |  |  |




| Atmosphere (continued) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Please indicate your agreement or disagreement with the following statements: ( $1=$ Strongly disagree, $5=$ Strongly agree) | Cohort | Mean | Standard Deviation | Responses | Strongly disagree | Somewhat disagree | Neither agree nor disagree | Somewhat agree | Strongly agree | Total |
| I feel excluded from an informal network in my [unit]. (non-ladder survey only) | All Faculty | 2.78 | 1.38 | 275 | 25.1\% | 19.3\% | 21.1\% | 21.5\% | 13.1\% | 100\% |
| I feel excluded from an informal network in my [unit]. (non-ladder survey only) | Amer. Ind./Alaskan Nat. |  |  | small sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| I feel excluded from an informal network in my [unit]. (non-ladder survey only) | Asian or Pacific Islander | 2.89 | 1.29 | 19 | 21.1\% | 10.5\% | 36.8\% | 21.1\% | 10.5\% | 100\% |
| I feel excluded from an informal network in my [unit]. (non-ladder survey only) | Black | 3.29 | 1.70 | 7 | 14.3\% | 28.6\% | 14.3\% | 0.0\% | 42.9\% | 100\% |
| I feel excluded from an informal network in my [unit]. (non-ladder survey only) | Hispanic | 2.40 | 1.52 | 5 | 40.0\% | 20.0\% | 0.0\% | 40.0\% | 0.0\% | 100\% |
| I feel excluded from an informal network in my [unit]. (non-ladder survey only) | White | 2.77 | 1.37 | 243 | 25.1\% | 19.8\% | 20.6\% | 21.8\% | 12.8\% | 100\% |
| I feel excluded from an informal network in my [unit]. (non-ladder survey only) | Unknown Ethnicity |  |  | small sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| My [unit] is a forma/hierarchical place. (non-ladder survey only) | All Faculty | 3.05 | 1.33 | 286 | 16.1\% | 20.6\% | 22.7\% | 23.4\% | 17.1\% | 0\% |
| My [unit] is a forma/hierarchical place. (non-ladder survey only) | Amer. Ind./Alaskan Nat. |  |  | small sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| My [unit] is a forma/hierarchical place. (non-ladder survey only) | Asian or Pacific Islander | 2.89 | 1.41 | 19 | 21.1\% | 21.1\% | 21.1\% | 21.1\% | 15.8\% | 100\% |
| My [unit] is a formalhierarchical place. (non-ladder survey only) | Black | 3.38 | 1.19 | 8 | 0.0\% | 25.0\% | 37.5\% | 12.5\% | 25.0\% | 100\% |
| My [unit] is a formalhierarchical place. (non-ladder survey only) | Hispanic | 2.00 | 0.71 | 5 | 20.0\% | 60.0\% | 20.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 100\% |
| My [unit] is a formal/hierarchical place. (non-ladder survey only) | White | 3.07 | 1.34 | 253 | 16.2\% | 19.8\% | 22.1\% | 24.5\% | 17.4\% | 100\% |
| My [unit] is a forma/hierarchical place. (non-ladder survey only) | Unknown Ethnicity |  |  | small sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| My [leader] has helped me to understand my role in the [unit]. (non-ladder survey only) | All Faculty | 3.16 | 1.31 | 265 | 14.7\% | 15.8\% | 27.2\% | 23.0\% | 19.2\% | 100\% |
| My [leader] has helped me to understand my role in the [unit]. (non-ladder survey only) | Amer. Ind./Alaskan Nat. |  |  | small sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| My [leader] has helped me to understand my role in the [unit]. (non-ladder survey only) | Asian or Pacific Islander | 3.71 | 1.16 | 17 | 5.9\% | 5.9\% | 29.4\% | 29.4\% | 29.4\% | 100\% |
| My [leader] has helped me to understand my role in the [unit]. (non-ladder survey only) | Black | 3.33 | 1.12 | 9 | 11.1\% | 0.0\% | 44.4\% | 33.3\% | 11.1\% | 100\% |
| My [leader] has helped me to understand my role in the [unit]. (non-ladder survey only) | Hispanic | 2.80 | 1.30 | 5 | 20.0\% | 20.0\% | 20.0\% | 40.0\% | 0.0\% | 100\% |
| My [leader] has helped me to understand my role in the [unit]. (non-ladder survey only) | White | 3.12 | 1.33 | 233 | 15.5\% | 17.2\% | 26.2\% | 21.9\% | 19.3\% | 100\% |
| My [leader] has helped me to understand my role in the [unit]. (non-ladder survey only) | Unknown Ethnicity |  |  | small sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Nonladder Inclusion | Cohort |  |  | Responses | Yes | No |  |  |  | Total |
| Have you been invited to [unit] social events? (non-ladder survey only) | All Faculty |  |  | 297 | 94.3\% | 5.7\% |  |  |  | 100\% |
| Have you been invited to [unit] social events? (non-ladder survey only) | Amer. Ind./Alaskan Nat. |  |  | small sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Have you been invited to [unit] social events? (non-ladder survey only) | Asian or Pacific Islander |  |  | 20 | 95.0\% | 5.0\% |  |  |  | 100\% |
| Have you been invited to [unit] social events? (non-ladder survey only) | Black |  |  | 9 | 88.9\% | 11.1\% |  |  |  | 100\% |
| Have you been invited to [unit] social events? (non-ladder survey only) | Hispanic |  |  | 5 | 80.0\% | 20.0\% |  |  |  | 100\% |
| Have you been invited to [unit] social events? (non-ladder survey only) | White |  |  | 262 | 95.0\% | 5.0\% |  |  |  | 100\% |
| Have you been invited to [unit] social events? (non-ladder survey only) | Unknown Ethnicity |  |  | small sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Have you been included on [unit] lists? (non-ladder survey only) | All Faculty |  |  | 293 | 89.8\% | 10.2\% |  |  |  | 100\% |
| Have you been included on [unit) lists? (non-ladder survey only) | Amer. Ind./Alaskan Nat. |  |  | small sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Have you been included on [unit] lists? (non-ladder survey only) | Asian or Pacific Islander |  |  | 20 | 70.0\% | 30.0\% |  |  |  | 100\% |
| Have you been included on [unit] lists? (non-ladder survey only) | Black |  |  | 9 | 88.9\% | 11.1\% |  |  |  | 100\% |
| Have you been included on [unit] lists? (non-ladder survey only) | Hispanic |  |  | 5 | 100.0\% | 0.0\% |  |  |  | 100\% |
| Have you been included on [unit] lists? (non-ladder survey only) | White |  |  | 258 | 91.1\% | 8.9\% |  |  |  | 100\% |
| Have you been included on [unit] lists? (non-ladder survey only) | Unknown Ethnicity |  |  | small sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Have you been given an office? (non-ladder survey only) | All Faculty |  |  | 297 | 92.6\% | 7.4\% |  |  |  | 100\% |
| Have you been given an office? (non-ladder survey only) | Amer. Ind./Alaskan Nat. |  |  | small sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Have you been given an office? (non-ladder survey only) | Asian or Pacific Islander |  |  | $\stackrel{21}{9}$ | 81.0\% | 19.0\% |  |  |  | 100\% |
| Have you been given an office? (non-ladder survey only) | Black |  |  | 9 | 100.0\% | 0.0\% |  |  |  | 100\% |
| Have you been given an office? (non-ladder survey only) | Hispanic |  |  | 5 | 100.0\% | 0.0\% |  |  |  | 100\% |
| Have you been given an office? (non-ladder survey only) | White |  |  | 261 | 93.1\% | 6.9\% |  |  |  | 100\% |
| Have you been given an office? (non-ladder survey only) | Unknown Ethnicity |  |  | small sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Have you been given a mailbox? (non-ladder survey only) | All Faculty |  |  | 295 | 96.9\% | 3.1\% |  |  |  | 100\% |
| Have you been given a mailbox? (non-ladder survey only) | Amer. Ind./Alaskan Nat. |  |  | small sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Have you been given a mailbox? (non-ladder survey only) | Asian or Pacific Islander |  |  | 21 | 90.5\% | 9.5\% |  |  |  | 100\% |
| Have you been given a mailbox? (non-ladder survey only) | Black |  |  | 9 | 100.0\% | 0.0\% |  |  |  | 100\% |
| Have you been given a mailbox? (non-ladder survey only) Have you been given a mailbox? (non-ladder survey only) | Hispanic |  |  | 5 | 100.0\% | 0.0\% |  |  |  | 100\% |
| Have you been given a mailbox? (non-ladder survey only) Have you been given a mailbox? (non-ladder survey only) | White ${ }^{\text {Unknown Ethnicity }}$ |  |  | $\begin{gathered} 259 \\ \text { small sample } \end{gathered}$ | 97.3\% | 2.7\% |  |  |  | 100\% |
| Mentoring |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Overall: |  |  | Standard |  |  | Somewhat | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Neither } \\ & \text { effective nor } \end{aligned}$ | Somewhat |  |  |
| ( 1 = Very ineffective, 5 = Very effective) | Cohort | Mean | Deviation | Responses | Very ineffective | ineffective | ineffective | effective | Very effective | Total |
| Overall, how effective is your [unit] at mentoring its junior faculty? (ladder survey only) | All Faculty | 3.25 | 1.27 | 967 | 13.2\% | 17.3\% | 14.6\% | 40.8\% | 14.1\% | 100\% |
| Overall, how effective is your [unit] at mentoring its junior faculty? (ladder survey only) | Amer. Ind./Alaskan Nat. |  |  | small sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Overall, how effective is your [unit] at mentoring its junior faculty? (ladder survey only) | Asian or Pacific Islander | 3.25 | 1.33 | 84 | 17.9\% | 9.5\% | 17.9\% | 39.3\% | 15.5\% | 100\% |
| Overall, how effective is your [unit] at mentoring its junior faculty? (ladder survey only) | Black | 3.15 | 1.12 | 26 | 7.7\% | 26.9\% | 11.5\% | 50.0\% | 3.8\% | 100\% |
| Overall, how effective is your [unit] at mentoring its junior faculty? (ladder survey only) | Hispanic | 3.13 | 1.36 | 24 | 16.7\% | 16.7\% | 20.8\% | 29.2\% | 16.7\% | 100\% |
| Overall, how effective is your [unit] at mentoring its junior faculty? (ladder survey only) | White | 3.26 | 1.27 | 828 | 12.9\% | 17.8\% | 14.3\% | 40.9\% | 14.1\% | 100\% |
| Overall, how effective is your [unit] at mentoring its junior faculty? (ladder survey only) | Unknown Ethnicity |  |  | small sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Overall, how effective is your [unit] at mentoring its non-tenure track faculty? (non-ladder survey only) | All Faculty | 2.60 | 1.28 | 288 | 26.4\% | 25.0\% | 17.4\% | 25.0\% | 6.3\% | 100\% |
| Overall, how effective is your [unit] at mentoring its non-tenure track faculty? (non-ladder survey only) | Amer. Ind./Alaskan Nat. |  |  | small sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Overall, how effective is your [unit] at mentoring its non-tenure track faculty? (non-ladder survey only) | Asian or Pacific Islander | 2.60 | 1.14 | 20 | 15.0\% | 40.0\% | 20.0\% | 20.0\% | 5.0\% | 100\% |
| Overall, how effective is your [unit] at mentoring its non-tenure track faculty? (non-ladder survey only) | Black | 2.13 | 1.25 | 8 | 50.0\% | 0.0\% | 37.5\% | 12.5\% | 0.0\% | 100\% |
| Overall, how effective is your [unit] at mentoring its non-tenure track faculty? (non-ladder survey only) | Hispanic | 2.60 | 1.52 | 5 | 40.0\% | 0.0\% | 20.0\% | 40.0\% | 0.0\% | 100\% |
| Overall, how effective is your [unit] at mentoring its non-tenure track faculty? (non-ladder survey only) | White | 2.61 | 1.30 | 254 | 26.4\% | 25.2\% | 16.1\% | 25.6\% | 6.7\% | 100\% |
| Overall, how effective is your [unit] at mentoring its non-tenure track faculty? (non-ladder survey only) | Unknown Ethnicity |  |  | small sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Mentoring (continued) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| While a faculty member at Harvard University, have you served as a mentor for another faculty member (check all that apply): | Cohort |  |  | Affirmative Responses |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Yes, through a formal program (ladder survey only) | All Faculty |  |  | 166 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Yes, through a formal program (ladder survey only) | Amer. Ind./Alaskan Nat. |  |  | small sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Yes, through a formal program (ladder survey only) | Asian or Paciific Islander |  |  | 8 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Yes, through a formal program (ladder survey only) | Black |  |  | 3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Yes, through a formal program (ladder survey only) | Hispanic |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Yes, through a formal program (ladder survey only) | White |  |  | 153 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Yes, through a formal program (ladder survey only) | Unknown Ethnicity |  |  | small sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Yes, informally (ladder survey only) | All Faculty |  |  | 610 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Yes, informally (ladder survey only) | Amer. Ind./Alaskan Nat. |  |  | small sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Yes, informally (ladder survey only) | Asian or Paciific Islander |  |  | 45 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Yes, informally (ladder survey only) | Black |  |  | 17 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Yes, informally (ladder survey only) | Hispanic |  |  | 13 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Yes, informally (ladder survey only) | White |  |  | 534 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Yes, informally (ladder survey only) | Unknown Ethnicity |  |  | small sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| No (ladder survey only) | All Faculty |  |  | 280 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| No (ladder survey only) | Amer. Ind./Alaskan Nat. |  |  | small sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| No (ladder survey only) | Asian or Paciific Islander |  |  | 36 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| No (ladder survey only) | Black |  |  | 10 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| No (ladder survey only) | Hispanic |  |  | 10 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| No (ladder survey only) | White |  |  | 221 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| No (ladder survey only) | Unknown Ethnicity |  |  | small sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Had Formal Mentoring | Cohort |  |  | Responses | Yes, one was assigned to me | Yes, one was chosen by me | No |  |  | Total |
| Have you had a formal mentor(s) within your [unit]? (ladder survey only) | All Faculty |  |  | 964 | 10.5\% | 9.5\% | 80.0\% |  |  | 100\% |
| Have you had a formal mentor(s) within your [unit]? (ladder survey only) | Amer. Ind./Alaskan Nat. |  |  | small sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Have you had a formal mentor(s) within your [unit]? (ladder survey only) | Asian or Paciific Islander |  |  | 83 | 10.8\% | 12.0\% | 77.1\% |  |  | 100\% |
| Have you had a formal mentor(s) within your [unit]? (ladder survey only) | Black |  |  | 26 | 19.2\% | 7.7\% | 73.1\% |  |  | 100\% |
| Have you had a formal mentor(s) within your [unit]? (ladder survey only) | Hispanic |  |  | 25 | 16.0\% | 20.0\% | 64.0\% |  |  | 100\% |
| Have you had a formal mentor(s) within your [unit]? (ladder survey only) | White |  |  | 825 | 9.8\% | 9.0\% | 81.2\% |  |  | 100\% |
| Have you had a formal mentor(s) within your [unit]? (ladder survey only) | Unknown Ethnicity |  |  | small sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Had Informal Mentoring | Cohort |  |  | Responses | Yes | No |  |  |  | Total |
| While at Harvard University, have you had one or more informal mentors? (ladder survey only) | All Faculty |  |  | 965 | 62.8\% | 37.2\% |  |  |  | 100\% |
| While at Harvard University, have you had one or more informal mentors? (ladder survey only) | Amer. Ind./Alaskan Nat. |  |  | small sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| While at Harvard University, have you had one or more informal mentors? (ladder survey only) | Asian or Pacific Islander |  |  | 83 | 69.9\% | 30.1\% |  |  |  | 100\% |
| While at Harvard University, have you had one or more informal mentors? (ladder survey only) | Black |  |  | 26 | 76.9\% | 23.1\% |  |  |  | 100\% |
| While at Harvard University, have you had one or more informal mentors? (ladder survey only) | Hispanic |  |  | 25 | 64.0\% | 36.0\% |  |  |  | 100\% |
| While at Harvard University, have you had one or more informal mentors? (ladder survey only) | White |  |  | 826 | 61.4\% | 38.6\% |  |  |  | 100\% |
| While at Harvard University, have you had one or more informal mentors? (ladder survey only) | Unknown Ethnicity |  |  | small sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Helpfulness of Mentoring: <br> ( $1=$ Very unhelpful, $5=$ Very helpful) | Cohort | Mean | Standard Deviation | Responses | Very unhelpful | Somewhat unhelpful | Neither helpful nor unhelpful | Somewhat helpful | Very helpful | Total |
| How helpful have you found this formal mentoring? (ladder survey only) | All Faculty | 3.90 | 1.15 | 192 | 6.3\% | 6.8\% | 14.1\% | 37.0\% | 35.9\% | 100\% |
| How helpful have you found this formal mentoring? (ladder survey only) | Amer. Ind./Alaskan Nat. |  |  | small sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| How helpful have you found this formal mentoring? (ladder survey only) | Asian or Pacific Islander | 4.06 | 1.06 | 18 | 5.6\% | 0.0\% | 16.7\% | 38.9\% | 38.9\% | 100\% |
| How helpful have you found this formal mentoring? (ladder survey only) | Black | 3.71 | 1.11 | 7 | 0.0\% | 14.3\% | 28.6\% | 28.6\% | 28.6\% | 100\% |
| How helpful have you found this formal mentoring? (ladder survey only) | Hispanic | 3.56 | 1.51 | 9 | 22.2\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 55.6\% | 22.2\% | 100\% |
| How helpful have you found this formal mentoring? (ladder survey only) | White | 3.89 | 1.15 | 155 | 5.8\% | 7.7\% | 14.2\% | 36.1\% | 36.1\% | 100\% |
| How helpful have you found this formal mentoring? (ladder survey only) | Unknown Ethnicity |  |  | small sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| How helpful have you found this informal mentoring? (ladder survey only) | All Faculty | 4.59 | 0.60 | 606 | 0.5\% | 0.5\% | 1.5\% | 34.5\% | 63.0\% | 100\% |
| How helpful have you found this informal mentoring? (ladder survey only) | Amer. Ind./Alaskan Nat. |  |  | small sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| How helpful have you found this informal mentoring? (ladder survey only) | Asian or Pacific Islander | 4.62 | 0.59 | 58 | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 5.2\% | 27.6\% | 67.2\% | 100\% |
| How helpful have you found this informal mentoring? (ladder survey only) | Black | 4.80 | ${ }^{0.41}$ | 20 | ${ }^{0.0 \%}$ | ${ }^{0.0 \%}$ | 0.0\% | 27.0\% | 80.0\% | 100\% |
| How helpful have you found this informal mentoring? (ladder survey only) | Hispanic | 3.94 | 1.39 | 16 | 12.5\% | ${ }^{6.3 \%}$ | 0.0\% | 37.5\% | 43.8\% | 100\% |
| How helpful have you found this informal mentoring? (ladder survey only) | White | 4.60 | 0.56 | 507 | 0.2\% | 0.4\% | 1.2\% | 35.9\% | 62.3\% | 100\% |
| How helpful have you found this informal mentoring? (ladder survey only) | Unknown Ethnicity |  |  | small sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Mentoring (continued) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| While at Harvard University, do you feel as though you have received adequate mentoring regarding the following areas: <br> (1 = Inadequate, 5 = More than adequate) |  |  | Standard Deviation |  |  |  | Mostly adequate |  | More than adequate |  |
| ( $1=$ Inadequate, $5=$ More than adequate) | Cohort | Mean | Deviation | Responses | Inadequate | Barely adequate | adequate | Adequate | adequate | Total |
| Your career (non-ladder survey only) | All Faculty | 2.33 | 1.28 | 244 | 34.8\% | 27.5\% | 13.1\% | 19.3\% | 5.3\% | 100\% |
| Your career (non-ladder survey only) | Amer. Ind./Alaskan Nat. |  |  | small sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Your career (non-ladder survey only) | Asian or Pacific Islander | 2.20 | 1.21 | 15 | 40.0\% | 20.0\% | 20.0\% | 20.0\% | 0.0\% | 100\% |
| Your career (non-ladder survey only) | Black | 1.80 | 0.84 | 5 | 40.0\% | 40.0\% | 20.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 100\% |
| Your career (non-ladder survey only) | Hispanic | 1.80 | 0.84 | 5 | 40.0\% | 40.0\% | 20.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 100\% |
| Your career (non-ladder survey only) | White | 2.35 | 1.29 | 218 | 34.4\% | 27.5\% | 12.4\% | 19.7\% | 6.0\% | 100\% |
| Your career (non-ladder survey only) | Unknown Ethnicity |  |  | small sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Distribution of time among work-related activities (ladder survey only) | All Faculty | 2.64 | 1.28 | 569 | 26.4\% | 21.4\% | 19.9\% | 26.5\% | 5.8\% | 100\% |
| Distribution of time among work-related activities (ladder survey only) | Amer. Ind./Alaskan Nat. |  |  | small sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Distribution of time among work-related activities (ladder survey only) | Asian or Pacific Islander | 2.73 | 1.15 | 49 | 20.4\% | 16.3\% | 36.7\% | 22.4\% | 4.1\% | 100\% |
| Distribution of time among work-related activities (ladder survey only) | Black | 2.17 | 1.20 | 18 | 38.9\% | 27.8\% | 11.1\% | 22.2\% | 0.0\% | 100\% |
| Distribution of time among work-related activities (ladder survey only) | Hispanic | 2.33 | 1.30 | 12 | 33.3\% | 33.3\% | 0.0\% | 33.3\% | 0.0\% | 100\% |
| Distribution of time among work-related activities (ladder survey only) | White | 2.66 | 1.29 | 485 | 26.2\% | 21.4\% | 19.2\% | 27.0\% | 6.2\% | 100\% |
| Distribution of time among work-related activities (ladder survey only) | Unknown Ethnicity |  |  | small sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Securing funds for research/course development (ladder survey only) | All Faculty | 2.64 | 1.27 | 587 | 26.1\% | 21.3\% | 21.1\% | 26.1\% | 5.5\% | 100\% |
| Securing funds for research/course development (ladder survey only) | Amer. Ind./Alaskan Nat. |  |  | small sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Securing funds for research/course development (ladder survey only) | Asian or Pacific Islander | 2.65 | 1.25 | 51 | 27.5\% | 13.7\% | 29.4\% | 25.5\% | 3.9\% | 100\% |
| Securing funds for research/course development (ladder survey only) | Black | 2.47 | 1.06 | 15 | 13.3\% | 46.7\% | 26.7\% | 6.7\% | 6.7\% | 100\% |
| Securing funds for research/course development (ladder survey only) | Hispanic | 2.43 | 1.16 | 14 | 28.6\% | 21.4\% | 28.6\% | 21.4\% | 0.0\% | 100\% |
| Securing funds for research/course development (ladder survey only) | White | 2.64 | 1.27 | 503 | 26.2\% | 21.5\% | 19.9\% | 27.0\% | 5.4\% | 100\% |
| Securing funds for research/course development (ladder survey only) | Unknown Ethnicity |  |  | small sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Publishing scholarly work (ladder survey only) | All Faculty | 3.03 | 1.26 | 747 | 16.6\% | 17.1\% | 23.6\% | 31.7\% | 11.0\% | 100\% |
| Publishing scholarly work (ladder survey only) | Amer. Ind./Alaskan Nat. |  |  | small sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Publishing scholarly work (ladder survey only) | Asian or Pacific Islander | 2.85 | 1.24 | 72 | 19.4\% | 18.1\% | 29.2\% | 25.0\% | 8.3\% | 100\% |
| Publishing scholarly work (ladder survey only) | Black | 2.90 | 1.26 | 21 | 19.0\% | 14.3\% | 33.3\% | 23.8\% | 9.5\% | 100\% |
| Publishing scholarly work (ladder survey only) | Hispanic | 2.67 | 1.39 | 21 | 23.8\% | 33.3\% | 4.8\% | 28.6\% | 9.5\% | 100\% |
| Publishing scholarly work (ladder survey only) | White | 3.07 | 1.25 | 628 | 15.9\% | 16.7\% | 23.2\% | 33.1\% | 11.0\% | 100\% |
| Publishing scholarly work (ladder survey only) | Unknown Ethnicity |  |  | small sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Teaching | All Faculty | 3.10 | 1.29 | 1014 | 14.3\% | 20.3\% | 21.9\% | 28.0\% | 15.5\% | 100\% |
| Teaching | Amer. Ind./Alaskan Nat. |  |  | small sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Teaching | Asian or Pacific Islander | 3.14 | 1.22 | 85 | 10.6\% | 18.8\% | 32.9\% | 21.2\% | 16.5\% | 100\% |
| Teaching | Black | 2.81 | 1.36 | 27 | 18.5\% | 29.6\% | 18.5\% | 18.5\% | 14.8\% | 100\% |
| Teaching | Hispanic | 3.22 | 1.34 | 27 | 14.8\% | 14.8\% | 22.2\% | 29.6\% | 18.5\% | 100\% |
| Teaching | White | 3.10 | 1.30 | 869 | 14.5\% | 20.5\% | 20.8\% | 28.8\% | 15.4\% | 100\% |
| Teaching | Unknown Ethnicity |  |  | small sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Advising Research Assistants (ladder survey only) | All Faculty | 2.70 | 1.20 | 560 | 22.0\% | 21.4\% | 25.7\% | 26.4\% | 4.5\% | 100\% |
| Advising Research Assistants (ladder survey only) | Amer. Ind./Alaskan Nat. |  |  | small sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Advising Research Assistants (ladder survey only) | Asian or Pacific Islander | 2.78 | 1.07 | 49 | 16.3\% | 18.4\% | 38.8\% | 24.5\% | 2.0\% | 100\% |
| Advising Research Assistants (ladder survey only) | Black Hispanic | 2.60 | ${ }^{0.99}$ | 15 | 13.3\% | 33.3\% | 33.3\% | 20.0\% | 0.0\% | 100\% |
| Advising Research Assistants (ladder survey only) | Hispanic | 2.38 | 1.33 | 13 | 38.5\% | 15.4\% | 15.4\% | 30.8\% | ${ }^{0.0 \%}$ | 100\% |
| Advising Research Assistants (ladder survey only) | White | 2.71 | 1.22 | 478 | 22.2\% | 21.8\% | 24.3\% | 26.8\% | 5.0\% | 100\% |
| Advising Research Assistants (ladder survey only) | Unknown Ethnicity |  |  | small sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Requirements for promotion and tenure (ladder survey only) | All Faculty | 3.11 | 1.30 | 673 | 16.9\% | 15.5\% | 20.8\% | 33.6\% | 13.2\% | 100\% |
| Requirements for promotion and tenure (ladder survey only) | Amer. Ind./Alaskan Nat. |  |  | small sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Requirements for promotion and tenure (ladder survey only) | Asian or Pacific Islander | 2.90 | 1.34 | 68 | 23.5\% | 14.7\% | 19.1\% | 33.8\% | 8.8\% | 100\% |
| Requirements for promotion and tenure (ladder survey only) | Black | 3.13 | 1.36 | 16 | 12.5\% | 18.8\% | 37.5\% | 6.3\% | 25.0\% | 100\% |
| Requirements for promotion and tenure (ladder survey only) | Hispanic | 3.00 | 1.45 | 21 | 19.0\% | 19.0\% | 28.6\% | 9.5\% | 23.8\% | 100\% |
| Requirements for promotion and tenure (ladder survey only) | White | 3.13 | 1.29 | 564 | 16.3\% | 15.2\% | 20.4\% | 35.1\% | 12.9\% | 100\% |
| Requirements for promotion and tenure (ladder survey only) | Unknown Ethnicity |  |  | small sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Negotiating office politics | All Faculty | 2.59 | 1.30 | 907 | 29.0\% | 19.7\% | 21.1\% | 23.6\% | 6.6\% | 100\% |
| Negotiating office politics | Amer. Ind./Alaskan Nat. |  |  | small sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Negotiating office politics | Asian or Pacific Islander | 2.32 | 1.26 | 81 | 37.0\% | 18.5\% | 25.9\% | 12.3\% | 6.2\% | 100\% |
| Negotiating office politics | Black | 2.40 | 1.38 | 25 | 36.0\% | 20.0\% | 24.0\% | 8.0\% | 12.0\% | 100\% |
| Negotiating office politics | Hispanic | 2.50 | 1.60 | 22 | 45.5\% | 9.1\% | 9.1\% | 22.7\% | 13.6\% | 100\% 100\% |
| Negotiating office politics Negotiating office politics | White | 2.62 | 1.29 | 773 | 27.6\% | 20.2\% | 20.8\% | 25.4\% | 6.1\% | 100\% |
| Negotiating office politics Work-life balance | Unknown Ethnicity |  |  | small sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Work-life balance Work-life balance | All Faculty | 2.34 | 1.20 | 903 | 33.3\% | 23.5\% | 22.5\% | 17.4\% | 3.3\% | 100\% |
| Work-life balance Work-life balance | Amer. Ind./Alaskan Nat. |  |  | small sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Work-life balance Work-life balance | Asian or Pacific Islander Black | 2.18 2.12 | 1.05 | 82 25 | 36.6\% | 22.0\% | 24.0\% | 12.0\% | 0.0\% | 100\% |
| Work-life balance | Hispanic | 2.17 | 1.47 | 23 | 52.2\% | 13.0\% | 8.7\% | 17.4\% | 8.7\% | 100\% |
| Work-life balance | White | 2.37 | 1.21 | 767 | 32.3\% | 23.7\% | 22.0\% | 18.4\% | 3.5\% | 100\% |
| Work-life balance | Unknown Ethnicity |  |  | small sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Running a lab or research group (ladder survey only) | All Faculty | 2.50 | 1.16 | 359 | 26.7\% | 22.6\% | 26.7\% | 22.0\% | 1.9\% | 100\% |
| Running a lab or research group (ladder survey only) | Amer. Ind./Alaskan Nat. |  |  | small sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Running a lab or research group (ladder survey only) | Asian or Pacific Islander | 2.47 | 1.06 | 36 | 22.2\% | 27.8\% | 30.6\% | 19.4\% | 0.0\% | 100\% |
| Running a lab or research group (ladder survey only) | Black | 2.43 | 0.98 | 7 | 14.3\% | 42.9\% | 28.6\% | 14.3\% | 0.0\% | 100\% |
| Running a lab or research group (ladder survey only) | Hispanic | 2.29 | 1.38 | 7 | 42.9\% | 14.3\% | 14.3\% | 28.6\% | 0.0\% | 100\% |
| Running a abo or research group (ladder survey only) | White | 2.50 | 1.17 | 308 | 27.3\% | 21.8\% | 26.6\% | 22.1\% | 2.3\% | 100\% |
| Running a lab or research group (ladder survey only) | Unknown Ethnicity |  |  | small sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Overall Overall | All Faculty ${ }^{\text {Amer. Ind./Alaskan Nat. }}$ | 2.87 | 1.19 | $\begin{gathered} 1015 \\ \text { small sample } \end{gathered}$ | 16.3\% | 22.7\% | 26.1\% | 28.3\% | 6.7\% | 100\% |
| Overall | Asian or Pacific Islander | 2.76 | 1.16 | 85 | 17.6\% | 22.4\% | 31.8\% | 22.4\% | 5.9\% | 100\% |
| Overall | Black | 2.64 | 1.11 | 25 | 16.0\% | 32.0\% | 28.0\% | 20.0\% | 4.0\% | 100\% |
| Overall | Hispanic | 2.77 | 1.34 | ${ }_{8}^{26}$ | 26.9\% | 11.5\% | 26.9\% | 26.9\% | 7.7\% $6.8 \%$ | 100\% 100\% |
| Overall | White | 2.88 | 1.19 | 873 | 15.8\% | 22.9\% | 25.5\% | 29.0\% | 6.8\% | 100\% |
| Overall | Unknown Ethnicity |  |  | small sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Prepared by Harvard Institutional Research |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 16 of 28 |

## Faculty Climate Survey | Ethnicity Appendix



| Cohort | Mean |
| :---: | :---: |
| All FacultyAmer. Ind./Alaskan Nat. |  |
|  |  |
| Asian or Paciific Islander | 3.06 |
| Black | 3.24 |
| Hispanic | 3.17 |
| White | 3.38 |
| Unknown Ethnicity |  |
| All Faculty | 3.33 |
| Amer. Ind./Alaskan Nat. |  |
| Asian or Pacific Islander | 3.11 |
| Black | 2.92 |
| Hispanic | 2.83 |
| White | 3.38 |
| Unknown Ethnicity |  |
| All Faculty | 2.95 |
| Amer. Ind./Alaskan Nat. |  |
| Asian or Pacific Islander | 2.74 |
| Black | 2.52 |
| Hispanic | 2.64 |
| White | 2.99 |
| Unknown Ethnicity |  |
| All Faculty | 2.34 |
| Amer. Ind./Alaskan Nat. |  |
| Asian or Pacific Islander | 2.38 |
| Black | 2.13 |
| Hispanic | 2.40 |
| White |  |

Unknown Ethnicity

|  |  |
| :--- | :---: |
| Cohort | Mean |
| All Faculty | 2.93 |
| Amer. Ind./Ilaskan Nat. | 2.8 |
| Asian or Pacific Islander | 2.88 |
| Black | 2.96 |
| Hispanic | 2.83 |
| White | 2.93 |
| Unknown Ethnicity | 1.93 |
| All Faculty |  |
| Amer. Ind./Alaskan Nat. | 1.96 |
| Assian or Pacific slander | 1.96 |
| Black | 1.83 |
| Hispanic | 2.00 |
| White | 1.93 |
| Unknown Ethnicity | 1.65 |
| All Faculty |  |
| Amer. Ind./Alaskan Nat. |  |
| Asian or Pacific Islander | 1.67 |
| Black |  |
| Hispanic | 1.36 |
| White | 1.83 |
|  | 1.66 |



| Promotion / Tenure (continued) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| How appropriately are these items valued in the tenure process at your School: ( $1=$ Very undervalued, $5=$ Very overvalued) | Cohort | Mean | Standard Deviation | Responses | Very undervalued | Somewhat undervalued | $\begin{gathered} \text { Valued } \\ \text { appropriately } \end{gathered}$ | Somewhat overvalued | $\begin{gathered} \text { Very } \\ \text { overvalued } \end{gathered}$ | Total |
| Research/scholarly work (ladder survey only) | All Faculty | 3.18 | 0.69 | 915 | 1.9\% | 5.6\% | 70.7\% | 16.4\% | 5.5\% | 100\% |
| Research/scholarly work (ladder survey only) | Amer. Ind./Alaskan Nat. |  |  | small sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Research/scholarly work (ladder survey only) | Asian or Pacific Islander | 3.21 | 0.76 | 75 | 0.0\% | 9.3\% | 70.7\% | 9.3\% | 10.7\% | 100\% |
| Research/scholarly work (ladder survey only) | Black | 3.39 | 0.58 | 23 | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 65.2\% | 30.4\% | 4.3\% | 100\% |
| Research/scholarly work (ladder survey only) | Hispanic | 2.95 | 0.97 | 21 | 9.5\% | 14.3\% | 52.4\% | 19.0\% | 4.8\% | 100\% |
| Research/scholarly work (ladder survey only) | White | 3.18 | 0.68 | 791 | 1.9\% | 5.2\% | 71.3\% | 16.6\% | 5.1\% | 100\% |
| Research/scholarly work (ladder survey only) | Unknown Ethnicity |  |  | small sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Teaching contributions (ladder survey only) | All Faculty | 2.37 | 0.85 | 904 | 15.5\% | 39.8\% | 37.8\% | 5.6\% | 1.2\% | 100\% |
| Teaching contributions (ladder survey only) | Amer. Ind./Alaskan Nat. |  |  | small sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Teaching contributions (ladder survey only) | Asian or Pacific Islander | 2.47 | 0.87 | 73 | 15.1\% | 32.9\% | 42.5\% | 9.6\% | 0.0\% | 100\% |
| Teaching contributions (ladder survey only) | Black | 2.04 | 0.77 | 23 | 21.7\% | 56.5\% | 17.4\% | 4.3\% | 0.0\% | 100\% |
| Teaching contributions (ladder survey only) | Hispanic | 2.50 | 1.15 | 20 | 15.0\% | 45.0\% | 25.0\% | 5.0\% | 10.0\% | 100\% |
| Teaching contributions (ladder survey only) | White | 2.37 | 0.85 | 783 | 15.3\% | 39.7\% | 38.4\% | 5.4\% | 1.1\% | 100\% |
| Teaching contributions (ladder survey only) | Unknown Ethnicity |  |  | small sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Service (ladder survey only) | All Faculty | 2.52 | 0.85 | 861 | 13.6\% | 29.8\% | 49.6\% | 5.3\% | 1.6\% | 100\% |
| Service (ladder survey only) | Amer. Ind./Alaskan Nat. |  |  | small sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Service (ladder survey only) | Asian or Pacific Islander | 2.49 | 0.92 | 69 | 15.9\% | 30.4\% | 43.5\% | 8.7\% | 1.4\% | 100\% |
| Service (ladder survey only) | Black | 2.09 | 0.67 | 23 | 17.4\% | 56.5\% | 26.1\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 100\% |
| Service (ladder survey only) | Hispanic | 2.59 | 1.12 | 17 | 17.6\% | 29.4\% | 35.3\% | 11.8\% | 5.9\% | 100\% |
| Service (ladder survey only) | White | 2.53 | 0.84 | 748 | 13.2\% | 29.0\% | 51.1\% | 5.1\% | 1.6\% | 100\% |
| Service (ladder survey only) | Unknown Ethnicity |  |  | small sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| To what extent are student evaluations of your courses valued in your promotion? ( $1=$ Very undervalued, $5=$ Very overvalued) | Cohort | Mean | Standard Deviation | Responses | Very undervalued | Somewhat undervalued | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Valued } \\ & \text { appropriately } \end{aligned}$ | Somewhat overvalued | $\begin{gathered} \text { Very } \\ \text { overvalued } \end{gathered}$ | Total |
| Student evaluations of courses | All Faculty | 2.84 | 1.05 | 673 | 13.7\% | 16.5\% | 49.3\% | 13.7\% | 6.8\% | 100\% |
| Student evaluations of courses | Amer. Ind./Alaskan Nat. |  |  | small sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Student evaluations of courses | Asian or Pacific Islander | 2.48 | 0.94 | 58 | 19.0\% | 24.1\% | 48.3\% | 6.9\% | 1.7\% | 100\% |
| Student evaluations of courses | Black | 2.75 | 0.85 | 20 | 10.0\% | 20.0\% | 55.0\% | 15.0\% | 0.0\% | 100\% |
| Student evaluations of courses | Hispanic | 3.13 | 1.67 | 16 | 25.0\% | 18.8\% | 6.3\% | 18.8\% | 31.3\% | 100\% |
| Student evaluations of courses | White | 2.86 | 1.04 | 576 | 13.0\% | 15.6\% | 50.2\% | 14.2\% | 6.9\% | 100\% |
| Student evaluations of courses | Unknown Ethnicity |  |  | small sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| At any time since you started working at Harvard University, have you received relief from teaching or other workload duties for any of the following: | Cohort |  |  | Responses | Yes, within the past year tar | Yes, more than a year ago, but within the past five years | Yes, more than five years ago | No |  | Total |
| Caregiving for a child or parents | All Faculy |  |  | 1223 | 3.3\% | 4.3\% | 2.9\% | 89.6\% |  | 100\% |
| Caregiving for a child or parents | Amer. Ind./Alaskan Nat. |  |  | small sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Caregiving for a child or parents | Asian or Pacific Islander |  |  | 101 | 8.9\% | 7.9\% | 2.0\% | 81.2\% |  | 100\% |
| Caregiving for a child or parents | Black |  |  | 32 | 3.1\% | 9.4\% | 3.1\% | 84.4\% |  | 100\% |
| Caregiving for a child or parents | Hispanic |  |  | 28 | 3.6\% | 3.6\% | 3.6\% | 89.3\% |  | 100\% |
| Caregiving for a child or parents | White |  |  | 1056 | 2.7\% | 3.7\% | 2.9\% | 90.6\% |  | 100\% |
| Caregiving for a child or parents | Unknown Ethnicity |  |  | small sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Your own health concerns | All Faculty |  |  | 1212 | 2.1\% | 2.5\% | 2.6\% | 92.7\% |  | 100\% |
| Your own health concerns | Amer. Ind./Alaskan Nat. |  |  | small sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Your own health concerns | Asian or Pacific Islander |  |  | 96 | 1.0\% | 3.1\% | 1.0\% | 94.8\% |  | 100\% |
| Your own health concerns | Black |  |  | 33 | 3.0\% | 6.1\% | 0.0\% | 90.9\% |  | 100\% |
| Your own health concerns | Hispanic |  |  | 27 | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 7.4\% | 92.6\% |  | 100\% |
| Your own health concerns | White |  |  | 1050 | 2.3\% | 2.4\% | 2.8\% | 92.6\% |  | 100\% |
| Your own health concerns | Unknown Ethnicity |  |  | small sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| A family crisis A family crisis | All Faculty |  |  | 1199 | 1.5\% | 1.6\% | 1.0\% | 95.9\% |  | 100\% |
| A family crisis A family crisis | Amer. Ind./Alaskan Nat. Asian or Pacific islander |  |  | ${ }_{\text {small sample }}^{96}$ | 1.0\% | 0.0\% | 2.1\% | 96.9\% |  | 100\% |
| A family crisis | Black |  |  | 32 | 0.0\% | 6.3\% | 0.0\% | 93.8\% |  | 100\% |
| A family crisis | Hispanic |  |  | 27 | 0.0\% | 3.7\% | 3.7\% | 92.6\% |  | 100\% |
| A family crisis | White |  |  | 1038 | 1.6\% | 1.5\% | 0.9\% | 96.0\% |  | 100\% |
| A family crisis | Unknown Ethnicity |  |  | small sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Relief Support <br> ( $1=$ Very unsupportive, $5=$ Very supportive) | Cohort | Mean | Standard Deviation | Responses | Very unsupportive | Somewhat unsupportive | Neither suppportive nor unsupportive | Somewhat supportive | Very | Total |
| How supportive was your [unit] concerning your relief from teaching or other workload duties? | All Faculty | 4.42 | 0.95 | 226 | 1.3\% | 3.5\% | 13.7\% | 14.6\% | 66.8\% | 100\% |
| How supportive was your [unit] concerning your relief from teaching or other workload duties? | Amer. Ind./Alaskan Nat. |  |  | small sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| How supportive was your [unit] concerning your relief from teaching or other workload duties? | Asian or Pacific Islander | 4.08 | 1.19 | 25 | 4.0\% | 4.0\% | 28.0\% | 8.0\% | 56.0\% | 100\% |
| How supportive was your [unit] concerning your relief from teaching or other workload duties? | Black | 5.00 | 0.00 | 7 | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 100.0\% | 100\% |
| How supportive was your [unit] concerning your relief from teaching or other workload duties? | Hispanic | 4.33 | 1.21 | 6 | 0.0\% | 16.7\% | 0.0\% | 16.7\% | 66.7\% | 100\% |
| How supportive was your [unit] concerning your relief from teaching or other workload duties? | White | 4.45 | 0.91 | 187 | 1.1\% | 3.2\% | 12.8\% | 15.5\% | 67.4\% | 100\% |
| How supportive was your [unit] concerning your relief from teaching or other workload duties? | Unknown Ethnicity |  |  | small sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Promotion / Tenure (continued) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| At any time since you started working at Harvard University, have you had your tenure clock slowed or stopped for: | Cohort |  |  | Responses | Yes, within the past year | Yes, more than a year ago, but within the past five years | Yes, more than five years ago | No |  | Total |
| Caregiving for a child or parent (ladder survey only) | All Facult |  |  | 917 | 3.2\% | 3.2\% | 1.1\% | 92.6\% |  | 100\% |
| Caregiving for a child or parent (ladder survey only) | Amer. Ind./Alaskan Nat. |  |  | small sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Caregiving for a child or parent (ladder survey only) | Asian or Pacific Islander |  |  | 78 | 7.7\% | 6.4\% | 1.3\% | 84.6\% |  | 100\% |
| Caregiving for a child or parent (ladder survey only) | Black |  |  | 25 | 8.0\% | 0.0\% | 4.0\% | 88.0\% |  | 100\% |
| Caregiving for a child or parent (ladder survey only) | Hispanic |  |  | 22 | 0.0\% | 9.1\% | 0.0\% | 90.9\% |  | 100\% |
| Caregiving for a child or parent (ladder survey only) | White |  |  | 787 | 2.7\% | 2.8\% | 1.0\% | 93.5\% |  | 100\% |
| Caregiving for a child or parent (ladder survey only) | Unknown Ethnicity |  |  | small sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Your own health concerns (ladder survey only) | All Facult |  |  | 906 | 0.4\% | 1.0\% | 0.19 | 98.5\% |  | 100\% |
| Your own heath concerns (ladder survey only) | Amer. Ind./Alaskan Nat. |  |  | small sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Your own heath concerns (ladder survey only) | Asian or Pacific Islander |  |  | 75 | 0.0\% | 1.3\% | 0.0\% | 98.7\% |  | 100\% |
| Your own heath concerns (ladder survey only) | Black |  |  | 25 | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 100.0\% |  | 100\% |
| Your own heath concerns (ladder survey only) | Hispanic |  |  | 21 | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 100.0\% |  | 100\% |
| Your own health concerns (ladder survey only) | White |  |  | 780 | 0.5\% | 1.0\% | 0.1\% | 98.3\% |  | 100\% |
| Your own heath concerns (ladder survey only) | Unknown Ethnicity |  |  | small sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| A family crisis (ladder survey only) | All Faculty |  |  | 897 | 0.2\% | 0.1\% | 0.2\% | 99.4\% |  | 100\% |
| A family crisis (ladder survey only) | Amer. Ind./Alaskan Nat. |  |  | small sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| A family crisis (ladder survey only) | Asian or Pacific Islander |  |  | 74 | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 1.4\% | 98.6\% |  | 100\% |
| A family crisis (ladder survey only) | Black |  |  | 25 | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 100.0\% |  | 100\% |
| A family crisis (ladder survey only) | Hispanic |  |  | 21 | 0.0\% | 4.8\% | 0.0\% | 95.2\% |  | 100\% |
| A family crisis (ladder survey only) | White |  |  | 772 | 0.3\% | 0.0\% | 0.1\% | 99.6\% |  | 100\% |
| A family crisis (ladder survey only) | Unknown Ethnicity |  |  | small sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Tenure Clock Support <br> ( $1=$ Very unsupportive, $5=$ Very supportive) | Cohort | Mean | Standard Deviation | Responses | Very unsupportive | Somewhat unsupportive | $\begin{gathered} \text { Neither } \\ \text { suppportive } \\ \text { nor } \\ \text { unsupportive } \end{gathered}$ | Somewhat supportive | Very supportive | Total |
| How supportive was your [units concerring your having your tenure clock stopped or slowed? (ladder | All Faculty | 4.24 | 1.05 | 78 | 2.6\% | 3.8\% | 17.9\% | 17.9\% | 57.7\% | 100\% |
| How supportive was your [unit] concerning your having your tenure clock stopped or slowed? (ladder survey only) | Amer. Ind./Alaskan Nat. |  |  | small sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| How supportive was your [unit] concerning your having your tenure clock stopped or slowed? (ladder survey only) | Asian or Pacific Islander | 3.90 | 1.29 | 10 | 10.0\% | 0.0\% | 20.0\% | 30.0\% | 40.0\% | 100\% |
| How supportive was your [unit] concerning your having your tenure clock stopped or slowed? (ladder survey only) | Black |  |  | small sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| How supportive was your [unit] concerning your having your tenure clock stopped or slowed? (ladder survey only) | Hispanic |  |  | small sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| How supportive was your [unit] concerning your having your tenure clock stopped or slowed? (ladder survey only) | White | 4.26 | 1.04 | 62 | 1.6\% | 4.8\% | 19.4\% | 14.5\% | 59.7\% | 100\% |
| How supportive was your [unit] concerning your having your tenure clock stopped or slowed? (ladder survey only) | Unknown Ethnicity |  |  | small sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Hiring / Retention |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| In the last five years, while at Harvard University, have you ... | Cohort |  |  | Responses | Yes | No |  |  |  | Total |
| actively sought outside job offers or responded to job solicitations? (ladder survey only) actively sought outside job offers or responded to job solicitations? (ladder survey only) | All Faculty Amer. Ind./Alaskan Nat |  |  | $\begin{gathered} 907 \\ \text { small sample } \end{gathered}$ | 34.1\% | 65.9\% |  |  |  | 100\% |
| actively sought outside job offers or responded to job solicitations? (ladder survey only) | Asian or Pacific Islander |  |  | 83 | 32.5\% | 67.5\% |  |  |  | 100\% |
| actively sought outside job offers or responded to job solicictaions? (ladder survey only) | Black |  |  | 22 | 59.1\% | 40.9\% |  |  |  | 100\% |
| actively sought outside job offers or responded to job solicitations? (ladder survey only) | Hispanic |  |  | 23 | 30.4\% | 69.6\% |  |  |  | 100\% |
| actively sought outside job offers or responded to job solicitations? (ladder survey only) | White |  |  | 775 | 33.4\% | 66.6\% |  |  |  | 100\% |
| actively sought outside job offers or responded to job solicitations? (ladder survey only) | Unknown Ethnicity |  |  | small sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| received a formal or informal outside job offer that you took to your [leader]? (ladder survey only) received a formal or informal outside job offer that you took to your [leader]? | All Faculty |  |  | 907 | 22.9\% | 77.1\% |  |  |  | 100\% |
| received a formal or informal outside job offer that you took to your [leader]? (ladder survey only) received a formal or informal outside job offer that you took to your [leader]? (ladder survey only) | Amer. Ind./Alaskan Nat. Asian or Pacific Islander |  |  | small sample 84 | 25.0\% | 75.0\% |  |  |  | 100\% |
| received a formal or informal outside job offer that you took to your [leader]? (ladder survey only) | Black |  |  | 22 | 45.5\% | 54.5\% |  |  |  | 100\% |
| received a formal or informal outside job offer that you took to your [leader]? (ladder survey only) | Hispanic |  |  | 23 | 34.8\% | 65.2\% |  |  |  | 100\% |
| received a formal or informal outside job offer that you took to your [leader]? (ladder survey only) received a formal or informal outside job offer that you took to your [leader]? (ladder survey only) | White ${ }_{\text {Unknown Ethnicity }}$ |  |  | 774 small sample | 21.8\% | 78.2\% |  |  |  | 100\% |
| received a formal or informal outside job offer that you took to your [leader]? (ladder survey only) | Unknown Ethnicity |  |  | small sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Has that formal or informal outside job offer(s) resulted in adjustments to any of the following |  |  |  | Affirmative |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| (check all that apply): | Cohort |  |  | Responses |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Salary (ladder survey only) | All Faculty |  |  | 85 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Salary (ladder survey only) | Amer. Ind./Alaskan Nat. |  |  | small sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Salary (ladder survey only) | Asian or Pacific Islander |  |  | 7 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Salary (ladder survey only) | ${ }^{\text {Black }}$ |  |  | 4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Salary (ladder survey only) Salary (ladder suvey only) | Hispanic White |  |  | 4 68 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Salary (ladder survey only) | Unknown Ethnicity |  |  | small sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Course load (ladder survey only) | All Faculy |  |  | 9 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Course load (ladder survey only) | Amer. Ind./Alaskan Nat. |  |  | small sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Course load (ladder survey only) | Asian or Pacific Islander |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Course load (ladder survey only) Course load (ladder survey only) | Black Hispanic |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Course load (ladder survey only) | White |  |  | 7 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Course load (ladder survey only) | Unknown Ethnicity |  |  | small sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Hiring / Retention (continued)
Has that formal or informal outside job offer(s) resulted in adjustments to any of the following
lat
(check all that opply):
Administrative responsibilities (ladder survey only)
Administrative responsibilities (ladder surve
Administratrive responsibibilities (ladder survey only)
Administrative responsibilities (ladder survey only)
Administrative responsibilities (ladder survey only)
Administrative responsibilities (ladder survey only)
(ladder survey only)
Leave time (ladder survey only)
Leave time (ladder surveey only)
Leave time (laddder survey only)
eave time (ladder survey only)
Leave time (ladder survey only)
Leave time (ladder survey only)
Summer salary (ladder survey only)
Summer salary (ladder survey only)
Summer salary (ladder survey only)
ummer salary (ladder survey only)
summer salary (ladder survey only)
Special timing of the tenure clock (ladder survey only)
special timing of the tenure clock (ladder survey only)
Special timing of the tenure clock (ladder survey only)
Special timing of the tenure clock (ladder survey only)
Special timing of the tenure clock (ladder survey only)
pecial timing of the tenure clock (ladder survey only)
Special timing of the terure clock (ladder survey only)
Promotion to a higher rank (ladder survey only)
Promotion to a higher rank (ladder survey only)
Promotion to a higher rank (ladder survey only)
Promotion to a higher rank (ladder survey only)
Promotion to a higher rank (ladder survey only)
Equipmentlaboratory/research start-up (ladder survey only)
Equipment/laboratory/research start-up (ladder survey only)
Equipment/laborator/research start-up (ladder survey only)
Equipment/aboratory/research start-up (ladder survey only)
quipmentlaboratory/research start-up (ladder survey only)
quipment/laboratory/research start-up (ladder survey only)
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as that formal or informal outside job offer(s) resulted in adjustments to any of the following
Employment for spouse/partner (ladder survey only)
Employment for spouse/partner (ladder survey only)
mployment for spouse/parner (ladder survey only
mployment for spouse/partner (ladder survey only)
Employment for spouse/partner (ladder survey only)
Employment for spouse/partner (ladder survey only)
Employment for spouse/partner (ladder survey only)
ther (ladder survey only
Other (ladder survey only)
Other (ladder survey only)
Other (ladder survey only)
Other (ladder survey only)
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Asian or Pacificic slander
Black
Hispanic
Hispanic
White
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Asian or Pacific Islander
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Hispanic
Hispanic
White
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Black
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White
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Black
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White
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Asian or Pacific Islande
Asian or
Black
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White
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Black
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White
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14
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4
1
0
0
9
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0
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1
3
3
26
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9
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2
0
1
6
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17
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2
0
0
15
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27
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| Hiring / Retention (continued) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Likelihood of Leaving ( 1 = Very unlikely, $5=$ Very likely) | Cohort | Mean | Standard Deviation | Responses | Very unlikely | Somewhat unlikely | Neither likely nor unlikely | Somewhat likely | Very likely | Total |
| In the next three years, how likely are you to leave Harvard University (including retirement)? (ladder s | All Faculty | 2.54 | 1.43 | 945 | 34.2\% | 19.4\% | 17.7\% | 15.6\% | 13.2\% | 100\% |
| In the next three years, how likely are you to leave Harvard University (including retirement)? (ladder survey only) | Amer. Ind./Alaskan Nat. |  |  | small sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| In the next three years, how likely are you to leave Harvard University (including retirement)? (ladder |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| survey only) | Asian or Pacific Islander | 2.73 | 1.38 | 84 | 25.0\% | 20.2\% | 28.6\% | 9.5\% | 16.7\% | 100\% |
| In the next three years, how likely are you to leave Harvard University (including retirement)? (ladder survey only) | Black | 2.96 | 1.51 | 25 | 28.0\% | 8.0\% | 24.0\% | 20.0\% | 20.0\% | 100\% |
| In the next three years, how likely are you to leave Harvard University (including retirement)? (ladder |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| survey only) | Hispanic | 2.67 | 1.61 | 24 | 41.7\% | 8.3\% | 4.2\% | 33.3\% | 12.5\% | 100\% |
| In the next three years, how likely are you to leave Harvard University (including retirement)? (ladder survey only) | White | 2.50 | 1.42 | 807 | 35.2\% | 20.1\% | 16.7\% | 15.4\% | 12.6\% | 100\% |
| In the next three years, how likely are you to leave Harvard University (including retirement)? (ladder |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| survey only) | Unknown Ethnicity |  |  | small sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| To what extent, if at all, have you considered the following as reasons to leave: |  |  | Standard |  |  |  | To a great |  |  |  |
| ( $1=$ Not at all, $3=$ To a great extent) | Cohort | Mean | Deviation | Responses | Not at all | To some extent | extent |  |  | Total |
| To increase your salary | All Faculty | 1.62 | 0.73 | 1137 | 53.6\% | 31.3\% | 15.1\% |  |  | 100\% |
| To increase your salary | Amer. Ind./Alaskan Nat. |  |  | small sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| To increase your salary | Asian or Pacific Islander | 1.66 | 0.77 | 94 | 52.1\% | 29.8\% | 18.1\% |  |  | 100\% |
| To increase your salary | Black | 1.72 | 0.73 | 32 | 43.8\% | 40.6\% | 15.6\% |  |  | 100\% |
| To increase your salary | Hispanic | 1.77 | 0.91 | 26 | 53.8\% | 15.4\% | 30.8\% |  |  | 100\% |
| To increase your salary | White | 1.60 | 0.73 | 979 | 54.0\% | 31.5\% | 14.5\% |  |  | 100\% |
| To increase your salary | Unknown Ethnicity |  |  | small sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| To move to a tenure-track position (non-ladder survey only) | All Faculty | 2.01 | 0.90 | 255 | 40.0\% | 19.2\% | 40.8\% |  |  | 100\% |
| To move to a tenure-track position (non-ladder survey only) | Amer. Ind./Alaskan Nat. |  |  | small sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| To move to a tenure-track position (non-ladder survey only) | Asian or Pacific Islander | 2.70 | 0.66 | 20 | 10.0\% | 10.0\% | 80.0\% |  |  | 100\% |
| To move to a tenure-track position (non-ladder survey only) | Black | 1.38 | 0.74 | 8 | 75.0\% | 12.5\% | 12.5\% |  |  | 100\% |
| To move to a tenure-track position (non-ladder survey only) | Hispanic |  |  | small sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| To move to a tenure-track position (non-ladder survey only) | White | 1.97 | 0.90 | 223 | 41.7\% | 19.7\% | 38.6\% |  |  | 100\% |
| To move to a tenure-track position (non-ladder survey only) | Unknown Ethnicity |  |  | small sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| To improve your prospects for tenure (ladder survey only) | All Faculty | 1.73 | 0.85 | 566 | 53.0\% | 21.2\% | 25.8\% |  |  | 100\% |
| To improve your prospects for tenure (ladder survey only) | Amer. Ind./Alaskan Nat. |  |  | small sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| To improve your prospects for tenure (ladder survey only) | Asian or Pacific Islander | 1.93 | 0.85 | 59 | 39.0\% | 28.8\% | 32.2\% |  |  | 100\% |
| To improve your prospects for tenure (ladder survey only) | Black | 1.87 | 0.83 | 15 | 40.0\% | 33.3\% | 26.7\% |  |  | 100\% |
| To improve your prospects for tenure (ladder survey only) | Hispanic | 2.06 | ${ }^{0.90}$ | 17 | 35.3\% | 23.5\% | 41.2\% |  |  | 100\% |
| To improve your prospects for tenure (ladder survey only) | White | 1.68 | 0.84 | 471 | 56.1\% | 19.5\% | 24.4\% |  |  | 100\% |
| To improve your prospects for tenure (ladder survey only) | Unknown Ethnicity |  |  | small sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| To enhance your career in other ways To enhance your career in other ways | All Faculty <br> Amer. Ind./Alaskan Nat. | 1.91 | 0.78 | $\begin{aligned} & 1106 \\ & \text { small sample } \end{aligned}$ | 35.5\% | 38.2\% | 26.2\% |  |  | 100\% |
| To enhance your career in other ways | Asian or Pacific Islander | 2.14 | 0.75 | 91 | 22.0\% | 41.8\% | 36.3\% |  |  | 100\% |
| To enhance your career in other ways | Black | 2.00 | 0.80 | 29 | 31.0\% | 37.9\% | 31.0\% |  |  | 100\% |
| To enhance your career in other ways | Hispanic | 1.88 | 0.86 | 26 | 42.3\% | 26.9\% | 30.8\% |  |  | 100\% |
| To enhance your career in other ways | White | 1.88 | 0.78 | 954 | 36.9\% | 37.9\% | 25.2\% |  |  | 100\% |
| To enhance your career in other ways | Unknown Ethnicity |  |  | small sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| To find a more supportive work environment | All Faculty | 1.82 | 0.83 | 1122 | 45.6\% | 27.0\% | 27.4\% |  |  | 100\% |
| To find a more supportive work environment | Amer. Ind./Alaskan Nat. |  |  | small sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| To find a more supportive work environment | Asian or Pacific Islander | 1.98 | 0.86 | 87 | 37.9\% | 26.4\% | 35.6\% |  |  | 100\% |
| To find a more supportive work environment | Black | 1.81 | 0.87 | 31 | 48.4\% | 22.6\% | 29.0\% |  |  | 100\% |
| To find a more supportive work environment | Hispanic | 1.81 | 0.88 | 27 | 48.1\% | 22.2\% | 29.6\% |  |  | 100\% |
| To find a more supportive work environment | White | 1.80 | 0.83 | ${ }^{971}$ | 46.1\% | 27.3\% | 26.6\% |  |  | 100\% |
| To find a more supportive work environment | Unknown Ethnicity |  |  | small sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| To increase your time to do research | All Faculty ${ }^{\text {Amer Ind/Alaskan Nat. }}$ | 1.77 | 0.80 | 1131 small sample | 46.3\% | 30.2\% | 23.4\% |  |  | 100\% |
| To increase your time to do research To increase your time to do research | Amer. Ind./Alaskan Nat. Asian or Pacific Islander | 1.76 | 0.82 | ${ }_{\text {smal sample }}$ | 47.8\% | 28.3\% | 23.9\% |  |  | 100\% |
| To increase your time to do research | Black | 1.70 | 0.79 | 30 | 50.0\% | 30.0\% | 20.0\% |  |  | 100\% |
| To increase your time to do research | Hispanic | 2.08 | 0.84 | 26 | 30.8\% | 30.8\% | 38.5\% |  |  | 100\% |
| To increase your time to do research | White | 1.77 | 0.80 | 977 | 46.4\% | 30.5\% | 23.1\% |  |  | 100\% |
| To increase your time to do research | Unknown Ethnicity |  |  | small sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| To pursue a non-academic job | All Faculty | 1.29 | 0.56 | 1047 | 76.0\% | 18.7\% | 5.3\% |  |  | 100\% |
| To pursue a non-academic job | Amer. Ind./Alaskan Nat. |  |  | small sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| To pursue a non-academic job To pursue a non-academic job | Asian or Pacific Islander Black | 1.29 1.40 | 0.58 0.62 | 82 30 | 76.8\% $66.7 \%$ | 26.7\% | 6.1\% ${ }_{6} 6$ |  |  | 100\% |
| To pursue a non-academic job | Hispanic | 1.44 | 0.65 | 25 | 64.0\% | 28.0\% | 8.0\% |  |  | 100\% |
| To pursue a non-academic job | White | 1.29 | 0.55 | 904 | 76.4\% | 18.5\% | 5.1\% |  |  | 100\% |
| To pursue a non-academic job | Unknown Ethnicity |  |  | small sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Faculty Climate Survey | Ethnicity Appendix

| Hiring / Retention (continued) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| To what extent, if at all, have you considered the following as reasons to leave: ( $1=$ Not at all, $3=$ To a great extent) | Cohort | Mean | Standard Deviation | Responses | Not at all | To some extent | To a great extent |  |  |  | Total |
| To reduce stress | All Faculty | 1.73 | 0.77 | 1122 | 46.6\% | 33.9\% | 19.5\% |  |  |  | 100\% |
| To reduce stress | Amer. Ind./Alaskan Nat. |  |  | small sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| To reduce stress | Asian or Pacific Islander | 1.78 | 0.76 | 88 | 42.0\% | 37.5\% | 20.5\% |  |  |  | 100\% |
| To reduce stress | Black | 1.77 | 0.82 | 30 | 46.7\% | 30.0\% | 23.3\% |  |  |  | 100\% |
| To reduce stress | Hispanic | 1.65 | 0.80 | 26 | 53.8\% | 26.9\% | 19.2\% |  |  |  | 100\% |
| To reduce stress | White | 1.72 | 0.77 | 972 | 47.0\% | 33.7\% | 19.2\% |  |  |  | 100\% |
| To reduce stress | Unknown Ethnicity |  |  | small sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| To address child-related issues | All Faculty | 1.33 | 0.64 | 976 | 75.8\% | 15.0\% | 9.2\% |  |  |  | 100\% |
| To address child-related issues | Amer. Ind./Alaskan Nat. |  |  | small sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| To address child-related issues | Asian or Pacific Islander | 1.59 | 0.76 | 78 | 57.7\% | 25.6\% | 16.7\% |  |  |  | 100\% |
| To address child-related issues | Black | 1.48 | 0.80 | 27 | 70.4\% | 11.1\% | 18.5\% |  |  |  | 100\% |
| To address child-related issues | Hispanic | 1.50 | 0.80 | 22 | 68.2\% | 13.6\% | 18.2\% |  |  |  | 100\% |
| To address child-related issues | White | 1.30 | 0.61 | 845 | 77.8\% | 14.2\% | 8.0\% |  |  |  | 100\% |
| To address child-related issues | Unknown Ethnicity |  |  | small sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| To improve the employment situation of your spouse/partner | All Faculty | 1.44 | 0.71 | 1030 | 68.3\% | 19.1\% | 12.5\% |  |  |  | 100\% |
| To improve the employment situation of your spouse/partner | Amer. Ind./Alaskan Nat. |  |  | small sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| To improve the employment situation of your spouse/partner | Asian or Pacific Islander | 1.65 | 0.76 | 82 | 52.4\% | 30.5\% | 17.1\% |  |  |  | 100\% |
| To improve the employment situation of your spouse/partner | Black | 1.80 | 0.89 | 30 | 50.0\% | 20.0\% | 30.0\% |  |  |  | 100\% |
| To improve the employment situation of your spouse/partner | Hispanic | 1.52 | 0.75 | 21 | 61.9\% | 23.8\% | 14.3\% |  |  |  | 100\% |
| To improve the employment situation of your spouse/partner | White | 1.41 | 0.68 | 891 | 70.7\% | 18.0\% | 11.3\% |  |  |  | 100\% |
| To improve the employment situation of your spouse/partner | Unknown Ethnicity |  |  | small sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| To lower your cost of living | All Faculty | 1.41 | 0.66 | 1092 | 69.0\% | 21.3\% | 9.7\% |  |  |  | 100\% |
| To lower your cost of living | Amer. Ind./Alaskan Nat. |  |  | small sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| To lower your cost of living | Asian or Pacific Islander | 1.48 | 0.71 | 88 | 64.8\% | 22.7\% | 12.5\% |  |  |  | 100\% |
| To lower your cost of living | Black | 1.67 | 0.76 | 30 | 50.0\% | 33.3\% | 16.7\% |  |  |  | 100\% |
| To lower your cost of living | Hispanic | 1.30 | 0.56 | 23 | 73.9\% | 21.7\% | 4.3\% |  |  |  | 100\% |
| To lower your cost of living | White | 1.40 | 0.65 | 945 | 69.7\% | 21.0\% | 9.3\% |  |  |  | 100\% |
| To lower your cost of living | Unknown Ethnicity |  |  | small sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Retirement | All Faculty | 1.37 | 0.65 | 989 | 72.6\% | 18.2\% | 9.2\% |  |  |  | 100\% |
| Retirement | Amer. Ind./Alaskan Nat. |  |  | small sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Retirement | Asian or Pacific Islander | 1.21 | 0.47 | 76 | 81.6\% | 15.8\% | 2.6\% |  |  |  | 100\% |
| Retirement | Black | 1.35 | 0.71 | ${ }^{23}$ | 78.3\% | 8.7\% | 13.0\% |  |  |  | 100\% |
| Retirement | Hispanic | 1.21 | 0.51 | 24 | 83.3\% | 12.5\% | 4.2\% |  |  |  | 100\% |
| Retirement | White | 1.39 | 0.66 | 862 | 71.3\% | 18.8\% | 9.9\% |  |  |  | 100\% |
| Retirement | Unknown Ethnicity |  |  | small sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Other | All Faculty | 2.28 | 0.86 | 141 | 27.0\% | 17.7\% | 55.3\% |  |  |  | 100\% |
| Other Other | Amer. Ind./Alaskan Nat. Asian or Pacific Islander | 1.60 | 0.89 | small sample <br> 5 | 60.0\% | 20.0\% | 20.0\% |  |  |  | 100\% |
| Other | Black |  |  | small sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Other | Hispanic |  |  | small sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Other Other | White | 2.31 | 0.86 | 130 | 26.2\% | 16.9\% | 56.9\% |  |  |  | 100\% |
| Other | Unknown Ethnicity |  |  | small sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Hiring / Renewal of Contract |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Current Position | Cohort |  |  | Responses | Job posting | Contacted by faculty member | Contacted by administrator | Contacted the Academic Unit | Asked Unit to create a job | Other | Total |
| Which statement best describes how you came into your current position? (non-ladder survey only) | All Faculty |  |  | 292 | 22.9\% | 42.5\% | 10.3\% | 9.6\% | 6.2\% | 8.6\% | 100\% |
| Which statement best describes how you came into your current position? (non-ladder survey only) | Amer. Ind./Alaskan Nat. |  |  | small sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Which statement best describes how you came into your current position? (non-ladder survey only) | Asian or Pacific Islander |  |  | 22 | 40.9\% | 22.7\% | 4.5\% | 13.6\% | 4.5\% | 13.6\% | 100\% |
| Which statement best describes how you came into your current position? (non-ladder survey only) | Black |  |  | 8 | 12.5\% | 25.0\% | 50.0\% | 12.5\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 100\% |
| Which statement best describes how you came into your current position? (non-ladder survey only) | Hispanic |  |  | 5 | 0.0\% | 60.0\% | 20.0\% | 0.0\% | 20.0\% | 0.0\% | 100\% |
| Which statement best describes how you came into your current position? (non-ladder survey only) | White |  |  | 256 | 21.9\% | 44.5\% | 9.4\% | 9.4\% | 6.3\% | 8.6\% | 100\% |
| Which statement best describes how you came into your current position? (non-ladder survey only) | Unknown Ethnicity |  |  | small sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Case Writing/ Course |  |  |
| Primary Role | Cohort |  |  | Responses | Teaching | Research | Advising | Other | Development |  | Total |
| What is your primary role in your [unit]? (non-ladder survey only) | All Faculty |  |  | 297 | 69.0\% | 15.5\% | 3.7\% | 11.4\% | 0.3\% |  | 100\% |
| What is your primary role in your [unit]? (non-ladder survey only) | Amer. Ind./Alaskan Nat. |  |  | small sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| What is your primary role in your [unit]? (non-ladder survey only) | Asian or Pacific Islander |  |  | 21 | 61.9\% | 28.6\% | 0.0\% | 9.5\% | 0.0\% |  | 100\% |
| What is your primary role in your [unit]? (non-ladder survey only) | Black |  |  | 9 | 77.8\% | 0.0\% | 11.1\% | 11.1\% | 0.0\% |  | 100\% |
| What is your primary role in your [unit]? (non-ladder survey only) | Hispanic |  |  | 5 | 80.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 20.0\% | 0.0\% |  | 100\% |
| What is your primary role in your [unit]? (non-ladder survey only) What is your primary role in your [unit]? (non-ladder survey only) | White Unknown Ethnicity |  |  | $\begin{gathered} 261 \\ \text { small sample } \end{gathered}$ | 69.3\% | 14.9\% | 3.8\% | 11.5\% | 0.4\% |  | 100\% |
| What is your primary role in your [unit]? (non-ladder survey only) | Unknown Ethnicity |  |  | small sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |



| Hiring / Renewal of Contract (continued) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Likelihood of Renewal ( $1=$ Very unlikely, 5 = Very likely) | Cohort | Mean | Standard Deviation | Responses | Very unlikely | Somewhat unlikely | Neither likely nor unlikely | Somewhat likely | Very likely | Total |
| Given the opportunity, how likely would you be to renew your contract? (non-ladder survey only) | All Faculty | 4.27 | 1.10 | 136 | 5.1\% | 3.7\% | 8.1\% | 25.0\% | 58.1\% | 100\% |
| Given the opportunity, how likely would you be to renew your contract? (non-ladder survey only) | Amer. Ind./Alaskan Nat. |  |  | small sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Given the opportunity, how likely would you be to renew your contract? (non-ladder survey only) | Asian or Pacific Islander | 4.27 | 0.79 | 11 | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 18.2\% | 36.4\% | 45.5\% | 100\% |
| Given the opportunity, how likely would you be to renew your contract? (non-ladder survey only) | Black | 3.86 | 1.95 | 7 | 28.6\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 71.4\% | 100\% |
| Given the opportunity, how likely would you be to renew your contract? (non-ladder survey only) | Hispanic |  |  | small sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Given the opportunity, how likely would you be to renew your contract? (non-ladder survey only) | White | 4.32 | 1.03 | 116 | 3.4\% | 4.3\% | 7.8\% | 25.9\% | 58.6\% | 100\% |
| Given the opportunity, how likely would you be to renew your contract? (non-ladder survey only) | Unknown Ethnicity |  |  | small sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Renewal Process (Yes/No) | Cohort |  |  | Responses | Yes | No |  |  |  | Total |
| Does your [unit] have an established renewal of contract process for non-tenure track faculty? (non-lad | dill Faculty |  |  | 164 | 64.6\% | 35.4\% |  |  |  | 100\% |
| Does your [unit] have an established renewal of contract process for non-tenure track faculty? (non- |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ladder survey only) | Amer. Ind./Alaskan Nat. |  |  | small sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Does your [unit] have an established renewal of contract process for non-tenure track faculty? (nonladder survey only) | Asian or Pacific Islander |  |  | 8 | 62.5\% | 37.5\% |  |  |  | 100\% |
| Does your [unit] have an established renewal of contract process for non-tenure track faculty? (nonladder survey only) | Black |  |  | small sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Does your [unit] have an established renewal of contract process for non-tenure track faculty? (non- |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ladder survey only) | Hispanic |  |  | small sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Does your [unit] have an established renewal of contract process for non-tenure track faculty? (nonladder survey only) | White |  |  | 48 | 63.5\% | 36.5\% |  |  |  | 100\% |
| Does your [unit] have an established renewal of contract process for non-tenure track faculty? (nonladder survey only) | Unknown Ethnicity |  |  | small sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Criteria for Contract Renewal |  |  | Standard |  |  |  | Neither agree |  |  |  |
| ( $1=$ Strongly disagree, $5=$ Strongly agree) | Cohort | Mean | Deviation | Responses | Strongly disagree | Somewhat disagree | nor disagree | Somewhat agree | Strongly agree | Total |
| To what extent do you agree that the criteria for renewal of contract are clearly communicated? (non-la | All Faculty | 3.21 | 1.32 | 106 | 15.1\% | 16.0\% | 18.9\% | 33.0\% | 17.0\% | 100\% |
| To what extent do you agree that the criteria for renewal of contract are clearly communicated? (nonladder survey only) | Amer Ind Alaskan Nat. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| To what extent do you agree that the criteria for renewal of contract are clearly communicated? (non- |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ladder survey only) ${ }_{\text {To }}$ what extent do you agree that the criteria for renewal of contract are clearly communicated? (non- | Asian or Pacific Islander | 3.20 | 1.48 | 5 | 20.0\% | 0.0\% | 40.0\% | 20.0\% | 20.0\% | 100\% |
| To what extent do you agree that the criteria for renewal of contract are clearly communicated? (nonladder survey only) | Black |  |  | small sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| To what extent do you agree that the criteria for renewal of contract are clearly communicated? (nonladder survey only) | Hispanic |  |  | small sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| To what extent do you agree that the criteria for renewal of contract are clearly communicated? (nonladder survey only) | White | 3.17 | 1.33 | 94 | 16.0\% | 16.0\% | 19.1\% | 33.0\% | 16.0\% | 100\% |
| To what extent do you agree that the criteria for renewal of contract are clearly communicated? (nonladder survey only) | Unknown Ethnicity |  |  | small sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| In your experience, to what extent are the following items valued in the renewal of contract process at your School: |  |  | Standard |  | Valued slightly or |  |  |  |  |  |
| ( $1=$ Valued slightly or not at all, $3=$ Highly valued) | Cohort | Mean | Deviation | Responses | not at all | Somewhat valued | Highly valued |  |  | Total |
| Research/scholarly work (non-ladder survey only) | All Faculty | 2.46 | 0.68 | 89 | 10.1\% | 33.7\% | 56.2\% |  |  | 100\% |
| Research/scholarly work (non-ladder survey only) | Amer. Ind./Alaskan Nat. |  |  | small sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Research/scholarly work (non-ladder survey only) | Asian or Pacific Islander | 2.20 | 0.84 | 5 | 20.0\% | 40.0\% | 40.0\% |  |  | 100\% |
| Research/scholarly work (non-ladder survey only) | Black |  |  | small sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Research/scholarly work (non-ladder survey only) | Hispanic |  |  | small sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Research/scholarly work (non-ladder survey only) | White | 2.47 | 0.68 | 79 | 10.1\% | 32.9\% | 57.0\% |  |  | 100\% |
| Research/scholarly work (non-ladder survey only) | Unknown Ethnicity |  |  | small sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Teaching contributions (non-ladder survey only) | All Faculty | 2.48 | 0.71 | 96 | 12.5\% | 27.1\% | 60.4\% |  |  | 100\% |
| Teaching contributions (non-ladder survey only) Teaching contributions (non-ladder survey only) | Amer. Ind./Alaskan Nat. Asian or Pacific Islander | 2.40 | 0.89 | $\underset{5}{\text { small sample }}$ | 20.0\% | 20.0\% |  |  |  |  |
| Teaching contributions (non-ladder survey only) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Asian } \\ & \text { Black } \\ & \text { Hisnan } \end{aligned}$ | 2.40 | 0.89 | ${ }_{\text {small sample }}$ | 20.0\% | 20.0\% | 60.0\% |  |  | 100\% |
| Teaching contributions (non-ladder survey only) | Hispanic |  |  | small sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Teaching contributions (non-ladder survey only) | White | 2.49 | 0.72 | 86 | 12.8\% | 25.6\% | 61.6\% |  |  | 100\% |
| Teaching contributions (non-ladder survey only) | Unknown Ethnicity |  |  | small sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Service (non-ladder survey only) | All Faculty | 2.11 | 0.69 | 88 | 18.2\% | 52.3\% | 29.5\% |  |  | 100\% |
| Service (non-ladder survey only) | Amer. Ind./Alaskan Nat. |  |  | small sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Service (non-ladder survey only) | Asian or Pacific Islander | 2.20 | 0.84 | 5 | 20.0\% | 40.0\% | 40.0\% |  |  | 100\% |
| Service (non-ladder survey only) | Black Hispanic |  |  | small sample small sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Service (non-ladder survey only) | White | 2.09 | 0.68 | 76 | 18.4\% | 53.9\% | 27.6\% |  |  | 100\% |
| Service (non-ladder survey only) | Unknown Ethnicity |  |  | small sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| How appropriately are these items valued in the renewal of contract process at your School: ( $1=$ Very undervalued, $5=$ Very overvalued) | Cohort | Mean | Standard Deviation | Responses | Very undervalued | Somewhat undervalued | Valued appropriately | Somewhat overvalued | Very overvalued | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Research/scholarly work (non-ladder survey only) | All Faculty | 3.11 | 0.92 | 89 | 7.9\% | 5.6\% | 61.8\% | 16.9\% | 7.9\% | 100\% |
| Research/scholarly work (non-ladder survey only) | Amer. Ind./Alaskan Nat. |  |  | small sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Research/scholarly work (non-ladder survey only) | Asian or Pacific Islander |  |  | small sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Research/scholarly work (non-ladder survey only) | Black |  |  | small sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Research/scholarly work (non-ladder survey only) | Hispanic |  |  | small sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Research/scholarly work (non-ladder survey only) | White | 3.08 | 0.89 | 78 | 7.7\% | 6.4\% | 62.8\% | 16.7\% | 6.4\% | 100\% |
| Research/scholarly work (non-ladder survey only) | Unknown Ethnicity |  |  | small sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Teaching contributions (non-ladder survey only) | All Faculty | 2.49 | 0.82 | 98 | 13.3\% | 29.6\% | 54.1\% | 1.0\% | 2.0\% | 100\% |
| Teaching contributions (non-ladder survey only) | Amer. Ind./Alaskan Nat. |  |  | small sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Teaching contributions (non-ladder survey only) | Asian or Pacific Islander | 2.40 | 0.89 | 5 | 20.0\% | 20.0\% | 60.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 100\% |
| Teaching contributions (non-ladder survey only) | Black |  |  | small sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Teaching contributions (non-ladder survey only) | Hispanic |  |  | small sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Teaching contributions (non-ladder survey only) | White | 2.45 | 0.73 | 86 | 12.8\% | 30.2\% | 55.8\% | 1.2\% | 0.0\% | 100\% |
| Teaching contributions (non-ladder survey only) | Unknown Ethnicity |  |  | small sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Service (non-ladder survey only) | All Faculty | 2.46 | 0.85 | 87 | 16.1\% | 27.6\% | 51.7\% | 3.4\% | 1.1\% | 100\% |
| Service (non-ladder survey only) | Amer. Ind./Alaskan Nat. |  |  | small sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Service (non-ladder survey only) | Asian or Pacific Islander | 2.80 | 1.10 | 5 | 20.0\% | 0.0\% | 60.0\% | 20.0\% | 0.0\% | 100\% |
| Service (non-ladder survey only) | Black |  |  | small sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Service (non-ladder survey only) | Hispanic |  |  | small sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Service (non-ladder survey only) | White Unknown Ethnicity | 2.41 | 0.76 | 75 small sample | 14.7\% | 30.7\% | 53.3\% | 1.3\% | 0.0\% | 100\% |
| Service (non-ladder survey only) | Unknown Ethnicity |  |  | small sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Performace Review (Yes/No) | Cohort |  |  | Responses | Yes | No |  |  |  | Total |
| Do you have an annual performance review with your [leader]? (non-ladder survey only) | All Faculty |  |  | 297 | 27.6\% | 72.4\% |  |  |  | 100\% |
| Do you have an annual performance review with your [leader]? (non-ladder survey only) | Amer. Ind./Alaskan Nat. |  |  | small sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Do you have an annual performance review with your [leader]? (non-ladder survey only) | Asian or Pacific Islander |  |  | 22 | 40.9\% | 59.1\% |  |  |  | 100\% |
| Do you have an annual performance review with your [leader]? (non-ladder survey only) | Black |  |  | 8 | 12.5\% | 87.5\% |  |  |  | 100\% |
| Do you have an annual performance review with your [leader]? (non-ladder survey only) | Hispanic |  |  | 5 | 40.0\% | 60.0\% |  |  |  | 100\% |
| Do you have an annual performance review with your [leader]? (non-ladder survey only) | White |  |  | 261 | 26.4\% | 73.6\% |  |  |  | 100\% |
| Do you have an annual performance review with your [leader]? (non-ladder survey only) | Unknown Ethnicity |  |  | small sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Have you ever been recognized by your Academic Unit or Unit Head for your contributions to: (check all that apply) | Cohort |  |  | Affirmative Responses |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Teaching (non-ladder survey only) | All Faculy |  |  | 133 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Teaching (non-ladder survey only) | Amer. Ind./Alaskan Nat. |  |  | small sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Teaching (non-ladder survey only) | Asian or Pacific Islander |  |  | 8 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Teaching (non-ladder survey only) | Black |  |  | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Teaching (non-ladder survey only) | Hispanic |  |  | $\stackrel{2}{12}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Teaching (non-ladder survey only) Teaching (non-ladder survey only) | White |  |  | 120 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Teaching (non-ladder survey only) Advising (non-ladder survey only) | Unknown Ethnicity |  |  | small sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Advising (non-ladder survey only) Advising (non-ladder survey only) | All Faculty Amer. Ind./Alaskan Nat. |  |  | 5mall sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Advising (non-ladder survey only) | Asian or Pacific Islander |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Advising (non-ladder survey only) | Black |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Advising (non-ladder survey only) | Hispanic |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Advising (non-ladder survey only) | White |  |  | 47 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Advising (non-ladder survey only) | Unknown Ethnicity All Faculy |  |  | small sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Research (non-ladder survey only) | Amer. Ind./Alaskan Nat. |  |  | small sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Research (non-ladder survey only) | Asian or Pacific Islander |  |  | 6 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Research (non-ladder survey only) | Black |  |  | 0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Research (non-ladder survey only) Research (non-ladder survey only) | Hispanic White |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Research (non-ladder survey only) | Unknown Ethnicity |  |  | small sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| e Outside Harvard University |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| To what extent have the following been a source of stress over the past twelve months: ( $1=$ Not at all, 3 = Extensive) | Cohort | Mean | Standard Deviation | Responses | Not at all | Somewhat | Extensive |  |  | Total |
| Managing household responsibilities | All Faculty | 1.88 | 0.73 | 1199 | 33.3\% | 45.5\% | 21.2\% |  |  | 100\% |
| Managing household responsibilities | Amer. Ind./Alaskan Nat. |  |  | small sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Managing household responsibilities | Asian or Pacific Islander | 1.97 | 0.75 | 96 | 29.2\% | 44.8\% | 26.0\% |  |  | 100\% |
| Managing household responsibilities | Black | 2.00 | 0.83 | 33 | 33.3\% | 33.3\% | 33.3\% |  |  | 100\% |
| Managing household responsibilities | Hispanic | 2.08 | 0.80 | 26 | 26.9\% | 38.5\% | 34.6\% |  |  | 100\% |
| Managing household responsibilities | White | 1.86 | 0.72 | 1038 | 33.7\% | 46.3\% | 19.9\% |  |  | 100\% |
| Managing household responsibilities | Unknown Ethnicity |  |  | small sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Childcare | All Faculty | 1.69 | 0.78 | 937 | 50.6\% | 29.7\% | 19.7\% |  |  | 100\% |
| Childcare | Amer. Ind./Alaskan Nat. |  |  | small sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Childcare | Asian or Pacific Islander | 1.89 | 0.81 | 80 | 38.8\% | 33.8\% | 27.5\% |  |  | 100\% |
| Childcare | Black | 1.64 | 0.83 | 28 | 57.1\% | 21.4\% | 21.4\% |  |  | 100\% |
| Childcare | Hispanic | 1.90 | 0.89 | 21 | 42.9\% | 23.8\% | 33.3\% |  |  | 100\% |
| Childcare | White | 1.67 | 0.77 | 805 | 51.7\% | 29.7\% | 18.6\% |  |  | 100\% |
| Childcare | Unknown Ethnicity |  |  | small sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Reproductive decisions/issues | All Faculty | 1.27 | 0.59 | 939 | 80.1\% | 12.5\% | 7.5\% |  |  | 100\% |
| Reproductive decisions/issues | Amer. Ind./Alaskan Nat. |  |  | small sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Reproductive decisions/issues | Asian or Pacific Islander | 1.38 | 0.64 | 81 | 70.4\% | 21.0\% | 8.6\% |  |  | 100\% |
| Reproductive decisions/issues | Black | 1.42 | 0.76 | 26 | 73.1\% | 11.5\% | 15.4\% |  |  | 100\% |
| Reproductive decisions/issues | Hispanic | 1.57 | 0.75 | 21 | 57.1\% | 28.6\% | 14.3\% |  |  | 100\% |
| Reproductive decisions/issues | White | 1.25 | 0.57 | 807 | 81.9\% | 11.2\% | 6.9\% |  |  | 100\% |
| Reproductive decisions/issues | Unknown Ethnicity |  |  | small sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Care of someone who is ill, disabled, aging, and/or in need of special services | All Faculy | 1.50 | 0.70 | 1000 | 61.8\% | 26.1\% | 12.1\% |  |  | 100\% |
| Care of someone who is ill, disabled, aging, and/or in need of special services | Amer. Ind./Alaskan Nat. |  |  | small sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Care of someone who is ill, disabled, aging, and/or in need of special services | Asian or Pacific Islander | 1.46 | 0.71 | 79 | 67.1\% | 20.3\% | 12.7\% |  |  | 100\% |
| Care of someone who is ill, disabled, aging, and/or in need of special services | Black | 1.31 | 0.60 | 29 | 75.9\% | 17.2\% | 6.9\% |  |  | 100\% |
| Care of someone who is ill, disabled, aging, and/or in need of special services | Hispanic | 1.50 | 0.80 | 22 | 68.2\% | 13.6\% | 18.2\% |  |  | 100\% |
| Care of someone who is ill, disabled, aging, and/or in need of special services | White | 1.51 | 0.70 | 865 | 60.8\% | 27.3\% | 11.9\% |  |  | 100\% |
| Care of someone who is ill, disabled, aging, and/or in need of special services | Unknown Ethnicity |  |  | small sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Your health | All Faculty | 1.42 | 0.60 | 1155 | 63.9\% | 30.6\% | 5.5\% |  |  | 100\% |
| Your health | Amer. Ind./Alaskan Nat. |  |  | small sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Your health | Asian or Pacific Islander | 1.45 | 0.63 | 93 | 62.4\% | 30.1\% | 7.5\% |  |  | 100\% |
| Your health | Black | 1.44 | 0.62 | 32 | 62.5\% | 31.3\% | 6.3\% |  |  | 100\% |
| Your health | Hispanic | 1.44 | 0.65 | 25 | 64.0\% | 28.0\% | 8.0\% |  |  | 100\% |
| Your health | White | 1.41 | 0.59 | 999 | 64.0\% | 30.7\% | 5.3\% |  |  | 100\% |
| Your health | Unknown Ethnicity |  |  | small sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cost of living | All Faculty | 1.64 | 0.74 | 1182 | 51.2\% | 33.2\% | 15.7\% |  |  | 100\% |
| Cost of living | Amer. Ind./Alaskan Nat. |  |  | small sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cost of living | Asian or Pacific Islander | 1.68 | 0.70 | 97 | 45.4\% | 41.2\% | 13.4\% |  |  | 100\% |
| Cost of living | Black | 1.88 | 0.81 | 34 | 38.2\% | 35.3\% | 26.5\% |  |  | 100\% |
| Cost of living | Hispanic | 1.86 | 0.76 | 28 | 35.7\% | 42.9\% | 21.4\% |  |  | 100\% |
| Cost of living | White | 1.63 | 0.74 | 1017 | 52.6\% | 32.1\% | 15.3\% |  |  | 100\% |
| Cost of living | Unknown Ethnicity |  |  | small sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Other | All Faculty | 2.04 | 0.92 | 117 | 40.2\% | 15.4\% | 44.4\% |  |  | 100\% |
| Other | Amer. Ind./Alaskan Nat. |  |  | small sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Other | Asian or Pacific Islander | 1.33 | 0.52 | 6 | 66.7\% | 33.3\% | 0.0\% |  |  | 100\% |
| Other | Black |  |  | small sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Other | Hispanic |  |  | small sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Other | White | 2.07 | 0.93 | 107 | 39.3\% | 14.0\% | 46.7\% |  |  | 100\% |
| Other | Unknown Ethnicity |  |  | small sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Domestic Responsibilities - Conflicts | Cohort |  |  | Responses | Never | Once or twice | Two or three times a semester | Once or twice a month | Once or twice a week | Total |
| In the last year, how often have you had to leave early from, arrive late to, or miss an important workrelated meeting or commitment because of care-giving and/or other domestic responsibilities? | All Faculty |  |  | 1241 | 43.1\% | 30.3\% | 13.8\% | 9.5\% | 3.3\% | 100\% |
| In the last year, how often have you had to leave early from, arrive late to, or miss an important workrelated meeting or commitment because of care-giving and/or other domestic responsibilities? | Amer. Ind./Alaskan Nat. |  |  | small sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| In the last year, how often have you had to leave early from, arrive late to, or miss an important workrelated meeting or commitment because of care-giving and/or other domestic responsibilities? | Asian or Pacific Islander |  |  | 102 | 45.1\% | 27.5\% | 14.7\% | 10.8\% | 2.0\% | 100\% |
| In the last year, how often have you had to leave early from, arrive late to, or miss an important workrelated meeting or commitment because of care-giving and/or other domestic responsibilities? | Black |  |  | 34 | 58.8\% | 29.4\% | 5.9\% | 5.9\% | 0.0\% | 100\% |
| In the last year, how often have you had to leave early from, arrive late to, or miss an important work- |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| related meeting or commitment because of care-giving and/or other domestic responsibilities? | Hispanic |  |  | 29 | 58.6\% | 13.8\% | 17.2\% | 10.3\% | 0.0\% | 100\% |
| In the last year, how often have you had to leave early from, arrive late to, or miss an important workrelated meeting or commitment because of care-giving and/or other domestic responsibilities? |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| related meeting or commitment because of care-giving and/or other domestic responsibilities? |  |  |  |  | 42.1\% | 31.0\% | 13.6\% | 9.5\% | 3.6\% | 100\% |
| In the last year, how often have you had to leave early from, arrive late to, or miss an important workrelated meeting or commitment because of care-giving and/or other domestic responsibilities? | Unknown Ethnicity |  |  | small sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Life Outside Harvard University (continued) <br> Domestic Responsibilities - Impact <br> ( $1=$ Strongly disagree, $5=$ Strongly agree) | Cohort | Mean | Standard Deviation | Responses | Strongly disagree | Somewhat disagree | Neither agree nor disagree | Somewhat agree | Strongly agree |  |  | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Please indicate your agreement or disagreement with the following statement: My care-giving and/ or other domestic responsibilities have had a negative impact on my career. | All Faculty | 2.55 | 1.44 | 1066 | 37.9\% | 12.9\% | 16.9\% | 21.6\% | 10.8\% |  |  | 100\% |
| Please indicate your agreement or disagreement with the following statement: My care-giving and/ or other domestic responsibilities have had a negative impact on my career. | Amer. Ind./Alaskan Nat. |  |  | small sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Please indicate your agreement or disagreement with the following statement: My care-giving and/ or other domestic responsibilities have had a negative impact on my career. | Asian or Pacific Islander | 3.05 | 1.49 | 87 | 27.6\% | 4.6\% | 23.0\% | 25.3\% | 19.5\% |  |  | 100\% |
| Please indicate your agreement or disagreement with the following statement: My care-giving and/ or other domestic responsibilities have had a negative impact on my career. | Black | 2.11 | 1.37 | 27 | 51.9\% | 11.1\% | 18.5\% | 11.1\% | 7.4\% |  |  | 100\% |
| Please indicate your agreement or disagreement with the following statement: My care-giving and/ or other domestic responsibilities have had a negative impact on my career. | Hispanic | 2.60 | 1.38 | 25 | 32.0\% | 16.0\% | 20.0\% | 24.0\% | 8.0\% |  |  | 100\% |
| Please indicate your agreement or disagreement with the following statement: My care-giving and/ or other domestic responsibilities have had a negative impact on my career. | White | 2.51 | 1.44 | 921 | 38.8\% | 13.5\% | 16.0\% | 21.6\% | 10.2\% |  |  | 100\% |
| Please indicate your agreement or disagreement with the following statement: My care-giving and/ or other domestic responsibilities have had a negative impact on my career. | Unknown Ethnicity |  |  | small sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Spouse / Domestic Partner | Cohort |  |  | Responses | Yes | No |  |  |  |  |  | Total |
| Do you have a spouse or domestic partner? | All Faculty |  |  | 1247 | 88.8\% | 11.2\% |  |  |  |  |  | 100\% |
| Do you have a spouse or domestic partner? | Amer. Ind./Alaskan Nat. |  |  | small sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Do you have a spouse or domestic partner? | Asian or Pacific Islander |  |  | 102 | 89.2\% | 10.8\% |  |  |  |  |  | 100\% |
| Do you have a spouse or domestic partner? | Black |  |  | 34 | 88.2\% | 11.8\% |  |  |  |  |  | 100\% |
| Do you have a spouse or domestic partner? | Hispanic |  |  | 29 | 96.6\% | 3.4\% |  |  |  |  |  | 100\% |
| Do you have a spouse or domestic partner? | White |  |  | 1076 | 88.5\% | 11.5\% |  |  |  |  |  | 100\% |
| Do you have a spouse or domestic partner? | Unknown Ethnicity |  |  | small sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Were you with your spouse/domestic partner before you became employed at Harvard? | All Faculty |  |  | 1102 | 78.8\% | 21.2\% |  |  |  |  |  | 100\% |
| Were you with your spouse/domestic partner before you became employed at Harvard? | Amer. Ind./Alaskan Nat. |  |  | small sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Were you with your spouse/domestic partner before you became employed at Harvard? | Asian or Pacific Islander |  |  | 90 | 75.6\% | 24.4\% |  |  |  |  |  | 100\% |
| Were you with your spouse/domestic partner before you became employed at Harvard? | Black |  |  | 30 | 90.0\% | 10.0\% |  |  |  |  |  | 100\% |
| Were you with your spouse/domestic partner before you became employed at Harvard? | Hispanic |  |  | 28 | 82.1\% | 17.9\% |  |  |  |  |  | 100\% |
| Were you with your spouse/domestic partner before you became employed at Harvard? | White |  |  | 948 | 78.6\% | 21.4\% |  |  |  |  |  | 100\% |
| Were you with your spouse/domestic partner before you became employed at Harvard? | Unknown Ethnicity |  |  | small sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Did your School help your spouse/domestic partner find employment locally? | All Faculty |  |  | 790 | 15.6\% | 84.4\% |  |  |  |  |  | 100\% |
| Did your School help your spouse/domestic partner find employment locally? | Amer. Ind./Alaskan Nat. |  |  | small sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Did your School help your spouse/domestic partner find employment locally? | Asian or Pacific Islander |  |  | 66 | 16.7\% | 83.3\% |  |  |  |  |  | 100\% |
| Did your School help your spouse/domestic partner find employment locally? | Black |  |  | 22 | 13.6\% | 86.4\% |  |  |  |  |  | 100\% |
| Did your School help your spouse/domestic partner find employment locally? | Hispanic |  |  | 26 | 11.5\% | 88.5\% |  |  |  |  |  | 100\% |
| Did your School help your spouse/domestic partner find employment locally? | White |  |  | 671 | 15.5\% | 84.5\% |  |  |  |  |  | 100\% |
| Did your School help your spouse/domestic partner find employment locally? | Unknown Ethnicity |  |  | small sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Has your spouse/ domestic partner had problems finding an appropriate job in this area? | All Faculty |  |  | 864 | 33.3\% | 66.7\% |  |  |  |  |  | 100 |
| Has your spouse/ domestic partner had problems finding an appropriate job in this area? | Amer. Ind./Alaskan Nat. |  |  | small sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Has your spouse/ domestic partner had problems finding an appropriate job in this area? | Asian or Pacific Islander |  |  | 76 | 44.7\% | 55.3\% |  |  |  |  |  | 100\% |
| Has your spouse/ domestic partner had problems finding an appropriate job in this area? | Black |  |  | 24 | 54.2\% | 45.8\% |  |  |  |  |  | 100\% |
| Has your spouse/ domestic partner had problems finding an appropriate job in this area? | Hispanic |  |  | 25 | 40.0\% | 60.0\% |  |  |  |  |  | 100\% |
| Has your spouse/ domestic partner had problems finding an appropriate job in this area? | White |  |  | 733 | 31.1\% | 68.9\% |  |  |  |  |  | 100\% |
| Has your spouse/ domestic partner had problems finding an appropriate job in this area? | Unknown Ethnicity |  |  | small sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Spousal Employment | Cohort |  |  | Responses | Employed at Harvard (academic) | Employed at another university (academic) | Employed at Harvard (nonacademic) | Employed elsewhere in some other capacity | Not employed outside the home | Actively seeking employme nt | Other | Tota |
| What is your spouse's / domestic partner's employment status? | All Faculty |  |  | 1086 | 14.6\% | 14.4\% | 5.1\% | 40.5\% | 15.6\% | 3.1\% | 6.7\% | 100\% |
| What is your spouse's / domestic partner's employment status? | Amer. Ind./Alaskan Nat. |  |  | small sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| What is your spouse's / domestic partner's employment status? | Asian or Pacific Islander |  |  | 88 | 12.5\% | 18.2\% | 6.8\% | 40.9\% | 13.6\% | 4.5\% | 3.4\% | 100\% |
| What is your spouse's / domestic partner's employment status? | Black |  |  | 29 | 20.7\% | 10.3\% | 3.4\% | 37.9\% | 13.8\% | 6.9\% | 6.9\% | 100\% |
| What is your spouse's / domestic partner's employment status? | Hispanic |  |  | 28 | 14.3\% | 25.0\% | 3.6\% | 42.9\% | 3.6\% | 3.6\% | 7.1\% | 100\% |
| What is your spouse's / domestic partner's employment status? | White |  |  | 935 | 14.7\% | 13.9\% | 5.0\% | 40.3\% | 16.3\% | 2.8\% | 7.1\% | 100\% |
| What is your spouse's / domestic partner's employment status? | Unknown Ethnicity |  |  | small sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Do you and your spousel domestic partner have a commuting relationship, where one or both of you commute to another community (more than an hour away) for work, or where you live in different communities (more than an hour away) from one another? | Cohort |  |  | Responses |  | No, same community | Yes, where one travels | Yes, live in separate communities |  |  |  | Total |
| Commuting | All Faculty |  |  | 1011 |  | 78.8\% | 11.5\% | 9.7\% |  |  |  | 100\% |
| Commuting | Amer. Ind./Alaskan Nat. |  |  | small sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Commuting | Asian or Pacific Islander |  |  | 81 |  | 66.7\% | 21.0\% | 12.3\% |  |  |  | 100\% |
| Commuting | Black |  |  | 28 |  | 67.9\% | 28.6\% | 3.6\% |  |  |  | 100\% |
| Commuting | Hispanic |  |  | 27 |  | 70.4\% | 7.4\% | 22.2\% |  |  |  | 100\% |
| Commuting Commuting | White |  |  | 869 |  | 80.6\% | 10.1\% | 9.3\% |  |  |  | 100\% |
| Commuting | Unknown Ethnicity |  |  | small sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Spouse / Domestic Partner Benefits ( $1=$ Very dissatisfied, $5=$ Very Satisfied) | Cohort | Mean | Standard Deviation | Responses | Very dissatisfied | Somewhat dissatisfied | Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied | Somewhat satisfied | Very satisfied |  |  | Total |
| How satisfied are you with Harvard University's spouse / domestic partner benefits? | All Faculty | 3.79 | 1.16 | 943 | 5.2\% | 8.1\% | 24.6\% | 26.4\% | 35.7\% |  |  | 100\% |
| How satisfied are you with Harvard University's spouse / domestic partner benefits? | Amer. Ind./Alaskan Nat. |  |  | small sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| How satisfied are you with Harvard University's spouse / domestic partner benefits? | Asian or Pacific Islander | 3.17 | 1.27 | 82 | 13.4\% | 14.6\% | 31.7\% | 22.0\% | 18.3\% |  |  | 100\% |
| How satisfied are you with Harvard University's spouse / domestic partner benefits? | Black | 3.59 | 1.45 | 27 | 14.8\% | 11.1\% | 7.4\% | 33.3\% | 33.3\% |  |  | 100\% |
| How satisfied are you with Harvard University's spouse / domestic partner benefits? | Hispanic | 3.54 | 1.41 | 24 | 12.5\% | 12.5\% | 16.7\% | 25.0\% | 33.3\% |  |  | 100\% |
| How satisfied are you with Harvard University's spouse / domestic partner benefits? | White | 3.86 | 1.11 | 804 | 3.9\% | 7.2\% | 24.9\% | 26.7\% | 37.3\% |  |  | 100\% |
| How satisfied are you with Harvard University's spouse / domestic partner benefits? | Unknown Ethnicity |  |  | small sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Prepared by Harvard Institutional Research |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 27 of 28 |


| Life Outside Harvard University (continued) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| How many children do you have in the following age ranges: | Cohort |  |  | Responses | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 or More | Total |
| $0-4$ years | All Facult |  |  | 594 | 64.8\% | 26.1\% | 8.6\% | 0.2\% | 0.3\% | 0.0\% | 100\% |
| $0-4$ years | Amer. Ind./Alaskan Nat. |  |  | small sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $0-4$ years | Asian or Pacific Islander |  |  | 64 | 51.6\% | 28.1\% | 20.3\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 100\% |
| $0-4$ years | Black |  |  | 18 | 61.1\% | 33.3\% | 5.6\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 100\% |
| $0-4$ years | Hispanic |  |  | 16 | 75.0\% | 12.5\% | 6.3\% | 0.0\% | 6.3\% | 0.0\% | 100\% |
| $0-4$ years | White |  |  | 491 | 66.2\% | 26.1\% | 7.3\% | 0.2\% | 0.2\% | 0.0\% | 100\% |
| $0-4$ years | Unknown Ethnicity |  |  | small sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5-12 years | All Faculty |  |  | 687 | 56.3\% | 28.2\% | 13.8\% | 1.3\% | 0.3\% | 0.0\% | 100\% |
| $5-12$ years | Amer. Ind./Alaskan Nat. |  |  | small sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $5-12$ years | Asian or Paciific Islander |  |  | 67 | 56.7\% | 22.4\% | 20.9\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 100\% |
| $5-12$ years | Black |  |  | 16 | 68.8\% | 25.0\% | 6.3\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 100\% |
| $5-12$ years | Hispanic |  |  | 21 | 57.1\% | 9.5\% | 23.8\% | 4.8\% | 4.8\% | 0.0\% | 100\% |
| 5-12 years | White |  |  | 578 | 55.7\% | 29.8\% | 13.0\% | 1.4\% | 0.2\% | 0.0\% | 100\% |
| $5-12$ years | Unknown Ethnicity |  |  | small sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 13-17 years | All Faculty |  |  | 603 | 65.5\% | 27.2\% | 6.3\% | 0.5\% | 0.3\% | 0.2\% | 100\% |
| 13-17 years | Amer. Ind./Alaskan Nat. |  |  | small sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $13-17$ years | Asian or Pacific Islander |  |  | 53 | 77.4\% | 18.9\% | 3.8\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 100\% |
| $13-17$ years | Black |  |  | 14 | 78.6\% | 7.1\% | 14.3\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 100\% |
| $13-17$ years | Hispanic |  |  | 17 | 64.7\% | 17.6\% | 5.9\% | 5.9\% | 5.9\% | 0.0\% | 100\% |
| $13-17$ years | White |  |  | 514 | 63.6\% | 29.2\% | 6.4\% | 0.4\% | 0.2\% | 0.2\% | 100\% |
| $13-17$ years | Unknown Ethnicity |  |  | small sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $18-23$ years | All Faculty |  |  | 608 | 65.6\% | 24.7\% | 8.7\% | 0.8\% | 0.2\% | 0.0\% | 100\% |
| $18-23$ years | Amer. Ind./Alaskan Nat. |  |  | small sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $18-23$ years | Asian or Paciific Islander |  |  | 55 | 78.2\% | 20.0\% | 1.8\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 100\% |
| $18-23$ years | Black |  |  | 14 | 78.6\% | 21.4\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 100\% |
| $18-23$ years | Hispanic |  |  | 14 | 85.7\% | 7.1\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 7.1\% | 0.0\% | 100\% |
| 18 -23 years | White |  |  | 522 | 63.2\% | 25.9\% | 10.0\% | 1.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 100\% |
| $18-23$ years | Unknown Ethnicity |  |  | small sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 24 or older | All Faculty |  |  | 759 | 51.1\% | 15.9\% | 20.6\% | 8.3\% | 2.9\% | 1.2\% | 100\% |
| 24 or older | Amer. Ind./Alaskan Nat. |  |  | small sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 24 or older | Asian or Pacific Islander |  |  | 48 | 83.3\% | 10.4\% | 6.3\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 0.0\% | 100\% |
| 24 or older | Black |  |  | 20 | 50.0\% | 5.0\% | 25.0\% | 5.0\% | 10.0\% | 5.0\% | 100\% |
| 24 or older | Hispanic |  |  | 17 | 70.6\% | 5.9\% | 17.6\% | 0.0\% | 5.9\% | 0.0\% | 100\% |
| 24 or older | White |  |  | 670 | 48.2\% | 17.0\% | 21.5\% | 9.3\% | 2.8\% | 1.2\% | 100\% |
| 24 or older | Unknown Ethnicity |  |  | small sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Harvard Child Care (Yes/No) | Cohort |  |  | Responses | Yes | No, I wanted to but I was unable to get in | No, I chose to make other child care arrangments | No, I do not have children in need of child care |  |  | Total |
| Do you currently use Harvard-affiliated child care centers? | All Faculty |  |  | 1219 | 5.3\% | 4.8\% | 15.3\% | 74.5\% |  |  | 100\% |
| Do you currently use Harvard-affiliated child care centers? | Amer. Ind./Alaskan Nat. |  |  | small sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Do you currently use Harvard-affiliated child care centers? | Asian or Paciific Islander |  |  | 102 | 13.7\% | 6.9\% | 20.6\% | 58.8\% |  |  | 100\% |
| Do you currently use Harvard-affiliated child care centers? | Black |  |  | 33 | 3.0\% | 6.1\% | 18.2\% | 72.7\% |  |  | 100\% |
| Do you currently use Harvard-affiliated child care centers? | Hispanic |  |  | 28 | 3.6\% | 7.1\% | 7.1\% | 82.1\% |  |  | 100\% |
| Do you currently use Harvard-affiliated child care centers? | White |  |  | 1050 | 4.7\% | 4.6\% | 15.0\% | 75.8\% |  |  | 100\% |
| Do you currently use Harvard-affiliated child care centers? | Unknown Ethnicity |  |  | small sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Providing Care |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| (Yes/No) | Cohort |  |  | Responses | Yes | No |  |  |  |  | Total |
| Are you currently caring for or managing care for an aging/ill parent, spouse, or other relative? | All Faculty |  |  | 1238 | 16.3\% | 83.7\% |  |  |  |  | 100\% |
| Are you currently caring for or managing care for an aging/ill parent, spouse, or other relative? | Amer. Ind./Alaskan Nat. |  |  | small sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Are you currently caring for or managing care for an aging/ill parent, spouse, or other relative? | Asian or Paciific Islander |  |  | 102 | 10.8\% | 89.2\% |  |  |  |  | 100\% |
| Are you currently caring for or managing care for an aging/ill parent, spouse, or other relative? | Black |  |  | 34 | 11.8\% | 88.2\% |  |  |  |  | 100\% |
| Are you currently caring for or managing care for an aging/ill parent, spouse, or other relative? | Hispanic |  |  | 29 | 10.3\% | 89.7\% |  |  |  |  | 100\% |
| Are you currently caring for or managing care for an aging/ill parent, spouse, or other relative? | White |  |  | 1067 | 17.1\% | 82.9\% |  |  |  |  | 100\% |
| Are you currently caring for or managing care for an aging/ill parent, spouse, or other relative? | Unknown Ethnicity |  |  | small sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Overall Assessment |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Please indicate your agreement or disagreement with the following statement: ( $\mathbf{1}=$ Strongly disagree, 5 = Strongly agree) |  |  | Standard |  |  |  | Neither agree |  |  |  | Total |
| ( $1=$ Strongly disagree, $5=$ Strongly agree) ) do do it over again, would accept my current position. | All Faculty | Mean | ${ }_{1}$ Deviation |  | $\underset{\text { Strongly disagree }}{\substack{\text { 2.3\% }}}$ | Somewhat disagree | nor disagree | Somewhat agree $23.5 \%$ | Strongly agree $60.9 \%$ |  | Total |
| If I had to do it over again, I would accept my current position. | Amer. Ind./Alaskan Nat. |  |  | small sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| If I had to do it over again, I would accept my current position. | Asian or Paciific Islander | 4.30 | 0.94 | 103 | 1.0\% | 5.8\% | 9.7\% | 29.1\% | 54.4\% |  | 100\% |
| If I had to do it over again, I would accept my current position. | Black | 4.33 | 1.16 | 33 | 6.1\% | 6.1\% | 0.0\% | 24.2\% | 63.6\% |  | 100\% |
| If I had to do it over again, I would accept my current position. | Hispanic | 4.25 | 1.17 | 28 | 7.1\% | 3.6\% | 3.6\% | 28.6\% | 57.1\% |  | 100\% |
| If I had to do it over again, I would accept my current position. | White | 4.34 | 1.02 | 1060 | 2.2\% | 7.3\% | 6.3\% | 22.7\% | 61.5\% |  | 100\% |
| If I had to do it over again, I would accept my current position. | Unknown Ethnicity |  |  | small sample |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


[^0]:    ${ }^{1}$ Summary statistics for each survey question are provided by ethnicity in the Ethnicity Appendix, as sample size permits.

[^1]:    ${ }^{2}$ This practice is the norm in the social science literature, though has been criticized by some contributors to the literature. For a theoretical discussion comparing OLS and ordered logit models, see Jae-On Kim, 1975, "Multivariate Analysis of Ordinal Variables," The American Journal of Sociology, 81(2): 261-298. For a practical example comparing OLS and ordered logit models, see Anna Maria Mayda and Dani Rodrik, 2005, "Why are some people (and countries) more protectionist than others?" European Economic Review 49: 1393-1430. For studies of job satisfaction in particular using OLS, see Monica C Higgins, 2000, "The more, the merrier? Multiple developmental relationships and work satisfaction," The Journal of Management Development 19(3/4): 277-296.

[^2]:    ${ }^{3}$ A faculty member is included as a respondent if he or she has a time stamp indicating the start of the survey.
    ${ }^{4}$ The percentages may not add to 100 due to rounding.
    ${ }^{5}$ The percentages may not add to 100 due to rounding.
    ${ }^{6}$ There is one faculty member with an unknown rank in the sample. Thus, the total number of respondents under rank sum to 1399 instead of 1400.

[^3]:    ${ }^{7}$ Statistical significance is determined by running chi-squared goodness of fit tests to test whether the number of responding faculty within each demographic grouping (observed frequency) is different from the number of invited faculty within each demographic grouping (expected frequency).
    ${ }^{8}$ Gender, ethnicity, rank, School, citizenship, and age data for faculty are from University and School databases. These data were merged with the faculty responses to the survey by the MIT web survey administrators and stripped of personal identifiers before being sent back to Harvard for analysis.
    ${ }^{9}$ For a complete list of Schools and School abbreviations used throughout this report, please see Table D1 in the Demographics Appendix. Some members have appointments in more than one School. The responses of these faculty members are included among those for the School in which they hold their primary appointment.

[^4]:    ${ }^{10}$ There is one faculty member who took the ladder faculty survey in the database with an unknown rank. All individuals with the rank of "professor" are classified as tenured faculty. (We believe there are a small number of non-tenured "professors" in the database who completed the ladder survey. Since we are unable to identify any individual faculty member, we have no way of breaking out these individuals.) However, "Professors of the Practice" (with the exception of those at GSD) and "Baker Foundation Professors" at HBS are classified as nonladder faculty. "Professors of the Practice" at GSD are classified as tenured faculty.

[^5]:    ${ }^{11}$ Faculty who reported "unknown" ethnicity are not included in this table

[^6]:    ${ }^{12}$ Using a one-sample t-test, we find that the University mean (4.16) is significantly higher than 4 or "somewhat satisfied."
    ${ }^{13}$ The survey also asks the faculty to indicate their agreement with the statement: "If I had to do it over again, I would accept my current position." This question, which is significantly correlated with the faculty's University satisfaction (Pearson’s r = 0.59), finds that $61 \%$ of faculty respondents "strongly agree" that they would do it over again and an additional $23 \%$ "somewhat agree" (mean $=4.34$ ) with this statement.

[^7]:    ${ }^{14}$ We compare each minority group to white faculty. We perform pair-wise comparisons of the three ranks.
    ${ }^{15}$ We do not examine gender differences across ranks (e.g., the difference between tenure-track women and tenured men).

[^8]:    ${ }^{16}$ We use paired t-tests to determine that the mean satisfaction with one's School is significantly different from the mean satisfaction with Harvard.
    ${ }^{17}$ We use paired t-tests to determine if the mean satisfaction with one's School for a particular demographic group is significantly different from the mean satisfaction with Harvard for that same demographic group. All three ranks report significantly lower levels of satisfaction with their School than with Harvard. Likewise, both men and women feel this way.
    ${ }^{18}$ We compare each minority group to white faculty. We perform pair-wise comparisons of the three ranks.

[^9]:    ${ }^{19}$ We exclude variables from the analysis that have less than a $50 \%$ response rate for a given group or that are not asked of faculty at all Schools.
    ${ }^{20}$ This approach allows us to maintain a relatively large sample for the analysis - including all variables together would result in a very small sample as some questions were answered by only a few faculty members. It does not allow us to take into account the relationship among variables.
    ${ }^{21}$ This is a subsection of the Hiring and Retention section.

[^10]:    ${ }^{22}$ We restrict the analysis to those satisfaction questions that are asked of faculty at all Schools. Therefore, questions associated with labs and research, as well as administrative support for grants, technical and research staff, students, and teaching assistants are excluded. We also exclude "satisfaction with School" and "I would do it over again" as both questions are related to the University satisfaction question.
    ${ }^{23}$ We do not include all factors in the baseline model at once in an expanded model for non-ladder faculty because few answered all of these questions. Thus, the sample size decreases considerably (to only 45 faculty) and the population becomes incomparable.

[^11]:    ${ }^{24}$ In analyzing monetary compensation, we do not analyze actual salary, which depends on a faculty member's discipline and, therefore, varies widely across Schools and departments of the University. We instead measure satisfaction with monetary compensation, which is a relative measure. In other words, faculty members are likely to make judgments about whether or not they are satisfied with their particular salary based on comparisons to others within their field. We, therefore, feel that it is appropriate to examine satisfaction with monetary compensation at the University level.
    ${ }^{25}$ Faculty at HLS were not asked this question.
    ${ }^{26}$ Faculty at HBS and HLS were not asked this question.
    ${ }^{27}$ Faculty at HBS and HLS were not asked this question.
    ${ }^{28}$ Faculty at HBS and HLS were not asked this question.
    ${ }^{29}$ Faculty at HBS and HLS were not asked this question.
    ${ }^{30}$ Faculty at HBS were asked to rate their satisfaction with the quality of MBA students and the quality of doctoral students. Their responses to these questions were not included in this analysis. Faculty at HLS, regardless of rank, were asked to rate their satisfaction with the quality of students (as opposed to the quality of graduate/professional students). Their responses to this question are included with faculty from other schools in this analysis.
    ${ }^{31}$ Faculty at HLS were not asked this question.
    ${ }^{32}$ The determination of "most" or "least" satisfied in this section is based on the highest percentage of faculty who report that they are either "somewhat" or "very" satisfied with a particular issue.

[^12]:    Standard deviations are in parentheses.
    ${ }^{\dagger}$ The means for tenure-track and non-ladder faculty at HLS are not reported because there are fewer than 5 faculty members within each group.

[^13]:    ${ }^{33}$ The unit of analysis for "department" is Department/Committee at FAS, Academic Unit at HBS, Department at GSD, HMS/HSDM, and SPH, Area at HDS and KSG, and School at HLS and GSE.

[^14]:    ${ }^{34}$ The four that are unique to the non-ladder faculty are as follows: help from the department chair to understand one's role; feeling excluded from an informal network in one’s department; feeling that one’s department is a formal/hierarchical place; and colleagues value one's work/contributions to the department.

[^15]:    ${ }^{35}$ We compare each minority group to white faculty. We perform pair-wise comparisons of all three ranks.

[^16]:    ${ }^{36}$ We do not examine gender differences across ranks (e.g., the difference between tenure-track women and tenured men).

[^17]:    ${ }^{37}$ We do not analyze one item in the atmosphere section of the survey at the University level because it only pertains to a small subset of the population: "I am satisfied with opportunities to share scientific equipment and other resources in my department."

[^18]:    ${ }^{38}$ The gender-rank interaction term is not statistically significant for any of the 3 respect specifications.
    ${ }^{39}$ We do not examine gender differences across ranks (e.g., the difference between tenure-track women and tenured men).

[^19]:    ${ }^{40}$ The gender-rank interaction term is not statistically significant for any of the 4 collaboration and camaraderie specifications.
    ${ }^{41}$ We do not examine gender differences across ranks (e.g., the difference between tenure-track women and tenured men).

[^20]:    ${ }^{42}$ We do not examine gender differences across ranks (e.g., the difference between tenure-track women and tenured men).

[^21]:    ${ }^{43}$ Each time we add a variable to the baseline specification, we compare the gender coefficient from this new specification to the gender coefficient from the baseline specification run on a sub-sample that is restricted to the population who responded to both the good fit question and the specific atmosphere question. This procedure keeps us from finding results that only depend on a change in sample.

[^22]:    ${ }^{44}$ Comparisons of which questions have the most predictive power are performed using standardized coefficients.

[^23]:    ${ }^{45}$ The mean difference between ladder and non-ladder faculty for respected by faculty, while controlling for gender, ethnicity, age, citizenship, and School is statistically significant ( 0.34 point difference).
    ${ }_{7}^{46}$ Note this statement is worded slightly differently for ladder faculty and thus not compared.
    ${ }^{47}$ The mean difference between ladder and non-ladder faculty for respected by students, while controlling for gender, ethnicity, age, citizenship and School is not statistically significant.

[^24]:    ${ }^{48}$ Regression analysis shows that the differences in means between ladder and non-ladder faculty while controlling for gender, ethnicity, citizenship, age and School are not statistically significant for these questions.

[^25]:    ${ }^{49}$ Regression analysis shows that the difference in means between ladder and non-ladder faculty while controlling for gender, ethnicity, age, citizenship and School is statistically significant for collaboration outside ( 0.36 point difference).

[^26]:    ${ }^{50}$ Regression analysis shows that the difference in means between ladder and non-ladder faculty while controlling for gender, ethnicity, age, citizenship and School is statistically significant for having a voice in decision-making ( 0.73 point difference).
    ${ }^{51}$ Regression analysis shows that the difference in means between ladder and non-ladder faculty while controlling for gender, ethnicity, age, citizenship and School is not statistically significant for comfort in raising personal responsibilities when scheduling department obligations.
    ${ }^{52}$ These two issues were not included in the ladder faculty survey and thus not compared.

[^27]:    ${ }^{53}$ Each time we add a variable to the baseline specification, we compare the gender coefficient from this new specification to the gender coefficient from the baseline specification run on the sub-sample restricted to the population that responded to the question. This procedure keeps us from finding results which only depend on a change in sample.

[^28]:    ${ }^{54}$ Comparisons of which questions have the most predictive power are performed using standardized coefficients.

[^29]:    ${ }^{55}$ Examples: $82 \%$ of HBS faculty taught 1-2 graduate school courses in the previous academic year, while $70 \%$ of HLS faculty and $76 \%$ of HDS faculty actually taught 3-4 courses. GSE faculty average 6.87 graduate student dissertation writers for whom they have a major advising responsibility, while FAS faculty average 4.13 and HMS/HSDM faculty average 2.43. Approximately $78 \%$ of HLS faculty submitted 0 grant proposals in the past 12 months, while $45 \%$ of SPH faculty, $56 \%$ of KSG faculty, $62 \%$ of HDS faculty, and $57 \%$ of GSD faculty submitted 1-3.
    ${ }^{56}$ Faculty without a spouse/domestic partner are included in this analysis.
    ${ }^{57}$ The unit of analysis for "department" is Department/Committee at FAS, Academic Unit at HBS, Department at GSD, HMS/HSDM, and SPH, Area at HDS and KSG, and School at HLS and GSE.
    ${ }^{58}$ For HLS and GSE, University/School committees refer to University committees only and department committees refer to School committees.

[^30]:    ${ }^{59}$ HBS faculty are not included in the analyses of expectations for teaching or research because HBS asks a different, but related question on their survey regarding this subject.
    ${ }^{60}$ HLS faculty are not included in the analysis of hours spent working per week because this question is not included on the Law School's survey.

[^31]:    ${ }^{61}$ There are 19 part-time tenured faculty (4\%), 5 part-time tenure-track faculty (2\%), and 65 part-time non-ladder faculty (25\%) who responded to both the part-time status and hours spent working per week questions on the survey. Appendix W1 disaggregates hours worked by part-time and full-time faculty.

[^32]:    ${ }^{62}$ The difference between tenured and tenure-track faculty found in the baseline specification is larger than what is indicated in Figure W1 because of the age control variable. The baseline model suggests that younger faculty spend more hours working per week than older faculty (though the age coefficient is only statistically significant at the $8 \%$ level). Controlling for age causes the difference between tenured and tenure-track faculty to appear larger. If we remove age from the baseline model, the difference between tenure-track and tenured faculty is still statistically significant, but is only 1.85 hours.
    ${ }^{63}$ Pre-school age children are ages 0-4, school-age children are ages 5-17, and children of college-age or older are ${ }_{64}^{18+}$. Faculty with no children are the comparison group.
    ${ }^{64}$ Faculty with employed spouses are the comparison group.

[^33]:    ${ }^{65}$ The unit of analysis for "department" is Department/Committee at FAS, Academic Unit at HBS, Department at GSD, HMS/HSDM, and SPH, Area at HDS and KSG, and School at HLS and GSE.
    ${ }^{66}$ For HLS and GSE, University/School committees refer to University committees only and department committees refer to School committees.
    ${ }^{67}$ If faculty were on leave during the previous academic year, they were asked to answer the question for the preceding academic year.

[^34]:    ${ }^{68}$ We do not examine gender differences across ranks (e.g., the difference between tenure-track women and tenured men).

[^35]:    ${ }^{69}$ Examples: 83\% of HBS faculty taught 1-2 graduate school courses in the previous academic year, while $70 \%$ of HLS faculty and $76 \%$ of HDS faculty taught 3-4 courses. GSE faculty average 6.87 graduate student dissertation writers for whom they have a major advising responsibility, while FAS faculty average 4.13 and HMS/HSDM faculty average 2.43. Approximately $78 \%$ of HLS faculty submitted 0 grant proposals in the past 12 months, while $45 \%$ of SPH faculty, $56 \%$ of KSG faculty, $62 \%$ of HDS faculty, and $57 \%$ of GSD faculty submitted 1-3.
    ${ }^{70}$ HBS faculty are not included in the analyses of expectations for teaching or research because a different question was asked on their survey regarding these subjects. However, they are included in the analyses of service expectations.

[^36]:    ${ }^{71}$ These results are based on a one-sample mean comparison t-test used to see if each mean in Figure W6 is statistically different from "about right."
    ${ }^{72}$ These differences from "about right" are statistically significant using a one-sample t-test.

[^37]:    ${ }^{73}$ In this one case, we do cross-rank gender comparisons (i.e., compare tenured women to tenure-track men) because tenured women have vastly different sentiments from all other faculty groups.

[^38]:    ${ }^{74}$ The mean teaching expectation rating for tenured men is significantly lower than "about right" but is close in magnitude, namely only 0.05 points lower.
    ${ }^{75}$ These comparisons are based on a one-sample t-test.

[^39]:    ${ }^{76}$ We do not examine gender differences across ranks (e.g., the difference between tenure-track women and tenured men).

[^40]:    ${ }^{77}$ These results are based on a one-sample mean comparison t-test used to see if each mean in Figure W6 is statistically different from "about right."
    ${ }^{78}$ These results are based on a one-sample mean comparison t-test used to see if the means for men and women are statistically different from "about right."

[^41]:    ${ }^{79}$ There is one item on the survey that is not included in this University-level analysis, "professional licensing," because it only pertains to a small subset of the faculty at Harvard and will, thus, only be analyzed in the Schoolspecific reports to follow.
    ${ }^{80}$ This item is not included on the HBS or HLS survey.
    ${ }^{81}$ This item is not included on the HBS or HLS survey.
    ${ }^{82}$ This question is not included for HLS or GSE because their unit of analysis for department is School. Therefore, we use the data from "timing of School-wide or Harvard-wide meetings and functions" in our analysis of the departmental meetings question and the School-wide or Harvard-wide meetings question for these two Schools .

[^42]:    ${ }^{\dagger}$ This question was not included on the HBS or HLS survey.

[^43]:    ${ }^{83}$ Recall that the lists of sources of stress differ slightly for the three faculty groups. Therefore these comparisons among the stress indices need to be interpreted cautiously.

[^44]:    Robust standard errors in parentheses

[^45]:    ${ }^{84}$ The unit of analysis for "department" is Department/Committee at FAS, Academic Unit at HBS, Department at GSD, HMS/HSDM, and SPH, Area at HDS and KSG, and School at HLS and GSE.

[^46]:    ${ }^{85}$ The survey also includes a question regarding the overall adequacy of mentoring. The questions on overall effectiveness and adequacy provide very similar information in the sense that the tenured faculty find mentoring more effective and adequate than tenure-track faculty, and men find mentoring more effective and adequate than women. We perform the analysis for both effectiveness and adequacy and report the results for effectiveness in the text and adequacy in the footnotes.

[^47]:    ${ }^{86}$ There is also a statistically significant difference between tenure-track and tenured faculty regarding the adequacy of overall mentoring using the baseline specification ( 0.57 point difference).
    ${ }^{87}$ There is also a statistically significant difference between men and women regarding the adequacy of overall mentoring using the baseline specification ( 0.49 point difference).
    ${ }^{88}$ We do not examine gender differences across ranks (e.g., the difference between tenure-track women and tenured men).

[^48]:    ${ }^{89}$ There is also a statistically significant difference between non-ladder men and women regarding the adequacy of mentoring, whereby women regard overall mentoring as less adequate than men using the baseline specification (0.58 point difference).

[^49]:    ${ }^{90}$ The data presented in Figure M4 excludes 2 tenured faculty members who provided contradictory information by indicating on two separate survey questions that they had served as an informal mentor and had not served as a mentor of any kind.
    ${ }^{91}$ Due to rounding, the numbers in the graph add up to $91 \%$ and $26 \%$, respectively.

[^50]:    ${ }^{92}$ The data presented in Figure M5 excludes 6 tenure-track faculty who responded to the formal or informal mentoring questions, but not to both. As a result, we could not determine if faculty members had both formal and informal mentors or only one of them.
    ${ }^{93}$ There may be more people who report having a formal mentor than serving as a formal mentor because faculty may have been mentored by someone who is no longer a faculty member at Harvard, or because faculty members may have served as formal mentors to more than one person.
    ${ }^{94}$ This analysis applies our baseline specification to the overall mentoring question and also includes variables that indicate whether or not the tenure-track faculty have mentors.

[^51]:    ${ }^{95}$ Note that HLS did not ask the following 2 questions: (1) running a lab or research group and (2) securing funds for research (and, therefore, is not included in the analysis of these questions). HBS did not ask the following 4 questions on its survey (and, therefore, is not included in the analysis of these questions): (1) securing funds for research, (2) advising student research assistants, (3) distribution of time among work-related activities and (4) running a lab or research group. HBS asked similarly worded questions for 3 of these 4 questions. The question regarding "securing funds for research" is phrased as "securing funds for research/course development"; the question regarding "distribution of work-related activities" for HBS gives as an example of an outside activity that the other Schools do not; the question regarding advising student research assistants does not use the modifier "student." HBS also surveyed the ladder faculty about 5 additional areas: (1) field research and/or field visits, (2) advising MBA assistants, (3) advising doctoral students, (4) outside activities, and (5) course development. All of these questions will be analyzed in separate School reports to follow.

[^52]:    ${ }^{96}$ Due to rounding in Figure M7, the percentage of tenure-track faculty who find mentoring for teaching to be adequate is $66 \%$.

[^53]:    ${ }^{97}$ HBS surveyed its non-ladder faculty on 8 additional issues: They are: (1) distribution of time among work-related activities, (2) securing funds for research/course development, (3) field research and/or field visits, (4) publishing scholarly work, (5) advising MBA assistants, (6) advising research assistants, (7) outside activities, and (8) course development. All of these will be analyzed in separate School reports to follow.

[^54]:    ${ }^{98}$ We do not examine gender differences across ranks (e.g., the difference between tenure-track women and tenured men).

[^55]:    ${ }^{99}$ Effectiveness of mentoring is measured on a 5-point scale where $1=$ very ineffective, $2=$ somewhat ineffective, $3=$ neither effective nor ineffective, $4=$ somewhat effective, and $5=$ very effective.

[^56]:    ${ }^{100}$ Due to rounding, the responses to "somewhat" and "very" overvalued for teaching contributions add up to 44\% in figure T5.

[^57]:    ${ }^{101}$ These results are statistically significant according to simple t-tests, which compare each group's mean to 3 ("valued appropriately").

[^58]:    ${ }^{102}$ We do not examine gender differences across ranks (e.g., the difference between tenure-track women and tenured men).

[^59]:    ${ }^{103}$ We do not examine gender differences across ranks (e.g., the difference between tenure-track women and tenured men).

[^60]:    ${ }^{104}$ Effectiveness of mentoring is measured on a 5-point scale where 1=very ineffective, 2=somewhat ineffective, $3=$ neither effective nor ineffective, $4=$ somewhat effective, and 5=very effective.

[^61]:    Robust standard errors in parentheses

    * significant at 5\%; ** significant at $1 \%$
    ${ }^{\dagger}$ This demographic group is controlled for in every model but its results are not reported because it contains less than 5 faculty.

[^62]:    ${ }^{105}$ Thirty-seven percent of these faculty are considering retirement "to a great extent" as a reason to leave.

[^63]:    ${ }^{106}$ There are no tenured faculty younger than 30 .
    ${ }^{107}$ We graphed the mean likelihood of leaving for faculty at each age to see where trends change and found it to be at 65 years old. Thus we use a spline with a knot at 65 years old as our function of age in this model.

[^64]:    ${ }^{108}$ Tenured faculty also report to what extent they have considered leaving Harvard "to improve your prospects for tenure" and "Other." These items are omitted from the analysis. "To improve your prospects for tenure" is omitted because many tenured faculty skipped this question and a vast majority of those who responded ( $90 \%$ ) answered "not at all" (as they have already received tenure). "Other" is omitted because only $10 \%$ of tenured respondents answered this question. (Of this group, 48\% say that they have considered leaving for some "Other" reason "to a great extent").
    ${ }^{109}$ The term "top" is defined here as the reason(s) for which the largest percentage of tenured faculty respondents report that they have considered leaving Harvard "to a great extent".
    ${ }^{110}$ Both tenured men and women report the same "top" reasons to extensively consider leaving.

[^65]:    ${ }^{111}$ We also use regression analysis for the remaining, less commonly cited, reasons to leave. The results are not discussed in the text but are presented in Table H13 in the Hiring and Retention Appendix.
    ${ }^{112}$ The survey does not ask about job offers that faculty members do not take to their deans.
    ${ }^{113}$ The unit of analysis is Dean at FAS, GSE and HLS, Unit Head at HBS, Department Chair at GSD, HMS/HSDM, and SPH, Area Convener at HDS, and Area Chair at KSG.
    114 These survey items are not sequential. A faculty member can answer "no" to seeking an outside job or responding to a job solicitation, but still answer "yes" to receiving a formal or informal job offer.

[^66]:    ${ }^{115}$ The difference in the predicted probability of seeking and receiving outside job offers for 40 - versus 50 -year olds is calculated by setting all non-age variables in the model to their sample means.
    ${ }^{116}$ The difference in the predicted probability of receiving an adjustment for 40 - versus 50 -year olds is calculated by setting all non-age variables in the model to their sample means.
    ${ }^{117}$ Note that faculty members can receive more than one adjustment. This is included into the calculations in Figure H5.

[^67]:    ${ }^{118}$ In separate analyses, we add a variable to the baseline specification to distinguish between assistant and associate professors and find that the age difference is no longer statistically significant. However, including this measure in the model does not explain the gender gap found in the first model, as women remain more likely to leave than men, and the difference between assistant and associate professors is also not statistically significant.

[^68]:    ${ }^{119}$ The term "top" is defined here as the reason(s) for which the largest percentage of tenure-track faculty respondents report that they have considered leaving Harvard "to a great extent."
    ${ }^{120}$ Both tenure-track men and women report the same "top" reasons to extensively consider leaving.

[^69]:    ${ }^{121}$ HLS is not included because of small sample size.
    ${ }^{122}$ We also perform regression analysis on the remaining, less commonly cited reasons to leave. The results are not discussed in the text, but are presented in Table H14 of the Hiring and Retention Appendix.
    ${ }^{123}$ Results listed from the two baseline specifications do not change if we add a variable that accounts for being an assistant or associate professor. Also, this variable is not a significant predictor of either "top reason" to leave.
    ${ }^{124}$ We also run the model predicting leaving to move to a more supportive work environment including the 4 issues from the Atmosphere section where tenure-track women have less positive assessments of departmental atmosphere than tenure-track men. With the inclusion of these variables, the gender coefficient reduces to 0.12 and is no longer statistically significant at the $5 \%$ level. This is not due to the slight decrease in population that occurs when we add these variables to the model, because if we run the baseline model - without these four Atmosphere questions - on this restricted population (i.e., faculty who answered these 4 questions), the gender coefficient is 0.44 and statistically significant at the $5 \%$ level.
    ${ }^{125}$ HLS faculty are not included in the analyses for this section because they were not asked about outside offers in the same manner as faculty at other Schools.

[^70]:    ${ }^{126}$ The survey does not ask about job offers that faculty do not take to their deans.
    ${ }^{127}$ The unit of analysis is Dean at FAS, GSE and HLS, Unit Head at HBS, Department Chair at GSD, HMS/HSDM, and SPH, Area Convener at HDS, and Area Chair at KSG.
    ${ }^{128}$ Note that these survey items are not sequential. A faculty member can answer "no" to seeking an outside job or responding to a job solicitation, but still answer "yes" to receiving a formal or informal job offer.

[^71]:    ${ }^{129}$ Faculty can receive more than one adjustment. This is included in the calculations in Figure H9.
    ${ }^{130}$ No tenure-track faculty respondents received employment for their spouse or partner as a result of receiving an outside job offer.

[^72]:    ${ }^{131}$ The term "top" is defined here as the reason(s) for which the largest percentage of non-ladder faculty respondents report that they have considered leaving Harvard "to a great extent".
    ${ }^{132}$ Both non-ladder men and women report the same "top" reasons to extensively consider leaving.
    ${ }^{133}$ HLS is not included because of small sample size.
    ${ }^{134}$ We also perform regression analysis of the remaining, less commonly cited reasons to leave. The results are not discussed in the text, but are presented in Table H15 of the Hiring and Retention Appendix.

[^73]:    ${ }^{135}$ The unit of analysis is Department/Committee Chair at FAS, GSE and HLS, Unit Head at HBS, Department Chair at GSD, HMS/HSDM, and SPH, Area Convener at HDS, and Area Chair at KSG.
    ${ }^{136}$ HBS non-ladder faculty members are also asked whether or not they have ever been recognized for their contributions to case writing/course development, $38 \%$ of whom indicate that they have been.

[^74]:    ${ }^{137}$ Due to rounding, Figure H15 indicates that $15 \%$ of the tenure-track faculty "somewhat" or "strongly" agree with the stepping stone statement.

[^75]:    ${ }^{138}$ We do not examine gender differences across ranks (e.g., the difference between tenure-track women and tenured men).

[^76]:    ${ }^{139}$ Academics include tenured, tenure-track, and non-tenure track faculty, post-doctoral fellows/research associates, and graduate students.

[^77]:    ${ }^{140}$ Overall, $75 \%$ of the ladder faculty who are married to another academic at Harvard were with their spouse/domestic partner before coming to Harvard, while the remaining 25\% were not.

[^78]:    ${ }^{141}$ Percentages for children do not add up to $100 \%$ because faculty can have children in multiple categories.
    ${ }^{142}$ The question asks "Are you currently caring for or managing care for an aging and/or ill parent, spouse, or other relative?"

[^79]:    ${ }^{143}$ These policies are in contrast to stop-the-clock policies, available to ladder faculty only and discussed in the Tenure section of this report.

[^80]:    ${ }^{144}$ The question asks "Do you currently use Harvard-affiliated child care centers?" and offers four possible answers: (1) "Yes," (2) "No, I wanted to but I was unable to get in," (3) "No, I chose to make other child care arrangements," and (4) "No, I do not have children in need of child care." $74 \%$ of the respondents report that they do not have children in need of childcare.
    ${ }^{145}$ We compare each minority group to white faculty. We perform pair-wise comparisons of the three ranks.

[^81]:    ${ }^{146}$ We do not examine gender differences across ranks (e.g., the difference between tenure-track women and tenured men).

[^82]:    ${ }^{147}$ Since having children of college age and children of post-college age might have different effects on one’s life outside Harvard (e.g., cost of living), for all instances in this section, we separate out the two age groups instead of grouping them together as we do in other sections.
    ${ }^{148}$ Pre-school age children are ages $0-4$, school-age children are ages 5-17, college-age children are ages 18-24 and post-college age children older than 24 . These categories are not mutually exclusive in that a faculty member could have a child in two or more age groups in this model.
    ${ }^{149}$ Being in a commuting relationship is not significant when added to the baseline regression and thus left out of the model in the appendix.

[^83]:    ${ }^{150}$ The figure illustrates $16 \%$ instead of $17 \%$ of women because of rounding.
    ${ }^{151}$ The predicted probabilities for non-ladder faculty are calculated by setting all rank variables (other than nonladder) to zero and all non-rank variables in the model to their sample means.

[^84]:    ${ }^{152}$ For each child-age variable, the predicated probability is calculated by setting all other child-age variables to 0 and the rest of the variables in the model to their sample means.
    ${ }^{153}$ The predicted probability is calculated by setting all other variables in the model to their means.
    ${ }^{154}$ This question asks specifically about the "care of someone who is ill, disabled, aging, and/or in need of special service."

[^85]:    ${ }^{155}$ Due to rounding the difference for childcare is 0.30 in the above figure.

[^86]:    ${ }^{156}$ We do not examine gender differences across ranks (e.g., the difference between tenure-track women and tenured men).

[^87]:    ${ }^{157}$ For specification predicting cost of living, we also add a control variable for satisfaction with monetary compensation, which is associated with less stress regarding cost of living.

[^88]:    ${ }^{158}$ The difference between men and women in the baseline specification of cost of living is not statistically significant and remains this way when we add these additional controls for children, marriage, and caring for a family member.
    ${ }^{159}$ We do not examine gender differences across child-age categories (e.g., the difference between men with preschool age children versus women with school age children).

[^89]:    ${ }^{160}$ The difference of 0.64 is based on the baseline model restricted to the population of faculty who answered all five sources of stress questions used in the larger model and the question about negative impact on career. Without this restriction, the gender-based difference is 0.66 as previously stated.
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