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I. Introduction

During Spring 2001, a committee of researchers, primarily members of Purdue’s University Senate, designed, pilot tested, and distributed a survey to faculty on the West Lafayette Campus. The purpose of the survey was to gain a better understanding of factors that influence faculty performance and promote career development. Specifically, the survey covered the following broad topics: overall satisfaction with Purdue, faculty recruitment and retention, teaching and research activities, professional development, tenure and merit review, faculty’s voice on campus, and institutional climate.

Methodology and Response Rates

All tenured, tenure-track, and clinical/professional faculty members on the West Lafayette Campus were eligible to complete the survey. Initially 1740 faculty were contacted by email or campus mail, but 11 faculty were withdrawn from the list because they terminated with the university during the spring semester or they were deemed ineligible for the survey through self-report. Of the 1729 who were successfully contacted regarding the survey, 791 completed the web-based version and 85 completed the paper and pencil version for a total of 876 responses and a 51% response rate.

Demographics

As a whole, the demographics of the respondents were similar to those of Purdue’s entire faculty, although males responded at a lower rate than females, professors at a lower rate than associate and particularly assistant professors, and Asian Americans and underrepresented minorities at a lower rate than Caucasians. In terms of citizenship, faculty who are naturalized U.S. citizens and non-U.S. citizens responded at lower rates than did those who are native U.S. citizens. Representation across the schools was very close to the distribution for the entire faculty population. The first table provides further details about respondents’ demographics and how these compare to Purdue’s faculty population as a whole.

Three more tables then follow that provide further demographic information about the survey respondents. Highlights of these tables include: a clear majority (63%) were born between 1940 and 1959, 81% are married, and 64% have at least one child living with them. A majority of faculty (51%) live in the West Lafayette school district and commute three or fewer miles one-way to campus (55%).

Over one third of respondents (36%) earn more than $80,000 annually from Purdue. Additionally, 23% of respondents have been on the faculty for over 21 years, 7% hold joint appointments, and 14% earned their highest degree from Purdue.
Demographic of Purdue Faculty Survey Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic</th>
<th>Number of Respondents</th>
<th>Percent of Respondents</th>
<th>Percent of Total Faculty Headcount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>591</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian American</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Underrepresented minorities</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(African American, American Indian, and Hispanic)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>706</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizenship</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States citizen, native</td>
<td>670</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States citizen, naturalized</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-US citizen, including permanent residents and non-immigrants</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Rank</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>362</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consumer and Family Sciences</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Science, Nursing, Pharmacy and Pharmacal Sciences</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal Arts</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Libraries</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veterinary Medicine</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 An additional 16 respondents did not identify themselves as Asian American but wrote in a response that would be classified as Asian American under university guidelines (e.g., Indian, Chinese). Including these 16 would bring the total percent of Asian American respondents to 5%.

2 Throughout the report, Health Science, Nursing, Pharmacy and Pharmacal Sciences are discussed in the aggregate because the sample size was not large enough to analyze by individual unit. They are referred to collectively as “Health Sciences.”
## Personal Demographics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic</th>
<th>Number of Respondents</th>
<th>% of Respondent Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Year Born</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1926-1929</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1930-1939</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1940-1949</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950-1959</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960-1969</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970-1973</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Marital Status</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>651</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unmarried, living with partner</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Spouse/partner lives full time in the same residence as you</strong></td>
<td>647</td>
<td>95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of Children</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Five</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Six or more</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of Children Living With You</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Five or more</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of Children Under Age Five Living w/ You</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>352</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>School District Where You Live</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Lafayette</td>
<td>399</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lafayette</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tippecanoe</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Not all respondents completed every question, so totals do not always add up to 876, the total number of respondents.
### Personal and Academic Demographics, cont.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic</th>
<th>Number of Respondents</th>
<th>% of Respondent Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Miles Commute One-Way to Purdue</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One or less</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1 – 2</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1 – 3</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1 – 4</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1 – 5</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.1 – 10</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.1 – 25</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.1 – 100</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Salary During 2000 Calendar Year</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below $40,000</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$40,000 - $60,000</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$60,001 - $80,000</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$80,001 - $100,000</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$100,001 - $120,000</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$120,000 or more</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Year First Received Faculty Appointment at Purdue</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1945 – 1959</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960 – 1969</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970 – 1979</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980 – 1989</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990 – 1999</td>
<td>337</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000 - 2001</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Rank When First Hired at Purdue</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>606</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Years in Current Rank</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 – 1</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-10</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-20</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-25</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-39</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Not all respondents completed every question, so totals do not always add up to 876, the total number of respondents.
Academic Demographics, cont.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic</th>
<th>Number of Respondents</th>
<th>% of Respondent Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Joint Appointment</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appointment in same school</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Appointment</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earned Highest Degree from Purdue</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participating in Voluntary Early Partial Retirement Program</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Not all respondents completed every question, so totals do not always add up to 876, the total number of respondents.

Guide to the Reader

- This report is designed to provide an overview of responses to the survey questions, as well as to examine response differences by school, rank, gender, and race/ethnicity. Future reports will include multivariate analyses of many questions, including how gender, school, and rank each uniquely help to explain responses. For several survey items, Purdue responses will also be compared with responses from faculty at other institutions. These and many other analyses are very important for understanding the meaning and significance of the findings, but current limitations in terms of time and resources require that they be planned for future reports.

- It is not our intent to translate this first report into actionable recommendations. Rather, our goal is to present the results and allow individuals and groups at the unit, school, and campus levels to determine how the results should best be used.

- The means and distributions for each of the survey questions are available at the following URL: http://www.mmkd.org/faculty/survey/index.htm

- Throughout the report, Health Science, Nursing, Pharmacy and Pharmacal Sciences are discussed in the aggregate because the sample size was not large enough to analyze by individual unit. They are referred to collectively as “Health Sciences.”

- Throughout the report, responses from schools singled out for comment were generally at least ten percentage points above or below the mean.

- Due to the small number of African American, American Indian, and Hispanic respondents (N = 24), they are grouped together into a category called “underrepresented minorities” throughout this report.
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II. Satisfaction with Purdue

This report begins by considering faculty members’ overall satisfaction with Purdue. Their current satisfaction levels, reasons for initially choosing to work at Purdue, and factors that would motivate them to leave this institution are included in this section.

Overall Satisfaction With Position at Purdue (Q 1)

Respondents were first asked to rate their satisfaction with their job at Purdue on a 6 point scale, with 1 low and 6 high. Their mean response was 4.3, indicating that a majority of faculty put themselves on the satisfied side of the continuum (3.5 was the midpoint). By school, the means ranged from lows of 4.08 in Science and 4.14 in Management to highs of 4.57 in Health Sciences and Consumer and Family Sciences (CFS). By rank, means ranged from a low of 4.12 for associate professors, to 4.34 for assistant professors, and 4.46 for professors. Females indicated that they are considerably less satisfied than males with their job at Purdue (4.14 compared to 4.39 mean response) and finally, considering responses by race/ethnicity, underrepresented minorities (African Americans, Hispanics, and Native Americans) are less satisfied (4.04 mean) than Asian Americans (4.22 mean) and Caucasian respondents (4.35 mean).

Choosing Purdue (Q 6)

The next two questions allow us to first step back and consider why faculty initially chose Purdue and then to compare these responses with their current levels of satisfaction with eight specific facets of the university.

The following four factors most positively influenced respondents’ decisions to initially accept a position at Purdue:

1) Prestige of the unit, school, or university (88% agreed that this was a positive influence)
2) University benefits (81%)
3) Balance between teaching and research responsibilities (78%)
4) Access to research facilities (72%)

Of the eight factors listed for this question, respondents were least likely to say that geographic location (43%) and opportunities available for their spouse/partner (44%) positively influenced their decision to come to Purdue. (This latter number reflects the proportion after the 36% of respondents who chose “not applicable” - presumably because they were single or their spouse/partner was not seeking employment - were removed from the total N for this question.) (See Table 1.)

Differences by School

A number of differences exist when we consider responses by school. Faculty in Veterinary Medicine (68%) were the least likely to report that the prestige of their unit, school, or the university positively influenced their decision to come to Purdue, compared to 90% or more of faculty in the following schools: Agriculture, CFS, Education,
Table 1
Factors Positively Influencing Decision to Accept a Position at Purdue

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Geographic location</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities available for spouse/partner</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salary</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership (i.e., unit head, dean)</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to research facilities</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance between teaching &amp; research responsibilities</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefits</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prestige of unit, school, or university</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Engineering, Health Sciences, and Technology. Geographic location was a significant draw for a clear majority in Health (76%), CFS (65%), Education (65%), and Technology (61%), while Engineering (31%) and Science (21%) faculty were far less likely to say that geographic location positively influenced their decision to come to Purdue. Also, Engineering (31%), Science (38%), and Agriculture (39%) faculty were less likely than their peers to say that opportunities available for their spouse positively influenced their decision to come to Purdue.\(^3\)

Salary’s role in influencing whether one accepts a position at Purdue varies tremendously by school. A majority of Library (86%) and Agriculture (72%) faculty reported that this was a positive influence, while only 30% of Technology faculty and 33% of those in Education and Management described their salary offer as a positive influence.

A clear majority of faculty in every school described the benefits package as a positive influence on their decision to accept Purdue’s offer of employment. Responses ranged from 66% of Management faculty to 90% of Health Sciences and 94% of Veterinary Medicine faculty who perceived this as a positive influence.

Finally, the extent to which access to research facilities positively influenced individuals’ decisions to come to Purdue varied by school affiliation. In this case, just 54% of Liberal Arts faculty and 58% of Technology faculty saw this as a positive influence, while 85% of Science faculty reported that this was a positive draw.

**Differences by Rank**

Salary was most likely to attract full professors (55%) and least likely to be a positive factor in attracting assistant professors to Purdue (46%). Full professors were also the most likely to say that access to research facilities (79% vs. 66% and 68% for associate and assistant professors respectively), balance between teaching and research responsibilities (83% vs. 75% and 74% for associate and assistant professors respectively) and the leadership of one’s unit head or dean (66% vs. 56% and 63% for associate and assistant professors respectively) positively influenced their decision to accept a position at Purdue.

**Differences by Gender**

Opportunities available for their spouse/partner were more likely to positively influence females’ (55%) than males’ (40%) decisions to come to Purdue. Males, on the other hand, were more likely to report that salary (54% vs. 45%), balance between teaching and research responsibilities (82% vs. 70%), and access to research facilities (76% vs. 63%) drew them to Purdue. Differences in the distribution of males and females across the schools and across the ranks may account for most of these differences.

---

\(^3\) Throughout the report, responses from schools singled out for comment were generally at least ten percentage points above or below the mean.
Differences by Race

Examining responses by race, underrepresented minorities were less likely than Asian Americans or Caucasians to report that geography (35% vs. 41% and 45% respectively) or benefits (65% vs. 87% and 82% respectively) attracted them to Purdue. They were, on the other hand, more likely than Asian Americans and Caucasians to say that the leadership of their unit head or dean (75% vs. 57% and 62% respectively) and opportunities available for their spouse/partner (56% vs. 25% and 44% respectively) influenced their decision to come to Purdue.

Asian Americans were the least likely to say that salary (41% vs. 58% of underrepresented minorities and 53% of Caucasians) or opportunities for their spouse (see above) attracted them to Purdue and were the most likely to say that Purdue’s prestige was a significant drawing factor (100% vs. 87% of underrepresented minorities and 88% of Caucasians).

Current Satisfaction with Purdue (Q 7)

Once faculty settle into life at Purdue, with which of these same eight factors are they currently most satisfied? The top four factors remain the same – benefits, prestige, balance between teaching and research, and access to research facilities, but prestige has fallen from first to second place behind benefits. (See Table 2.)

Among the other four factors included in the survey question, geographic location was an attraction for 43% as they decided whether to accept a position at Purdue. However, having settled into the community, 52% report current satisfaction with Purdue’s location. Likewise, only 43% reported that opportunities available for their spouse or partner were a positive draw to Purdue, but 55% are currently satisfied with the availability of these opportunities.

Differences by School

Faculty in CFS, Health Sciences, and Technology are particularly satisfied with their unit, school, and/or the university’s prestige (96%, 94%, and 93% respectively), while only 64% of faculty from Science are satisfied with this. It is also interesting to note that Agriculture, Education, Engineering, Liberal Arts, and Science satisfaction levels with Purdue’s prestige have dropped noticeably since faculty initially chose Purdue (comparing responses to the previous question). In the two schools with the most significant drop, 93% of Engineering and 87% of Science faculty were initially drawn to Purdue because of its prestige, compared to 71% and 64% respectively who are currently satisfied with this.

---

4 Throughout the report, differences in survey responses that are analyzed by race/ethnicity must be examined with caution because relatively few respondents identified themselves as Asian American (32) or underrepresented minorities (24) and not all of these individuals answered every question. These smaller numbers can lead to more volatility in response patterns, thus putting into question the meaningfulness of the results. The same caution is appropriate regarding analyses of several of the smaller schools’ responses, such as Consumer and Family Sciences, Education, the Libraries, and Management.
Faculty from three of the schools who were most likely to say geographic location initially drew them to Purdue are still the most likely to be satisfied with Purdue’s location (CFS, Technology, and Health Sciences). Likewise, Science faculty were the least likely to say they were drawn by Purdue’s location and they are also the least likely to say that they are currently satisfied with it.

Faculty from Technology and Veterinary Medicine are particularly satisfied with the employment opportunities that are available for their spouse/partner (73% and 67% respectively), while Management faculty are the least satisfied with this (42%). Overall, satisfaction with spouse/partner opportunities rose in almost every school between the time when faculty initially chose Purdue and the present, particularly in Agriculture, Education, Engineering, and Technology where levels rose by at least 15 percentage points.

CFS and Library faculty (67% and 68% respectively) are most likely to say they are satisfied with their current salary. These were also the two schools (along with Agriculture) that were most likely to report that their salary offer was a positive influence on their decision to come to Purdue. Likewise, Education, Management, and Technology faculty are the least satisfied with their current salaries (28%, 35%, and 36% respectively) and were the three groups least likely to say the salary offer initially drew them to Purdue. Although not among the schools least likely to say the salary offer initially drew them, only 35% of Liberal Arts faculty are currently satisfied with their salary as well.

A clear majority of faculty from every school are currently satisfied with their benefits package. Satisfaction levels range from 79% in Engineering and Science to 92% in Veterinary Medicine. While only 73% of Library faculty and 66% of Management faculty initially reported benefits as a positive influence on their decision to come to Purdue, those percentages rose to 86% and 83% respectively in terms of current satisfaction levels, the two most substantial changes in responses between the two questions.

Faculty from the Libraries (94%), Management (86%) and Agriculture (83%) are the most satisfied with their current access to research facilities, while Liberal Arts faculty are the least satisfied (51%). In terms of changes in these satisfaction levels between the time they decided to come to Purdue and now, two schools stand out. Seventy-eight percent of Engineering faculty reported that research facilities drew them to Purdue, but only 65% are satisfied with this facet of Purdue now. On the other hand, only 58% of Technology faculty were positively influenced initially by their access to research facilities, but that number has grown to 72% who are currently satisfied.

Faculty in CFS (74%) and Technology (68%) are more satisfied than average with the leadership from their unit head and/or dean, while those in Education (44%) and Veterinary Medicine (45%) are the least satisfied.
Agriculture faculty are currently the most satisfied with their balance between teaching and research (82%), but only 59% of Library faculty are satisfied with the balance they maintain between these two activities. In almost every school, people were more likely to say that the teaching and research balance initially attracted them to Purdue, than they were to say that they are currently satisfied with the balance. A typical example is Management where 78% said that the balance between teaching and research positively influenced their decision to come to Purdue, compared to 66% of respondents from this school who are currently satisfied with this balance. Only in Technology is the percentage who are currently satisfied actually higher than the percentage who said this positively influenced their initial decision to join Purdue.

The tables below provide a graphic comparison, by school, of the percentage who reported that a factor initially drew them to Purdue, compared to the percentage who are currently satisfied with the factor.

**Tables 2a-k**

**Comparison by School of Factors That Initially Drew Faculty to Purdue vs. Current Satisfaction with the Factors**

### School of Agriculture

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Initial Positive Influence</th>
<th>Current Satisfaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prestige of unit, school or university</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance between teaching and research</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>responsibilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to research facilities</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefits (e.g., retirement, health)</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salary</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership (i.e., unit head, dean)</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geographic location</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities available for spouse/partner</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Percent who agree or strongly agree that the above factors positively influenced their decision to accept a position at Purdue and who agree or strongly agree that they are currently satisfied with these aspects of Purdue.)

### School of Consumer and Family Sciences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Initial Positive Influence</th>
<th>Current Satisfaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prestige of unit, school or university</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefits (e.g., retirement, health)</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance between teaching and research</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>responsibilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership (i.e., unit head, dean)</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to research facilities</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salary</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geographic location</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities available for spouse/partner</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Percent who agree or strongly agree that the above factors positively influenced their decision to accept a position at Purdue and who agree or strongly agree that they are currently satisfied with these aspects of Purdue.)
**School of Education**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Initial Positive Influence</th>
<th>Current Satisfaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prestige of unit, school or university</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance between teaching and research</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefits (e.g., retirement, health)</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to research facilities</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geographic location</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities available for spouse/partner</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership (i.e., unit head, dean)</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salary</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Percent who agree or strongly agree that the above factors positively influenced their decision to accept a position at Purdue and who agree or strongly agree that they are currently satisfied with these aspects of Purdue.)

**Schools of Engineering**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Initial Positive Influence</th>
<th>Current Satisfaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prestige of unit, school or university</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance between teaching and research</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefits (e.g., retirement, health)</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to research facilities</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership (i.e., unit head, dean)</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salary</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities available for spouse/partner</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geographic location</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Percent who agree or strongly agree that the above factors positively influenced their decision to accept a position at Purdue and who agree or strongly agree that they are currently satisfied with these aspects of Purdue.)

**School of Health Sciences**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Initial Positive Influence</th>
<th>Current Satisfaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prestige of unit, school or university</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefits (e.g., retirement, health)</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geographic location</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership (i.e., unit head, dean)</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to research facilities</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance between teaching and research</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salary</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities available for spouse/partner</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Percent who agree or strongly agree that the above factors positively influenced their decision to accept a position at Purdue and who agree or strongly agree that they are currently satisfied with these aspects of Purdue.)
### School of Liberal Arts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Initial Positive Influence</th>
<th>Current Satisfaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Benefits (e.g., retirement, health)</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prestige of unit, school or university</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance between teaching and research responsibilities</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to research facilities</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership (i.e., unit head, dean)</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities available for spouse/partner</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salary</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geographic location</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Percent who agree or strongly agree that the above factors positively influenced their decision to accept a position at Purdue and who agree or strongly agree that they are currently satisfied with these aspects of Purdue.)

### The Libraries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Initial Positive Influence</th>
<th>Current Satisfaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Access to research facilities</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salary</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prestige of unit, school or university</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities available for spouse/partner</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefits (e.g., retirement, health)</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership (i.e., unit head, dean)</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance between teaching and research responsibilities</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geographic location</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Percent who agree or strongly agree that the above factors positively influenced their decision to accept a position at Purdue and who agree or strongly agree that they are currently satisfied with these aspects of Purdue.)

### School of Management

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Initial Positive Influence</th>
<th>Current Satisfaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prestige of unit, school or university</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to research facilities</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance between teaching and research responsibilities</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefits (e.g., retirement, health)</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership (i.e., unit head, dean)</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geographic location</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities available for spouse/partner</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salary</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Percent who agree or strongly agree that the above factors positively influenced their decision to accept a position at Purdue and who agree or strongly agree that they are currently satisfied with these aspects of Purdue.)
### School of Science

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Initial Positive Influence</th>
<th>Current Satisfaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prestige of unit, school or university</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to research facilities</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance between teaching and research</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>responsibilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefits (e.g., retirement, health)</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salary</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership (i.e., unit head, dean)</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities available for spouse/partner</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geographic location</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Percent who agree or strongly agree that the above factors positively influenced their decision to accept a position at Purdue and who agree or strongly agree that they are currently satisfied with these aspects of Purdue.)

### School of Technology

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Initial Positive Influence</th>
<th>Current Satisfaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prestige of unit, school or university</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefits (e.g., retirement, health)</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership (i.e., unit head, dean)</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geographic location</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to research facilities</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance between teaching and research</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>responsibilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities available for spouse/partner</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salary</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Percent who agree or strongly agree that the above factors positively influenced their decision to accept a position at Purdue and who agree or strongly agree that they are currently satisfied with these aspects of Purdue.)

### School of Veterinary Medicine

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Initial Positive Influence</th>
<th>Current Satisfaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Benefits (e.g., retirement, health)</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance between teaching and research</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>responsibilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to research facilities</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prestige of unit, school or university</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership (i.e., unit head, dean)</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salary</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities available for spouse/partner</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geographic location</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Percent who agree or strongly agree that the above factors positively influenced their decision to accept a position at Purdue and who agree or strongly agree that they are currently satisfied with these aspects of Purdue.)
Differences by Rank

Examining responses by rank, individuals responded to these questions as they did to the question about overall satisfaction (Q 1) – associate professors are generally the least satisfied, professors the most satisfied, and assistant professors tend to fall in the mid range in terms of satisfaction with these eight factors. Specifically, associate professors tend to be the least satisfied and professors the most satisfied with the following factors: salary (38% of associate professors are satisfied compared with 52% of professors and 45% of assistant professors), benefits (79% vs. 87% and 84% respectively), access to research facilities (61% vs. 73% and 67% respectively), and balance between teaching and research responsibilities (62% vs. 76% and 67% respectively).

Assistant professors are the least satisfied with Purdue’s geographic location (43% vs. 53% of associate professors and 56% of professors who are satisfied) and the opportunities that are available for one’s spouse or partner (48% vs. 58% of the other two ranks), but are the most satisfied with the prestige of their unit, school, or the institution (86% vs. 72% of associate professors and 73% of professors) and with the leadership from their unit head and/or dean (67% vs. 49% and 57% respectively).

Differences by Gender

Females are considerably less satisfied than males with five of the eight satisfaction variables included in this question: geographic location (45% vs. 54% are satisfied), salary (40% vs. 49%), access to research facilities (57% vs. 73%), leadership from their unit head or dean (50% vs. 60%), and balance between teaching and research responsibilities (57% vs. 74%). On the other three variables, males and females expressed virtually the same levels of satisfaction.

Differences by Race

Faculty responses to five of the eight factors varied by race, sometimes quite substantially. Asian Americans are less satisfied than the other two groups with the opportunities available for one’s spouse or partner (19% vs. 60% of underrepresented minorities and 58% of Caucasians who are satisfied) and with their salary (28% vs. 39% of underrepresented minorities and 48% of Caucasians).

Underrepresented minorities are the least satisfied with Purdue’s geographic location (35% vs. 44% of Asian Americans and 54% of Caucasians) and with the benefits that are available to them (65% vs. 81% of Asian Americans and 84% of Caucasians). However, they are more satisfied than the others with the prestige of their unit, school or the university as a whole (87% vs. 72% of Asian Americans and 76% of Caucasians).

Choosing Again (Q 4)

If they had to decide all over again whether to join the Purdue faculty, the majority of faculty members (56%) would do so, while 36% would have some second thoughts and 8% would not choose to be a faculty member at Purdue. (See Chart 3.)
Chart 3
If you had to decide all over again whether to be a faculty member at Purdue, what would you decide?

- I would choose to be a faculty member at Purdue: 56%
- I would have some second thoughts: 36%
- I would not choose to be a faculty member at Purdue: 8%
Differences by School

As is the case with so many questions, responses again vary by school. Two thirds of CFS (67%) and Health Sciences (66%) faculty and 64% of Technology faculty would choose Purdue again without reservation. At the other end of the continuum, only 43% of Science faculty and 50% of Education faculty would join Purdue’s faculty without reservation and fully 22% of Education faculty would not choose to be a faculty member at Purdue if they had it to do over again.

Differences by Rank

Associate professors are less sure about their decision to come to Purdue (only 47% would join Purdue again without reservation) compared to professors and assistant professors (60% and 55% of whom would join Purdue again without reservation).

Differences by Gender

If they had to decide all over again, only 48% of females, compared to 57% of males would choose to join the Purdue faculty again without reservation. At the other extreme, 12% of females compared to 7% of males would not choose Purdue again.

Differences by Race

While 56% of Caucasians and 54% of underrepresented minorities would join Purdue again without reservations, only 47% of Asian Americans would not at least have some second thoughts.

Thoughts of Leaving (Q 8)

Given that over one half of all faculty would choose Purdue without reservation if they had it to do over again, what percentage have seriously considered leaving Purdue? Results show that 42% have given this idea somewhat serious consideration, while 34% have very seriously considered leaving Purdue. (See Chart 4.)

Differences by School

Only 17% of CFS faculty and 15% of Technology faculty have very seriously considered leaving, compared to 46% of Library faculty, 42% of Education faculty, and 41% of Science faculty. While aggregate responses from CFS, Technology, Science, and Education are similar to question 4 above, correlations between these two questions based on individual responses are not significant.

Differences by Rank

Non-tenured faculty are less likely (29%) than associate and full professors (36% and 35% respectively) to have given very serious consideration to leaving Purdue.

Differences by Gender

The same proportion of men and women report having very seriously considered leaving Purdue (34%).
Chart 4
Have you ever seriously considered leaving Purdue?

- Yes, very seriously: 33%
- Yes, somewhat seriously: 42%
- No, not seriously: 25%
Differences by Race

Although Asian Americans are somewhat less likely than Caucasians and underrepresented minorities to say they would join Purdue again without reservation (see Question 4 above), they are the least likely to report very seriously considering leaving Purdue (23% have done so vs. 34% of Caucasians and 42% of underrepresented minorities).

Motivations for Leaving Purdue (Q 9)

Those who have somewhat seriously or very seriously considered leaving Purdue (76%) were asked to rate the importance of 14 factors that might make a move attractive to them. (See Table 5.) The most important factor to faculty was the desire to earn a higher salary (80% said that this would be a somewhat or very important factor), followed by the desire to join a unit where they would be more appreciated (70%). Living in a different part of the country would be an attractive reason to move for 69% of respondents, although only 41% reported that specifically living in a more cosmopolitan or urban setting would attract them to move.

Once the 27% who answered that the question was not applicable were excluded from the total N, 67% also indicated that a desire to enhance their spouse/partner’s career opportunities would be an attractive reason to move to another position.

Differences by School

Several of these questions lead to noteworthy variations among the schools. First, Science (73%) and Management (71%) faculty are the most likely to say that the desire to join a more prestigious unit or institution would be an important motivating factor for leaving Purdue. Conversely, only 21% of Technology faculty rate this as an important factor.

A desire to reduce teaching responsibilities would be an especially important factor for Management (67%), Health Sciences (44%), and Science (42%) faculty, while only 14% of Agriculture faculty and 17% of Veterinary Medicine faculty noted that this would be an important factor in their decision to leave.

Faculty who said that the desire to work in a less-pressured environment would be an important motivating factor for leaving Purdue were also likely to say that the desire to achieve a better balance between their work and personal life would motivate them to leave. Those in Health Sciences, the Libraries, Technology, and Veterinary Medicine were the most likely to report these as important factors, while those in Management and Science were the least likely to do so.

Table 5a provides a synopsis by school of the factors that would make a move attractive to faculty there.
Table 5
Motivation for Leaving Purdue

- Leave academic life: 34%
- Move to a more teaching-oriented institution: 19%
- Work in a less-pressured environment: 31%
- Reduce my teaching responsibilities: 31%
- Have wider social contacts: 24%
- Live in a more cosmopolitan or urban setting: 41%
- Live closer to family or friends: 45%
- Achieve a better balance between work & personal life: 52%
- Join a more prestigious unit or institution: 59%
- Obtain a position of higher rank, responsibility, or visibility: 54%
- Enhance my spouse/partner's career opportunities: 67%
- Live in a different part of the country: 69%
- Join a unit where I would be more appreciated: 70%
- Earn a higher salary: 80%

Percentage
Table 5a
Motivations for Leaving Purdue

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Ag.</th>
<th>CFS</th>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Engineering</th>
<th>Health Sciences</th>
<th>Liberal Arts</th>
<th>Libraries</th>
<th>Mgmt</th>
<th>Science</th>
<th>Techno -logy</th>
<th>Vet Med</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Earn a higher salary</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Join a unit where I would be more appreciated</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Live in a different part of the country</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhance my spouse/partner’s career opportunities</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obtain a position of higher rank, responsibility, or visibility</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Join a more prestigious unit or institution</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achieve better balance between work &amp; personal life</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Live closer to family or friends</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Live in a more cosmopolitan or urban setting</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have wider social contacts</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduce my teaching responsibilities</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work in a less-pressured environment</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Move to a more teaching-oriented institution</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leave academic life</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Among those who have somewhat or very seriously considered leaving Purdue, the percent who indicated that these would be somewhat or very important motivating factors)
**Differences by Rank**

Assistant professors, on the whole, are the most interested in moving for personal reasons, possibly reflecting the young ages of their children or the fact that somewhat more of them are single than in other ranks. They are more likely than associate and especially full professors to say that the desire to live closer to family or friends (55% vs. 44% and 42% respectively), to live in a more cosmopolitan setting (54% vs. 45% and 34%), to have wider social contacts (42% vs. 39% and 29%), to maintain a better balance between work and their personal lives (60% vs. 57% and 45%), and to enhance their spouse or partner’s career opportunities (73% vs. 69% and 62%) would be important motivators in their decision to move. Clearly, associate professors feel similarly to assistant professors on several of these issues.

In two cases, associate professors rated the motivating factor higher than did those in other ranks. They were the most likely to say that the desire for a position of higher rank, responsibility, or visibility (70% vs. 49% for assistant professors and 67% for professors) and the desire for a place where they would be more appreciated (81% vs. 59% for assistant professors and 71% for professors) would be important factors in their decision to leave Purdue. Full professors only rated the importance of joining a more prestigious unit or institution more highly than their peers (71% vs. 41% for assistant and 55% for associate professors).

**Differences by Gender**

Males were more likely than females to say that the desire to join a more prestigious unit would motivate them to leave Purdue (63% vs. 49%). Females, on the other hand, answered similarly to assistant professors in that they are more interested than males overall in moving for personal reasons. Specifically, they are more likely than males to say that the desire to live closer to family or friends (55% vs. 42%), to live in a more cosmopolitan setting (51% vs. 38%), to have wider social contacts (48% vs. 30%), to maintain a better balance between work and their personal lives (64% vs. 47%), and to enhance their spouse or partner’s career opportunities (78% vs. 64%) would make a move attractive to them. In addition, they are more likely than males to want to join a unit where they would be more appreciated (76% vs. 70%) and that would allow them to work in a less-pressured environment (39% vs. 30%).

Given that 41% of the female respondents are at the assistant professor rank compared to 20% of the males, it is important to consider how these variables may interact. In fact, when the responses of men and women are examined separately by rank, assistant professors are still more likely than their senior peers to be motivated to move for the personal reasons stated above.

**Differences by Race**

Because comparisons by rank only include those who have “somewhat seriously” or “very seriously” considered leaving Purdue, results must be examined with caution. Only 15 underrepresented minorities and 20 Asian Americans answered these questions.
Underrepresented minorities who answered these questions are more likely to be assistant professors than are respondents from the other two groups (50% vs. 38% of Asian Americans and 24% of Caucasians). They are also more likely to be women (46% vs. 19% of Asian Americans and 26% of Caucasians). And, in fact, they answered similarly to these two groups because they are more likely to be motivated to move for personal reasons. Again, they are more likely than Asian Americans and Caucasians to say that leaving Purdue would be attractive if they could live in a different part of the country (80% vs. 60% and 69% respectively), move to a more cosmopolitan or urban setting (67% vs. 35% and 40%), live closer to family or friends (71% vs. 50% and 45%), have wider social contacts (47% vs. 16% and 34%) and achieve a better balance between their work and personal life (67% vs. 47% and 52%).

Asian Americans would be more likely to move for professional reasons than would underrepresented minorities and Caucasians. Specifically, they are more likely to consider leaving because of a desire to join a more prestigious unit or institution (75% vs. 60% and 59% respectively), to earn a higher salary (90% vs. 80% for the other two groups), and to enhance their spouse or partner’s career opportunities (88% vs. 82% of underrepresented minorities and 65% of Caucasians). They, along with underrepresented minorities, are also more likely than Caucasians to be motivated to move to obtain a position of higher rank, responsibility, or visibility (75% and 73% vs. 63%).

Caucasians, compared to the other two groups, indicated a stronger desire to move only for the opportunity to work in a less-pressured environment (34% vs. 21% for underrepresented minorities and 10% for Asian Americans).

**Differences by Marital Status**

Compared to their married colleagues, single respondents and those living with partners are more likely to be assistant professors (35% of single respondents and 46% of those with partners vs. 20% of married respondents). Singles and those living with partners are also more likely to be female than their married peers (57% of singles and 41% of those with partners are female vs. 22% of married respondents).

Nevertheless, only singles responded to these questions similarly to assistant professors and females. They are more likely than married respondents and those with partners to be motivated to leave Purdue by a desire to live closer to family or friends (57% vs. 25% of those with partners and 44% of those who are married), to have wider social contacts (65% vs. 33% of those with partners and 29% of those who are married), and to achieve a better balance between their work and personal life (65% vs. 45% of those with partners and 50% of married respondents). Both those who are single and those with a partner are also more likely than married respondents to be motivated to move by a desire to live in a more cosmopolitan or urban setting (63% of singles, 57% of those with partners, and 36% of those who are married).

Those with a partner are the most likely to move in response to a desire to join a more prestigious unit or institution (71% vs. 50% of singles and 61% of married respondents). Married respondents are the most likely to be motivated to move in order to
obtain a position of higher rank, responsibility, or visibility (65% vs. 54% of singles and 60% of those with a partner).

Summary of Responses

Overall, faculty tend to be more satisfied than dissatisfied with their job at Purdue. A slight majority would choose to work at Purdue again without some second thoughts if they had it to decide over again and on a six-point scale with a midpoint of 3.5, the average response regarding overall satisfaction was 4.3.

Faculty are initially drawn to Purdue primarily because of the:
1) unit’s, school’s, or institution’s prestige
2) benefits
3) balance between research and teaching responsibilities
4) access to research facilities

These factors also rank the highest in terms of current satisfaction. Conversely, faculty are least likely to report that they initially came to Purdue because of its geographic location or the opportunities that were available for their spouse or partner. These factors also received relatively low marks in terms of current satisfaction.

The four most commonly cited reasons for which faculty would be motivated to leave Purdue include the desire to:
1) earn a higher salary
2) join a unit where they would be more appreciated
3) live in a different part of the country
4) enhance their spouse or partner’s career opportunities

Assistant professors, females, underrepresented minorities, and singles are the most likely to be motivated to move for personal reasons. These reasons include the desire to live closer to family or friends, to have wider social contacts, and to achieve a better balance between one’s work and personal life.

By school, faculty in Consumer and Family Sciences, Health Sciences, and Technology reported the most positive responses to many of these questions, while faculty from Education and Science were often the most dissatisfied with their circumstances at Purdue.

Associate professors tend to be less satisfied overall than their colleagues in other ranks, especially compared to full professors who report the highest levels of satisfaction. On several questions, females reported less satisfaction than males, while Caucasians tend to be more satisfied than either underrepresented minorities or Asian Americans.
III. Faculty Recruitment and Retention

This next section examines issues of faculty recruitment and retention through a series of open and closed-ended survey questions.

Closed-Ended Questions Regarding Recruitment and Retention (Q 26)

According to two thirds of respondents, faculty recruitment is a problem for their unit. This perspective is especially common in Science (83% perceive recruitment as a problem), Education (79%), Veterinary Medicine (76%), Engineering (75%), the Libraries (75%), and Management (75%) and the least prevalent in Agriculture (50%) and Consumer and Family Sciences (55%).

Faculty retention is perceived to be a problem by 59% of faculty. Three of the schools where faculty most often agreed recruitment is a problem for their unit were also the most likely to report that retention is a problem: Education (74% perceive retention as a problem), Science (70%), and Management (68%). Seventy two percent of Liberal Arts faculty were also likely to perceive this as a problem.

As with the recruitment question, Agriculture (43%) and Consumer and Family Sciences (36%) faculty were less likely than average to perceive that retention is an issue for their unit. Additionally, fewer than average Technology (40%) and Health Sciences faculty (45%) perceived this as a problem.

The following summary of responses to open-ended questions about faculty recruitment and retention offers more insight into this issue.

Open-Ended Questions Regarding Recruitment and Retention (Q 10)

Four out of five faculty responded to each of four open-ended questions regarding recruitment and retention. Unit and/or university prestige was by far the most often cited positive influence on recruitment, whereas location and low salary offers were the most frequently cited negative factors. As for impacts on retention, the most commonly mentioned positive factors were collegial environment and salary and benefits, while the most commonly mentioned negative factor was again salary.

Comparing the factors that faculty believe positively impact recruitment and retention in their unit, the top four factors – prestige of the unit and/or the university, salary and benefits, collegial environment, and quality of faculty members – were the same for both. However, prestige of the unit and/or the university and quality of faculty members were most commonly cited as positively influencing recruitment while collegial environment and salary and benefits were seen as most important for retention. As for factors negatively influencing recruitment and retention, faculty believed that location, low salaries, excessive workloads, and ineffective leadership are the most significant in both cases.
Responses to each of the four questions regarding positive and negative impacts on both recruitment and retention are described more fully below.

Q10a. What are the most significant positive factors that impact faculty recruitment in your unit?

There were several significant factors that respondents believed had a positive impact on faculty recruitment in their units. Each of these factors is described below and respondents’ quotes are included to provide the reader with a better understanding of the issue. All items are listed in order from most to least frequently cited.

The most commonly mentioned factors were:

- **Prestige of the unit and/or the university**
  
  “*National/international recognition of programs and the university.*”

  “*Top ranking in US World Report. Industry ranks Purdue Engineering tops.*”

- **Quality of faculty members**
  
  “*National and international reputation of other faculty in the department.*”

  “*Presence of a number of faculty with world-class research programs.*”

- **Salary and benefits**
  
  “*Competitive salary.*”

  “*Excellent retirement.*”

- **Collegial environment**
  
  “…We have had a tradition of collegiality in our department that has helped with recruitment, but that is not as strong as it used to be.”

  “*Good collegial relationships among faculty.*”

- **Availability and quality of resources and facilities**
  
  “*My department is active and large, with numerous facilities of high quality....*”

  “*Ready access to University-wide core facilities, e.g., campus wide mass spectrometry center, sequencing facilities, libraries, etc.*”
• Supportive research environment

“Purdue is a prestigious university with plenty of research resources…”
“Research climate good in most subdisciplines.”

• Balance between research and teaching responsibilities

“Nice balance between teaching load and research responsibilities…”
“Low teaching load compared to other institutions.”

• Opportunity for collaboration within unit and across schools

“Opportunities for intellectual exchange among colleagues.”

“There are many outstanding colleagues across the university—great scholars—with whom to interact and collaborate.”

• The start-up package

“Fairly good start-up package.”

“Good startup monies from department or school.”

• Positive and supportive administrative environment

“Strong leadership and a Department Head who has real practical experience and hasn’t forgotten what got him here.”

• Quality of undergraduate and graduate students

“Ability to recruit excellent students.”

“Quality of graduate students - past and present.”

• Pleasant community and a good place to raise family

“The community is good, and the Greater Lafayette area is a good place to raise a family, and there are strong schools in the community.”

“Community/quality of life factors schools, green space, short commute, low crime rate.”

• Low/reasonable cost of living

“Reasonable housing prices.”

“Cost of living is reasonable in the Lafayette area.”
Differences by School

In every school but one, by far the most commonly cited positive influence on faculty recruitment was the prestige of the unit and/or the university. The exception was Veterinary Medicine, where faculty believed that both the quality of faculty members and salary and benefits were the most important positive factors.

Another observation concerns the positive influence of the balance between research and teaching responsibilities in one’s units. This perspective was primarily shared by faculty in Liberal Arts and Education, while faculty in the remaining schools scarcely addressed this.

Q10b. What are the most significant negative factors that impact faculty recruitment in your unit?

Faculty believed the factors listed below (in order from most to least frequently cited) had a negative impact on recruitment in their units. The two most frequently mentioned issues, by far, were location and low salary offers. Clearly, respondents cited many of these items as positive influences on recruitment as well.

- Location

  “Lafayette is aesthetically dismal. This is a hurdle.”

- Low salary offers

  “A salary scale in the humanities which is not competitive within the big ten and other major research public institutions, let alone in comparison with the salaries that are being offered by private institutions.”

  “Salary—we are usually 9th in Big-10.”

  “The money available for salaries just doesn’t come close to attracting the high level of technical expertise that we need to meet the demands of our field. Other universities have higher pay levels for even entry level professorial positions, and more perks up front such as moving cost allowances, equipment availability, office space, and similar factors that make recruiting difficult.”

- Inadequate facilities and equipment

  “Lack of SPACE and facilities, laboratory, undersized offices, seminar/meeting rooms, storage, etc. Deterioration of facilities, poor university maintenance of building interiors and failure to provide necessary and timely upgrading of interior facilities such as bathrooms, hallways, ceilings, etc., without continuous prodding from school administration.”

  “Library resources are dishearteningly sparse or spotty, which means that candidates considering an offer from Purdue in our department have to consider
not only the new courses they will teach and their own research agenda but the prospect of having to spend an inordinate amount of time and energy trying to shore up library materials in their broad area of interest.”

• Excessive work load

“High work load and activity level expectations.”

“Extensive workloads, 4 classes each semester, plus overload teaching just to make a decent salary.”

• Ineffective leadership

“Lack of interest/understanding from Dean and EVPAA on the need for supporting recruiting opportunities, the long term nature of recruiting programs, and the lasting damage caused by aborting the recruiting process.”

“The biggest negative factor in recruitment in our area is the failure of our Dean to take our department head search seriously.”

“Our Dean, who like a feudal lord makes all the decisions, has a distinct talent in finding the least qualified individuals from a list of applicants for a faculty position. [This person] then hires these individuals who struggle with their academic record and who end up getting tenure with 5-6 refereed publications. To do away with faculty input and avoid conflict, our ex-Department Head instituted a single departmental search committee that handled all searches. The committee had never met, the Head of the search committee recently admitted this in our last faculty meeting—after the Head left for a new position. Apparently the Head and the Dean made the decisions and announced them to the faculty. Did the faculty ever complain? Oh yes, but those who were most vocal were forced out.”

• Limited opportunities for spouse

“Minimal opportunities for spouses and little support from Purdue to find opportunities for them during recruitment.”

• Lack of financial support for school and unit from central administration

“Extreme under funding of SLA, which the new president seems to intend to make even more extreme. Very low value and support given to SLA and my department in particular in the context of the university as a whole.”

“Limited financial support of upper administration for the growth required to keep our program competitive. In order for us to be eligible for major grant monies, we need a stand alone graduate program…Without this program, we will not be competitive in attracting experienced or highly qualified faculty members and we risk losing faculty to other institutions who have established graduate education.”
• Lack of ethnic/gender diversity

“My impression is that Purdue and Lafayette do not have good reputations in the African American scholarly community and I have had great difficulty persuading black colleagues to recommend us to their students.”

“Discriminate against minority, women, and any non-white candidates. Use English accent communication skill as an excuse for eliminating highly qualified candidates.”

“The lack of minority faculty/students is extremely problematic in my unit. In addition, there has not been a ‘true’ commitment or desire from leadership to recruit and/or obtain minority faculty as is evidenced by the high turnover rate.”

• Lack of cultural/recreational activities

“The community is one that has problems supporting the arts—movie theaters have had a hard time attracting enough of an audience to art films and even Purdue’s Cinema Now series had to be cancelled for lack of social interest.”

“Lack of green space, outdoor recreation, support for families and family recreation. Hard to attract and retain faculty who have opportunities to move to more exciting places with outdoor recreation.”

• Lack of able/quality faculty members

“Lack of a full complement of specialists/colleagues with which to work.”

“Deadwood faculty.”

“Too often the process of hiring tends to be driven by coalitions of faculty with special agendas rather than the goal of attracting the finest quality scholars. This has led to the hiring of a number of very low quality people in fringe research areas.”

• Lack of unit/university prestige

“Lack of prestige of department on campus and in the Big Ten.”

“Unit’s mediocre reputation.”

“Our ranking has fallen to number 13 in the US News and World Report.”

• Low start-up packages

“Inadequate start-up costs.”

“The slow loss of National Ranking due to lack of University resources for startup.”
• Negative internal politics

“My department is full of strife and vengeance. I cannot trust my department head—everything must be in writing.”

“The reputation that my school has for being divisive and political, while well deserved, makes it hard to attract the best candidates.”

Differences by School
While most faculty in Agriculture, Consumer and Family Sciences, Engineering, and Science believed that location was the most significant negative factor impacting recruitment, most faculty in Education, Liberal Arts, Libraries, Management, Technology, and Veterinary Medicine believed that low salary offers were the most significant negative factor. In addition to location and low salary offers, many faculty in Health Sciences commented that an excessive work load was another factor that negatively impacted recruitment. Low start-up packages were also mentioned quite often in Agriculture, Engineering, Liberal Arts, and Science as a factor that negatively influenced recruitment.

Q10c. What are the most significant positive factors that impact faculty retention in your unit?

Several factors were mentioned as having a positive impact on faculty retention. Each of these factors is described in more detail below and respondents’ quotes are included in some cases to provide the reader with a better understanding of the topic. All of the items are listed in the order from most to least frequently mentioned.

• Collegial environment

“...It is important too that people feel that they can be themselves and find acceptance and respect in the sum total of their lives and convictions (social, religious, political). It is a matter of feeling that Purdue is ‘home’ that they share with others. The more rooted and secure a person is, the more accepting of others they can be, and the better the ability to bloom.”

“Collegial, almost friendly, attitude and relations between faculty members in my unit—very different than most peer institutions.”

• Salary and benefits (especially good retirement packages)

“Good benefits package, especially the TIAA_CRFF contribution.”

“Rewards of all types—most importantly substantial pay increases to keep pace with market demand.”
• Quality of faculty members

“Outstanding faculty colleagues, excellent reputation, department is currently hiring several new faculty that will enhance reputation…”

“The intellectual environment is the single most important factor in faculty retention. Many people have told me that they have had specific opportunities, but have chosen to stay because of the working relationships that they have with highly respected colleagues.”

• Prestige of the unit/university

“Ongoing reputation of department and university.”

“Recognition by school and university entities of successful personnel and their achievements.”

• Supportive environment for research and teaching

“Very good place to do research.”

“Good balance of teaching/research support.”

• Good community and a good place to raise family

“An important reason to come to Purdue was family quality of life, i.e., the school system was good and the gang situation was minimal. Purdue should work to enhance this experience for families through sports, outdoor recreation, concerts, and outdoor theater. These activities should be affordable to families that are paid what our faculty are paid.”

• Quality of undergraduate/graduate students

“Student enthusiasm and interest in the subject matter.”

“Our students are truly great citizens!”

“Satisfaction of working with good students, graduate and undergraduate.”

• Leadership/department head

“Continued support from department head and upper administration is a strong determinant of retention.”

• Positive administrative environment

“There are many opportunities available at Purdue. I believe that the administration does a great job of handling the routine work of conducting the
business of the university, which keeps people on both sides from developing an antagonism that I have seen seriously damage morale elsewhere.”

- Availability and quality of resources and facilities

“Reasonably up-to-date research facilities and a relatively large group of young investigators with which to interact.”

“Great lab facilities to work in…”

- Balance between research and teaching responsibilities

“There is a good balance between research and teaching that those of us who care about both equally find hard to match at other institutions.”

- Opportunity for collaboration

“Most faculty find collaborators within department that lead to successful research/publishing.”

“The ability to form interdisciplinary teams for research, teaching or extension activities. Interdepartmental barriers are small.”

- Opportunity for professional growth

“Appreciation for professional development.”

“Forward-moving organization with opportunities for rapid development of young faculty.”

- Academic freedom/freedom to choose research direction

“Freedom to engage in whatever scholarly endeavors are of interest.”

“Relative autonomy of faculty in areas of research and teaching emphasis.”

- Fair tenure/promotion procedures

“Tenure process is straight-forward and fair.”

“Commitment to tenure, commitment to keeping lines and promotions.”

- Research funding

“Department endowment gives access to research funds.”

“Ability to obtain research funding.”
• Reasonable cost of living

“Low/reasonable cost of living.”

Differences by Schools

Analyzing responses by school, faculty in Agriculture, Education, Liberal Arts, and Veterinary Medicine most often indicated that the collegial environment was the most positive significant factor in retaining faculty members in their units, while faculty in Consumer and Family Sciences and Management most often mentioned both the collegial environment and the prestige of their unit or the university. Faculty in Health Sciences and Libraries chose salary and benefits as the most significant retention factor, while quality of faculty members was mentioned most often by faculty in Engineering and Science.

Q10d. What are the most significant negative factors that impact faculty retention in your unit?

Respondents reported that the factors below (listed in order from most to least frequently cited) had the most negative impact on faculty retention in their units.

• Low salary

“Meager salary increases after the beginning salary. One gets poorer with time.”

“There has been a good deal of salary compression in the past decade, with younger people getting higher percent salary increases than more established faculty. This causes faculty to become interested in moving and once they do that the battle to keep them is often lost.”

“Our salary levels are very inadequate compared to our counterparts in competing institutions.”

• Excessive work load, especially for junior faculty

“New faculty are often ‘given opportunities’ that over load them because there is someone new in the department and senior faculty can shed some of their responsibilities. Leads to early burn out.”

“High pressure environment. We are putting way too much pressure on new Assistant Professors.”

“Unrealistic expectations for junior faculty tenure in light of work loads.”

• Location

“Unattractive location.”
“Location of community in rural isolation makes it a severe deficiency in cultural or outdoor activities.”

- Ineffective leadership

“Lip service from departmental and upper level administration. They say they know there is a problem, they will look into it, and nothing constructive is done.”

“Lack of understanding of our program on part of Department Head and Dean. This impacts on many areas, including promotion/tenure, salaries, funding, etc.”

“Conservative, dictatorial, and pompous attitude of upper administration. The upper administrators need to realize that without the faculty they are not necessary. The upper administration should facilitate and not suppress faculty creativity.”

- Lack of research support

“Poor use of faculty as resource, e.g., resource of time allocated to quasi administrative and/or trivial work rather than productive research or scholarship.”

“Lack of research assistantships for graduate students. At some lesser universities, each faculty member is assigned at least one research assistant.”

- Lack of financial support for unit from central administration

“Lack of matching funding opportunities from within Purdue for industry grants.”

“Support for travel in our department is terrible. I feel like we get nicked and dimed to death because our department gets so little in the way of S&E funds. Really, unless you have grants you can’t cover your expenses for even one trip on departmental funds. Somehow our head has found a way to cover our phone costs, but we still have to pay for some of our own copying.”

“Lack of funding for TAs, travel, and teaching: $1.50 per student for copying!!”

- Limited opportunities for spouse

“Lack of awareness and concern about ‘two-body’ problems: Purdue must consider lack of employment opportunities for qualified spouses a serious issue, and must have policies in place to address it. There is not a supportive atmosphere for working couples.”
• Inadequate facilities and equipment

“Quality of research laboratory space: after one has been here several years, one begins to realize that some research is seriously hampered by sub par electric power and air handling.”

“Lack of internal support to keep standard major equipment updated.”

“Maintenance of buildings, e.g., broken glass panes and central air conditioning that does not work. 90F in lab on hot days.”

“Lack of state support for updating essential laboratories...Without doubling of state support we will soon be out of 2nd class of schools and down into the third. Michigan, Georgia Tech, Washington, are all passing us by because they can spend twice as much per student as we can. You cannot be outspent by your competitors 2:1 year in and year out and stay competitive.”

• Lack of appreciation and respect

“Hard work is often not sincerely acknowledged or rewarded.”

“There has been little reward for the historical type of Purdue success. There is not an emphasis on real scholarship and being the best engineer, but instead on the paper record and ‘visibility,’ that is, on appearances, or ‘fluff’ and ‘pedigrees.’ This has resulted in a two-tier system: people on the ‘fast track,’ who concentrate on such things and those who work hard with little reward and local recognition for important accomplishments.”

• Negative internal politics

“Old boys club alive and well.”

“Intradepartmental conflict between different disciplines.”

“The environment is mostly political rather than academic. I would tolerate even a 50/50 split between politics and academics but I cannot rationalize an 80/20 split, 80% politics and favoritism and 20% academics.”

• Lack of cultural/recreational activities

“A very conservative and religious atmosphere. West Lafayette—a cultural vacuum.”

• High pressure environment

“Pressures to do more than time and energy will allow.”

“Promotion/tenure stress.”
Differences by School

Low salary was the most frequently mentioned negative factor influencing retention in Agriculture, Education, Engineering, Libraries, Liberal Arts, Management, Technology, and Veterinary Medicine. While most faculty in Science suggested that location was the most significant negative factor, faculty in Consumer and Family Sciences mentioned excessive work load most often. In Health Sciences, both low salary and excessive work load were considered the most significant negative factors influencing retention in their unit.

The Recruitment and Hiring Process (Q 5)

Another survey question on the topic of recruitment offers insight into the personal experiences of the 238 respondents (30% of the total number of respondents) who joined the faculty within the past five years. (See Table 6.)

More than four-fifths were satisfied with their interactions with their future unit head (82%) and the search committee (88%). Sixty-seven percent felt that the orientation they received to the local community was satisfactory, but only 48% were satisfied with the new faculty orientation program offered once they arrived on campus. The start up package was satisfactory to 56% of respondents, while only 46% of those who needed assistance with spousal relocation found this satisfactory. In fact, 34% said that they were not at all satisfied with this facet of their recruitment process.

Differences by School and Race

Due to the relatively small number of respondents who answered these questions, analysis by school and race is not appropriate.

Differences by Rank

Faculty responses varied consistently by rank. However, only 16 full professors who joined the Purdue faculty within the last five years responded to the survey, so their responses to this set of questions must be considered with caution.

Full professors were the most satisfied with each facet of the recruitment and hiring process. Also, except for satisfaction with interactions with their unit head where assistant and associate professors responded similarly, assistant professors reported the least satisfaction with the entire process. They were notably less satisfied than their more experienced peers with their orientation to the local community (62% vs. 77% for associate and 87% for full professors), the assistance they received with spousal relocation (40% vs. 50% for associate and 70% for full professors), and with their start up package (54% vs. 64% for associate and 88% for full professors).

Differences by Gender

Women were less satisfied than men with their orientation to the local community (58% vs. 71%) and with the orientation for new faculty (41% vs. 52%). They were also less satisfied with the spousal relocation assistance they received (36% vs. 49%).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spousal relocation assistance</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orientation for new faculty</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Start-up package</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orientation to local community provided by search committee and/or realtor</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interactions with unit head</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interactions with search committee</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Opportunities for Spouse/Partner (Qs 53 – 59)

Finally, a series of questions asked respondents who are married or living with a partner to provide more information about their spouse/partner’s employment status and their satisfaction with Purdue’s assistance in helping them to locate appropriate employment for them.

Of the 84% of respondents who are married or living with a partner, 95% live in the same location with them. Just over half (51%) of the spouse/partners are currently employed full-time and only one percent more (52%), according to faculty respondents, prefers to be employed full time. Although 27% are not currently employed, only 21% choose not to work. Most who are not currently employed but would prefer to work would like to find part time employment (22% currently work part-time but 27% prefer to be employed at this level.) Forty percent of working spouses/partners are employed by Purdue, primarily as faculty members (47%), and administrative or professional staff (36%).

Among faculty who are married or living with a partner, 32% have sought help from Purdue in attempting to find appropriate employment for their spouse or partner. On a scale of 1 (low) to 6 (high) with 3.5 as the midpoint, the average level of satisfaction with Purdue’s help was 2.6. In fact, 40% of respondents gave Purdue’s assistance the lowest possible score.

Because the number of respondents who have sought help from Purdue is relatively small (177), analysis of responses to this last question by school and race are not appropriate.

Differences by Rank and Gender

Generally speaking, females are most likely to be assistant professors at Purdue (41% are at this rank), while males are most likely to be professors (53% are at this rank). Because both gender and rank could influence respondents’ perceptions of Purdue’s spousal relocation assistance, most responses are analyzed together to examine the influence of these two variables together.

Female assistant professors are more likely than male assistant professors to have sought assistance from Purdue in finding appropriate employment for their spouse or partner (57% vs. 51%), but virtually equal proportions of males and females in the other ranks have sought help from Purdue (28% of associate professors and 24% of professors).

Although assistant professors report the most satisfaction with Purdue’s assistance (2.8 mean vs. 2.4 mean for associate professors and 2.3 mean for professors), females are less satisfied than males (2.4 vs. 2.7 mean rating on the 6 point scale). Therefore, in this case, differences in males’ and females’ distributions by rank do not explain their different satisfaction levels – females are simply less satisfied than males with Purdue’s assistance. Similarly, females are far more likely than males at each rank to have considered leaving Purdue to improve career opportunities for their spouse/partner. At the assistant professor rank, 67% of females and 51% of males have considered doing so; at
the associate professor rank, 61% of females and 45% of males have considered doing so; and at the full professor rank, 63% of females and 28% of males have considered leaving Purdue to improve career opportunities for their spouse or partner.

**Summary of Responses**

According to two thirds of respondents, faculty recruitment is a problem for their unit. This perspective is especially common in Science, Education, Veterinary Medicine, Engineering, the Libraries, and Management, and the least prevalent in Agriculture and Consumer and Family Sciences. Faculty retention is perceived to be a problem by 59% of faculty. Three of the schools where faculty most often agreed recruitment is a problem for their unit were also the most likely to report that retention is a problem – Science, Education, and Management, in addition to Liberal Arts faculty.

Summarizing responses to the four open-ended questions regarding recruitment and retention, unit and/or university prestige was by far the most often cited positive influence on recruitment, whereas location and low salary offers were the most frequently cited negative factors. As for impacts on retention, the most commonly mentioned positive factors were collegial environment and salary and benefits, while the most commonly mentioned negative factor was again salary.

Among respondents who joined the faculty within the past five years, a clear majority was satisfied with their interactions with their future unit head and the search committee, as well as the orientation they received to the local community. However, less than half were satisfied with the new faculty orientation program and with the spousal relocation assistance they received (if applicable). Women and assistant professors were the least satisfied with several facets of their recruitment process.

The last set of survey questions in this section dealt specifically with the issue of Purdue’s spousal relocation assistance. From both the open and closed-ended questions, it is clear that faculty view this issue as a negative factor with regards to both recruitment and retention. Most of those who have personally sought assistance from Purdue are dissatisfied with the assistance they received and more than a third expressed great dissatisfaction. Females were less satisfied than males and they were also far more likely than males to have considered leaving Purdue to improve career opportunities for their spouse/partner.
IV. Teaching and Research Activities

This next section examines faculty productivity, the adequacy of institutional resources to support their work, how faculty spend their time on a weekly basis, and the extent to which they use technology to accomplish their work.

Research and Creative Productivity (Q 15)

First, several survey questions explored faculty productivity over the past two years. Productivity was defined as the number of articles, chapters, or books one had published or had had accepted for publication, the number of exhibitions or performances one had presented, and the number of grants one had been awarded.

In terms of publications, 92% of faculty had had at least one article published or accepted for publication in an academic or professional journal within the past two years and 34% had published at least five articles during this time period. Fifty-seven percent had published or had accepted for publication at least one chapter in an edited volume and 31% had had at least one book, manual, or monograph published or accepted for publication within the past two years. Three percent of liberal arts faculty had presented one or more exhibitions or performances in the fine or applied arts within the past two years.5 (See Table 7.)

During this same two-year period, 59% of faculty members were awarded a new grant as the primary investigator and 49% were awarded a new grant as a co-investigator.

Differences by School

Schools fall into one of four ranges in terms of article publications. Between 73% and 79% of Agriculture, Education, Engineering, and Science faculty had published or had had accepted for publication three or more articles. The second group consists of faculty from Health Sciences and Veterinary Medicine where 60% and 67% respectively have published three or more articles. Those schools where 50% to 52% of the faculty had published or had had accepted for publication three or more articles include: Consumer and Family Sciences, Liberal Arts, and Management. Finally, 40% of Technology and 36% of Library faculty have published three or more articles in the past two years.

The most likely to have published or had accepted for publication one or more chapters in an edited volume are faculty in Consumer and Family Sciences (83%) and Education (82%). A somewhat lower proportion of the faculty in the following schools has published one or more chapters in the past two years: Liberal Arts (69%), Veterinary

---

5 A small number (4%) of faculty from Agriculture, the Libraries, Science, Veterinary Medicine, and Health Sciences also indicated that they had “presented an exhibition or performance in the fine or applied arts within the last two years.” However, the research team assumes that they read the question to only say “presented an exhibition,” such as a poster presentation, because the responses do not reflect the type of work done in these respondents’ professional fields. Therefore, these numbers are not included in the analysis.
Table 7

Number of Times One Has Published or Been Awarded a Grant Within the Last Two Years

- Had articles published or accepted for publication in academic or professional journals
- Had chapters published or accepted for publication in edited volumes
- Had books, manuals, or monographs published or accepted for publication
- Presented an exhibition or performance in the fine or applied arts
- Been awarded a new grant as the primary investigator
- Been awarded a new grant as a co-investigator

Legend:
- 11 or more times
- 5 to 10 times
- 3 to 4 times
- 1 to 2 times
- Never
Medicine (63%), Science (61%), Agriculture (57%) and the Libraries (57%). Finally, a minority in Engineering (38%), Management (35%), and Technology (21%) has published at least one chapter in an edited volume during the past two years.

Faculty in Consumer and Family Sciences and Education are also the most likely to have published or had accepted for publication at least one book, manual, or monograph within the past two years (46% and 47% respectively have done so). Almost half of those in Technology (48%) have also done so. Between 31% and 36% of Agriculture, Liberal Arts, and Veterinary Medicine faculty have produced this type of publication, while 19% to 25% of the following have done so: Engineering, Health Sciences, Libraries, and Science. Finally 11% of Management faculty have published or had accepted for publication at least one book, manual, or monograph within the past two years.

During the past two years, more than two-thirds of the faculty in Engineering (79%), Agriculture (75%), Science (73%), Consumer and Family Sciences (71%), and Veterinary Medicine (68%) have been awarded one or more new grants where they serve as the primary investigator. Approximately half of the faculty in Health Sciences (56%), Education (47%), and Liberal Arts (46%) have been awarded a new grant as the primary investigator, as well as a third or less of those in Technology (32%), Management (29%), and the Libraries (10%).

Examining by school the proportion of faculty who have been awarded at least one new grant as a co-investigator within the past two years results in similar patterns. Again, more than 60% of faculty from Veterinary Medicine (68%), Agriculture (67%), Consumer and Family Sciences (65%), and Engineering (64%) have received this type of grant. In addition, approximately half of the faculty from Science (53%), Education (50%), and Health Sciences (50%) and a third or less of those in Technology (32%), Management (28%), Liberal Arts (22%), and the Libraries (19%) have also been named co-investigators on at least one new grant in the past two years.

**Differences by Rank**

Compared to associate and assistant professors, a greater proportion of full professors had published or had had accepted for publication: three or more articles (73% vs. 59% of associate and 54% of assistant professors), at least one chapter in an edited volume (63% vs. 56% of associate and 47% of assistant professors), and at least one book, manual, or monograph (42% vs. 28% of associate and 17% of assistant professors). For each of these three categories, associate professors were the second most likely of the three ranks to have authored these publication types.

A similar pattern also exists with regard to who is most likely to have been awarded at least one new grant in the past two years as the primary investigator (63% of full professors vs. 58% of associate and 56% of assistant professors) or as a co-investigator (54% of full professors vs. 41% of associate and 48% of assistant professors). However, in these cases the differences are not as substantial.
**Differences by Gender**

Females are less likely than males to have published three or more articles in the past two years (53% vs. 68%) or to have been awarded a new grant as either a primary (54% vs. 62%) or co-investigator (41% vs. 52%). However, examining these measures of productivity by gender must be done with caution because females are not present in equal proportions across the schools or among the ranks. Fewer than 20% of the respondents from Agriculture, Engineering, and Science and only 24% of faculty from Veterinary Medicine are female – four of the schools with the highest productivity in terms of journal publications and awarded grants. Also, 53% of males are full professors compared to 22% of females. As noted previously, full professors are the most likely to have published and to have been awarded grants.

In terms of other publications, males and females publish at essentially the same rates. Fifty-nine percent of females and 56% of males have published at least one chapter in an edited volume during the past two years and 30% of females and 32% of males have published one or more books, manuals, or monographs during this time period.

**Differences by Race**

Asian-Americans are the most likely to have published three or more articles in the past two years (78% have done so compared to 54% of underrepresented minorities and 63% of Caucasians). They are also the most likely to have been awarded a new grant as either the primary investigator (79% vs. 46% of underrepresented minorities and 59% of Caucasians) or the co-investigator (59% vs. 32% and 49% respectively). Asian-Americans and Caucasians are more likely than underrepresented minorities to have published a chapter in an edited volume (57% for the first two groups compared to 36% for underrepresented minorities). No noteworthy differences by race exist in terms of book/manual/monograph publications.

As with differences between genders, the distribution of faculty by race across the schools and ranks must be taken into account when these comparisons are made. Almost 60% of Asian-American respondents work in the Schools of Engineering and Science, compared to one quarter of underrepresented minorities and Caucasians. This is a significant fact because faculty in these two schools have a higher than average number of article publications and grant awards. Also, fewer underrepresented minorities are full professors (17%) compared to Asian Americans (47%) and Caucasians (46%) and a greater proportion are assistant professors (50% vs. 38% for Asian Americans and 24% for Caucasians). Again, full professors are the most likely to have published and been awarded grants and assistant professors are, in most cases, the least likely to have done so.

**The Adequacy of Institutional Resources and Institutional Support (Q 2)**

(Including Differences by School)

Do faculty have what they need to meet their scholarship and teaching responsibilities? In terms of departmental support from their unit head, the business
office, and the clerical staff, more than three quarters feel adequately supported (see Tables 8 and 9). Comparing responses by school, Education (67%), Management (66%), and Veterinary Medicine (65%) faculty feel somewhat less support than average from their unit head. Respondents from Management are more satisfied than average with their clerical/secretarial assistance (96%), while Libraries faculty are at the other end of the continuum with only 55% satisfied with their clerical support.

Faculty members are somewhat less likely to believe they are adequately supported in their research – 65% believe they receive adequate assistance in grant writing and budgeting (that percentage drops to 55% in Technology and 50% in Veterinary Medicine), and 62% believe assistance in obtaining patents, copyrights, and trademarks is adequate (only 52% in Engineering and 50% in Veterinary Medicine). Half (51%) feel study design and data analysis assistance is adequate, but far fewer are satisfied in Science (38%), Management (33%), and Engineering (27%).

Overall, 57% perceive laboratory space to be adequate, but that percentage is substantially less in Engineering (38%) and Education (44%). Space for housing research animals is deemed to be adequate by 48% of all respondents, but by only 18% of those from Veterinary Medicine.

Satisfaction with equipment and supplies is generally high (70%), but perceptions vary considerably by school. Only 47% of Education faculty believe they have adequate equipment and supplies, compared to 83% of Consumer and Family Sciences faculty and 93% of Management faculty. Somewhat fewer believe that their equipment is adequately maintained and upgraded (64%), particularly in Agriculture (54%) and Veterinary Medicine (50%).

Sixty-five percent of all respondents have found library resources to be adequate for their needs, but examining responses by school, that percentage stands at only 35% in Liberal Arts and 39% in Education, which is the laboratory for many in these schools.

Only a minority believes internal funding for new teaching ideas (45%), new research ideas (41%), travel (38%), and bridge support between external grants (33%) is adequate. Faculty in Education, the Libraries, and the Health Sciences are particularly dissatisfied with the availability of internal funds for these purposes.

Differences by Rank

Assistant professors are generally more satisfied with the support and resources provided by Purdue than their colleagues who have been in the field longer. They are more satisfied than associate and full professors with support from their unit head, maintenance and upgrade of equipment, assistance in obtaining patents, copyrights, and trademarks, and with internal funding for both new research ideas and bridge support between external grants. Associate professors, on the other hand, are particularly dissatisfied with equipment and supplies, unit travel funds, and library resources.
Table 8
Perceived Adequacy of Institutional Support

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assistance in study design and data analysis</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistance in obtaining patents, copyrights, and trademarks</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance &amp; upgrade of equipment</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistance in grant writing &amp; budgeting</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching assistants or graders</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PUCC services</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support from unit head</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone services/voice mail</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerical/secretarial assistance</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support from unit business office</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 9
Perceived Adequacy of Institutional Resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Internal funding for bridge support</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit travel funds</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal funding for new research ideas</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal funding for new teaching ideas</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Space for housing research animals</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laboratory space</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library resources</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office space</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment &amp; supplies</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to information on funding opportunities</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Perceptions regarding internal research support are especially noteworthy. For example, while 50% of assistant professors believe this support is satisfactory, only 42% of associate professors and 34% of professors are satisfied with current levels of this support. Satisfaction with bridge support also varies substantially by rank – 44% of assistant professors are satisfied with it while only 31% and 32% of associate and full professors respectively believe current levels are adequate.

**Differences by Gender**

Females responded differently than males on a number of these issues. However, most differences appear to simply reflect perceptual differences across the schools and the varying distribution of women in the schools (e.g., women are less satisfied than men with library resources, but this largely reflects the fact the Education and Liberal Arts schools, where faculty are the least satisfied with library resources, are also schools with relatively high proportions of women faculty).

Taking into account these differences in gender representation across the schools, females are still less likely to believe that they have adequate laboratory space (48%) than are males (60%). In particular, women in Agriculture, Health Sciences, and Science are substantially less likely than their male counterparts to feel that they have adequate lab space.

**Differences by Race**

Asian American respondents are less satisfied than their peers with a number of Purdue’s resources and institutional supports. In particular, they are less satisfied with support from their unit’s business office, maintenance and upgrade of equipment, office space, lab space, information on funding opportunities, assistance in grant writing and budgeting, and assistance in study design and data analysis.

Underrepresented minorities are more satisfied than Asian Americans and Caucasians with support from their unit head, unit travel funds, and bridge support, but are less satisfied than average with the adequacy of TAs or graders and internal funding for new teaching ideas.

**Work Load (Q 16)**

Having explored research productivity and the perceived adequacy of institutional resources to support faculty’s work, the focus now turns to an examination of how many hours per week faculty typically work and how they spend this time.

Two thirds of faculty work between 41 and 60 hours each week, and almost another quarter work 61 or more hours per week. (See Chart 10). During these hours, 36% work on campus between 81 and 100% of the time and another 41% spend between 61 and 80% of their work time on campus. Fully 92% work at least part of the time from home, but for 59% this translates into only 1 to 20% of their total work time. Additionally, 41% spend between 1 and 20% of their time working away from both home and campus, while 55% report never working in a third location.
**Differences by School**

Schools most likely to have faculty who work 50 or fewer hours each week include Liberal Arts (48%), Technology (61%), and the Libraries (73%). Those schools most likely to have faculty who work 61 or more hours per week include Agriculture (27%), Science (27%), Management (29%), and Engineering (39%).

The location where faculty work also varies by school and appears to fit with the cultural norms in departments and schools. Those most likely to work at least 81% of the time on campus include faculty from the Libraries (48%), Management (52%), and Veterinary Medicine (62%). Liberal Arts faculty are the most likely to spend at least 21% of their time working from home (51% do so), followed by Education (46%) and Technology (42%) faculty. Health Sciences faculty are the most likely to work off campus, away from home (17% spend at least 21% of their time in another location).

**Differences by Rank**

Associate professors are the most likely to work 50 or fewer hours per week, but the differences are minimal (39% of associate professors work 50 or fewer hours, compared to 33% of assistant professors and 37% of professors). Assistant professors are the most likely to work on campus (43% spend at least 81% of their time working there compared to 36% of associate and 30% of full professors). The percentages of faculty who spend at least 21% of their time working at home or at another off-campus location are virtually the same across the three ranks.

**Differences by Gender**

Males and females work a very similar number of hours per week. Thirty-six percent of males and 38% of females work 50 or fewer hours per week. Men are slightly more likely than women to spend 81% or more of their time working on campus (36% vs. 33%). Women, on the other hand, are more likely to spend at least 21% of their time working from home (41% vs. 31%) and working away from campus at another location (7% vs. 3%).

**Differences by Race**

Caucasians are the most likely to work 50 or fewer hours per week (38% vs. 32% of underrepresented minorities and 16% of Asian Americans) and they are also the least likely to work 61 or more hours per week (22% vs. 32% of the other two groups). Underrepresented minorities are the least likely to work on campus 81% or more of the time (25% vs. 36% of the other two groups), while Caucasians are the only ones who reported working off campus, away from home at least 21% of the time (4% do so).

**Time Allocation (Q 17)**

During a typical week, faculty spend more time teaching, including preparation time, than doing any other activity. They spend the second highest amount of time conducting research, while they are least likely to be involved in clinical work, fundraising, and consulting or freelance work. (See Chart 11.)
Differences by School

Across the schools, there are substantial differences in terms of how much time is spent on teaching activities. On average, faculty spend less than one-quarter of their time teaching in Agriculture (they spend an average of 24%), Consumer and Family Sciences (21%), and the Libraries (16%), while faculty in Technology spend an average of 51% of their time teaching.

Faculty generally spend about 12% of their time advising students. This amount of time is higher than average in Engineering and lower than average in Health Sciences, Management, and Technology.

An average of 18% of faculty across the schools do not spend any time on scholarship for professional growth. This is most common in Management (39% spend no time on this activity) and least common in the Libraries (5%), Education (9%) and Technology (11%).

Technology and Libraries faculty spend the least amount of time conducting research, (8% and 14% of their time on average), while those who spend the highest proportion of their time are found in Agriculture (they spend an average of 26% of their time on research), Management (33%), and Science (27%).

In four schools, at least 5% of the faculty spend time doing clinical work. Nine percent of Liberal Arts faculty, 18% of Education faculty, 33% of Health Sciences faculty, and 59% of Veterinary Medicine faculty report being involved in this type of work.

Overall, three quarters of the faculty spend between 1 and 20% of their time on internal service to Purdue. Management has the largest number of faculty who do not spend any time serving internally (18% compared to an average of 7% across the schools), but the average amount of time that Management faculty as a whole spend serving internally matches the university average (15%). Library faculty, by far, spend the most time on internal service - an average of 39% of their time, while Education is a distant second at an average of 17% of this faculty’s time. In addition, 64% of faculty spend between 1 and 20% of their time on service external to Purdue. Agriculture and CFS faculty average the most time on this activity (13% and 17% of their time respectively).

At least 85% of respondents from Consumer and Family Sciences, Education, Health Sciences, Liberal Arts, Libraries, Management, and Technology spend no time on fundraising, while 30% or more of those from Agriculture, Engineering, and Science spend at least some time engaged in this activity.

Between 25 and 30% of faculty in most schools are involved with consulting or freelance work from 1 to 20% of their time. This proportion is notably higher in Health Sciences (39%), Veterinary Medicine (48%), and Technology (50%).
Differences by Rank

Examining responses by rank, assistant and associate professors both spend an average of 33% of their time on teaching related activities, while full professors spend an average of 27% of their time teaching. Assistant professors spend an average of 24% of their time on research activities, compared to 19% of the associate professors’ time and 22% of full professors’ time. In terms of internal service, full professors spend the highest proportion of their time on this activity (18%), followed by associate professors (15%) and then assistant professors (9%). Time allocated to external service is far more similar across the ranks – an average of 7% of professors’ and associate professors’ time and 5% of assistant professors’ time is spent on this activity. The three ranks also spend similar amounts of time on scholarship, student advising, clinical work, fundraising, and consulting.

Differences by Gender

Males spend slightly less time teaching than females (an average of 30% of their time compared to an average of 32% of females’ time) and slightly more time researching (23% of males’ time compared to 20% of females’ time). Time spent on scholarship and advising are virtually the same for males and females.

Males are more likely than females to be involved with fundraising (24% of males are involved compared to 12% of females) and consulting (35% of males and 22% of females consult). These differences are partly due to the fact that consulting and fundraising activities are generally concentrated in schools that have a low proportion of females.

Time spent on internal service also varies by gender. Controlling for rank, women are more likely to spend time serving internally than men. Specifically, 12% of male assistant professors spend no time on this activity compared to 5% of female assistant professors, 14% of male associate professors spend at least one fifth of their time compared to 24% of female associate professors, and 21% of male professors spend at least one fifth of their time serving internally compared to 36% of female professors. Controlling for rank, external service patterns are very similar between males and females.

Differences by Race

Only slight differences exist in terms of time spent teaching and advising when responses are examined by race. Underrepresented minorities are, however, more likely than Asian Americans and Caucasians to spend time on scholarship (95% spend at least some time on it compared to 75% of Asian Americans and 82% of Caucasians), and less likely to spend time on external service (41% spend no time on it compared to 28% of Asian Americans and 30% of Caucasians) and fund raising (86% spend no time on it compared to 78% of Asian Americans and 79% of Caucasians). Caucasians are the most likely to consult (33% do so vs. 18% of underrepresented minorities and 13% of Asian Americans).
Asian Americans spend an average of 27% of their time on research activities, compared to an average of 22% for both underrepresented minorities and Caucasians. Underrepresented minorities, for their part, are somewhat more involved in internal service than are their peers (they spend an average of 16% of their time on this activity compared to Asian Americans who spend an average of 12% and Caucasians who spend an average of 15% of their time on internal service). This is in spite of the fact that again half of the underrepresented minority faculty are assistant professors, the group that typically spends much less time than their tenured colleagues on internal service.

**Teaching Responsibilities (Q11)**

The 633 respondents who indicated that they taught at least one course during the Spring 2001 term offered a total of 1,298 courses during that time period. A majority of the courses (58%) were at the undergraduate level (400 or below), 69% were three credit courses, and 60% had 30 or fewer students. (See Tables 12-14). Almost one half of the respondents (47%) did not have any teaching assistants or graders during this semester, while 39% had one or two.

By school, Veterinary Medicine and Technology had the highest average number of courses taught per respondent (2.65 and 2.41 respectively), while Science (1.52) and Engineering (1.54) had the lowest averages. (See Table 15).

**Advising Doctoral Students (Q 14)**

Looking more closely at the faculty’s advising role, 40% of respondents do not currently advise any doctoral students, 43% advise one to three students, 13% advise four to seven students, and 5% advise between 8 and 52 doctoral students. (See Table 16.)

**Differences by School**

At least 60% of faculty in the following schools advise no more than one doctoral student: Agriculture, Consumer and Family Sciences, Health Sciences, Libraries, Management, Technology, and Veterinary Medicine. At the other end of the spectrum, 40% of Education faculty, 33% of Engineering faculty, 24% of Science faculty, and 18% of Liberal Arts faculty advise at least 4 doctoral students. In fact, in Education 23% advise at least eight doctoral students.
Table 13: Spring 2001 Course Offerings by Number of Course Credits

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Credits</th>
<th>Number of Courses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 14
Spring 2001 Course Offerings by Class Size

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Students Per Course by Range</th>
<th>Number of Courses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>151 to 1500</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101 to 150</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81 to 100</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61 to 80</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 to 60</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 to 40</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 to 30</td>
<td>183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 to 20</td>
<td>272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 to 10</td>
<td>303</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number of Courses
Table 15
Average Number of Courses Taught Per Faculty Respondent by School

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Average Courses Taught</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Veterinary Medicine</td>
<td>2.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology</td>
<td>2.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management</td>
<td>2.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Libraries</td>
<td>2.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Sciences</td>
<td>2.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal Arts</td>
<td>1.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consumer &amp; Family Sciences</td>
<td>1.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>1.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>1.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>1.52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average Number of Courses Taught Per Faculty Member
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Table 16
Total Number of Ph.D. Students for Whom One Serves as Major Advisor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Ph.D. Students</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11 or more</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 to 10</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 to 7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Differences by Rank

Assistant professors are less likely to advise doctoral students than are their more senior colleagues (52% do not advise doctoral students compared to 44% of associate professors and 29% of professors who do not do so).

Differences by Gender

Females are less likely than males to advise doctoral students (48% of females advise no doctoral students compared to 37% of males). The fact that two large schools with higher than average advising responsibilities (Engineering and Science) are at least 85% male and that female faculty are concentrated in the lower ranks where individuals are less likely to advise doctoral students probably accounts for most of this difference.

Differences by Race

Seventy-nine percent of Asian Americans advise doctoral students compared to 58% of Caucasians. This difference is largely explained by the fact that 59% of Asian Americans work in the Schools of Engineering and Science, compared to 26% of Caucasians. Again, these two large schools are among the most likely to advise relatively high numbers of doctoral students.

Underrepresented minorities are also more likely than Caucasians to advise doctoral students (70% vs. 58% advise at least one student). This is true even though they are far more likely than Caucasians to be assistant professors (50% vs. 24%), again a rank that generally does not advise as many doctoral students. Unlike Asian Americans, underrepresented minorities are distributed fairly evenly across the schools, so this does not help to explain the difference either.

Advising Master’s Students (Q 14)

Patterns of advising master’s students are similar to those for doctoral students. Overall, 45% of faculty do not advise any master’s students, 42% advise one to three students, 10% advise four to seven students, and 3% advise between 8 and 37 students. (See Table 17.)

Differences by School

At least 60% of faculty in the following schools currently advise no more than one master’s students: Agriculture, Consumer and Family Sciences, Health Sciences, Libraries, Management, Technology, Science, and Veterinary Medicine. Similar to doctoral student advising patterns, faculty in Education, Engineering, and Liberal Arts advise more master’s students on average than their colleagues in the other schools. Specifically, 49% of Engineering faculty and 41% of Liberal Arts faculty advise between 2 and 10 master’s students. Education is again the outlier where 88% advise at least two master’s students and fully 53% advise at least 6 master’s students.

Differences by Rank and Gender

Master’s student advising patterns do not differ significantly by rank or gender.
Table 17

Total Number of Master’s Students for Whom One Serves as Major Advisor

Number of Master’s Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11 or more</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 to 10</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 to 7</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percentage
Differences by Race
A higher proportion of Asian Americans advise at least one master’s student compared to under-represented minorities or Caucasians (68% vs. 35% and 55% respectively).

Distance Education (Q 13)
Ten percent of respondents plan to offer courses through distance learning during the 2001-2002 academic year. Most of these courses will be taught through the Schools of Agriculture (27% of the total), Engineering (19% of the total), and Education (11% of the total).

E-mail and Internet Use (Q 18)
One half of 1% report spending no time communicating via email each week, while almost half (47%) spend between 1 and 5 hours each week doing so. On a weekly basis, 7% do not spend any time and 63% spend between 1 and 5 hours on the Internet for teaching or research purposes. Sixty-nine percent spend at least some of these hours working on-line from an off-campus location and 63% believe that Purdue provides adequate off-campus Internet and email access.

Differences by School
Email usage is similar across the schools, although fewer faculty in Health Sciences (6%) and Technology (9%) than average (15%) spend 11 or more hours per week communicating via this method. Faculty in Consumer and Family Sciences and the Libraries are the most likely to use the Internet for teaching and research purposes 11 or more hours per week (22% and 27% respectively do so, compared to an average of 13%). Faculty in Management and Veterinary Medicine are the least likely to use the Internet to this extent (4% and 5% respectively do so).

Those most likely to spend at least six hours each week working off campus on the Internet are faculty from the schools of Technology (24% do so), Science (27% do so), and Education (32% do so), compared to an average of 20% across the schools. Management and CFS faculty are the most satisfied with the off-campus Internet access that Purdue provides (74% from each school are satisfied), while faculty from Engineering are the least happy with it (only 53% report satisfaction).

Differences by Rank
Professors spend more time than their junior colleagues communicating via email each week (57% spend at least 6 hours compared to 48% of the other ranks), while assistant professors are the most likely to spend at least 6 hours on the Internet each week (40% do so compared to 28% of associate and 25% of full professors). Similar percentages across the ranks work on-line from an off-campus location each week and believe that Purdue provides adequate off-campus Internet and email access.
**Differences by Gender**

Females are somewhat more likely than males to spend at least 6 hours per week communicating via email (56% do so vs. 51% of males). They spend equivalent amounts of time on the Internet, but females are more likely do so from an off-campus location (26% spend at least 6 hours doing so compared to 18% of males). They shared the same perceptions about the adequacy of Purdue’s off-campus Internet and email access.

**Differences by Race**

Asian American faculty spend the most time communicating via email each week (62% spend at least 6 hours compared to 52% of Caucasians and 45% of underrepresented minorities). They, along with underrepresented minorities, use the Internet for teaching and research purposes substantially more than Caucasians (50% of underrepresented minorities and 48% of Asian Americans spend at least 6 hours each week compared to 27% of Caucasians).

Asian Americans are the most likely to work on the Internet from an off-campus location (29% do so at least 6 hours per week compared to 19% of Caucasians and 14% of underrepresented minorities), while Caucasians are the most likely to be satisfied with Purdue’s off-campus Internet and email access (63% vs. 58% of Asian Americans and 57% of underrepresented minorities).

**Satisfaction with the Technological Support System (Q 19)**

Two thirds of the faculty are satisfied with the training and support services available for the use of teaching technologies and just over half (55%) believe Purdue classrooms are well equipped for the use of these technologies. (See Table 18.)

**Differences by School**

Approximately three-quarters of the faculty in CFS, Education, Health Sciences, Liberal Arts, and the Libraries agree that Purdue provides adequate training regarding the use of teaching technologies. However, only 56% to 58% of those in Engineering, Science, and Technology agree with this statement.

Faculty from Education and Health Sciences are especially likely to agree that Purdue provides adequate support services for the use of teaching technologies (77% and 78% compared to an average of 66%), while again those in Engineering and Science are the least likely to share this perspective (57% and 54% respectively).

Perceptions of how well classrooms are equipped for the use of teaching technologies vary considerably across the schools. A clear majority in the following schools believes their classrooms are well equipped: CFS (90%), Health Sciences (74%), Technology (72%), and Veterinary Medicine (71%). Only a minority in Management (46%) and Science (42%), however, share this view.
Table 18: Adequacy of Teaching Technology Support

- Purdue classrooms are well equipped for the use of teaching technology: 55%
- Purdue provides adequate support services for the use of teaching technology: 65%
- Purdue provides adequate training regarding the use of teaching technology: 67%
Differences by Rank

Assistant professors are more likely than their senior colleagues to agree that Purdue provides adequate training regarding the use of teaching technologies (74% compared to 65% of associate and 64% of full professors). They are also the most likely to believe that adequate support services are available for the use of these technologies (71% vs. 61% of associate and 66% of full professors) and that classrooms are well equipped for their use (59% vs. 52% of associate and 55% of full professors).

Differences by Gender

Males and females share virtually the same perceptions regarding Purdue’s teaching technology support system.

Differences by Race

Asian Americans are less satisfied than the other groups with training (52% vs. 67% of Caucasians and 77% of underrepresented minorities), support services (59% vs. 66% of Caucasians and 73% of underrepresented minorities), and classroom equipment (52% vs. 55% of Caucasians and 65% of underrepresented minorities). However, 59% of this population are in the schools of Engineering and Science where faculty are less satisfied than average with these topics, so analysis by race must be done with caution. As these results show, underrepresented minorities are the most satisfied with each facet of Purdue’s teaching technologies support system.

Summary

This section on teaching and research activities highlights the diversity of cultures and needs across the schools. It provides important information as needs are assessed and resources are allocated, but it should not be viewed as a tool for comparisons across the schools.

To summarize this section, then, we begin with an overview of research productivity. In terms of publications, 92% of faculty had had at least one article published or accepted for publication in an academic or professional journal within the past two years and 34% had published at least five articles during this time period. Fifty-seven percent had published or had accepted for publication at least one chapter in an edited volume and 31% had had at least one book, manual, or monograph published or accepted for publication within the past two years. Finally, three percent of Liberal Arts faculty had presented one or more exhibitions or performances in the fine or applied arts within the past two years. During this same two-year period, 59% of faculty were awarded a new grant as the primary investigator and 49% were awarded a new grant as a co-investigator.

Full professors were the most likely of the three ranks to have published articles, chapters, and books, manuals, or monographs over the past two years and they were also the most likely to have been awarded at least one new grant as an investigator or co-investigator.
Satisfaction with institutional resources and support varies. Faculty are quite satisfied with the support that they receive from their unit head, clerical staff, and business office, while they are far less satisfied with internal funding, specifically internal funding for new teaching and research ideas, travel, and bridge support between external grants. Associate and full professors and Asian Americans are especially likely to be displeased with the level of internal funding available for these purposes. Those from Education, Engineering, and Veterinary Medicine are less satisfied than their peers on several of the variables explored through this survey question.

For two thirds of faculty, the average workweek is between 41 and 60 hours long, while almost one-quarter work 61 or more hours each week. During a typical week, more time is spent on teaching, including preparation time, than on any other activity, followed by time spent conducting research. Faculty from the School of Technology spend the highest proportion of time on teaching-related activities, while those in Agriculture, CFS, and the Libraries spend the lowest proportion. The proportion of time spent conducting research is highest in Agriculture, Management, and Science. Overall, respondents are least likely to be involved in clinical work, fundraising, and consulting or freelance work on a weekly basis.

Faculty from Education, Engineering, and Liberal Arts advise more doctoral and master’s students than faculty in other schools, with Education faculty advising considerably more than any other group at both levels.

Just one half of one percent of the faculty spend no time on a weekly basis communicating via email, while almost half spend between one and five hours each week communicating via this method. On a weekly basis, 63% spend between one and five hours using the Internet for teaching and research purposes.

Finally, a majority are satisfied with the training and support services that Purdue provides for the use of teaching technologies and over half also believe that Purdue classrooms are well equipped for the use of these technologies. Faculty in CFS, Education, and Health Sciences tend to be more satisfied than average with Purdue’s services and resources in this area, while faculty from Engineering and Science are the least satisfied overall.
V. Professional Development

The next series of survey questions explored faculty members’ knowledge of grant and professional development programs that are sponsored by Purdue, as well their use of these programs. This question set also sought information regarding faculty attitudes toward the value of these programs and their satisfaction with their own professional development.

Internal Grant Programs (Q 27)

Of the seven grant programs, faculty are most likely to be aware of the following: travel grants (92% are aware of these), summer salary grants (86% are aware), graduate student fellowships based on faculty applications (76% are aware), and academic reinvestment grants (73% are aware). Only a minority is aware of PRF matching grants for equipment purchases (41%) and Office of International Programs (IP) model department grants (31%). (See Table 19.)

Table 19
Purdue Grant Programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grant Program</th>
<th>Are you aware of this grant program?</th>
<th>If yes, have you applied for this grant in the past five years?</th>
<th>If yes, have you been awarded this grant in the past five years?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Purdue Research Foundation (PRF) summer salary grants</td>
<td>No 14%</td>
<td>No 73%</td>
<td>No 33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRF matching grants for equipment purchases</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRF travel grants (domestic and international)</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multimedia Instruction Development Center grants</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of International Programs model department grants</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Reinvestment grants</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate student fellowships based on faculty applications (e.g., Special Initiative, University, Andrew, and Minority Graduate Opportunity Fellowships; Interdisciplinary Research Awards)</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Among those who are aware of the grant programs, faculty members are most likely to have applied for a travel grant (42% have done so), a fellowship for one of their graduate students (42% have done so), and an academic reinvestment grant (40% have done so). Grant applicants are most likely, in turn, to have been awarded a fellowship for a graduate student (79% of applicants have received this award) or a travel grant (74% have received this award).

*Differences by School and Race*

Because of the relatively small numbers who have applied for these grants and particularly the small numbers who have been awarded these grants, analysis by school and race beyond awareness of these grants is not appropriate. So by school, Management faculty are among the least aware of the equipment grants, the Multimedia Instructional Development Center (MIDC) grants, the IP grants, the academic reinvestment grants, and the graduate student fellowships. Libraries and Technology faculty are less likely than most to know about summer salary grants, equipment grants, and graduate student fellowships.

By race, underrepresented minorities are the least likely to be aware of every grant program except the summer salary grants.

*Differences by Rank*

Assistant professors are the least likely to be aware of every one of the grant programs, particularly the MIDC grants (41% are aware compared to 64% of associate and 68% of full professors) and the academic reinvestment grants (44% are aware vs. 78% of associate and 86% of full professors). Among those who are aware of the grants, assistant professors are also the least likely to have applied for an equipment grant, a travel grant, an IP grant, or a graduate student fellowship.

The proportion of those who applied and were subsequently awarded a grant is highest for assistant professors in the following cases: summer salary grants (74% vs. 61% of associate and 55% of full professors) and MIDC grants (88% vs. 63% of associate and 58% of full professors). The proportion of applicants who were awarded the grant is lowest for assistant professors in the following cases: matching equipment purchase grants (50% vs. 65% of associate and 78% of full professors), International Program grants (50% vs. 62% of associate and 61% of full professors), and academic reinvestment grants (31% vs. 35% of associate and 47% of full professors). In the case of travel grants and graduate student fellowships, the proportions of awardees were approximately equal across the ranks.

*Differences by Gender*

Females are less likely than males to be aware of all but the summer salary grants and the MIDC grants. (In these two cases, the proportions are equal.) However, a higher proportion of females compared to males have applied for summer salary grants (37% vs. 24%), academic reinvestment grants (42% vs. 39%), and graduate student fellowships (49% vs. 40%).
In the case of each of the seven grants, the proportion of female applicants who were awarded the grants is lower than the proportion of male applicants who were awarded the grants. Specifically, 62% of female and 68% of male applicants have been awarded summer salary grants, 30% of female and 77% of male applicants have been awarded matching equipment purchase grants, 71% of female and 75% of male applicants have been awarded travel grants, 62% of female and 68% of male applicants have been awarded MIDC grants, 50% of female and 62% of male applicants have been awarded IP grants, 33% of female and 44% of male applicants have been awarded academic reinvestment grants, and 73% of female and 81% of male applicants have been awarded graduate student fellowships.

Faculty also had the opportunity to explain through an open-ended response why they had not applied for grants that they thought would be beneficial to them. Four out of ten respondents answered this portion of the question, mentioning four primary reasons they had not applied for a grant. These reasons are listed below, beginning with the most commonly cited reason.

- **Time constraints**

  “I’m so busy that it is hard to find the time to put together a strong proposal. That’s because the faculty resources in my unit are stretched too thin and we all have more responsibility than we can handle.”

  “Mostly because there simply isn’t enough time in the day it seems to do what needs to be done and to also pursue such development. I am so busy doing what I do that there is little time to pursue development opportunities.”

  “No time to spend on developing a proposal.”

- **Grants should go to less senior faculty**

  “Because I am a senior faculty member and such grants preferentially go to younger faculty, as it perhaps should be.”

  “I do not think senior faculty should be applying for PRF funds. They should be used for development of junior faculty.”

  “Nearing retirement! Programs primarily for new staff.”

- **Undesirable research area for the grants**

  “My application would not receive a high enough ranking within the unit. My work is too ‘classical’. If you are not working in the latest molecular biological area, you do not receive administrative support.”
“Graduate student fellowships are for only the most basic of research and would not fund any project in the application and implementation area that I do research in.”

“Because of the service nature of my duties I did not apply.”

- Grant amounts are too small

“I have been fairly successful with outside grants. At the moment, I regard Purdue base sources of funding as requiring a lot of effort for not very much money.”

“Grant amounts are too small to be worthwhile.”

“Too much work for too little money. Better to put the effort into an external grant.”

Differences by School
The most common reason for respondents from Veterinary Medicine, Technology, Liberal Arts, and Education to not apply for a grant was time constraints. Engineering and Agriculture faculty most often mentioned that the grants were designed for less senior faculty than themselves, while those in Science were most likely to say that grant amounts were too small for their needs. Too few respondents from Health Sciences, CFS, the Libraries, and Management answered this question to comment on their responses.

Importance of Current Professional Development Programs (Q 28)
Next, faculty were asked to indicate how important they believe it is for Purdue to make available four existing professional development programs. Approximately three quarters of respondents who had an opinion indicated that the Study in a Second Discipline Program (75%), the Teaching for Tomorrow Mentoring Program (78%), the Purdue Research Park (PRP) Gateway Program (69%), and the PRP incubator centers and programs (72%) are important to offer. Between 12% and 28% of respondents indicated that they did not have an opinion regarding these questions. (See Table 20.)

Differences by School
In most cases, Education and Library faculty were among the most likely to agree that it is important for Purdue to make these programs available to faculty, while CFS and Management faculty were often among the least likely to agree that these programs are necessary.

Differences by Rank
The proportion of full professors who believe these programs are important to offer is slightly lower in every case (4 to 8 percentage points) than the proportion of associate and assistant professors who believe these programs are valuable.

Differences by Gender
Females are more likely than males to believe that it is important for Purdue to offer the Study in a Second Discipline Program (85% vs. 72%) and the Teaching for
Table 20
It is important for Purdue to make the following programs available to faculty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Entrepreneurship support services available through Purdue Research</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park’s Gateway Program</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purdue Research Park incubator centers and programs</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study in a Second Discipline Program</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching for Tomorrow Mentoring Program</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percentage
Tomorrow mentoring program (91% vs. 74%). Their responses are very similar concerning the two PRP programs.

Differences by Race

Underrepresented minorities believe most strongly that the Teaching for Tomorrow mentoring program (94% vs. 65% of Asian Americans and 79% of Caucasians), the PRP Gateway Program (94% vs. 72% and 68% respectively), and the PRP incubator centers and programs (92% vs. 71% for the others) are important for Purdue to offer. Three quarters of underrepresented minorities and Caucasians agree that the Study in a Second Discipline program is important compared to 68% of Asian Americans.

Sabbatical Leaves (Qs 29 and 30)

Regarding sabbatical leaves specifically, 60% of associate and full professors have taken at least one sabbatical. By rank, 45% of associate professors compared to 71% of professors have done so. Examining the responses of these two ranks by school, Liberal Arts, Science, and Management faculty are the most likely to have taken at least one sabbatical (88%, 87%, and 79% respectively have done so), while faculty in Veterinary Medicine (32%), Technology (22%), and Health Sciences (18%) are the least likely to have done so.

Male associate and full professors are less likely than females at these ranks to have taken at least one sabbatical (59% vs. 66% have done so). There are virtually no differences by race among associate and full professors in terms of number of sabbaticals taken.

An additional question gave faculty the opportunity to explain why they had not taken a sabbatical leave. In addition to the issue of not being eligible, they mentioned seven primary reasons, which are listed below beginning with the most commonly cited reason.

- Family constraints
  
  “My family situation did not lend itself to an absence from this community.”

  “Family responsibilities and spousal employment constraints.”

  “Spouse does not want to leave her job.”

- Fear of losing ground in their research

  “I was worried that my group might fall apart or I would lose equipment or space.”

  “I would like to have taken a longer sabbatical, but fear that this would considerably disrupt my research program.”
• **Time constraints**

“Too busy to even plan it or apply for it. No time to look up the regulations and procedures to apply for it. No time to link up with the intended site.”

“There has really been no time…”

• **No one to teach their classes**

“There is no one qualified to teach my classes.”

“My teaching commitments cannot be taken over by someone else.”

• **Sabbaticals not encouraged in their unit**

“I have felt that I would not be encouraged to do so by Unit and School administration.”

“Dean's level says taking a sabbatical to write a book is a no no.”

“I did not feel my request for sabbatical would receive support from my department head.”

• **Mentoring and advising responsibilities**

“I have 8 grad students and feel that I would be neglecting them if I left on sabbatical.”

“It is difficult to leave 15 graduate students at Purdue.”

• **Financial constraints**

“The financial support for a 9 month to 1 year sabbatical is not sufficient.”

“It is subtly discouraged since we have to find funding for 1/2 our salary.”

**Differences by School**

The most common reasons for faculty members from Health Sciences and Technology to not take a sabbatical were the lack of individuals in their units who could teach their classes and the lack of encouragement to do so from their units. Science and Agriculture faculty most often mentioned family reasons and fear of losing ground in their research as the major factors, while faculty in Engineering most often mentioned family reasons and the needs of their current graduate students. Finally, faculty in Veterinary Medicine most commonly said that they were too busy to take a sabbatical leave. Too few respondents from Education, CFS, Liberal Arts, the Libraries, and Management answered this question to comment on their responses.
New Professional Development Programs (Q 31)

Finally, faculty had the opportunity to list new professional development programs that they would like to see Purdue offer in the future. They responded to this question by suggesting over 30 program topics. By far the most commonly cited programs were grant writing and teaching effectiveness workshops and training in instructional technology, followed by faculty mentoring and travel grants.

- Workshops

“Workshops for new professors to develop research article writing skills in their/or similar disciplines. That is, the programs that encourage professors to form writers’ groups, thus encouraging them to publish and get feedback from peers.”

“There recently was a teaching workshop led by an engineering professor from the outside. While it was useful to me, it would be nice to see similar workshops more geared toward liberal arts teaching.”

“Teaching effectiveness workshops, grant writing workshops.”

Several respondents also mentioned diversity awareness workshops.

- Instructional Technology Programs

“More opportunities to learn about teaching and about the use of instructional technology. There are plenty of programs but they tend to be offered at times I teach -- something like all day Friday or Saturday would work well for me. I’d like to learn more. Also the instructional technology programs have too many people in them -- we need a small group format with time for assistance and questions.”

“Program to help faculty members learn and adopt new communication and information technology for teaching.”

- Faculty Mentoring Programs

“A strong mentoring program for junior faculty in each school.”

“Tissue engineering faculty mentoring program.”

“New faculty mentoring and faculty development.”

- Travel Grants

“Much greater increase in travel grants.”

“Money to visit other academic units nationally or internationally that are engaged in innovative programs.”
“More travel support, international and domestic.”

Differences by Rank
It was interesting to note that different types of programs were mentioned by the different faculty ranks. A number of assistant professors would like to see mentoring programs to help them build their proposal writing, teaching, and general writing skills. Full professors, on the other hand, were more likely to mention an interest in leadership development and instructional technology programs. Also, data from the survey show that all three groups of faculty would like to see increased support for professional travel grants (international and domestic).

Satisfaction with One’s Professional Development (Q 3)
When faculty were asked to evaluate their own professional development, a large majority responded that they are quite satisfied with their teaching ability (83%) and their level of involvement in professional organizations related to their discipline (85%). Most are also satisfied with their current productivity level (68%), particularly full professors (77%) and Asian Americans (83%). Those in the Libraries (55%) and Management (59%) are less likely to feel satisfied with their level of productivity than are faculty in other schools. Also, females are less likely to be satisfied than males (61% vs. 71%).

Overall, 63% are satisfied with their ability to attract and mentor students, although that percentage is notably lower in four schools – Management (only 52% are satisfied), Science (only 51% are satisfied), and Libraries and Education where only 44% in each are satisfied with their ability to attract and mentor students.

Finally, just over one half of respondents (51%) are satisfied with their level of funding for research or creative efforts. This proportion is especially low among underrepresented minorities (38%), associate professors (41%), and faculty in Education (22%) and Technology (41%). (See Table 21.)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspect</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Funding for research/creative efforts</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to attract &amp; mentor students</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current productivity level</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My teaching</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in professional organizations in my discipline</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Summary

A majority of faculty is aware of most of the seven internal grant programs that Purdue funds, although assistant professors, females, and underrepresented minorities are less aware of these programs than others. Less than half of respondents had applied for each of the grants within the past five years. Some who had not applied perceived that their research area would not elicit interest among grant reviewers, while others felt that the grants were too small to be worth pursuing or that they should be awarded to less senior faculty than themselves.

Faculty were most likely to have applied for travel grants, academic reinvestment grants, and fellowships for graduate students, and grant applicants were most likely to have been awarded graduate student fellowships, travel grants, summer salary grants, and Multimedia Instructional Development Center (MIDC) grants. Assistant professors were the most likely to have been awarded summer salary and MIDC grants, while full professors were the most likely to have been awarded matching equipment purchase grants and academic reinvestment grants. Female applicants were less likely than male applicants to have been awarded each of the seven internal grants.

More than two thirds of respondents believed that four existing professional development programs, Study in a Second Discipline Program, Teaching for Tomorrow Mentoring Program, the Purdue Research Park (PRP) Gateway Program, and the PRP incubator centers and programs, are important to continue to offer. Females and underrepresented minorities were especially likely to believe that the Teaching for Tomorrow mentoring program is important to continue.

Sixty percent of associate and full professors have taken a sabbatical leave. Those in Liberal Arts, Science, and Management are the most likely to have taken at least one sabbatical while those in Veterinary Medicine, Technology, and Health Sciences are the least likely to have done so. The most common reasons for not taking a sabbatical leave include family constraints, fear of losing ground in their research, and time constraints.

Faculty also had the opportunity to list new professional development programs that they would like to see Purdue offer in the future. By far the most commonly cited programs were 1) grant writing and teaching effectiveness workshops, 2) training in instructional technology, 3) faculty mentoring, and 4) travel grants.

Finally, when faculty were asked to evaluate their own professional development, a large majority responded that they are quite satisfied with their teaching ability and their level of involvement in professional organizations related to their discipline. Most are also satisfied with their current productivity level and their ability to attract and mentor students, while only half are satisfied with their level of funding for research or creative efforts.
VI. Tenure and Merit Review

The following section explores faculty attitudes about the tenure and annual merit review processes in their unit. Responses to both open and closed-ended questions are described below.

Tenure Review Process and Criteria (Q 23)

Faculty as a whole believed that some of the most important factors in tenure decisions include the following: regular reviews (89% agree), securing a grant (74% agree), getting along well with the “right” people (66% agree), and publishing high quality research/creative work (64% agree). The least important factors were perceived to be one’s particular research area (39% agree that tenure decisions depend to an important degree on this), receiving high teaching evaluations from students (45% believe this is necessary), and doing one’s fair share of committee and service work (47% believe this is necessary). (See Table 22.)

Three quarters of respondents believed that tenure procedures are clearly defined and that they are appropriate. However, only 57% agreed that the processes and criteria used to reach tenure decisions are evenly applied. Almost three quarters (73%) believed that the annual promotion and tenure review helps faculty prepare for eventual promotion and tenure decisions, and 76% believed that all full professors should undergo regular performance reviews by their peers. (See Table 23.)

Differences by School

The following paragraphs highlight those responses from each school that were substantially different from the overall averages.

Agriculture faculty were more likely than average to perceive that receiving high teaching evaluations from students, doing one’s fair share of committee and service work, and securing grants were important factors in securing tenure. They were also more likely than average to believe that the annual promotion and tenure review helps faculty prepare for eventual promotion and tenure decisions. They were less likely than average to perceive that tenure decisions depend to an important degree on the particular area of research pursued, outside evaluations, and knowing the “right” people.

Consumer and Family Sciences faculty were more likely than average to perceive that tenure decisions depend almost exclusively on the quantity of research published and that the particular area of research pursued, securing grants or fellowships, and regular reviews are important within the tenure process. They were also more likely than average to perceive that the annual promotion and tenure review helps faculty prepare for eventual promotion and tenure decisions and that all full professors should undergo regular performance reviews by their peers. They were less likely than average to perceive that tenure procedures are clearly defined.

Education faculty were more likely than average to believe that receiving high teaching evaluations from students and doing one’s fair share of committee and service work...
Table 22
Perceived Importance of Factors in Tenure Reviews

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>My particular research area</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receiving high student evaluations of my teaching</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doing my fair share of committee and service work</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receiving positive outside evaluations</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decisions depend almost exclusively on the quantity of published research/creative work</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The quality of published research/creative work</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Getting along well with the &quot;right&quot; people</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Securing a grant or fellowship</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular reviews</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 23
Perceptions of the Criteria and Processes Used for Tenure Review

- Processes and criteria used to reach tenure decisions are evenly applied: 57%
- Annual review helps faculty prepare for eventual promotion and tenure decisions: 73%
- Tenure procedures are clearly defined: 75%
- Criteria used to reach tenure decisions are generally appropriate: 76%
- All full professors should undergo regular performance reviews by their peers: 76%
work were necessary in order to secure tenure. They were less likely than average to perceive that the tenure procedures are clearly defined, that it is important to secure a grant or fellowship in order to secure tenure, and that tenure decisions depend almost exclusively on the quantity of published research. Finally, they were more likely than average to believe that full professors should undergo regular performance reviews by their peers.

Engineering faculty were more likely than average to believe that getting along well with the “right” people and securing a grant or fellowship were important in order to secure tenure. Also, they, more than most others, believed that tenure decisions depend almost exclusively on the quantity of published research. They were less likely than most to agree that tenure decisions depend to an important degree on the quality of published research and high teaching evaluations from students and that the criteria and processes used to reach tenure decisions are evenly applied.

Health Sciences faculty were more likely than average to say that securing a grant or fellowship was important in order to secure tenure and that tenure decisions depend almost exclusively on the quantity of published research. Fewer than average believed that the criteria and processes used to reach tenure decisions are evenly applied.

Liberal Arts faculty were more likely than average to say that tenure decisions depend heavily on outside evaluations and less likely than most to say that doing one’s fair share of committee and service work and securing a grant or fellowship were important in order to secure tenure.

A higher than average number of Library faculty believed that doing one’s fair share of committee and service work is important in order to secure tenure, while fewer than average perceived that outside evaluations, high teaching evaluations from students, and securing grants or fellowships are important.

Management faculty were less likely than average to believe that tenure procedures are clearly defined, that the annual promotion and tenure review helps faculty prepare for eventual promotion and tenure decisions, and that regular reviews are important within the tenure process. Fewer than average also perceived that securing a grant or fellowship, doing one’s fair share of committee and service work, and the quality of one’s published research are important factors in securing tenure.

More Science faculty than average perceived that outside evaluations, securing a grant or fellowship, and the quality of one’s published research were important factors in tenure decisions. Fewer than average believed that receiving high teaching evaluations from students, doing one’s fair share of committee and service work, and getting along well with the “right” people were important factors in tenure decisions. Fewer than average also believed that tenure decisions depend almost exclusively on the quantity of published research and that full professors should undergo regular performance reviews by their peers.
Those in Technology were more likely than average to perceive that receiving high teaching evaluations from students, doing one’s fair share of committee work, and getting along well with the “right” people were important factors in securing tenure. They were less likely than average to believe that tenure decisions depend heavily on outside evaluations or securing a grant or fellowship.

Finally, more Veterinary Medicine faculty than average reported that getting along well with the “right” people was an important factor in securing tenure, while fewer than average believed that outside evaluations were important and that tenure decisions depend almost exclusively on the quantity of one’s published research. Fewer than average also reported that the tenure procedures are clearly defined and that the process and criteria used to reach tenure decisions are evenly applied.

Differences by Rank

Just as with response patterns by school, response patterns by rank differ considerably. Assistant professors were more likely than those in the other two ranks to believe that outside evaluations (65% vs. 45% of associate and 48% of full professors), doing one’s fair share of committee work (61% vs. 44% and 42% respectively), and getting along well with the “right” people are important factors in tenure decisions (81% vs. 73% and 53% respectively). They were the least likely to believe that tenure procedures are clearly defined (60% vs. 68% of associate professors and 88% of full professors). Associate professors, along with assistant professors, were more likely than professors to believe that tenure decisions depend almost exclusively on the quantity of published research/creative work (61% of associate and 60% of assistant professors compared to 42% of professors).

In addition to these different response patterns, assistant professors were the most likely to answer that they did not know the answer to these tenure-related questions. In most cases, 10% to 15% at this rank answered that they did not know, but in four cases, substantially more chose this response. Specifically, 24% of assistant professors did not know whether tenure decisions depend to an important degree upon the particular area of research pursued, 46% did not know whether tenure decisions depend heavily on outside evaluations, 24% did not know whether criteria used to reach tenure decisions are generally appropriate, and 38% did not know whether the processes and criteria used to reach tenure decisions are evenly applied.

Associate professors took the most negative view of the tenure process, being the least likely to report that regular reviews are important within the tenure process (83% vs. 92% of assistant and 91% of full professors), that the criteria used to reach tenure decisions are generally appropriate (59% of associate vs. 77% of assistant and 86% of full professors), that the process and criteria used to reach tenure decisions are evenly applied (39% vs. 52% of assistant and 69% of full professors), and that annual promotion and tenure review helps faculty prepare for eventual promotion and tenure decisions (60% vs. 69% of assistant and 83% of full professors). They were also the least likely to report that the quality of published research/creative work (49% vs. 65% of assistant and 73% of full professors), high teaching evaluations from students (39% vs. 45% of
assistant and 49% of full professors), and securing a grant or fellowship (66% vs. 77% of assistant and 77% of full professors) are important factors in tenure decisions.

Full professors, for their part, took the most positive stance toward tenure procedures and criteria. As noted above, they were the most likely to say that tenure procedures are clearly defined (88% vs. 60% of assistant and 68% of associate professors), that the criteria used to reach tenure decisions are generally appropriate (86% vs. 77% of assistant and 59% of associate professors) and evenly applied (69% vs. 52% of assistant and 39% of associate professors), and that annual promotion and tenure review helps faculty prepare for eventual promotion and tenure decisions (83% vs. 69% of assistant and 60% of associate professors). Further, they were the most likely to say that tenure decisions depend to an important degree on the quality of published research/creative work (73% vs. 65% of assistant and 49% of associate professors). On the other hand, they were the least likely to say that one’s particular area of research (34% vs. 47% of assistant and 41% of associate professors) and getting along well with the “right” people (53% vs. 81% of assistant and 73% of associate professors) are important factors in tenure decisions. Finally, they are the least in favor of a regular performance review for full professors (66% vs. 93% of assistant and 80% of associate professors).

**Differences by Gender**

Given these different perspectives on tenure criteria and procedures based on one’s school and rank, and given that males and females are unequally distributed across both school and rank, considering differences by gender alone is of uncertain value. Notable differences follow, but these must be examined in more detail before valid conclusions can be drawn.

Generally, men were more likely to believe tenure decisions are clearly defined (78% vs. 68%), that to secure tenure it is important to secure a grant/fellowship (76% vs. 67%), that tenure decisions are generally appropriate (80% vs. 64%), that the processes and criteria used to reach tenure decision are evenly applied (60% vs. 48%), and that annual reviews help faculty prepare for eventual promotion and tenure decisions (76% vs. 63%). Females, on the other hand, were more likely to perceive that tenure decisions depend almost exclusively on the quantity of published research/creative work (59% vs. 50%), that tenure decisions depend heavily on outside evaluations (60% vs. 48%), and that to secure tenure, it is important to get along well with the “right” people (74% vs. 62%). They were also more likely than males to believe that all full professors should undergo regular performance reviews by their peers (82% vs. 75%).

**Differences by Race**

Differences by race are also difficult to interpret without further analyses because of differences in representation across schools and ranks. Most significantly, Asian Americans are far more likely to be members of the Schools of Science or Engineering than are Caucasians or underrepresented minorities (59% compared to 25% of the others). Also, underrepresented minorities are more likely to be assistant professors than are the other two groups (50% vs. 38% of Asian Americans and 24% of Caucasians).
In each case that underrepresented minorities were the most likely to agree with a tenure-related question, their responses matched those of assistant professors. Specifically, they were the most likely to believe that tenure decisions depend almost exclusively on the quantity of published research/creative work and that outside evaluations, regular reviews, and getting along well with the right people are important factors in tenure decisions. They were also the most likely to indicate that full professors should undergo regular performance reviews by their peers.

Response patterns for survey items for which Asian Americans indicated the highest level of agreement are not as clear. This population, like those in Science and Engineering, were more likely than others to believe that securing a grant or fellowship is important for securing tenure. However, they were also the most likely to indicate that the quality of published research/creative work (71% vs. 55% of underrepresented minorities and 64% of Caucasians) and the particular area of research pursued (69% vs. 42% and 37% respectively) are important factors in tenure decisions, which rank or school demographics do not readily explain. Finally, they were the most likely to perceive that the criteria used to reach tenure decisions are evenly applied (62% vs. 54% and 57% respectively) and, along with underrepresented minorities, that the criteria used are appropriate (89% and 88% vs. 75% of Caucasians).

Open-Ended Responses Regarding the Tenure Process (Q 23b)

One in three respondents took the opportunity to respond to the following open-ended question: Please add any comments you would like to make about how the tenure process works in your unit. Negative comments outnumbered positive comments four to one. The specific issues that they mentioned are listed below, in order from the most to least commonly cited negative and then positive comments.

The process does not work well

- The criteria are applied inconsistently

“Changes from year to year. Hard to hit a moving target. Tends to discourage people, not encourage them. Does not take into account the diversity of abilities, it seems to be only one way to get promoted, but each year the ‘one way’ seems to be different.”

“The decision to promote to full professor is too often influenced by the personal popularity of the candidate.”

- The criteria are not well understood or are secretive

“It is the best kept secret on campus.”
“At the beginning, one is told that one should “excel” in 2 of three areas: research, teaching, and service. However, it is not clear what is meant by excellence in these areas. As a result, the tenure process is rather obscure.”

• Research, teaching, and service should all be valued

“We promote research excellence only. Service is irrelevant. Teaching quality is only of little importance.”

“…We lose those who are excellent in every respect, but not quantity publishers. That’s unfortunate for the students.”

“Teaching evaluation by students is a politically correct stupidity: the administration takes them as virtually only criterion of how well one teaches, while students at Purdue (in my area) are heavily under-prepared and totally incompetent to judge the quality of one’s teaching…”

• The tenure standards are too low

“There is too little intervention by the school and university administration to ensure that proper professional standards are applied. It is assumed that assistant professors will receive tenure. None has been denied tenure since 1982.”

“Faculty who are not worthy of tenure are able to receive tenure by threats to leave. Dean is very weak and has very low standards.”

“The standards for research productivity are very low. There are full professors with very poor records and who have very low standards. I have been a member of the primary committee for the last two years. Both years, over half of the primary committee members came to vote without having reviewed the candidates’ files. They had not seen, let alone read the candidates’ publications. Indices of quality, e.g., journal rankings, number of times cited in the social science citation index are not part of the process. Low quality, service-type publications are not always differentiated from refereed publications. Service to the Dean and the school takes precedence over important national service. This state of affairs should not be acceptable.”

Suggestions for improvement

• Institute post tenure review or abolish tenure

“Post tenure review is very important to enhance the quality of Purdue’s faculty. A post tenure review process should be initiated and developed by the faculty for the faculty rather than being mandated by the President or the Council on Higher Education or the State Legislature.”
“It is time to either abolish tenure or begin a review process of tenured faculty every 2-5 years with probation and termination as available options for those who do not perform.”

“I think the tenure process should be abolished in its current state. In our unit it has given faculty the opportunity to quit contributing in the capacity for which they were hired. This means that we often have two people to do one job. In addition, often tenured faculty do not keep their courses up to date and don’t listen to the students. There should definitely be some way to hold ALL faculty accountable. I understand and agree with the spirit of tenure, but feel it is being abused greatly.”

“Tenure is an outmoded concept, and should be replaced by some procedure of review at five year intervals.”

- Establish a more supportive environment for faculty to understand the process

“A lot of work needs to be done to support and present the work of faculty who do not have traditional teaching and research appointments. It would help if faculty could have a more active role in presenting themselves rather than the secretive, behind-closed-doors process that is used.”

“New faculty need to be mentored regularly by the unit head and have yearly review of their progress. Associate faculty need this as well as they move toward full. The ground rules for the number of publications and scholarly presentations that are accepted has changed with each new head or Dean. Somebody needs to be there and be consistent for what is good show for progress.”

**The process works well**

- The process and expectations are clearly defined

“My unit does an outstanding job of explaining the process and providing constructive criticism. I was tenured two years ago.”

“I am very satisfied with the tenure process in my unit. New faculty are made immediately aware of expectations (good teaching, excellent research) and are advised annually of their progress…”

“My department has a very well defined mentoring system which makes tenure a manageable process. If the candidate follows the suggestions given by the department head and the full professors, establishing a consistent track record for tenure is a relatively painless process.”
• The process used in my unit is fair

“The process used in my unit is fair, equitable, transparent, and rigorous. The discussions at Area Committee are frank but are focused on appropriate considerations relative to performance and NOT on personality or other irrelevant factors.”

Differences by Rank

Associate professors were the most likely to respond to this question and they and assistant professors were more likely to have negative comments regarding the tenure process than were professors. Similarly, assistant and associate professors frequently commented that the process and expectations should be more clearly explained at the beginning of the process, and that generous and accurate feedback should be provided.

Annual Merit Review Process and Criteria (Q 24)

Approximately half of the respondents believed that the annual merit review process in their unit – the procedure for determining salary increases – is clearly defined, that the criteria used to reach merit decisions are applied fairly from year to year, and that the process has significant value for faculty development. (See Tables 24 and 25.)

Differences by School

Agriculture faculty answered similarly to the average in every case, except that they were more likely than average to believe that the merit review process has significant value for faculty development.

Consumer and Family Sciences faculty were more likely than average to agree with almost every survey item related to merit review – that the merit review process is clearly defined in their unit, that the criteria are appropriate, and that they are applied fairly year to year. More than most also agreed that the process depends almost exclusively on the quantity of research produced, positive teaching evaluations by students, doing one’s fair share of committee and service work, and getting along well with the “right” people. Fewer than average agreed that the merit review process is influenced by peer review.

Education faculty were more likely than most to agree that the criteria are appropriate and clearly defined. They also agreed in higher proportions than average that receiving high teaching evaluations from students, doing one’s fair share of committee and service work, getting along well with the “right” people, and peer review influence merit review decisions. They are less likely than average to believe that these decisions depend almost exclusively on the quantity of research produced, and although they believe the criteria are appropriate and clearly defined, fewer than average believe the merit review process has significant value for faculty development.

Engineering faculty, for their part, were less likely than average to believe that the merit review criteria are appropriate, that they are applied fairly, and that they are clearly
Table 24: Perceived Importance of Factors in Annual Merit Reviews

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Peer review</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The quality of research/creative work produced</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decisions depend almost exclusively on the quantity of research/creative work produced</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receiving high student evaluations of my teaching</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Getting along well with the &quot;right&quot; people</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doing my fair share of committee and service work</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 25
Perceptions of The Criteria And Processes Used for The Annual Merit Review

- Annual merit review process in my unit is clearly defined: 48%
- Processes and criteria used to reach merit decisions are applied fairly year to year: 58%
- The merit review process has significant value for faculty development: 59%
- Criteria used to reach merit decisions are generally appropriate: 64%
defined. They were also less likely than average to perceive that merit review decisions depend on the quality of research produced and peer reviews.

Health Sciences faculty generally answered close to the average response for each item, although they were more likely than average to perceive that teaching evaluations by students influence merit review decisions and that the merit review process has significant value for faculty development.

Liberal Arts faculty were more likely than average to believe that the merit review process is clearly defined in their unit and that it depends almost exclusively on the quantity of research/creative work produced. They were less likely than average to believe that these decisions depend on the quality of work produced.

Library faculty believed, more than most, that merit review decisions in their unit depend on doing one’s fair share of committee work, getting along well with the “right” people, and peer review. Conversely, fewer than average perceived that teaching evaluations and the quantity or quality of one’s research/creative work influenced these decisions or that the merit review process has significant value for faculty development.

Those in Management were more likely than average to report that peer review and teaching evaluations influence merit review decisions and less likely than average to report that doing one’s fair share of committee and service work and getting along well with the “right” people influenced the decisions. They were also less likely than average to perceive that the merit review process has significant value for faculty development.

Smaller proportions of Science faculty than average perceived that getting along well with the “right” people, doing one’s fair share of committee and service work, and receiving high teaching evaluations influenced merit review decisions. They were also less likely than average to believe that these decisions depend almost exclusively on the quantity of research work produced and more likely than most to believe that decisions are based on the quality of work produced.

Technology faculty were among the least likely to perceive that merit decisions are based almost exclusively on the quantity of research produced, and among the most likely to perceive that doing one’s fair share of committee and service work, receiving high teaching evaluations from students, and getting along well with the right people influence merit review decisions. They were also more likely than most to perceive that the criteria used are appropriate and that the merit review process has significant value for faculty development.

Finally, Veterinary Medicine faculty were less likely than average to report that the merit review criteria are applied fairly or that they are clearly defined. They were more likely than average to perceive that peer review and the quality of one’s research are important factors in merit decisions, and among the least likely to believe that these decisions depend almost exclusively on the quantity of research produced.
Differences by Rank

Attitudes regarding the annual merit review process virtually mirror attitudes regarding tenure review when considered by rank. Assistant professors were the least likely to perceive that the process is clearly defined and the most likely to believe that doing one’s fair share of committee and service work is important in order to receive a positive merit review. They were also the most likely to report that the merit review process is influenced by peer review, a question that was not explored concerning the tenure process.

Associate professors held the most negative views about the merit review process, just as they did concerning the tenure process. Specifically, they were the least likely to believe that the quality of one’s research or creative work influences merit review decisions and the least likely to perceive that the criteria used to reach merit decisions are appropriate and are applied fairly year to year. Finally, they were the least likely to believe that the merit review process has significant value for faculty development.

Professors, as with their perceptions regarding the tenure review process, were the least likely to say that merit review decisions depend almost exclusively on the quantity of research/creative work produced and that to receive a positive merit review, it is important to get along well with the “right” people.

Differences by Gender

As with the tenure review process analyses, gender differences must be understood in the larger context of males and females’ distribution by rank and school affiliation. Having said that, in this case, males and females answered half the questions regarding merit review in very similar ways. With the other five questions, females were more likely than males to answer as assistant professors did. They were more likely than males to believe that merit review decisions rely almost exclusively on the quantity of research/creative work produced (55% vs. 48%) and that getting along well with the “right” people is important in order to receive a positive merit review (61% vs. 50%).

Males, on the other hand, tended to view the merit review process more fairly than females did. They were more likely to indicate that the criteria used to reach merit decisions are generally appropriate (65% vs. 59%), that they are applied fairly (61% vs. 50%), and that the merit review process has significant value for faculty development (61% vs. 49%).

Differences by Race

As mentioned with the tenure discussion above, differences by race are also difficult to interpret without further analyses because of differences in representation across schools and ranks. With that precaution in mind, it is interesting to note that Caucasians were the most likely to believe that the quality of one’s research/creative work strongly influences merit review decisions (49% vs. 41% of underrepresented minorities and 36% of Asian Americans) and that the processes and criteria used to reach merit review decisions are applied fairly year to year (59% vs. 50% of underrepresented minorities and 52% of Asian Americans).
Asian Americans, compared to underrepresented minorities and Caucasians, were the most likely to believe that these decisions depend almost exclusively on the quantity of research/creative work produced (57% vs. 41% and 50% respectively), that peer review influences the process (44% vs. 33% and 32% respectively), and that the process has significant value for faculty development (81% vs. 47% and 58% respectively).

Underrepresented minorities, compared to Asian Americans and Caucasians, were the most likely to perceive that receiving high teaching evaluations from students (69% vs. 48% and 50% respectively), doing one’s fair share of committee and service work (67% vs. 52% and 56% respectively), and getting along well with the “right” people are important factors in merit review decisions.

Please add any comments you would like to make about how the merit review process works in your unit. (Q 24b)

One in three respondents answered the open-ended question regarding merit review and negative comments outnumbered positive comments ten to one. Across the schools, respondents repeatedly cited four problems concerning the process: 1) the criteria are unclear, mysterious, and unfair; 2) there is not enough money in any given year to make a difference; 3) research, teaching, and service should all be rewarded, rather than just research; and 4) the process is full of favoritism and politics. These and other issues are described below, in order from the most to least commonly cited negative and then positive comments.

The process does not work well and needs to be changed

- The criteria are not well understood or are secretive

“In its current form, the merit review process for my unit is a very secretive and poorly described process. Only once has the unit head discussed what is involved in the merit review process with the faculty, and this has been since my unit had a new head take over. Additionally, the merit review process COULD have significant value for faculty development, but with the "formula" for pay increases a closely guarded secret and with limited understanding of how the merit review links to promotion decisions, it is unclear how this process is helpful to faculty in its current form.”

“Since there is no peer review, no objective and logical basis for the merit review, no feedback or ranking except a good-ole-boy ‘we’re so glad you’re here,’ there continues to be NO LOGICAL BASIS FOR RAISES. It is common for the administration to give big/bigger raises to those threatening to leave ‘market competition’, etc., or to their buddies or to predetermined stars based on who's determination? In fact, threats to leave by perceived stars have become the established method of getting ahead here. There is never a decent rationale given for raise decisions, including merit, it continues to be a ‘black box’ process full of
administrator-babble. THIS IS THE SINGLE MOST IMPORTANT CAUSE OF POOR MORALE IN OUR DEPT AND SCHOOL. Established, senior faculty who would find it hard to move, who are continuing to work very hard and doing a very good job, continue to get screwed at the expense of acquiring and retaining perceived young superstars, who often don't pan out and LEAVE ANYWAY, after this considerable investment.”

“Perhaps the merit review process could be better streamlined if faculty were given information in writing as to what exactly is taken into consideration for the review. How much teaching, research, conference participation, etc. count, and who makes the decisions. Perhaps if there were some outside review of how the dept. head applies these criteria could add an effective checks & balances.”

“It would be very helpful if the head of department would tell his/her faculty members what they are being rewarded for if they receive high raise. Importantly, it would be very helpful the department head would let those who are given low raises know why they received low raises.”

• The criteria are inconsistently and unfairly applied

“The procedure adopted by the University Senate is not followed.”

“[My department head’s] merit decisions are arbitrary and based on whether a particular faculty member is on his ‘good list’ or ‘bad list.’ He makes these decisions on his own without input from faculty peers.”

“The merit review process is totally related to whether the department head likes the faculty member, the member’s race, the member’s gender and the marital status.”

“Merit reviews and raises, influence on school programs and policies, allocation of various resources and the promotion process are all easy to understand: POLITICS. Either ignore academic excellence in teaching and research and ingratiate yourself to ‘right’ people, or suffer the consequences!”

“This is the worst run, most ridiculous process I have ever seen. The dept head is completely unprepared, and for at least FIVE YEARS RUNNING, hasn’t even read or looked at the document before the meeting for others and me. You basically sit there and see if he can figure out on the spot what you’ve been doing that year. This is a ridiculous waste of time and effort and ends up meaning nothing. I have never received the "required" final page of the school document, i.e., dept head evaluation and comments and signed off by the head. This is a joke that points to the ludicrous incompetence of our administration and the fact they are not being held accountable for anything.”
• The amount to be allocated is so meager that it makes little difference

“I have observed over the years that the difference in merit increase between highly productive faculty and highly unproductive faculty in the areas of research, etc. is sometimes only 1%. There is, therefore, little or no incentive for the unproductive faculty to produce, particularly when the productive faculty must fund their own travel and research due to lack of internal funding. In other words, faculty who produce nothing and spend nothing come out ahead.”

“The merit system tends to discourage those who have "down" years in certain categories like grants, publications, even though they may have made significant contributions to the department or university in other ways. It can divide faculty and staff and cause lower morale. The pitiful raises that are given out are a disgrace to faculty who work extremely hard.”

“Merit review processes would be useful if there was ever any money passed around. As it turns out, the difference between doing absolutely nothing in our department and killing yourself works out to maybe a 1000-2000 bucks a year raise, which if you're working 60 hour weeks over a 34 week year translates into a .50-1.00/hour raise. Having to go through the considerable amount of time to log, develop and submit the merit brief tends to increase resentment when the raises are passed out.”

“The amount of money involved is not worth the effort for faculty to present their own cases and for others to go to the trouble of assessing those cases.”

• Research, teaching, and service should all be rewarded

“Criteria are too narrow and give no recognition of the diverse ways in which faculty can make significant contributions and be active professionally.”

“The evaluation depends on conformity with the narrow definitions of merit as interpreted by the Dept. Chair.”

“Good teaching doesn't count. Research is evaluated primarily by number of publications. In my last annual performance review my department head did not discuss my activities and accomplishments at all.

“Exemplary activity in any and all of the three main fields--research, teaching and service--should be rewarded.”

• Need standard raises in addition to merit raises

“The University should always provide a fixed percentage pay raise which they announce AND an additional outstanding-merit pay raise in dollars to a unit that is NOT ANNOUNCED as part of the percentage raise.”
“I strongly think there should be some sort of standard raise in addition to merit increases. Not because merit isn’t important, but because by making raises entirely dependent on merit, and by having a limited pie to divide up, the system essentially pits faculty members against one another. People who don’t publish a lot mutter bitterly about the high salaries that publishing faculty are assumed to get. Having publishing be something that affects one’s salary, but doesn’t determine it completely, might reduce some of these antagonisms.”

The process works well

- The process is well-defined

“The merit review process is well defined, clear, and articulated fully. It is clear what the categories are and what levels of performance are needed to warrant a pay raise.”

“The process of reviewing the merit document is well defined, and very fair.”

- The process is rigorous and fair

“Our merit review process includes input at both the level of Department Head and at the level of the Dean - thus insuring equity across the entire School. I believe the system in place is rigorous, fair, and transparent in general.”

“Every faculty member including full professors MUST write an annual performance review and they receive written and verbal confidential feedback from the Department Head. Then this written information is reviewed by the Associate Department Head and feedback is provided to the Department Head. All assistant and associate professors are reviewed by the Primary Committee every year with written and verbal feedback from the Department Head and this information is reviewed by the Associate Department Head. This Department seriously believes and practices faculty review annually.”

“The merit review process is one of the best aspects of employment at Purdue. In my department, it works adequately and is far better than any other administrative process.”

Differences by School

Respondents’ overwhelmingly negative views regarding the merit review process were consistent across the schools.

Summary

This section examined faculty perceptions of both the tenure and merit review processes. Faculty as a whole believed that some of the most important factors in tenure decisions include the following: regular reviews, securing a grant, getting along well with
the “right” people, and publishing high quality research/creative work. The least important factors were perceived to be one’s particular research area, receiving high teaching evaluations from students, and doing one’s fair share of committee and service work.

Three quarters of respondents believed that tenure procedures are clearly defined and that they are appropriate, but only 57% agreed that the processes and criteria used to reach tenure decisions are evenly applied. In addition, three quarter believed that full professors should undergo regular performance reviews by their peers.

Assistant professors were the least likely to believe that tenure procedures are clearly defined, while associate professors took the most negative view of the tenure process overall. Full professors, for their part, took the most positive stance toward tenure procedures and criteria, but they were the least in favor of a regular performance review for full professors.

Negative comments to an open-ended question regarding the tenure process outnumbered positive comments four to one. The problems most commonly described included: 1) the criteria are applied inconsistently; 2) the criteria are not well understood or are secretive; 3) research, teaching, and service should all be valued; 4) the tenure standards are too low.

Regarding the annual merit review process, approximately half of the respondents believed that the process is clearly defined, that the criteria used to reach merit decisions are applied fairly from year to year, and that the process has significant value for faculty development. Assistant professors were the least likely to perceive that the process is clearly defined, while associate professors held the most negative views about the merit review process, just as they did concerning the tenure process.

One in three respondents answered the open-ended question regarding merit review and in this case negative comments outnumbered positive comments ten to one. Across the schools, respondents repeatedly cited four problems concerning the process: 1) the criteria are unclear, mysterious, and unfair; 2) there is not enough money in any given year to make a difference; 3) research, teaching, and service should all be rewarded, rather than just research; and 4) the criteria are inconsistently and unfairly applied. Clearly, three of these four problems were commonly cited regarding the tenure process as well.
VII. Faculty Voice on Campus

Topics in this section include 1) faculty perceptions of their ability to influence decision-making in their unit, 2) perceptions regarding characteristics of their unit head, including the extent to which he or she includes the faculty in decision-making, and finally 3) perceptions of the University Senate.

Influencing One’s Unit (Q 20)

The survey included a series of questions regarding the influence faculty believed they have or could have upon their unit. A quarter or less believed that they have the ability to “somewhat” or “substantially” influence class sizes (15%), faculty course loads (19%), resource allocation (20%), and the annual merit pay increases they receive (25%). Although a clear minority felt they were unable to influence those decisions, 40% to 60% believed that they could influence the following: teaching schedules (40%), selection of the next unit head (50%), strategic planning (52%), the overall climate of their unit (60%), and the subjects that they teach (60%).

In addition, at least two thirds believed that they could influence the securing of the facilities or equipment that they need for their work (66%), unit curriculum decisions (71%), and the selection of new faculty members (74%) and graduate students (77%). (See Table 26.)

Differences by School

One’s perceived ability to influence teaching-related issues varies substantially by school, and a few patterns did emerge. Faculty in Science and Liberal Arts are the least likely to believe they could influence decisions regarding course loads (just 12% and 13% respectively), while faculty in Veterinary Medicine (33%) were the most likely to believe so. Influencing class sizes was perceived to be the most unlikely in Management and Engineering (just 3% and 7% respectively thought they could influence this in any significant way) and the most likely in Education and the Libraries (29% and 30% respectively).

Perceptions about the ability to influence one’s teaching schedule fall generally into two groups. Less than 30% of faculty in the following schools believe they could have “some” or “substantial” influence over this area: Veterinary Medicine (16%), Health Sciences (23%), Agriculture (23%), Engineering (25%), and Consumer and Family Sciences (27%). On the other hand, at least 60% of faculty in these schools believed they could influence their teaching schedules: Liberal Arts (60%), Management (66%), the Libraries (67%), and Education (74%).

Similar to the responses regarding determining one’s teaching schedule, faculty from Health Sciences (39%) and Veterinary Medicine (39%) were the least likely to believe they could influence what subjects they taught. Liberal Arts (69%), Library (69%), and Education (77%) faculty, on the other hand, were the most likely to believe they could influence this area as well.
Table 25
Perceived Areas of Influence in One’s Unit

- Determining class sizes: 15
- Determining faculty course loads: 19
- Allocating resources: 21
- Determining annual merit pay increases I receive: 25
- Determining teaching schedules: 40
- Selecting the next unit head: 50
- Strategic planning: 52
- Affecting the overall unit climate/culture: 56
- Determining subjects taught: 60
- Securing facilities/equipment needed for research/creative work: 66
- Making unit curriculum decisions: 71
- Selecting new faculty members to be hired in my unit: 74
- Selecting new graduate students: 77

Percentage
The final question regarding teaching focused on the ability to influence unit curriculum decisions. Here again, faculty in Veterinary Medicine were the least likely to believe they could influence this area (61%), while fully 91% of faculty in Technology believed they could do so.

Compared to teaching-related issues, faculty across the schools share slightly more similar views regarding their ability to influence personnel decisions. Most schools hovered around the average of 74% who believed they could influence the selection of new faculty members. The noteworthy exceptions are CFS where fully 83% believed they could influence this hiring decision and Education where only 60% believed they could do so. The ability to influence the selection of the next unit head did result in a much wider range of perceptions. Again, fewer than average Education faculty, along with those from Management and Veterinary Medicine, believed they could influence this decision (31%, 36%, and 40% respectively). This stands in marked contrast to the Libraries (60%), Technology (62%), and CFS (74%) where a majority believed they could influence this decision.

Faculty again shared similar views concerning their ability to influence the selection of new graduate students, although Health Sciences faculty were less likely than average (63%) and Education faculty were more likely than average (89%) to perceive that they could influence these decisions.

Faculty in the Libraries were the most likely to believe they could influence both annual merit pay increases and resource allocation decisions (53% believe they could do so in each case). Conversely, Engineering faculty were the least likely to believe they could influence merit pay increases (16%) and Liberal Arts faculty were the least likely to believe they could influence resource allocation decisions (12%).

Finally, three other areas of influence were explored – strategic planning, securing facilities and equipment for one’s work, and affecting the overall climate of one’s unit. In terms of strategic planning, a higher than average percentage of Consumer and Family Sciences (71%) and Libraries faculty (73%) believed they influence these decisions, while fewer than average from Management (36%) believed they could do so. The perceived ability to secure facilities and equipment for their work was highest again among Library faculty (76%) as well as those in Agriculture (79%) and was lowest among those in Education (34%) and Liberal Arts (52%). In terms of the ability to affect the overall climate of one’s unit, Consumer and Family Sciences (83%), Library (82%) and Technology (70%) faculty perceived a higher than average ability to do so, while those in Management felt the least empowered to affect this area (48%).

Generally, Library faculty, as well as CFS faculty to a lesser extent, believe that they can influence these thirteen areas more than their colleagues in other schools. Management faculty, on the other hand, feel that they have less influence than average in several of these areas.
Differences by Rank

With each of these thirteen questions, assistant professors were the least likely and full professors were the most likely to believe they could influence the decision. Cases where the difference between these two ranks in their perceived ability to influence these decisions is at least fifteen percentage points include: the ability to influence curriculum decisions, the selection of the next unit head, the selection of new faculty members, strategic planning, the securing of facilities and equipment needed for their work, the overall climate of the unit, faculty course loads, and resource allocation.

Differences by Gender

On questions where differences between genders exist, females perceive that they could exert less influence than males in shaping the issue. However, recognizing that perceptions of influence are highly correlated with rank and that 53% of males are full professors compared to 22% of females, this finding is not necessarily meaningful. When responses are examined by gender controlling for rank, one finds a somewhat different pattern. In terms of influencing unit curriculum decisions, selection of the next unit head, new faculty members, and determining the subjects they will teach, assistant and associate female professors perceived less ability to influence these issues than their male counterparts. However, female full professors were more likely than male full professors to perceive that they have the ability to influence these decisions. With regard to the issue of influencing the securing of facilities/equipment for their work, females in all three ranks felt less influence than males and female assistant and associate professors felt less able to shape the overall climate than males. Finally, female assistant professors felt less able to influence resource allocation decisions than did males at this rank.

Overall then, females in the lower ranks perceive that they have less ability to influence many of these areas than do their male colleagues, but female full professors, in five areas, perceive that they have more ability to influence the decisions than do male full professors.

Differences by Race

Asian Americans feel less able to influence the following areas compared to underrepresented minorities and Caucasians: curricular decisions (66% vs. 77% of underrepresented minorities and 72% of Caucasians), annual merit pay increases (13% vs. 27% and 26% respectively), the selection of new faculty (68% vs. 76% and 75%), and strategic planning (38% vs. 59% and 53%). They, along with underrepresented minorities, also feel less able than Caucasians to influence their unit’s climate (45% of Asian Americans and 50% of underrepresented minorities vs. 60% of Caucasians).

Underrepresented minorities also feel less able to influence the securing of facilities and equipment for their work than do Asian Americans and Caucasians (62% vs. 71% and 66% respectively), but they feel more able to influence class sizes than their peers (29% vs. 20% and 14% respectively).
Finally, Caucasians are more likely than Asian Americans and underrepresented minorities to feel that they could influence the selection of their next unit head (51% vs. 40% for the other two groups) but less likely than the others to perceive an ability to influence their teaching schedule (39% vs. 47% of Asian Americans and 48% of underrepresented minorities) or the subjects that they teach (59% vs. 74% and 76% respectively).

Compared to gender differences, differences by race are not as easily explained by rank distributions, because Asian Americans and Caucasians have equal proportions at the full professor rank and although underrepresented minorities are more likely to be assistant professors than individuals from the other two groups, they, for the most part, do not perceive that they have less influence than their colleagues with regard to these issues.

### Characteristics of the Unit Head (Q 22)

Faculty generally perceived their unit head to demonstrate integrity (83% agree), to show respect for them (80% agree), and to have adequate fiscal resource management skills (75% agree). They were less likely to agree that their unit head is an effective fundraiser (59% agree) or has adequate human resource management skills (63%). (See Table 27.)

### Differences by School

The survey did not ask respondents to identify their home department, because the researchers believed this would compromise anonymity. Therefore, analysis for this question is only available at the school level.

Education faculty were less satisfied than average with their unit heads’ fiscal resource management skills, human resource management skills, respect for faculty, fundraising skills, and the extent to which they seek and use faculty input. Library faculty were also generally less satisfied than average with their unit heads, specifically with regard to human resource management skills, respect shown for faculty, communication with faculty, and the extent to which faculty input is sought and used. They were, however, more satisfied than average with their unit heads’ fiscal resource management skills and effectiveness as fundraisers.

The Veterinary Medicine faculty is a third group that was less satisfied than average with several characteristics of their unit heads. In this case, they were less likely than average to agree that their unit heads have adequate fiscal and human resource management skills, that they communicate sufficiently with faculty, and that they are effective fundraisers. Veterinary Medicine faculty, were, however, more satisfied than average with their unit heads’ respect for faculty and with the integrity that their unit heads demonstrates.

---

6 At the beginning of the survey, respondents were told that “unit” was defined as “your academic home, most often a department. In schools without departments, such as Nursing and Engineering, this is your school.”
Table 27
Characteristics of the Unit Head

- Is an effective fundraiser: 59%
- Has adequate human resource management skills: 63%
- Utilizes faculty input in decision making: 64%
- Communicates sufficiently with faculty: 65%
- Seeks input from faculty in decision making: 70%
- Has adequate fiscal resource management skills: 75%
- Shows respect for faculty: 80%
- Demonstrates integrity: 83%
Consumer and Family Sciences and Science faculty, on the other hand, were more satisfied than average with their unit heads on a number of factors. CFS faculty were more likely than most to agree that their heads have adequate fiscal and human resource management skills, that they seek input from faculty in decision-making, and that they are effective fundraisers. Science faculty were more likely than most to report that their unit heads show respect for faculty, communicate sufficiently with them, seek input from faculty, and use this input in decision-making. They were, however, less likely than average to report that their unit heads are effective fundraisers.

**Differences by Rank**

In answering each of these eight questions, assistant professors were consistently the most likely to agree that their unit head demonstrated these characteristics or skills while associate professors were the least likely to agree. In some cases the differences were minimal (e.g., has adequate fiscal resource management skills and demonstrates integrity), but in most cases the differences were noteworthy. For example, 87% of assistant professors agreed that their unit head shows respect for faculty compared to 79% of professors and 75% of associate professors. Also, 77% of assistant professors believed that their unit head seeks input from faculty in decision-making, compared to 71% of professors and only 63% of associate professors.

**Differences by Gender**

Males were considerably more likely than females to agree with each of the statements about their unit head, except their effectiveness as a fundraiser, where males and females responded similarly (60% of males compared to 57% of females agreed). The average difference between males’ and females’ rate of agreement with the remaining seven questions was 11 percentage points. The most significant difference reflects males’ and females’ views about their unit head’s human resource management skills, which 67% of males agreed are adequate compared to 51% of females.

**Differences by Race**

Asian Americans were less likely than the others to agree that their unit head has adequate human resource management skills (58% compared to 70% of underrepresented minorities and 63% of Caucasians) and that he or she utilizes faculty input in decision-making (56% compared to 86% of underrepresented minorities and 64% of Caucasians). Underrepresented minorities, as these figures show, were the most likely to agree with these statements about their unit head, as well as to agree that he or she shows respect for faculty (96% vs. 83% of Asian Americans and 80% of Caucasians). They are, however, less likely than the others to agree that their unit head communicates sufficiently with faculty (58% vs. 69% of Asian Americans and 65% of Caucasians) and that he or she is an effective fundraiser (39% vs. 63% of Asian Americans and 59% of Caucasians).

Caucasians, for their part, are the least likely to agree that their unit head demonstrates integrity (83% vs. 89% of Asian Americans and 91% of underrepresented minorities).
Finally, two questions briefly explored perceptions of faculty influence through the University Senate. Two thirds of the faculty agreed that they are familiar with the University Senate’s role at Purdue and just over half (54%) believed that their views are represented through the Senate.

**Differences by School**

Consumer and Family Sciences and Library faculty were the most likely to agree that they are familiar with the Senate’s role (82% each), followed by respondents from Health Sciences (79%), Education (77%), and Technology (75%). The proportion who are familiar with the Senate’s role is considerably lower in Management (46%), Engineering (55%), and Science (56%). Faculty in the Libraries were also the most likely to be satisfied that their views are represented through the Senate (72% agreed with this question), along with Health Sciences (69%) and Agriculture faculty (63%). Again, fewer than average in Management (35%), Science (45%), Engineering (46%), and in this case Education (45%), were satisfied that the Senate represents their views.

**Differences by Rank**

Assistant professors were far less likely than their more senior colleagues to report familiarity with the Senate’s role at Purdue (39% vs. 69% of associate and 79% of full professors). Faculty from the three ranks, however, were equally satisfied that their views are represented through the Senate.

**Differences by Gender**

Males and females did not answer these questions in substantially different ways.

**Differences by Race**

Caucasian faculty were more likely than others to be familiar with the University Senate’s role (68% compared to 41% of Asian Americans and 54% of underrepresented minorities). They were also more likely to be satisfied that their views are represented through the Senate (55% compared to 40% of Asian Americans and 35% of underrepresented minorities).

**Summary**

Faculty perceived that they have the greatest ability to influence curriculum decisions and the selection of new faculty members and graduate students within their units, while they felt least able to influence class sizes, course loads, and two financial decisions within their units: resource allocation generally and annual merit pay increases specifically. Library faculty, as well as CFS faculty to a lesser extent, believe that they have a greater ability to influence their unit than do their colleagues in other schools. Management faculty, on the other hand, feel that they have less influence than average regarding several issues. By rank, assistant professors perceive that they have the least ability to influence unit decisions while professors perceive that they have the most influence.
To summarize the questions focusing on one’s unit head, a clear majority of faculty perceived that their unit head demonstrates integrity, shows respect for them, and has adequate fiscal resource management skills. They were less likely to agree that their unit head is an effective fundraiser or has adequate human resource management skills. Education, Library, and Veterinary Medicine faculty were less satisfied than average with a number of characteristics of their unit heads, while Consumer and Family Sciences and Science faculty were more satisfied than average with their unit heads on a number of factors. Females tended to be substantially less satisfied with their unit heads than males.

Finally, with regards to the University Senate, two thirds of the faculty agreed that they are familiar with the University Senate’s role at Purdue and just over half believed that their views are represented through the Senate. Full professors and Caucasians were the most likely to be familiar with the Senate’s role at Purdue and Caucasians were more likely than Asian Americans and underrepresented minorities to believe that the Senate represented their views.
VIII. Climate

Survey questions regarding climate can be divided into five themes: 1) workload, stress levels, and sources of stress, 2) discrimination and harassment, 3) perceptions of fairness, 4) the extent to which people feel that they and their unit are valued by others, and 5) satisfaction with the Purdue campus and the Greater Lafayette Community.

Workload and Stress (Qs 25 and 26)

Looking first at workload, 82% perceived that the pace of work in their unit seems to be increasing annually and only 53% of faculty believed that they have as much time available for research as do others at their level in the unit. However, 77% also believed that their unit expects a reasonable level of output from them.

In terms of stress levels, approximately half of faculty perceived that they are asked to serve on too many committees (47%) and that an excessive workload is interfering with their personal lives (55%). In addition, a slight majority feels burned out from work (52%). (See Table 28.)

Differences by School

Faculty from CFS (95%), the Libraries (95%), Technology (95%), and Veterinary Medicine (96%) were more likely than average (82%) to report that the pace of work in their unit seems to be increasing annually, while those in the Liberal Arts (68%), Management (65%), and Science (69%) were the least likely to perceive this to be the case. Management faculty (70%) were also more likely than average (52%) to believe that they have as much time available for research as do others at their level in the unit, while Veterinary Medicine faculty (40%) were the least likely to believe this to be true.

Management’s comparatively positive outlook toward their workload continues as we examine the stress-related questions. These faculty were also the least likely to say that they are asked to serve on too many committees (28% compared to an average of 47%), that their workload is interfering with their personal lives (28% vs. an average of 54%), and that they feel burned out (28% vs. a 52% average).

A higher than average proportion of Education (77%) and Library faculty (65%) felt that they are asked to serve on too many committees, while faculty from Agriculture (68%), CFS (70%), Engineering (67%), and the Libraries (68%) were the most likely to report that an excessive workload is interfering with their personal lives. Finally, Agriculture (63%) and Veterinary Medicine faculty (63%) were the most likely to feel burned out from their work.

Differences by Rank

Full professors tended to have the most positive outlook regarding workload and stress levels, while associate professors generally had the least positive outlook. Specifically, although professors were more likely than the others to agree that the pace of work in their unit seems to be increasing annually (86% vs. 80% of associate and 76%
Table 28
Workload and Stress

- I am asked to serve on too many committees: 47%
- I feel that I have as much time available for research as do other faculty at my level in this unit: 53%
- I feel burned out from my work: 52%
- An excessive workload is interfering with my personal life: 55%
- My unit expects a reasonable level of output from me: 77%
- The pace of work in my unit seems to be increasing annually: 82%
of assistant professors), they were also the most likely to indicate that their unit expects a reasonable level of output from them (81% agree vs. 73% of associate and 74% of assistant professors) and the least likely to say that an excessive work load is interfering with their personal lives (52% vs. 57% of associate and 58% of assistant professors).

Associate professors, on the other hand, were the least likely to believe that they have as much time for research as do others at their level in their unit (44% vs. 55% of assistant and 57% of full professors) and the most likely to believe that they are asked to serve on too many committees (54% vs. 40% of assistant and 48% of full professors). (Full professors, however, actually reported spending a higher proportion of their time on internal committee work than associate professors – see Time Allocation above). Associate professors also feel burned out from their work at a substantially higher rate than assistant and full professors (60% vs. 48% for the others).

**Differences by Gender**

Females and males perceived several aspects of their workloads quite differently. Females were less likely than males to feel that their unit expects a reasonable level of output from them (68% vs. 80%) and that they have as much time available for research as do others at their level in their unit (43% vs. 56%). In addition, they were more likely to believe that they are asked to serve on too many committees (54% of females vs. 45% of males). Referring back again to the Time Allocation questions above, females do in fact report spending slightly less time than males on research-related activities and more time serving on internal committees. While females were more likely than males to report that an excessive workload is interfering with their personal lives (59% vs. 53%), they are only slightly more likely to feel burned out from their work (53% vs. 50%).

**Differences by Race**

Asian Americans were the least likely to believe that they have as much time available for research as do others at their level (38% vs. 46% of underrepresented minorities and 53% of Caucasians) and the most likely to believe they are asked to serve on too many committees (57% vs. 46% of underrepresented minorities and 48% of Caucasians). However, in terms of the proportion of time that this group spends on these two activities, they reported spending more time on research than both underrepresented minorities and Caucasians. They also reported spending the least amount of time on committee work of the three groups. Finally, this group is more likely than the others to feel burned out from their work (55% vs. 39% of underrepresented minorities and 52% of Caucasians).

Underrepresented minorities, although the least likely to feel burned out, were slightly more likely than the others to feel that an excessive work load is interfering with their personal lives (61% vs. 58% of Asian Americans and 55% of Caucasians). Caucasians, for their part, were the most likely to believe that the pace of work in their unit is increasing annually (83% vs. 71% of Asian Americans and 63% of underrepresented minorities).
Sources of Stress (Q 34)

The survey also asked faculty to report the extent to which a series of specific work and personal factors had been a source of stress for them over the past two years. Among the 17 items included in this question, faculty reported that high self-expectations were the leading source of stress (49% reported this as an extensive source of stress). Institutional procedures and “red tape” and research or publishing demands were also top sources of stress. (See Tables 29 and 30.)

Differences by School

Because several of the 17 items do not pertain to all of the faculty (i.e., interactions with Purdue’s Animal Care and Use Committee, child care, after-school care, and care of an elderly parent), the numbers are too small to analyze by school. Analyses of the remaining 13 factors are included below.

Agriculture faculty did not report more extensive stress for any of the remaining items compared to the averages across the schools.

CFS faculty were more likely than average to say that their teaching load (32% vs. an average of 21%) and interactions with Purdue’s Committee on the Use of Human Research Subjects (33% vs. an average of 16%) were extensive sources of stress. They were less likely than average to report that committee work (9% vs. an average of 24%) and managing household responsibilities (9% vs. an average of 20%) caused extensive stress.

In the case of Education faculty, they were more likely than average to report that committee work (51% vs. an average of 24%) was an extensive source of stress and less likely to say that their teaching load (9% vs. an average of 21%), managing household responsibilities (7% vs. an average of 20%), and colleagues’ lack of understanding of their family responsibilities (0% vs. an average of 8%) were extensive sources of stress.

Engineering faculty only reported that their high self-expectations were more often an extensive source of stress compared to the faculty average (57% vs. 49% on average).

Faculty from the Health Sciences were more likely than average to find their teaching load (42% vs. an average of 21%) and the tenure/promotion process (38% vs. an average of 30%) to cause extensive stress. On the other hand, they found interactions with Purdue’s Committee on the Use of Human Research Subjects to cause less extensive stress than average (4% vs. an average of 16%).

Liberal Arts faculty did not report more or less extensive stress for any items compared to the averages across the schools.

Faculty from the Libraries, on the other hand, found committee work (55% vs. an average of 24%), institutional procedures and “red tape,” (48% vs. an average of 38%), and being part of a dual-career couple (55% vs. an average of 25%) to cause more
Table 29
Work-Related Sources of Stress During Last Two Years

- Lack of flexible work hours
- Colleagues' lack of understanding of my family responsibilities
- Discrimination
- Interactions with Purdue's Animal Care and Use Committee
- Keeping up with information/computer technology
- Interactions with Purdue's Committee on the Use of Human Research Subjects
- Teaching load
- Committee work
- Tenure/promotion process
- Research or publishing demands
- Institutional procedures and "red tape"
- High self-expectations

[Bar chart showing percentages for each source of stress]
Table 30: Personal Sources of Stress

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Stress</th>
<th>Extensive Source of Stress</th>
<th>Somewhat a Source of Stress</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>After-school care</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child care</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Care of elderly parent</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managing household responsibilities</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being part of a dual-career couple</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
extensive stress than average. They found the tenure/promotion process (17% vs. an average of 30%) and their teaching load (6% vs. an average of 21%) to be less stressful than average.

Management faculty found their teaching load to bring more extensive stress than average (38% vs. 21%), but they deemed their committee work (7% vs. an average of 24%) and institutional procedures and “red tape” (28% vs. an average of 38%) to be less stressful than average.

Those in Technology reported that their teaching load (32% vs. an average of 21%), keeping up with information/computer technology (22% vs. an average of 13%), and the tenure/promotion process (42% vs. an average of 30%) brought on more extensive stress than average. However, they reported that high self-expectations (39% vs. an average of 49%) and being part of a dual-career couple (14% vs. an average of 25%) caused less extensive stress than average.

Finally, Veterinary Medicine faculty found institutional procedures and “red tape” (62% vs. an average of 38%) and interactions with Purdue’s Animal Care and Use Committee (28% vs. an average of 11%) to bring more extensive stress than average, while research or publishing demands (26% vs. an average of 37%) caused less extensive stress than average.

**Differences by Rank**

Overall, a number of work and personal factors caused more stress for assistant professors than for associate and full professors. Specifically, higher percentages of assistant professors found research or publishing demands (66% vs. 35% of associate and 22% of full professors), high self-expectations (64% vs. 50% of associate and 39% of full professors), the tenure/promotion process (52% vs. 32% of associate and 11% of full professors), managing household responsibilities (29% vs. 21% of associate and 13% of full professors), child care (22% vs. 15% of associate and 10% of full professors), and being part of a dual-career couple (37% vs. 26% of associate and 17% of full professors), to be more common sources of extensive stress than did faculty at the other two ranks.

More associate professors found committee work to bring on extensive stress (30%) than did assistant (18%) or full professors (22%). For their part, professors reported that keeping up with information/computer technology more often caused extensive stress (16% found this to be true) than did assistant (8%) or associate professors (12%).

**Differences by Gender**

Where males and females answered differently, in almost every case, females reported experiencing more extensive stress than did males. Specifically, females reported higher levels of stress due to research or publishing demands (45% vs. 34%), committee work (31% vs. 21%), interactions with Purdue’s Animal Care and Use Committee (15% vs. 10%), the tenure/promotion process (37% vs. 26%), discrimination (17% vs. 4%), managing household responsibilities (27% vs. 17%), colleagues’ lack of understanding of their family responsibilities (13% vs. 6%), child care (25% vs. 12%),
after school care (27% vs. 7%), elderly care (23% vs. 11%), and being part of a dual career couple (36% vs. 21%). Males, on the other hand, were more likely to report that interactions with Purdue’s Committee on the Use of Human Research Subjects was a source of extensive stress (18% vs. 13%).

**Differences by Race**

Underrepresented minorities were the most likely to report extensive stress from the following work-related factors: research or publishing demands (50% vs. 39% of Asian Americans and 38% of Caucasians), high self-expectations (65% vs. 45% of Asian Americans and 49% of Caucasians), and the tenure and promotion process (45% vs. 31% of Asian Americans and 30% of Caucasians). They were also the most likely to report that discrimination caused them extensive stress (18% vs. 14% of Asian Americans and 7% of Caucasians).

Asian Americans were more likely than underrepresented minorities or Caucasians to report extensive stress related to personal issues: child care (27% vs. 14% and 15% respectively), being part of a dual-career couple (31% vs. 27% and 25% respectively), and household responsibilities (30% vs. 20% for the other two groups). Caucasians were the most likely to report extensive stress from committee work (25% vs. 10% of Asian Americans and 18% of underrepresented minorities) and institutional procedures and “red tape” (39% vs. 31% of Asian Americans and 23% of underrepresented minorities).

**Personal Discrimination or Harassment (Q 60)**

Looking at the issues of discrimination and harassment more closely, another set of survey questions asked whether the respondent had been personally harassed or discriminated against or had observed faculty members harassing or making disparaging remarks about other faculty, students, or staff within the last two years. Twelve percent reported that they personally had been harassed or discriminated against. Analyzing differences by school, faculty in the Libraries (18%), Management (17%), Liberal Arts (15%), and Agriculture (15%) were the most likely to report being harassed or discriminated against. By rank, responses were virtually the same, but by gender, females were more than twice as likely as males to report discrimination or harassment (23% vs. 9% of males). Asian Americans were less likely than the other two groups to report having experienced this behavior (6% vs. 13% of underrepresented minorities and 12% of Caucasians).

Most of the individuals who had been harassed or discriminated against within the past two years chose to include written comments about their experience(s). They most commonly mentioned the three following types of harassment or discrimination:

- **Sexual harassment**

  “A member of the primary committee hugged me - it was unwelcome and unsolicited but I did not feel that I could avoid it without angering this powerful person.”
“Sexual harassment by full professor. Warning by a second full professor not to discuss sexual harassment with Dean”

“From people less in power, including undergraduates."

- Age discrimination

“I believe I am seriously discriminated against because of my age 71."

“For young faculty, age discrimination is a problem.”

- Research discrimination

“Based on research area, continuous since I have been here…”

“Professor X in Department A openly asked me to withdraw from Department A because I was also active in Department B. I had done 10 times as much research in area A than Professor X.”

Differences by Gender

Females were more likely than males to write that they had been sexually harassed, although a few males reported that they had experienced this as well. Full professors, older male professors, and students were most often the reported harassers.

Differences by Rank

Associate and full professors were the most likely to report discrimination, especially by their unit head, because of their opinions, gender, or research area. Full professors were the most likely to report general discrimination because of their research area, while assistant professor were the most likely to report instances of sexual harassment.

Observations of Harassment or Disparaging Remarks (Q 61)

With regard to the second question specifically on the topic of discrimination and harassment, a number of respondents had observed other faculty members harassing or making disparaging remarks against someone within the last two years. Most commonly, faculty reported that these behaviors focused on someone’s research area (40% had witnessed this), theoretical or methodological orientation (31% had witnessed this), dress or personal appearance (25% had witnessed this), or someone’s sex (21% had witnessed this). (See Table 31.)

Differences by School

Considering differences by school, harassment or disparaging remarks regarding race were most commonly observed in Education, Engineering, and Science (17% had observed this in each case compared to an average of 13%) and Liberal Arts faculty (20%) most often observed these behaviors with regard to religion (compared to an average of 14%). Harassment or disparaging remarks based on sex were most common in
Table 31

Within your unit, in the last two years have you heard faculty members harass or make
disparaging remarks about other faculty, students, or staff
based on the characteristics listed below?

- Research area: 40%
- Theoretical or methodological orientation: 31%
- Dress or personal appearance: 25%
- Sex: 21%
- Religion: 14%
- Sexual orientation: 13%
- Race: 13%
- National origin or ancestry: 13%
- Family responsibilities: 11%
- Color: 8%
- Marital status: 7%
- Parental status: 6%
- Disability: 3%
- Status as a disabled or Vietnam-era veteran: 1%
Liberal Arts and Veterinary Medicine (28% in both cases) and least common in CFS (5%) and Health Sciences (8%).

These behaviors regarding national origin or ancestry were most commonly observed in Science (23%) and least commonly observed in Technology (6%), the Libraries (5%), and Health Sciences (4%). Harassment or disparaging remarks regarding sexual orientation were noticed most commonly again in Liberal Arts (21%) and least often in Health Sciences (6%), the Libraries (5%), and CFS (5%). With regard to dress or personal appearance, Management (39%) and Education faculty (36%) were most likely to have observed these negative behaviors while faculty in Science (16%), CFS (14%), and Health Sciences (12%) were the least likely to have done so.

Liberal Arts (52%), Education (47%), and Management faculty (42%) were the most likely to report observing harassment or disparaging remarks regarding one’s theoretical or methodological orientation, while Agriculture (17%), Veterinary Medicine (17%), Health Sciences (16%), and Technology faculty (10%) were the least likely to report observing this. Liberal Arts (51%) and Management faculty (52%) were also the most likely to report observing these behaviors with regard to one’s research area, while Health Sciences (25%), CFS (23%), and Technology faculty (6%) were the least likely to have observed this. Finally, Liberal Arts and Libraries faculty were the most likely to report observing harassment or disparaging remarks related to someone’s family responsibilities (16% and 15% respectively compared to an average of 10%), while Management faculty (4%) were the least likely to report this.

With regard to a number of characteristics, Liberal Arts faculty observed more harassment or disparaging remarks than average, while Health Sciences and CFS faculty witnessed fewer problems than average.

Differences by Rank
Where responses varied by rank, in every case associate professors were the most likely to have observed faculty harassing or making disparaging remarks about other faculty, students, or staff. Specifically the were the most likely to report harassment or disparaging remarks regarding race (16% vs. 12% of assistant and 10% of full professors), sex (27% vs. 24% of assistant and 15% of full professors), national origin/ancestry (17% vs. 11% of assistant and 12% of full professors), sexual orientation (19% vs. 11% of assistant and 10% of full professors), dress/personal appearance (29% vs. 22% of assistant and 23% of full professors), and family responsibilities (15% vs. 13% of assistant and 7% of full professors).

Differences by Gender
With regard to almost every category, females were more likely than males to have observed faculty harassing or making disparaging remarks about other faculty, students, or staff. In some cases, the difference in responses was only four to seven percentage points (with regard to religion, color, national origin/ancestry, marital status, disability, and research area). In other cases, however, the differences were quite substantial – females were far more likely than males to have observed harassment or disparaging
remarks with regard to: race (21% vs. 10%), sex (39% vs. 14%), parental status (14% vs. 4%), sexual orientation (20% vs. 10%), dress or personal appearance (35% vs. 21%), theoretical or methodological orientation (39% vs. 28%), and family responsibilities (20% vs. 8%).

**Differences by Race**

Considering responses to this question by race, Asian Americans were the most likely to have observed harassment or disparaging remarks regarding race (32% vs. 18% of underrepresented minorities and 11% of Caucasians), national origin/ancestry (30% vs. 5% of underrepresented minorities and 12% of Caucasians), theoretical or methodological orientation (39% vs. 29% of underrepresented minorities and 30% of Caucasians), and research area (59% vs. 26% of underrepresented minorities and 38% of Caucasians). Underrepresented minorities were the most likely to have observed these behaviors with regard to color (18% vs. 8% of Asian Americans and Caucasians) and sex (35% vs. 19% of Asian Americans and 20% of Caucasians).

**Perceptions of Fairness (Q 25 and 26)**

The next series of six questions examined whether faculty members perceived that lab and office space, support services, and salaries are distributed fairly across their unit. It also examined whether faculty believed that requesting preferential teaching assignments or a tenure clock extension is feasible without accompanying negative repercussions.

Looking first at the distribution of resources, a clear majority believed that office space (82%), support services and other resources (73%), and to a lesser extent lab space (63%) are distributed fairly across the unit. Only half believed that their salary is appropriate compared to others of comparable rank in their unit. (See Table 32.)

**Differences by School**

Faculty in Technology were more likely than average to believe that office space (96%), support services and other resources (89%), and lab space (80%) are distributed fairly in their units. Management faculty were also more likely than average to believe that support services and other resources are equitably distributed (93%), while Engineering faculty were less likely than average (52%) to perceive that lab space is fairly distributed. Regarding salary, more library faculty than average (67%) perceived that their salary is appropriate compared to others at comparable rank, while only 38% of Education faculty believed this to be true.

**Differences by Rank**

Faculty across the ranks believed, to approximately the same extent, that office space is distributed fairly. Associate professors were the least likely to believe that the other resources are equitably distributed, followed by full professors. Specifically, distributions by rank are as follows: lab space: 57% of associate, 63% of full, and 69% of assistant professors agreed that this is distributed fairly; support services: 41% of associate, 52% of full, and 58% of assistant professors agreed that this is distributed fairly; and salary:
Table 32
Perceptions of Fairness in One’s Unit

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perceived Fairness</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>If necessary, I would feel comfortable requesting a tenure clock extension...</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My salary is appropriate compared to others of comparable rank in my unit</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lab space in my unit is distributed fairly among my peers and me</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If necessary, I would feel comfortable requesting preferential teaching...</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support services and other resources are distributed fairly among faculty...</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office space in my unit is distributed fairly among my peers and me</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
41% of associate, 52% of full, and 58% of assistant professors agreed that this is distributed fairly.

**Differences by Gender**

Males and females responded in almost identical ways in terms of their perceptions regarding the equitable distribution of lab and office space. Females were, however, less likely than males to believe that support services (67% vs. 75%) and salary (44% vs. 53%) were distributed equitably.

**Differences by Race**

In each of these four cases, Caucasians were the most likely to believe that resources are distributed equitably. In the case of lab space and support services, underrepresented minorities were the least likely to agree. (Fifty-three percent of underrepresented minorities and 56% of Asian Americans, compared to 64% of Caucasians believe lab space is equitably distributed, and 59% of underrepresented minorities and 61% of Asian Americans, compared to 74% of Caucasians believed support services are equitably distributed). Asian Americans were the least likely to believe that office space (72% vs. 82% of underrepresented minorities and 83% of Caucasians) and salaries (26% vs. 44% and 52% respectively) are equitable.

Shifting now to the two questions regarding special work requests, 63% of those with an opinion believed that they could request preferential teaching assignments at a critical phase of their career development without fearing negative repercussions. An additional 18% reported that they did not know the answer to this question, with equal proportions of males and females unsure. Only 40% of those with an opinion believed that they could request a tenure clock extension without fearing negative repercussions. In this case, 46% indicated that they did not know whether they could do so or not without experiencing negative repercussions and males were more likely to not have an opinion than were females (53% vs. 31%).

**Differences by School**

Faculty in CFS (50%), Health Sciences (50%), and Education (36%) were the least likely to believe that they would feel comfortable requesting a preferential teaching assignment without fearing negative repercussions, while Science faculty were the most likely (79%). Health Sciences faculty were also the least likely to believe that they would feel comfortable requesting a tenure clock extension without fearing negative repercussions (29%), while Technology faculty were the most likely to feel comfortable doing so (52%).

**Differences by Rank, School, and Race**

Associate professors were the least likely to feel comfortable requesting a preferential teaching assignment (54% vs. 62% of assistant and 69% of full professors), while assistant professors were the least likely to feel comfortable requesting a tenure clock extension (32% vs. 39% of associate and 51% of full professors). In both cases, females were substantially less likely than males to feel comfortable asking for a preferential teaching assignment (52% vs. 67%) or a tenure clock extension (33% vs.
Responses varied by race only with regard to a tenure clock extension – Asian Americans were the least likely to feel comfortable requesting this (31% vs. 36% of underrepresented minorities and 41% of Caucasians).

Feeling Valued (Qs 25 and 26)

This section includes two questions about the extent to which faculty feel valued by their unit colleagues, as well as two questions about the extent to which they believe their unit is valued by faculty and administrators across the campus.

Examining feelings of value at the individual level, 74% felt that others in their unit value their teaching, while 27% felt pressured to change their research or creative work agenda in order to fit in with the priorities of their unit.

Faculty from CFS (84%), Technology (84%), and Veterinary Medicine (91%) were especially likely to feel that their teaching is valued, while faculty from the Libraries were more likely than average to feel pressured to change their research agenda (38%). Associate professors were the least likely to believe that their teaching is valued (69% vs. 75% of assistant and 77% of full professors) and the most likely to perceive pressure to change their research/creative work agenda (32% vs. 27% of assistant and 24% of full professors).

By gender, females were somewhat less likely to feel that their teaching is valued (71% vs. 75%) and more likely to feel pressure to change their research agenda (33% vs. 25%). Finally, by race, underrepresented minorities were the most likely to feel that their teaching is valued (90% vs. 67% of Asian Americans and 74% of Caucasians). They, along with Asian Americans, were also less likely than Caucasians to feel pressure to change their research agenda (19%, 17% and 27% respectively).

To what extent did people feel that faculty and administrators across the campus value their unit? On average, 52% felt that outside faculty value their unit and 39% felt that central administrators value their unit. However, perceptions by school are widely divergent. A clear majority of faculty from Agriculture (74%), Engineering (77%), and Science (63%) felt that faculty across Purdue value their unit. Faculty from these three schools were also the most likely to believe that central administrators value their unit (61% of Agriculture, 55% of Engineering, and 49% of Science faculty).

At the other end of the spectrum, only 38% of Management, 33% of CFS, 32% of Liberal Arts, 31% of Technology and a scant 13% of Education faculty members felt that other faculty value their unit. Similarly, only 20% of Liberal Arts, 17% of Management, and 7% of Education faculty believed that central administrators value their unit. (See Tables 33 and 34.)

Associate professors were the least likely to believe that their unit is valued by outside faculty (41% vs. 45% of assistant and 62% of full professors) or central administrators (29% vs. 38% of assistant and 46% of full professors). Compared to
Table 34
Perception That Central University Administrators Value One's Unit

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal Arts</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consumer and Family Sciences</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veterinary Medicine</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Sciences</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Libraries</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
males, females were substantially less likely to perceive that either outside faculty (36% vs. 57%) or central administrators (30% vs. 43%) value their unit.

Examining differences by race, Caucasians were the least likely to believe that faculty across the campus value their unit (51% vs. 56% of underrepresented minorities and 60% of Asian Americans). However, Asian Americans were substantially less likely than Caucasians and underrepresented minorities to believe that central administrators value their unit (26% vs. 39% and 53% respectively), even though 59% of this population works in Science and Engineering where this sentiment is higher than average.

Social Contact with Other Faculty (Q 25 and 26)

Fully 89% of faculty agreed that their social contacts with other faculty members in their unit are pleasant and 72% felt that they have as much social contact with Purdue faculty members as they would like. Faculty from the Libraries (100%), Technology (98%), and CFS (96%) were the most likely to say that their social interaction with others in their unit is pleasant. CFS faculty were also more likely than average to report that they have as much social contact with faculty across the campus as they would like (83%). On the other hand, Engineering (62%), Libraries (64%), and Veterinary Medicine (64%) faculty were the least likely to report that they have as much social contact across campus as they would like.

Assistant professors were the most likely to say their unit interactions are pleasant (94% vs. 86% of associate and 88% of full professors) but the least likely to say they have as much social contact with faculty members across campus as they would like (69% vs. 75% of associate and 71% of full professors). Females and males answered these questions in essentially the same ways and responses varied by race only in the second instance. Underrepresented minorities (59%) and Asian Americans (63%) were less likely than Caucasians (72%) to report that they have as much social contact with faculty members across the campus as they would like.

Retirement, including Perceptions of the Voluntary Early Partial Retirement Program (Qs 35 and 49)

Four percent of faculty respondents currently participate in the Voluntary Early Partial Retirement Program and another 15% reported that they are likely to retire from Purdue in the next five years. Examining responses by school, the following are likely to have 20% or more of their faculty retire in the next five years: Agriculture (23%), Engineering (21%), Science (21%), Technology (31%), Veterinary Medicine (25%), and Health Sciences (21%). Fifty-nine percent of respondents also indicated that they would retire early if Purdue offered them an additional incentive to do so.

Overall, 74% of respondents are satisfied with the Voluntary Early Partial Retirement Program, but professors are less likely than the other ranks to be satisfied (70% vs. 78% of associate and 88% of assistant professors). Respondents also had the opportunity to comment on the Voluntary Early Partial Retirement Program.
Q 35. Please add any comments you would like to make regarding the Voluntary Early Partial Retirement Program.

Approximately half of those who answered this question made comments about the program that were of a very general nature. For example, “Since I am not anywhere close to retirement, I won't comment on this,” and “When I go I am gone.”

Another three out of ten respondents indicated that they were unaware of the Voluntary Early Partial Retirement Program, while two out of ten wrote very positive comments about the program. Only a few respondents’ comments expressed their negative feelings about the Voluntary Early Partial Retirement Program, most often commenting about the workload, which they must pick up when someone is on partial retirement.

- **Positive Comments**

  “It is a very effective and well-designed program.”

  “An excellent program - both for the university as well as the individual faculty members.”

  “I'm on last year of Voluntary Early Partial Retirement Program. Highly recommend!”

- **Negative Comments**

  “We end up with program units with faculty who aren't here half of the year and thus won't do committee work, and often dump their graduate students on those of us who are here and can't stand to see the students wander around with no one to answer their questions or help them. I think it's a horrible program”

  “I don't think that Purdue does a very good job of covering for the absent professor when they are missing from campus, and the program, unfortunately causes great hardships in our department when someone takes advantage of it.”

**Satisfaction with the Purdue Campus (Q 32)**

Respondents were quite satisfied with their perceived level of personal safety on campus (91% were satisfied), with bus services (84%), and with recreational facilities (72%). They were far less satisfied with childcare services (25% were satisfied), accommodations for bicyclists (38%), and the ethnic/racial diversity on campus (38%). (See Table 35.)
## Table 35
Satisfaction with the Purdue Campus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Child care services</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic/racial diversity</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accommodations for bicyclists</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus members’ acceptance of those different from them</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dining facilities</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural activities</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional and personal counseling services</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreational facilities</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus service</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal safety</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Differences by Gender

Males and females share similar levels of satisfaction regarding parking and accommodations for bicyclists. In every other case, however, females were less satisfied than males. The differences are especially noteworthy concerning the following issues: child care (15% of females vs. 29% of males were satisfied), professional and personal counseling (63% of females vs. 72% of males were satisfied), ethnic/racial diversity (24% of females vs. 44% of males were satisfied), campus members’ acceptance of those who are different from them (32% of females vs. 56% of males were satisfied), and personal safety (82% of females vs. 95% of males were satisfied).

Differences by Race

For several of these issues (child care, counseling services, accommodations for bicyclists, and bus service), the number of Asian Americans and underrepresented minorities who answered the question is too small to analyze. In the case of personal safety, answers from the three groups are virtually the same. Otherwise, Asian Americans were less satisfied than the others with dining facilities (33% were satisfied compared to 62% of underrepresented minorities and 56% of Caucasians) and recreational facilities (64% are satisfied compared to 79% of underrepresented minorities and 72% of Caucasians). Underrepresented minorities were less satisfied than the others with the following cultural issues: cultural activities (46% were satisfied compared to 64% of Asian Americans and 66% of Caucasians), ethnic/racial diversity (14% were satisfied compared to 38% of Asian Americans and 39% of Caucasians), and campus members’ acceptance of those who are different from them (24% were satisfied compared to 41% of Asian Americans and 50% of Caucasians).

Differences by rank and school are less relevant for this question and the next, so these analyses are not included in the report.

Satisfaction with the Greater Lafayette Community (Q 33)

Faculty reported the highest satisfaction with the following aspects of the Greater Lafayette Community: personal safety (95% satisfaction), K-12 schools (88%), libraries (86%), and housing in their price range (83%). They were considerably less satisfied with community members’ acceptance of those who are different from them (40% were satisfied), ethnic/racial diversity (42%), restaurants (45%), and the social life available (47%). (See Table 36.)

Differences by Gender

Females and males shared very similar levels of satisfaction regarding the housing that is available in their price range, safety, and parks and recreational facilities, while females were between five and nine percentage points less satisfied than males with the following: K-12 schools (84% vs. 89%), libraries (82% vs. 87%), cultural programs (46% vs. 53%), and day care facilities (40% vs. 51%). Females were also substantially less satisfied than males with the following: ethnic/racial diversity (28% vs. 47%), community members’ acceptance of those who are different from them (27% vs. 44%), restaurants (35% vs. 48%), social life (37% vs. 51%), and medical services (57% vs. 72%).
Table 36
Satisfaction with the Greater Lafayette Community

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspect</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community members' acceptance of those who are different from them</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic/racial diversity</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restaurants</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social life</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day care facilities</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural programs</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks and recreational facilities</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical services</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing in your price range</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Libraries</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K-12 schools</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Differences by Race

Both Asian Americans and underrepresented minorities were less satisfied than Caucasians with several aspects of the local community: libraries (65% of Asian Americans and 76% of underrepresented minorities were satisfied compared to 87% of Caucasians), cultural programming (37% and 29% respectively vs. 53% of Caucasians), day care (41% and 38% vs. 49%), community members’ acceptance of those who are different from them (26% and 24% vs. 41%), restaurants (32% and 38% vs. 46%), social life (21% and 27% vs. 50%), and medical services (52% and 57% vs. 69%).

In addition, underrepresented minorities were considerably less satisfied than the others with K-12 schools (57% vs. 95% of Asian Americans and 88% of Caucasians), and ethnic/racial diversity (24% vs. 41% of Asian Americans and 43% of Caucasians). Asian Americans were the least satisfied with parks (50% vs. 70% of underrepresented minorities and 61% of Caucasians) and housing in their price range (60% vs. 75% of underrepresented minorities and 84% of Caucasians).

Summary

As an overview to this broad section on climate, no clear patterns emerged regarding school level responses. No particular school’s faculty consistently feels more or less stress than average, perceives a more or less fair distribution of resources in their unit than average, or feels more or less valued on an individual basis than average. However, by rank, associate professors reported the highest levels of stress and were the least likely to perceive that resources were distributed fairly in their unit and that others valued their teaching and research.

Females were more likely than males to report higher levels of stress, a higher number of specific stressors that caused extensive stress for them, more discriminatory behavior toward them, and an unfair distribution of support services and salaries in their unit. They also felt less valued for their teaching and research than did males and were less satisfied with a number of components of the Purdue campus and the local community.

Finally, Asian Americans reported higher levels of stress overall than Caucasians and underrepresented minorities, as well as more extensive stress from personal stressors, while underrepresented minorities experienced the most extensive stress from work-related stressors. Regarding the campus, Asian Americans were particularly dissatisfied with available dining facilities while underrepresented minorities were the least satisfied with cultural activities, ethnic/racial diversity, and campus members’ acceptance of those who are different from them. Both Asian Americans and underrepresented minorities were less satisfied than Caucasians with the following aspects of the local community: libraries, cultural programming, day care, community members’ acceptance of those who are different from them, restaurants, social life, and medical services. In addition, underrepresented minorities were considerably less satisfied than the others with K-12 schools and ethnic/racial diversity.
Turning now to a summary of the specific components of this section on climate, with regard to workload, 82% perceived that the pace of work in their unit seems to be increasing annually, but 77% also believed that their unit expects a reasonable level of output from them. In terms of stress levels, approximately half of faculty perceived that they are asked to serve on too many committees, that an excessive workload is interfering with their personal lives, and that they are burned out from work.

By school, responses from Agriculture, CFS, Libraries, and Veterinary Medicine faculty reflected that they, more than most, feel extensive pressure and stress as a result of their workload. Management faculty, on the other hand, were the least likely to report feeling this extensive stress. Full professors tended to have the most positive outlook regarding workload and stress levels, while associate professors generally had the least positive outlook.

Females were less likely than males to feel that their unit expects a reasonable level of output from them and that they have as much time available for research as do others at their level in their unit. In addition, they were more likely to believe that they are asked to serve on too many committees. While females were more likely than males to report that an excessive workload is interfering with their personal lives, they were only slightly more likely to feel burned out from their work.

Asian Americans were the least likely to believe that they have as much time available for research as do others at their level and were the most likely to believe they are asked to serve on too many committees. This group was also slightly more likely than the others to feel burned out from their work. Underrepresented minorities, although the least likely to feel burned out, were slightly more likely than the others to feel that an excessive workload is interfering with their personal lives.

The survey also asked faculty to report the extent to which a series of specific work and personal factors had been a source of stress for them over the past two years. Among the 17 items included in this question, faculty reported that high self-expectations were the leading source of stress, followed by institutional procedures and “red tape,” and research or publishing demands.

Overall, a number of work and personal factors caused more stress for assistant professors than for associate and full professors. Specifically, higher percentages of assistant professors found research or publishing demands, high self-expectations, the tenure/promotion process, managing household responsibilities, child care, and being part of a dual career couple to be more common sources of extensive stress than did faculty at the other two ranks.

Where males and females answered differently, in almost every case, females reported experiencing more extensive stress than did males. Underrepresented minorities were the most likely to report extensive stress from the following work-related factors: research or publishing demands, high self-expectations, and the tenure and promotion process. They were also the most likely to report that discrimination caused them
extensive stress. Asian Americans were more likely than underrepresented minorities or Caucasians to report extensive stress related to personal issues: child care, being part of a dual-career couple, and household responsibilities. Caucasians were the most likely to report extensive stress from committee work and institutional procedures and “red tape.”

Twelve percent of faculty reported that they personally had been harassed or discriminated against. The three most common issues, according to open-ended responses, were sexual harassment, and discrimination based on one’s age and research area. With regard to a second question on the topic of discrimination and harassment, a number of respondents had observed other faculty members harassing or making disparaging remarks against someone within the last two years. Most commonly, faculty reported that these behaviors focused on someone’s research area, theoretical or methodological orientation, dress or personal appearance, or sex.

A clear majority believed that office space, support services and other resources, and to a lesser extent lab space are distributed fairly across their unit. However, only half believed that their salary is appropriate compared to others of comparable rank in their unit. Faculty across the ranks believed, to approximately the same extent, that office space is distributed fairly, while associate professors were the least likely to believe that lab space, support services, and salaries are equitably distributed. In each of these four cases, Caucasians were the most likely to believe that resources are distributed equitably.

Sixty-three percent of those with an opinion believed that they could request preferential teaching assignments at a critical phase of their career development without fearing negative repercussions, while only 40% believed that they could request a tenure clock extension without fearing negative repercussions. In both cases, females were considerably less likely than males to feel comfortable asking for a preferential teaching assignment or a tenure clock extension.

Examining feelings of value at the individual level, 74% felt that others in their unit value their teaching, while 27% felt pressured to change their research or creative work agenda in order to fit in with the priorities of their unit. Associate professors were the least likely to believe that their teaching is valued and the most likely to perceive pressure to change their research/creative work agenda. Females were somewhat less likely to feel that their teaching is valued and more likely to feel pressure to change their research agenda.

A clear majority of faculty from Agriculture, Engineering, and Science felt that faculty across Purdue value their unit. These three schools were also the most likely to believe that central administrators value their unit. At the other end of the spectrum, only a minority of Management, CFS, Liberal Arts, Technology and Education faculty members felt that other faculty value their unit. Similarly, less than a fifth of Liberal Arts, Management, and Education faculty believed that central administrators value their unit.

Respondents were quite satisfied with their perceived level of personal safety on campus, with bus services, and with recreational facilities. They were far less satisfied
with childcare services, accommodations for bicyclists, and the ethnic/racial diversity on campus.

Asian Americans were less satisfied than the others with dining facilities and recreational facilities. Underrepresented minorities were less satisfied than the others with cultural activities, ethnic/racial diversity, and campus members’ acceptance of those who are different from them.

Faculty reported the highest satisfaction with the following aspects of the Greater Lafayette Community: personal safety, K-12 schools, libraries, and housing in their price range. They were considerably less satisfied with community members’ acceptance of those who are different from them, ethnic/racial diversity, restaurants, and the social life available. Both Asian Americans and underrepresented minorities were less satisfied than Caucasians with several aspects of the local community: libraries, cultural programming, day care, community members’ acceptance of those who are different from them, restaurants, social life, and medical services.
IX. Final Open-Ended Responses

This report concludes with a synopsis of responses to three broad open-ended questions that were at the end of the survey.

Q 62. What do you like most about Purdue?

Seven out of ten respondents answered this question and almost everyone mentioned at least one of seven factors in their response. These factors are first listed in order from the most to least commonly cited and then are illustrated in more detail below.

- Students
- Colleagues
- Freedom to choose research direction/flexibility
- The academic environment
- The local community
- Prestige of the unit, school, or university
- Salary and benefits

- Students

“The students and the opportunity to work with them.”

“We have great students.”

“I like teaching students and knowing I have made an impact on their life. I not only want my students to learn but also to mature and become someone that will represent Purdue well in industry.”

“Quality of grad students and some undergrads.”

- Colleagues

“Colleagues in Department have been supportive.”

“My colleagues are great. They come by to talk about research collaboration possibilities, learn how I am doing in my new job, offer advice, go to lunch, etc. My colleagues have high research and teaching standards.”

“I have excellent colleagues within my program area--they are good friends and stimulate me intellectually.”

- Freedom to choose research direction/flexibility

“Freedom to choose career development.”
“You are left alone to do your research and scholarly work if you wish. There is flexibility to arrange your schedule as needed.”

“The freedom to do my research and teaching as I see fit.”

“Freedom to teach and research what I want.”

- The academic environment

“Great place to work and teach, great atmosphere.”

“The professional and warm working conditions.”

“Atmosphere, great scientific community, great facilities.”

- The local community

“A great, safe place to bring up children.”

“Low crime, low urban stress, reasonable cost of living.”

“Safe environment to raise children, good quality of elementary school.”

- Prestige of the unit, school, or university

“I like the prestige associated with being at a Big Ten institution.”

“Purdue is a premier research and educational institution.”

“It's reputation and standing in Engineering.”

- Salary and benefits

“It has treated me personally very well -- salary, etc.”

“Great retirement package.”

“Wonderful salary and benefits.”

Q 63. What would you most like to change about Purdue? Approximately the same number of respondents answered this question as answered Question 62, but these responses were typically 2-3 times longer. The 16 most frequently mentioned issues are included below, in order from the most to least commonly cited.
• Administrative performance

“If I could, I would make the administrators realize that their role is to serve as facilitators instead of as dictators.”

“Administrators that don’t have the guts to treat all academic units and faculty fairly and put resources including pay increases where they should be going. Administrators should quit sitting around creating red tape that the faculty has to deal with when they want and should be teaching. This list could go on and on.”

“The top-down type of administration. People are generally happier if they feel that they have some control over their lives, including many of the aspects of their jobs. Administrators who truly listen to faculty input and not just say they do are sorely needed.”

“I would like Purdue to aggressively consider what administrative functions could be moved out of faculty hands and be accomplished more efficiently in a centralized fashion.”

• Salaries

“Competitive salaries. We don’t do too badly on averages, but on the high-end salaries, or salaries in key disciplines, we do very poorly. Our best faculty members are often lured away by significant salary increases.”

“We have been receiving basically cost-of-living increases now for as long as I have been here. Faculty salaries should be increased.”

“Provide 12 month salary for faculty who are trying to build a world-class research area, but are on academic year support. Hard to do on an academic year salary.”

“Faculty salaries have fallen way behind those at peer institution. Tap into the endowment if necessary to remedy this now.”

• The location

“Move it to the west coast.”

“Move it to a suburb of Chicago! I’m partly serious. Geographical location is not the best. Climate is not terrific either. It’s the land of married people, and it’s quite horrible for single faculty in terms of meeting people.”

“Move it to tropics.”

“Move it up by lake Michigan.... seriously, have bike/walking/running paths...have ice rinks...outdoor recreation!! Real stuff...not some little 0.5 mile trail...”
• Conservatism

“Become less conservative!”

“The incredibly conservative nature of the University and community.”

“I would like to see more open-mindedness, more awareness of the world beyond Indiana, more bold initiatives, and more creativity.”

“We must move on to the next level. Purdue is a great institution -except for a few individuals- but it is also extremely conservative. Conservatism in this rapidly evolving era will put us behind sooner than we think. Our faculty, staff and students should be trained to accept and adapt to the changing science and society.”

• The bureaucracy

“Its over bureaucratization. The micromanagement from the vice president through the deans to the department heads. The feudalism of its schools and departments.”

“The strong hierarchical structure of the university. I'd like to make it more participative where things don't come down to you, but you actually have a say in decisions –like electing a dept head, or establishing the policies in the dept. I'd like the institution to actually connect its discourse with its actions...it’s very frustrating to hear constantly that we are a research institution and then find all your attempts at conducting research hindered by bureaucracy from lack of space to ‘we've never done it this way before…”

“Red tape, and it seems to increase almost every day. Top down philosophy is becoming overbearing.”

“Reduce the bureaucracy/red tape and the slowness with which change can occur. Increase flexibility and be more open-minded to new ways of tackling our responsibilities.”

• The infrastructure

“Better research infrastructure, better labs and offices.”

“Quality of building, both labs, office, and seminar and teaching rooms.”

“Infrastructure is terrible, especially with respect to air-handling systems which are very noisy and ineffective for modern research labs. Plumbing, gas lines, and electrical are also inadequate.”
• Level of support for Schools of Liberal Arts and Education

“That the central administration allots more resources to the humanities units in the university. I once heard a vice president of the University refer to such units as "non-productive" because they did not bring in research monies and because their research had no commercial viability. And it is these units in particular that are suffering from problems in faculty recruitment and retention.”

“I’m tired of being poor. The School of Education is drastically under funded by central administration… This leads to many problems with equipment and S&E. Our salaries are low compared to other institutions, which makes faculty recruitment difficult.”

“Make it more of a real university rather than the engineering dominated school it is. i.e. it would be great if liberal arts programs on campus were in the top ten in the country. This would automatically change the environment of campus and local community.”

“The lack of institutional support for the School of Liberal Arts is demoralizing. We are treated as second-class citizens by administrators, faculty in other schools, and our own students sometimes. Morale is at one of its all-time lows in my department because of this. Our salaries are not anywhere near to being competitive with peer institutions, and even when they are, faculty leave because they tire of being unappreciated. These issues need to be addressed urgently and substantively if there is any hope of taking Purdue "to the next level," as we've heard from President Jischke in recent months. What good will it do us if we turn out technically trained undergrads who don't know how to read, write, and think critically? The School of Liberal Arts is not a useless appendage. It ought to be the cornerstone of an excellent university education.”

• The lack of diversity

“I would like to increase the racial diversity.”

“Cultural diversity.”

“Need more racial and ethnic diversity.”

• Funding levels

“Lack of funding, in general, in the School of Education--we have no flexibility to do anything. Every little penny is counted.”

“I would like more funding for my research and scholarship.”
“Probably funding…. I think our faculty and administration know how to succeed, but the funds to do it are just not forthcoming.”

• Dental plan

“Lack of dental plan is hurting us when we interview.”

“Dental Coverage! I have never been on a faculty that does not have dental coverage as a family benefit. We need to add dental coverage to the health plans of the university. The escrow approach to predicting costs of annual major dental/medical procedures and setting this aside in a pretax "savings" account which cannot be accessed for other purposes if not used, and does not carry over from one year to the next, is a terrible alternative!”

“We need dental coverage.”

• Library resources

“Double the number of books and periodicals in the HSSE Library.”

“Better library.”

“We desperately need not only a new central library, but also far more funding for books and academic journals in the humanities.”

• The quality of undergraduate students

“Better undergraduate students.”

“The overall low quality of the undergraduate students at Purdue.”

“Requirements for undergraduate admission seem rather low. We have lots of great students, but too many students are marginal. The need to keep enrollment high is a negative.”

• Support for spouses

“Approach to spousal hiring. We need a coherent policy to address the fact that a high percentage of candidates for positions are partnered with other academics. As it is now, we have a hit-and-miss policy of cooperation among departments. I've now seen five or six junior faculty members leave the school due to spousal job concerns.”

“Lack of support for dual-career couples. Unless something changes in this area, we will likely leave Purdue within the next couple years. Living apart is an unacceptable arrangement for us. Purdue tries to act as if they want to help dual-career couples, but there is no real follow-through as far as commitment to hire spouses of Purdue
faculty first over other candidates. Cross-department collaboration on this issue needs to be fostered through powerful incentive programs for hiring qualified faculty spouses."

“My wife’s experience with the Spousal Relocation Office was not only frustrating, it was humiliating to her (she has a Ph.D. as well). She went on to find a position here on her own, but I doubt she will ever feel an attachment to Purdue based on her early, very negative experiences. We will likely leave as soon as we can find other positions. To provide start up packages worth tens of thousands of dollars and then not pay any attention to this other important detail is very short-sighted.”

• The emphasis on teaching

“The reward in the faculty and recommendation process to those who engage in the scholarship of teaching, integration and application. Too much is focused solely on discovery.”

“The only thing valued in our department is getting external grant money and publishing. Good teaching and collegiality are not valued at all.”

“The de-emphasis on quality teaching.”

“Absolutely no rewards monetary or otherwise for undergraduate teaching. In fact, we’re criticized if we spend too much time on it.”

• Class size

“Have smaller class size.”

“Class size is way too large and getting larger.”

“I would put caps on class size, at least in Liberal Arts.”

• Parking

“Parking! The parking here is amazingly bad, compared to other universities I have been to. I would be willing to pay MUCH, MUCH more in order to have a spot close to my building. When I had small infants who were nursing, I once calculated that I spent 10 hours per week looking for parking spots and walking to/from them and my office. This is not including driving time to/from my house. That is an enormous waste of productive time.”

“Parking, parking, parking - a daily frustration which truly impedes my research and wastes a tremendous amount of my time! The hours spent looking for parking and walking back and forth multiple times daily to the parking lot because of a lack of research facilities on campus would be better spent on teaching and research! I am
really tired of getting parking tickets while loading and unloading materials and
equipment - campus police are occasionally but not consistently understanding about
this.”

Differences by School
Faculty in Education, Liberal Arts, Technology, and Veterinary Medicine were the
most likely to say that they would like to see an increase in their salary.

Q 64. What else do you want to add about your experiences as a faculty member at
Purdue?
Faculty members offered a wide variety of comments in response to this question,
often describing personal experiences, both positive and negative, about their time at
Purdue. Many of the negative comments focused specifically on difficulties related to
spousal employment, so these are listed separately below.

• Negative comments about Purdue experiences

“Had a very bad experience with other faculty member who wrongly attacked my
scientific integrity. He was protected by Purdue, I was not.”

“I have identified what I call "the Purdue way," a style of administration that leaves
all of us demoralized. ... "The Purdue way" asks "What have you done for me
yesterday?" instead of recognizing years of service and commitment to excellence. It
means making grudging counter-offers when professors are recruited by other
institutions. It flings about the term "the Purdue family," then treats hard-working
employees as undeserving. It sucks the life and enthusiasm out of even the most
energetic people.”

“When I came to Purdue, it had been a longstanding dream of mine to be a professor.
After two years at Purdue, I was discouraged with academics, particularly with
proposal writing and the National Science Foundation. After three years, I was on
the verge of a nervous breakdown. At that time, I began to get counseling. Now, at the
end of my fourth year, I am sure that I want to be a professor, but I am not convinced
that Purdue wants me or that I want Purdue.”

Spousal Employment
“My biggest stress point as a faculty member has been my dual career situation. My
spouse has now earned her PhD and has been employed for [several] years on soft
money that is now coming to an end. There don't seem to be any special efforts to
accommodate spousal hiring for those of us who have been here for a long time.
Instead, these efforts seem to be channeled into new hires.”

“Regarding spousal hires: I know of at least one colleague who left because of the
unlikely prospects for spousal hires. I nearly was in this situation myself. My spouse
obtained a job at Purdue through an open competition, not a spousal hire but this was
largely luck and had it not happened, we would likely be gone – I had a number of interviews but withdrew from the competitions... I felt that the ‘Gee we hope you don’t leave’ attitude of my colleagues was naive. It basically assumes that faculty members on their own will ‘work it out,’ which means unsustainable long distance families, stressful commuting relationships, and the like. If it wasn’t for my Husband’s appointment here, I would have left in a heartbeat- I had interviews at more prestigious schools, in more favorable locations. Improved spousal hiring is one way to greatly improve retention, a big problem, at least in our department.”

“Finding employment for the spouses of Purdue employees would be easier if the Personnel Office took this as a priority. Many faculty members are married to individuals with advanced degrees. Some of those partners are willing to accept jobs for which they are over-qualified, in the interests of accommodating a dual career marriage. The Purdue Personnel Office seems decidedly uninterested in such individuals. The requirement for ‘Purdue experience’ or ‘university experience’ in many job ads excludes from consideration qualified individuals just moving into the community.”

- Positive comments about Purdue experiences

“It has been a privilege to serve as a faculty member at Purdue. I have been fortunate to know and work with a great group of students and colleagues. I would recommend Purdue to any aspiring young person over most other universities in the country.”

“Overall, I am very positive about my experiences as a faculty member here.”

“Overall, I am very satisfied here at Purdue. My positive experiences far outweigh the few negative experiences that I have had. The impact on me of the things I would like to change are minor. I feel very fortunate and am honored to be a faculty member at this world-class university.”

To the hundreds of Purdue faculty members who took the time to respond to this survey - thank you. Without your input, an increased understanding of the factors that influence faculty performance and promote career development would not have been possible.
Appendix A - Purdue Faculty Survey Instrument