

HARVARD UNIVERSITY FACULTY CLIMATE SURVEY 2006/7



A Summary of the Full Report

Prepared by:
Institutional Research &
Faculty Development and Diversity

TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY 3

METHODOLOGY SUMMARY 6

DEMOGRAPHICS SUMMARY 7

SATISFACTION SUMMARY 8

ATMOSPHERE SUMMARY 9

WORKLOAD SUMMARY 11

MENTORING SUMMARY 13

TENURE SUMMARY..... 14

HIRING AND RETENTION SUMMARY 16

LIFE OUTSIDE HARVARD SUMMARY 18

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 issue are summarized below. More detailed summaries are provided in this document after the executive summary. **For access to the full report, please use the following link: <http://www.faculty.harvard.edu/01/0151.html>.**

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 faculty 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*.

¹ Summary statistics for each survey question are provided by ethnicity in the Ethnicity Appendix of the full report, as sample size permits.

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 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 non-ladder 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 tenure-track 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 Summary

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, which peer institutions have already included or will include in future surveys of their faculty, so that results of Harvard's survey can 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 2006-07 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

We provide a description of our statistical methodology in the full report.

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.)

Demographics Summary

The overall response rate for the Harvard Faculty Climate Survey is 75%. Response rates from all Schools and across all 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) on the 1,863 faculty who were invited to participate in the survey, as well as the 1,400 who responded.²

Figure D1: Response Rates and Distribution of Respondents and Faculty

		Number of Respondents	Response Rate	% of Respondents ³	% of Population ⁴
Rank	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%
Ethnicity	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%
Age	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 A faculty member is included as a respondent if he or she entered data for at least one question on the survey.

³ The percentages may not add to 100 due to rounding.

⁴ The percentages may not add to 100 due to rounding.

Almost every demographic group has a response rate of 70% or higher, with the exceptions of Asian faculty, faculty of unknown ethnicity and international faculty. Even within these three groups, 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 group, the composition of the respondent population is no more than 1 percentage point different than that of the actual population. Furthermore none of these differences are statistically significant.⁵

Satisfaction 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

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

⁵ 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).

- *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, non-ladder 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*.

Atmosphere 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.⁶ 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, tenure-track 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.

⁶ 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.

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 tenure-track 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*.

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.⁷ For these 8 common issues, a similar percentage of ladder and non-ladder faculty are in agreement with the following 5:

⁷ 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.

- (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 decision-making that affects the direction of one's department*, and (5) *comfort in raising personal responsibilities when scheduling department obligations*.

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.

Workload 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.⁸ 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.⁹ 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.^{10,11}

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*.¹² 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

⁸ 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.

⁹ Faculty without a spouse/domestic partner are included in this analysis.

¹⁰ 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.

¹¹ For HLS and GSE, University/School committees refer to University committees only and department committees refer to School committees.

¹² 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.

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.

Mentoring 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.¹³ 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.

¹³The 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.

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 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: *work-life 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.

Tenure 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 tenure-track 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.

Stopping the Tenure Clock

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.

Hiring and Retention 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.¹⁴ 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 age-based 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.

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.

¹⁴ Thirty-seven percent of these faculty are considering retirement “to a great extent” as a reason to leave.

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 non-ladder 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.

Life Outside Harvard 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 *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.