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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

In Spring 2008, the Faculty Council on Women in Academia invited all voting faculty to participate in a survey of faculty careers and workload. (Survey questions appear in Appendix A.) The purpose of the study was to explore the experiences and level of satisfaction of UW faculty related to teaching, service, mentoring, flexible policy options, and career advancement, with particular attention to differences by gender or rank. (Significant differences by gender are reported in Appendix B.) In addition to multiple-choice questions each section solicited faculty comments. This report details the respondent characteristics and findings for each section, including qualitative responses from faculty. Note that in sharing some faculty comments we have redacted information that could identify a faculty member and sometimes a unit.

Response rate and respondent characteristics
Of the 3,944 faculty members invited to participate, 669 responded to the survey, for a 17 percent response rate. Compared to data available from the most current EOO report, the sample differs statistically from that population proportionally within the categories of rank, age, and gender. Note that these responses were made before the onset of the current economic challenges.

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

(Abbreviations by academic field: AHSS=Arts, Humanities, Social Sciences ; SOM=School of Medicine; AH=Allied Health; PROF=Professional Schools; STEM=Science, Technology, Engineering, Mathematics;)

FINDINGS BY TOPIC

Teaching

- Most respondents are satisfied with their teaching loads. Those who are unhappy with their teaching load, the majority are women as well as those in lecturer and instructor ranks (more of whom are women). Being female, single, in a professional field, and in a lecturer or instructor rank (most of whom are women) relates to lower levels of satisfaction.
- Comments speak to a lack of transparency with respect to who receives TA support and how much. Additionally, even before the current budget cuts, many comments express concern over a trend toward increased class size and the inadequacy of classrooms and classroom technology.
- More women than men offered comments related to excessive workload.
- Several comments relate to a lack of value placed on quality teaching, as seen in the lack of teaching support, low levels of compensation for teaching, and the fact that teaching is perceived to receive little consideration in promotion and merit reviews.

1 Thanks to Kate Quinn and research assistant Angela Abel for help developing the survey. Thanks also to them and to Professor Marjorie Olmstead for help analyzing the survey data.
**Service**

- The highest proportion of respondents indicate spending more than 10 hours/month on service work.
- The number and type of committees does not differ by gender except in the School of Medicine, where the gender differences are significant. Women in the SOM report less hiring authority and fewer committee assignments at the university and department levels than do their male colleagues.
- Overall, fewer women than men report serving on committees with budgetary authority.
- Being a full or associate professor relates to higher levels of service work in all kinds of committees, while being an assistant professor relates to lower levels.
- Some 71 percent of respondents agreed that they are gaining leadership experience through their committee involvement.
- While 51 percent agree that their service is valued by the department for merit review, promotion, and tenure, some open-ended responses argue that service is largely unrewarded.
- Although (outside the professional schools and the SOM) women report similar committee service loads to men, some women and faculty of color report higher service loads overall; the survey does not provide data on the range of additional kinds of service and outreach women and faculty of color perform.

**Mentoring**

- Faculty across the career cycle report wanting more mentoring. Overall, women indicate lower levels of satisfaction with mentoring on both professional and work/life issues, with the largest and most significant difference occurring for women in the professional schools. Not satisfied with the mentoring they have received, female respondents report working to provide it for others.

**Career Advancement**

- Women faculty are less satisfied with prospects for career advancement or advancement to date than their male counterparts and indicate lower levels of agreement than men with the proposition that they could move into a leadership position. This gender effect is particularly strong for faculty in professional schools and the School of Medicine.
- Full professors report higher levels of satisfaction with advancement prospects, advancement so far, and perceptions of being able to move into a leadership role if desired. Associate professors tend to indicate lower levels of satisfaction in those areas. Assistant professors tend to indicate higher levels of satisfaction with advancement prospects. Having the rank of instructor or lecturer relates to lower levels of satisfaction with advancement prospects, advancement so far, and perceptions of the ability to move into leadership if desired.
- Open-ended comments from faculty in STEM and Allied Health expressed concern about the possibility of advancement.
- Other comments (many from women faculty) express concern over lack of time for grant writing and the subsequent effect on promotion.

**Flexible Policy Options**

- Respondents were more likely to comment if female, and a larger proportion of women than men commented that they were unaware of options.
- Comments also expressed concern about options being inconsistently implemented across campus and about inequities in eligibility related to appointment (WOT, research faculty, lecturers, etc.).
- Another inequality mentioned was the help given to families with young children vs. those facing eldercare.
- Comments expressed concern about the burden placed on full-time colleagues when a faculty member reduces an appointment or takes a leave.
Others, mostly female respondents, indicated that flexible policy use would be frowned upon or detrimental to one’s career trajectory.

GENDER DIFFERENCES BY ACADEMIC FIELD

STEM:
It was impressive how few gender differences arose in STEM, where women are traditionally underrepresented. (We did not have baseline, pre-ADVANCE data to allow us to infer the contributions of that program to the current context.) The only significant differences were:
- the number of large undergrad courses taught – this may reflect the absence of large undergraduate classes in engineering, so that these numbers are dominated by biology and psychology
- the desire for additional mentoring on professional career issues.

AH, non-SOM:
There were also very few gender differences in AH. The only statistically relevant difference was that AH women taught fewer grad classes per year. They also reported spending more hours on committee work, but serving on fewer committees with budgetary or hiring authority, although these differences of nearly 0.5 committees were not statistically significant. AH had the smallest sample of the 5 areas.

AHSS.
There were 6 statistically different differences in AHSS. Women are more likely to teach 3 or more small UG classes, and less satisfied with their teaching load (we don’t know whether this was related to women being more likely to be lecturers) Women serve on fewer college-wide committees, but no significant differences were noted in budgetary or hiring authority. AHSS women were more satisfied with current mentoring than their male colleagues, but also more desirous of more career/professional mentoring and provided more mentoring to junior colleagues.

PROF and SOM:
The SOM had the most significant gender differences, followed by PROF. We might note that PROF and SOM departments are more independent, with more authority in the hands of department chairs than in Arts & Sciences and Engineering.

PROF:
PROF women were less satisfied than the men with their teaching load or types of courses, but average satisfaction with courses was the same as in other areas; satisfaction with teaching load was the lowest among the groups. PROF women serve on fewer committees with budgetary authority. The largest difference for PROF women was on career advancement, with 0.5 to 0.6 point differences (on a range of 3) on both past advancement and prospects for future advancement, plus possibilities of moving into leadership. Like women in other colleges, PROF women were more satisfied than men with current mentoring, and more desirous of increased mentoring.

SOM:
The SOM shows the most gender differences. Women report teaching fewer graduate classes than men, but no other differences in teaching. In the service area, the SOM shows women serving on fewer university or departmental committees, spending less time on committee work, serving on fewer committees with budgetary or hiring authority, gaining less leadership skill through committees, and serving on fewer committees than departmental colleagues. SOM women report being less satisfied than men with career advancement in all three categories, though with about 2/3 the size of the difference in PROF (0.33 to 0.38 points). SOM women receive more mentoring than men, but want more mentoring, as well.
**Recommendations**

- The institution needs to ensure that instructional quality does not suffer in the current challenging context.
- Particularly in these challenging economic times, workload should be equitably distributed and decisions transparent. The university needs to prevent or remedy situations in which women and/or minority faculty bear a disproportionate burden of instructional budget cuts (e.g., in terms of teaching load, layoffs of non-tenure-stream faculty, etc.)
- The difference in perception of service loads documented for women and minority faculty (documented here as well as in the LCVI 2005 & 2008 surveys) needs to be addressed.
- To maximize potential for faculty success in all arenas, professional and work-life mentoring should be provided across career stages.
- The university needs to remedy the discrepancy between the percentage of women in central leadership positions (which we applaud) and those at the college and (especially the) department level by increasing the latter.
- The university should enhance the visibility and consistent implementation of flexible policies.
- The climate for all faculty will be enhanced if decisions regarding workload, distribution of resources, promotion, service, and leadership opportunities are consistent and transparent.
FCWA SURVEY REPORT

The survey
In Spring 2008, the Faculty Council on Women in Academia invited all voting faculty to participate in a survey of faculty careers and workload. The purpose of the study was to explore the experiences and level of satisfaction of UW faculty related to teaching, service, mentoring, flexible policy options, and career advancement, with particular attention to differences by gender or rank. (The survey questions appear in the Appendix.) In addition to multiple-choice questions (reported here at the .05 level of significance), each section solicited faculty comments. This report details the respondent characteristics and findings for each section, including qualitative responses from faculty. Note that in sharing some faculty comments we have redacted information that could identify a faculty member or even a unit.

Response rate and respondent characteristics
Of the 3,944 faculty members invited to participate, 669 responded to the survey for a 17 percent response rate. Compared to data available from the most current EOO report, the sample differs statistically from the population proportionally within the categories of rank, age, and gender. Women are slightly overrepresented among survey respondents as compared to the EOO population, as are faculty under 40 years of age and faculty in assistant professor, lecturer, and senior lecturer positions. The survey collected additional demographics, finding that 12 percent of respondents are single and 70 percent have children. The highest proportions of parents have children aged 6 to 12 (33 percent of parents) and older than college-age (32 percent of parents). Regarding FTE, 88 percent of respondents are full-time. Some 73 percent receive their total income from their University position. Only 30 percent of respondents are primarily appointed in the School of Medicine (SOM). Some 75 percent of non-SOM faculty are appointed in ladder teaching ranks, while SOM faculty are fairly evenly divided between research faculty (34 percent), clinical scientist (38 percent), and clinician educator (29 percent) positions. The breakdown of survey respondents is provided in Table 1.

Table 1. Survey Respondents as Compared to Educational Opportunity and Affirmative Action (EOAA) Reports for University of Washington Faculty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>EOAA Reports</th>
<th>Survey Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>2428</td>
<td>1399</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 40</td>
<td>656</td>
<td>3271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 40</td>
<td>3271</td>
<td>3271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>1265</td>
<td>472</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assoc. Prof.</td>
<td>679</td>
<td>472</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asst. Prof.</td>
<td>472</td>
<td>398</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sr. Lecturer</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecturer</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2528</td>
<td>1399</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Field</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allied Health-SOM</td>
<td>960</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allied Health-not SOM</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STEM</td>
<td>579</td>
<td>151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AHSS</td>
<td>383</td>
<td>255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>660</td>
<td>660</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Additionally, many respondents took the opportunity to provide open-ended comments related to each section of the survey. Comment response breakdowns as compared to overall survey responses are provided in Table 2.

### Teaching

A substantial portion of respondents did not answer questions about the number and types of classes taught, ranging from 14 percent (not responding to questions regarding graduate seminars) to 44 percent (not responding to questions regarding clinical courses). The format of future surveys would need to more clearly accommodate different teaching profiles.

For those responding, academic field correlates with teaching load with respondents in STEM and AHSS teaching higher levels of large and medium sized undergrad courses than faculty in other fields, respondents in Allied Health fields teaching the most clinical courses, and professional fields teaching the most graduate seminars. Respondent gender was a small effect, likely associated with the gender differences among faculty types (e.g., more female lecturers, fewer women in clinical teaching). Respondent age and marital status showed no relationship to teaching load.

The majority of respondents (59 percent) indicate that their teaching load is comparable to their department colleagues, with 22 percent indicating a higher load and 15 percent lower. About 20 percent of respondents indicate not knowing how their teaching loads compared to non-UW colleagues, while 27 percent indicate higher loads, 39 percent comparable, and 16 percent lower. Only 5 percent of respondents indicate receiving a higher level of teaching support than their departmental colleagues, while 55 percent indicate comparable levels of support, 25 percent indicate lower levels, and 15 percent indicate not knowing. Perception of teaching load compared to department colleagues does not correlate with respondent gender, age, marital status, or academic field, but, not surprisingly, respondents in lecturer and instructor positions tend to indicate that their teaching loads are higher than colleagues'. Perception of teaching load compared to non-UW colleagues correlates with several demographics: respondents who are women, in AHSS, in professional fields, and assistant professors indicate higher teaching loads, and respondents who are parents, in Allied Health, and in the SOM indicate lower loads. Being single is the only demographic that correlates with level of teaching support, with single respondents indicating lower levels of support than their colleagues.

Most respondents are satisfied with their teaching loads (72 percent) and the courses or type of teaching they do (83 percent). Being female, single, in a professional field, and in a lecturer or instructor rank relates to lower levels of satisfaction with teaching load, while being a parent, in the SOM, and in a full professor position relate to higher levels of satisfaction.
Some 192 respondents offered comments to the open-ended question about teaching at UW. The proportions of faculty providing comments by gender and academic field do not differ from the overall survey respondents; however, respondents under 40 are significantly more highly represented in the comments than the overall survey (Table 2). Many comments reflect the fact that this was the first year of the survey and some ‘kinks’ need to be worked out; for example, many faculty commented that the teaching load questions did not address the reality of clinical supervision, and many research faculty and faculty with administrative positions are not teaching or are not paid for the teaching they do. Beyond comments related to improving the survey tool, common themes in comments speak to a lack of transparency in who receives TA support and in what situations, as well as dissatisfaction with the amount of TA support and the pay for teaching. Examples of comments include:

- “A class of 100 students would apparently qualify for 2 TAs yet I have only ever received one, even when my class was enrolled at 115 students. This places more of the grading and section teaching on me and my single TA. More senior faculty in my department are routinely granted 2 TAs for the equivalent enrollments. What guidelines account for these disparate allocations? Do we have a uniform set of guidelines?”

- “The other huge issue is availability of TAs—not enough TAs to help with classes of 80 to 90 students. Also some colleagues get a TA for a class of 75, others are not allowed to request this which is a huge inequity that I have never understood, except that it is due to weakness at the level of successive Dept Chairs in dealing with faculty who make demands.”

Additionally, even before the current budget cuts, many comments relate to a trend toward increased class sizes, pedagogical issues related to the quarter system, and the inadequacy of classrooms and classroom technology. Some comments reflect satisfaction with the quality of students and the moral support from colleagues, but many comments reflect perceived disparities in the assignment of teaching loads and teaching support and dissatisfaction with resources. Examples of comments include:

- “Undergraduate students are shortchanged at this University, because so many of their classes are very large. The large number of large-enrollment classes lowers the educational experience students receive. We don't like to acknowledge this, but it's the truth.”

- “There is pressure to increase class size, but not decrease # of classes taught.”

More women then men offered comments related to excessive workload, particularly as compared to other colleagues within and outside UW. Additionally, comments address potential discrepancies across the UW campuses and between colleges on the Seattle campus. Examples of comments include:

- “Teaching load and amount of support differs substantially between colleges. Colleagues in the _______ School teach one course less than in our department and get TAs for less students.”

- “There seems to be a disparity between the teaching load at various campuses. Tacoma faculty [teach more], yet are expected to produce the same amount of research as those on other campuses that have a lighter teaching load.”

Several comments relate to the lack of value placed on quality teaching, as seen in the lack of teaching support, low levels of compensation for teaching, and the fact that teaching is perceived to receive little consideration in promotion and merit reviews; several respondents question the commitment to teaching at a research institution:

- “I am not paid at my institutional base salary for my teaching. I am paid at my 1999 salary (the salary I received as an assistant professor. My current salary is twice the salary I received back in 1999.”

- “Many faculty including myself are funded to do research but not teaching—but teach anyway because we care. To do so means that we spend our evenings and weekends compensating so that we can do both—teach and keep up w. our research. This compromises family time and results in faculty burn-out. This is a particular problem for women who have many other responsibilities—including an overload of committee work—esp. in [units where] there are few senior women faculty [and] we are disproportionately called upon for committee work and feel obligated to do so, so that women's perspectives are represented.”
Service

Department-level committees represent the most common form of service indicated by respondents, followed by field or discipline committees and college-wide committees. University-wide committees represent the least common form of service work. The number and type of committees does not differ by gender except in the School of Medicine, but respondents under 40 are on fewer committees (excluding departmental committees) and spend less time per month in committee work. Similarly, being a full or associate professor relates to higher levels of service work in all kinds of committees, while being an assistant professor relates to lower levels. There were significant gender differences regarding committee service in the School of Medicine, in addition to committee service reported as lower overall in the SOM. While men and women reported serving on similar numbers of committees at a national level (and also similar outside the SOM), women reported serving on significantly fewer committees at the department, college, and university level, with 60% of the women (compared to 27% of the men) reporting serving on 0 or 1 departmental committees (outside SOM, this value is 17%).

The highest proportion of respondents indicate spending more than 10 hours per month on service work (31 percent), although only 1 woman (out of 79 answering the question) at the SOM reported this level (Fig. 1). Only 8 percent of those outside SOM indicate spending two hours or less per month overall, while 1/3 of the women (16% of the men) in the SOM reported this level of activity. When asked how service load compares to department colleagues, 42 percent of respondents indicate that their load is higher, 31 percent comparable, 15 percent lower, and 13 percent did not know.

The survey included questions related to the kinds of decision-making authority of the committees, any

Fig. 1. Pie Chart of Proportions of Responses by Number of Hours per Month in Committee Work
leadership experience gained through the committee-work, and whether the service is valued in review for merit, promotion, or tenure. The highest proportion of respondents (79% in STEM/AHSS, 70% elsewhere) indicate agreement that the committees they serve on have curricular decision-making authority, followed by 57 percent of respondents indicating authority in hiring decisions (65% in STEM/AHSS, 56% elsewhere), and 35 percent in budgetary decisions (same for both groups) (Fig. 2). There was no gender difference in AHSS or STEM regarding committee authority, but women reported less agreement than men with the statements that they served on committees with budgetary or hiring authority outside these groups (see graph). Full professors and men in professional fields indicate serving on committees with budgetary authority. Respondents in the SOM and assistant professors are less likely to report serving on committees with little or no curricular authority, while full professors, and respondents in AHSS and professional fields indicate serving on committees with curricular authority.

Some 71 percent of respondents agreed that they are gaining leadership experience through their committee involvement, while 51 percent agree that their service is valued by the department for merit review, promotion, and tenure (Table 3). There were no significant gender differences in these responses within the same field groups (SOM, AHSS, etc.). Respondents in assistant professor and lecturer/instructor positions indicate that they are not gaining leadership experience through their committee involvement, while full professors indicate gaining leadership experience. No other demographics relate to perceptions of gaining leadership experience. Fewer than half the women in the SOM or in the professional schools reported agreement that their committee service was valued.
Table 3. Proportions of Responses by Agreement to Service Questions. Top line is overall, lower line is % of male respondents / % of female respondents. Significant gender difference only on perception of value for committee service.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service Question</th>
<th>Disagree Strongly</th>
<th>Disagree Somewhat</th>
<th>Agree Somewhat</th>
<th>Agree Strongly</th>
<th>Don’t Know</th>
<th>NR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gaining leadership experience on committees</td>
<td>7%/7%</td>
<td>14%/16%</td>
<td>45%/48%</td>
<td>26%/28%</td>
<td>3%/6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service is valued for merit review and promotion</td>
<td>18%/19%</td>
<td>17%/21%</td>
<td>37%/38%</td>
<td>20%/14%</td>
<td>10%/6%</td>
<td>4%/7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review and promotion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=632; N_f=362; N_m = 267 [3 respondents didn’t identify gender].

Some 84 respondents offered comments to the open-ended question about service at UW. The proportions of faculty providing comments by gender do not differ from the overall survey respondents; however, respondents under 40 are significantly more highly represented in the comments than the overall survey. Likewise, proportions of faculty providing comments by academic field differ from the overall respondents with some fields slightly over-represented (AHSS and Professional) and others slightly under-represented (AH SOM, AH non-SOM, and STEM). Review of the open-ended comments provided by faculty about Service revealed several themes. The most common theme was that service is unrewarded, suggesting that many faculty are not motivated to do service since it does not affect promotion, salary, or tenure, which is seen in comments such as:

- "My department values committee service for merit reviews, but the College at large does not value it as much for promotion and tenure. This is a significant problem in a unit where service requirements are unusually high;"
- "Really what counts for merit, promotion and tenure, and everyone knows it, is research and publication. Service is necessary but largely goes unrewarded;" and
- "As far as I can tell, committee work at the UW is a pretty much thankless task. The only reason for doing it is to influence aspects of a department's functioning that might eventually be relevant to ones own teaching/research."

Additional themes that emerged from the comments include the feeling that women, minorities, and young faculty carry heavier service loads. These comments were predominately found from women respondents in AHSS and STEM. Comments include:

- "Service demands appear to be heavier for women and faculty of color."
- "I checked disagree for service work providing leadership experience because at this point, I'm not really learning anything from the experience. Also, this is complicated by being a person of color [because] we're all in demand."

Others also stated that service was in general a waste of time because of not gaining experience from committees or because the committees were poorly run. Again, most of the comments came from respondents in AHSS and STEM.

Lastly, there were a few comments from non-tenured faculty perceiving a reluctance of tenured faculty to participate on committees, causing concern and disappointment from lower ranking faculty.

Mentoring

Half or more of all respondents indicate that they receive mentoring, want additional professional mentoring, mentor junior faculty on professional issues, and mentor junior faculty on work-life issues (Fig. 3). However, half or more of all respondents indicate dissatisfaction with the mentoring they receive on work-life issues. Responses are evenly divided with respect to wanting additional work-life mentoring (42 percent agree and 42 percent disagree).

Female respondents tend to indicate lower levels of satisfaction with mentoring both for professional and work-life issues, while they indicate higher levels of mentoring junior faculty on both professional and work-life issues. Respondents under 40 are more likely to indicate receiving mentoring, being satisfied
with professional mentoring, and wanting additional mentoring for professional and work-life issues; they are less likely to indicate mentoring junior faculty on professional or work-life issues. Parents are less likely to indicate wanting additional professional mentoring, while they indicate higher levels of mentoring.

Faculty with primary appointments in the SOM tend to indicate higher levels of receiving mentoring, satisfaction with professional mentoring, and mentoring of junior faculty on professional and work-life issues. Being appointed in a STEM field relates to lower levels of satisfaction with professional mentoring and with lower levels of mentoring junior faculty on work-life issues. Being appointed in a Professional field relates to reporting lower levels of receiving mentoring and of satisfaction with both professional and work-life mentoring. Having the rank of full professor relates to not receiving mentoring and to not wanting additional professional or work-life mentoring and to higher levels of mentoring junior faculty on professional and work-life issues. Associate professors indicate lower levels of satisfaction with professional and work-life mentoring, tend to want additional professional mentoring and to mentor junior faculty on professional and work-life issues. Being an assistant professor relates to receiving mentoring, to higher levels of satisfaction with mentoring on professional issues, wanting additional mentoring on professional and work-life issues, and not mentoring junior faculty on professional or work-life issues. Finally, being a lecturer or instructor relates to wanting additional professional mentoring, to not receiving mentoring, to lower levels of satisfaction with professional mentoring, and to not mentoring junior faculty on professional or work-life issues.

**Fig. 3.** Proportion of respondents agreeing with statements that they receive mentoring, are satisfied with mentoring for professional or work/life issues, desire additional similar mentoring, and provide such mentoring to junior faculty on professional and work-life issues.
Some 94 respondents offered comments to the open-ended question about mentoring at UW. The proportions of faculty providing comments by gender do not differ from the overall survey respondents; however, respondents under 40 are significantly more highly represented in the comments than the overall survey. Likewise, proportions of faculty providing comments by academic field differ from the overall respondents, with some fields slightly over-represented (AH non-SOM and Professional) and others slightly under-represented (AH SOM, AHSS, and STEM). The most common themes emerging from the comments are that the mentoring available in the department or by colleagues is inadequate and that mentoring must be sought out independently. More women respondents than men commented on the lack of mentoring available to them. Examples of comments include:

- “Mentoring (formal and informal) is severely lacking in my department. I’ve asked my chair to help facilitate this type of relationship, but he didn’t follow through. The junior faculty hobble along, guiding each other, hoping that collectively we can figure out how to get what we need (at least our collective confusion leads to strong bonds among us!).”
- “As a new faculty member, but one who is senior, the presumption seems to be that I wouldn’t need mentoring on how to work effectively in this institution and balance its unique combination of demands. I would urge more active support for senior as well as junior faculty.”
- “I’ve had to seek it out; there is nothing in place to help us find mentors”

More than half the comments related to formal mentoring indicate that there is no formal mentoring available, but others argue that there is too little time for “forced” relationships (i.e., formal mentoring) or that formal mentors have proven harmful in the past. Some junior faculty respondents provided comments questioning what kinds of mentoring they could do for others while some senior faculty indicated that they no longer see any need for receiving mentoring. Some ‘late career’ respondents indicated that mentoring would have been useful earlier in their careers and that they go out of their way to mentor junior colleagues. More women respondents than men respondents commented on mentoring for work-life issues, including comments such as:

- “There are only 2 other tenured women with children in my unit. . . ; the men with kids have partners who do most of the parenting. There are few colleagues I feel comfortable talking with about work-family balance issues.”
- “Had I had a mentor at the time I needed to make the family-career decision, I might have been made more aware of the options available”
- “When I started at the UW, there were only a few female faculty in my department, none of whom had children of their own. I have tried very hard the last few years as we have brought several female faculty members on board to step up as a mentor about balancing career and family. Hopefully, that support is valued. I can always benefit from mentors. Although many of the questions I receive are about parenting, there are also issues unique to women in the workplace.”

**Career Advancement**

More than half of all respondents indicate that they are satisfied with their prospects for career advancement (66 percent), that they could move into a leadership role if desired (53 percent), and that they are satisfied with their career advancement so far at UW (66 percent). Figure 4 details the proportions of responses by agreement to the career advancement questions.

Female faculty in both the school of medicine and the professional schools are less satisfied with prospects for career advancement or advancement to date and less likely to believe that one can move into a leadership position while there is no significant gender difference elsewhere. Being under 40 relates to increased satisfaction with both the prospects for career advancement and advancement so far. Being appointed in a STEM field relates to lower satisfaction with career advancement so far (60% favorable responses in the SOM vs. 70% in the full sample). Having the rank of full professor relates to higher levels of satisfaction with advancement prospects, advancement so far, and perceptions of being able to move into a leadership role if desired. Associate professors tend to indicate lower levels of satisfaction with both advancement prospects and advancement so far. Assistant professors tend to indicate higher levels of satisfaction with advancement prospects. Having the rank of instructor or lecturer relates to lower levels of satisfaction with advancement prospects, advancement so far, and perceptions of the ability to move into leadership if desired.
Some 102 respondents offered comments to the open-ended question about career advancement at UW. The proportions of faculty providing comments by gender and academic field do not differ from the overall survey respondents; however, respondents under 40 are significantly more highly represented in the comments than the overall survey. Review of the open-ended comments provided by faculty about Career Advancement revealed several themes. The most common theme was internal problems with the school, department or administration. An overwhelming majority of these comments came from STEM and Allied Health. Some comments include:

- “I am extremely dissatisfied with my career advancement. I believe that my Chair is largely responsible. I wish I could get help for this situation. It seems hopeless right now and if I do seek help, I will be labeled as a trouble maker!”
- “Despite excellent annual reviews for many years, despite international recognition for research, despite the high qualifications and experience, any promotion was denied to me. I have been asking repeatedly for the reasons of the denials of the promotion but, until now, I have never received an answer to my questions.”

Additional themes that emerged from the data include a conflict between time devoted to both teaching and research, with not enough time to secure research grants, and in return, not getting promoted. Many of these concerns were from women faculty:
“I reiterate what I said before—I'm worried about my prospects for tenure/advancement at the university and within my field because of the conflicting expectations of the faculty. That is to say, there is an expectation for high quality teaching/involvement in teaching on the part of students (and administration?) and, at the same time a high quality/quantity of research on the part of the administration. I can't possibly devote the time required for that in both areas.”

“My initial career advancement was relatively slow because in my school advancement is tied tightly to obtaining research grants, and I was initially unsuccessful in this realm due to many conflicting responsibilities (mainly teaching) that were less important for promotion.”

“I'd like to get the research done that would allow me to be promoted to full professor, but I'm so overwhelmed with service and teaching (e.g., mentoring grad students, teaching writing intensive classes) that I'm having trouble doing that.”

“I recently joined UW and miss my previous institution already. Academia is male dominated, but my experience at UW—with deans, other faculty, and students—has been worse than at any other institution in which I have been involved (undergrad, grad school, post doc, and professional committees). Woman are not appreciated here and our achievements—even at the national level - are not appreciated or celebrated within our college.”

**Flexible Policy Options**

The highest proportion of respondents are aware of the Family Medical Leave Act (FMLA) and tenure clock extension options, while the Parental Teaching Release and Transitional Support Programs received the lowest proportions with respect to awareness and use (Table 4). FMLA was the most commonly sited option that respondents felt their department would support them using, followed by partial leave without pay and tenure clock extension.

### Table 4. Proportions of Responses to Flexible Policy Option Questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>TCE</th>
<th>PT TT</th>
<th>PLWOP</th>
<th>FMLA</th>
<th>TSP</th>
<th>PTR*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aware of option</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilized option</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eligible to use,</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Request to use</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>was denied</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Believe dept woul</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d support my</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>using</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TCE: Tenure Clock Extension; PT TT: Part-time tenure track; PLWOP: Partial leave without pay; FMLA: Family Medical Leave Act; TSP: Transitional Support Program; PTR*: Parental teaching release (piloted in select colleges)

N=669

Of the respondents who indicated being eligible to use an option but chose not to do so, 55 (8 percent) indicated fear of career repercussion as the reason for not using the option. Another 158 (24 percent) indicated not needing to use the option, 43 (6 percent) did not want to create a burden for colleagues, and 90 (14 percent) could not afford the reduction in salary.

Of the very small number of respondents who had their request to use an option denied, 12 (2 percent) think the request was denied because they did not meet eligibility requirements. Another 5 (1 percent) indicated that funding concerns were behind the denial and 8 (1 percent) indicated that their department is not supportive of policy use.

Some 113 respondents offered comments to the open-ended question about flexible options at UW. The proportions of faculty providing comments by academic field do not differ from the overall survey respondents; however, female respondents and respondents under 40 are significantly more highly represented in the comments than the overall survey. The most common themes from the comments provided for Flexible Options are that respondents were not aware of the options, that options are inconsistently implemented across campus, and that respondents appreciated learning of the options and desire additional
information. More women than men commented on not being aware of option availability. Examples of
comments include:

- “Difficult to get precise information about policies and how they work at departmental level. Information on Academic HR website is not very detailed, dept. interpretations of these vary greatly.”
- “To the best of my knowledge, my college has not informed the faculty as a whole or disseminated information about the above options, so I appreciate learning about these through this survey”
- “Very little information about these policy options are presented to new faculty, and the strain on limited departmental resources presented by these options means that they are not well known…”
- “I am going to look into two of the programs mentioned above that I am not fully aware of. (Part-time tenure track and Partial leave without pay. As I approach my 60’s and have a retired spouse, these options seem appealing to me as a way to continue to contribute yet have flexibility. I feel I am usually well-informed, yet these options are not discussed often. Thank you!”

Additional themes relate to eligibility restrictions for policy use, such as faculty on 9-month appointments not being eligible for paid sick leave in the summer, adoptive parents being ineligible for paid leave, and not being able to take partial sick leave as faculty. Other comments related to inequities in eligibility related to appointment (WOT, research faculty, lecturers, etc.) as well as the burden placed on full-time colleagues when someone reduces appointment or takes a leave. Examples of comments include:

- “I have never requested for any of these flexible policies, but am at the receiving end of picking up someone else’s slack likely because they are on these flexible support. These allowances will only work well if the department is organized enough to arrange for extra help when someone takes advantage of the flexibility. It certainly is not fair to those who have to carry extra load when a colleague takes off half of the time. I don’t think these policies are good or fair, it only allows so many to use the flexibility and leaves others doing extra work!”
- “there is no coverage for classes that would be eliminated due to taking these kinds of leaves and I teach in a unit in which every other colleague is teaching a full load, so there is no slack left in the system to support the students effected by taking such leaves, no matter how justified nor how supportive my director is”

Some comments addressed perceived discrepancies between the supports in place for faculty with young children versus eldercare, and general work-life balance. Others, mostly from female respondents, indicated that policy use would be frowned upon or detrimental to one’s career trajectory. Examples include:

- “for pre-tenure faculty, they are strongly frowned upon, and I would be hesitant to use them.”
- “I am unaware of many of the ones listed, and even if I had known about them, I would hesitate to use them because of career repercussions and the comments I already received when I took family and medical leave in my school”
- “I was advised not to take these options because of probable harm to my career.”

A couple of comments argued that flexible policies cannot make up for the lack of available childcare at UW. These comments include:

- “Parental teaching release is a step in the right direction, but it doesn’t last long and doesn’t address long-term commitments that parents have. The childcare situation at UW is ridiculous compared to peer institutions and local large-scale employers. I know many families whose work lives are made extremely complicated due to lack of childcare facilities near UW. I imagine that the women bear the brunt of these difficulties.”
- “The policies are fine: what we really need is reasonable and AVAILABLE child care. It’s truly obscene and undermines faculty morale.”
Appendix A: Print View of 'Survey of UW Faculty Careers and Workload'

The Faculty Senate, through its Council on Women, is collecting key data on issues related to faculty careers and workload. Thank you for taking a few moments to complete this short survey about your experiences at UW.

Your feedback will increase our understanding of UW faculty experiences and will help shape recommendations pertaining to UW faculty careers and workload.

Your identifiable information (i.e., UW NetID) is recorded by WebQ (the survey program) separately from your responses. This allows you to save and submit responses at a later time. All responses are confidential.

The first questions pertain to DEMOGRAPHICS.

**Question 1.**
Please indicate the gender with which you self-identify:
- Male
- Female
- Prefer not to answer

**Question 2.**
Are you currently single or in a committed relationship/married?
- Single
- In committed relationship/married
- Prefer not to answer

**Question 3.**
Please indicate which age bracket you are in:
- Younger than 40
- 40 or older
- Prefer not to answer

**Question 4.**
Regarding your parental status, please answer yes or no to the following:

- Have children (if no, skip child age questions)
- Have children 0-1 years old
- Have children 2-5 years old
- Have children 6-12 years old
- Have children 13-18 years old
- Have college-aged children
- Have children older than college-aged
Question 5.
In which group is your primary appointment?
- The divisions of Arts, Humanities, and Social Sciences of the UW-Seattle College of Arts & Sciences, as well as the Interdisciplinary A&S Programs at UW Bothell and UW Tacoma.
- The colleges of Engineering, Ocean and Fishery Sciences, and Forest Resources, as well as from the division of Natural Sciences of the UW-Seattle College of Arts & Sciences and the Computing and Software Systems programs at UW Bothell and UW Tacoma.
- The colleges of Architecture and Urban Planning, Business, Education, Information, Law, and Public Affairs, as well as the Business and Education programs at UW Bothell and UW Tacoma.
- The colleges of Medicine, Nursing, Pharmacy, Dentistry, Public Health, and Social Work, as well as the nursing programs at UW Bothell and UW Tacoma and the Social Work program at UW Tacoma.

Question 6.
If applicable, what is your rank?
- Professor
- Associate Professor
- Assistant Professor
- Instructor
- Senior Lecturer
- Lecturer

Question 7.
At what percentage of Full Time Equivalency (FTE) are you currently appointed?
- 100 percent (full-time)
- 76 percent to 99 percent
- 51 percent to 75 percent
- 50 percent (half-time)

Question 8.
In an average year, approximately how many months of support do you get from each of the following sources?

Rows

State
Grants and contracts
Other institutional sources
- <1
- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
Question 9.
What percentage of your total (individual) income is represented in the previous question (Question 8)?

Question 10.
Is your primary faculty appointment in the School of Medicine?

Logic destinations

- Yes
  - Don't skip (default)
- No
  - Question 12: What is your appointment type?

No response
  - Question 12: What is your appointment type?

Question 11.
What is your appointment type?

- Research Faculty
- Clinician Scientist (or equivalent)
- Clinician Educator

Logic destination

The next questions pertain ...

Question 12.
What is your appointment type?

- Ladder teaching faculty (tenure or tenure-track)
- Ladder teaching faculty (WOT)
- Research faculty
- Clinical faculty
- Senior lecturer, Lecturer, or Artist in residence
- Instructor

The next questions pertain to your TEACHING.

Question 13.
In an average year, how many of each kind of course do you teach?

Rows

- Large undergraduate (>100 students)
- Medium undergraduate (50-99 students)
Small undergraduate (<50 students)
Graduate courses
Courses with clinical trainees (medical/nursing/etc. students, residents, fellows)
   ○ 0
   ○ 1
   ○ 2
   ○ 3
   ○ >3

**Question 14.**
My TEACHING LOAD is [select one] colleagues IN MY DEPARTMENT.
   ○ Higher than
   ○ About the same as
   ○ Less than
   ○ Don’t know

**Question 15.**
My TEACHING LOAD is [select one] to colleagues AT OTHER INSTITUTIONS.
   ○ Higher than
   ○ About the same as
   ○ Less than
   ○ Don’t know

**Question 16.**
My AMOUNT OF TEACHING SUPPORT (e.g., TAs) is [select one] colleagues IN MY DEPARTMENT.
   ○ Higher than
   ○ About the same as
   ○ Less than
   ○ Don’t know

**Question 17.**
Please rate your level of agreement/disagreement with the following statements:

**Rows**

I am satisfied with my teaching load at UW.
I am satisfied with my courses and/or type of teaching at UW.
   ○ Agree strongly
   ○ Agree somewhat
   ○ Disagree somewhat
   ○ Disagree strongly
   ○ Don’t know

**Question 18.**
Thank you for providing any comments you have about teaching at UW.

The next questions pertain to FLEXIBLE POLICY OPTIONS.
UW has the following flexible policy options for faculty:

- Tenure clock extension (extra years to tenure for various personal and professional reasons)
- Part-time tenure track (permits faculty to remain on the tenure track both pre- and post tenure at reduced appointments)
- Partial leave without pay (permits faculty to be “part-time” for up to two years)
- Medical and family leave (paid and unpaid leave for medical and family care reasons)
- Transitional support program (provides temporary support for faculty experiencing potentially career-threatening situations)
- Parental teaching release (piloted in select colleges: releases new parents who are not eligible for paid sick leave from formal classroom instruction to bond with a new child)

**Question 19.**
For each statement, please check all flexible policy options that apply:

**Rows**

I am aware of the following flexible policy options at UW:
I have utilized the following flexible policy options at UW:
I was eligible to utilize the following flexible policy options, but chose not to do so:
My request to utilize the following flexible policy options at UW were denied:
I believe my department/unit would be supportive of my using the following flexible policy options:
  - [ ] Tenure clock extension
  - [ ] Part-time tenure track
  - [ ] Partial leave without pay
  - [ ] Medical and family leave
  - [ ] Transitional support program
  - [ ] Parental teaching release (piloted in select colleges)

**Question 20.**
*If you were eligible but CHOSE NOT TO USE a flexible policy option,*

Please indicate why you did not request to use a flexible policy option (check all that apply):
  - [ ] Was afraid of career repercussion
  - [ ] Did not need to use the option
  - [ ] Did not want to create a burden for my colleagues
  - [ ] Could not financially afford to reduce my appointment/pay
  - [ ] Other:

**Question 21.**
*If you requested to use a flexible policy option but WERE DENIED APPROVAL,*

Please indicate why you think your request was denied (check all that apply):
  - [ ] I did not meet eligibility requirements
  - [ ] Funding concerns
  - [ ] The department is not supportive of flexibility
  - [ ] Other:
**Question 22.**
Thank you for providing any comments you have about flexible policy options for faculty at UW.

The next questions pertain to your SERVICE work.

**Question 23.**
For the last 5 years, please indicate how many of each kind of committee you served on.

**Rows**

- UNIVERSITY WIDE committees
- COLLEGE WIDE committees
- DEPARTMENT committees
- LOCAL or NATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS (within your discipline) committees
  - 0
  - 1
  - 2
  - 3
  - >3

**Question 24.**
In the last 5 years, if you served on another type of committee, please specify it:

**Question 25.**
How many hours per month, on average, do you spend in committees and on committee work?

- 0-2 hours
- 2-4 hours
- 4-6 hours
- 6-8 hours
- 8-10 hours
- > 10 hours

**Question 26.**
In comparison to colleagues in my department, I serve on [select one] total committees.

- More
- About the same number of
- Less
- Don’t know

**Question 27.**
In considering the past 5 years, please rate your level of agreement/disagreement:

**Rows**

The committees I serve on have the authority to influence BUDGETARY decisions.
The committees I serve on have the authority to influence CURRICULAR decisions.
The committees I serve on have the authority to influence HIRING decisions.
I am gaining leadership experience through my involvement in committees. My committee service is valued by the department for merit review, promotion, and tenure.

- Agree strongly
- Agree somewhat
- Disagree somewhat
- Disagree strongly
- Don’t know

**Question 28.**
Thank you for providing any comments you have about service at UW.

The next questions pertain to your LEVEL OF SATISFACTION with your CAREER ADVANCEMENT at UW.

**Question 29.**
Please rate your level of agreement/disagreement with the following statements:

**Rows**

- I am satisfied with my prospects for career advancement at UW.
- I could move into a leadership role at UW if I wanted to do so.
- I am satisfied with how my career has already advanced at UW.

- Agree strongly
- Agree somewhat
- Disagree somewhat
- Disagree strongly
- Don’t know

**Question 30.**
Thank you for providing any comments you have about your level of satisfaction with your career advancement at UW.

The last questions pertain to MENTORING.

**Question 31.**
Please rate your level of agreement/disagreement with each statement:

**Rows**

- I receive mentoring.
- I am satisfied with the mentoring I receive on professional/career issues.
- I am satisfied with the mentoring I receive on work-family balance issues.
- I would like additional mentoring on professional/career issues.
- I would like additional mentoring on work-family balance issues.
- I mentor junior faculty on professional/career issues.
- I mentor junior faculty on work-family balance issues.
Question 32.
Thank you for providing any comments you have about faculty mentoring at UW.
APPENDIX B: Significant Gender Differences

Questions on which there was a significant (p≥0.05, 95% confidence level) difference between the means for male and female respondents within a given academic field [SOM = School of Medicine, AH = Allied Health, not SON; PROF = professional schools and colleges; STEM = Science, Engineering, Math; AHSS = Arts, Humanities, Social Sciences, ALL = entire sample]

First column is question; second is the group in which the gender difference was significant (same question appears more than once if the gender difference is significant in more than one group), N and Mean are the number answering the question and the mean for female (top) and male (bottom) respondents. ΔM = female mean – male mean, and σ(ΔM) is the standard error in the mean (average of ± if they were different), and p-val is the significance result of a t-test comparing the means.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>QUESTION</th>
<th>GROUP</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>ΔM</th>
<th>σ(ΔM)</th>
<th>p-val</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I am satisfied with the mentoring I receive on professional/career issues.</td>
<td>PROF</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>-0.79</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am satisfied with my teaching load at UW</td>
<td>PROF</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>-0.75</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would like additional mentoring on work-family balance issues.</td>
<td>SOM</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would like additional mentoring on work-family balance issues.</td>
<td>PROF</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>2.84</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am satisfied with how my career has already advanced at UW.</td>
<td>PROF</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td>-0.59</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am satisfied with the mentoring I receive on work-family balance issues.</td>
<td>PROF</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>-0.58</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am satisfied with my prospects for career advancement at UW.</td>
<td>PROF</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>-0.56</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The committees I serve on have the authority to influence BUDGETARY decisions.</td>
<td>PROF</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>-0.53</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would like additional mentoring on professional/career issues.</td>
<td>SOM</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I could move into a leadership role at UW if I wanted to do so.</td>
<td>PROF</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>-0.49</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would like additional mentoring on professional/career issues.</td>
<td>PROF</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would like additional mentoring on work-family balance issues.</td>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would like additional mentoring on professional/career issues.</td>
<td>AHSS</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I mentor junior faculty on work-family balance issues.</td>
<td>AHSS</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would like additional mentoring on professional/career issues.</td>
<td>STEM</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.018</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The committees I serve on have the authority to influence HIRING decisions.
I am satisfied with my courses and/or type of teaching at UW.
I receive mentoring
I would like additional mentoring on professional/career issues.
The committees I serve on have the authority to influence BUDGETARY decisions.
I am satisfied with the mentoring I receive on professional/career issues.
I am satisfied with my teaching load at UW.
I am satisfied with my prospects for career advancement at UW.
I could move into a leadership role at UW if I wanted to do so.
I am satisfied with how my career has already advanced at UW.
The committees I serve on have authority to influence budgetary decisions
I am satisfied with the mentoring I receive on work-family balance issues.
I mentor junior faculty on work-family balance issues.
I am satisfied with the mentoring I receive on professional/career issues.
I could move into a leadership role at UW if I wanted to do so.
I am satisfied with my teaching load at UW
I am satisfied with my prospects for career advancement at UW.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>F</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Lower</th>
<th>Upper</th>
<th>p-value</th>
<th>Alpha</th>
<th>Effect Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SOM</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>-0.44</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.017</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROF</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>-0.43</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.026</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOM</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>351</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOM</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>-0.39</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AHSS</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>-0.39</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.025</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AHSS</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>-0.38</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.012</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOM</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>-0.38</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOM</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>-0.32</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.039</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOM</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>-0.32</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.017</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>349</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>-0.24</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.008</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>334</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>-0.22</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.013</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>351</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.012</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>2.39</td>
<td>-0.21</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.014</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td>-0.20</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>351</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>-0.20</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.008</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>381</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>-0.20</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.008</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>344</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>2.49</td>
<td>-0.18</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.038</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALL</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>-0.16</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.035</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
QUESTIONS WITH NUMERICAL ANSWERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>QUESTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How many hours per month, on average, do you spend in committees and on committee work [1=0-2, 2=2-4, 3=4-6, 4=6-8, 5=8-10, 6=&gt;10]?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AHSS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In an average year, how many Graduate Classes [0, 1, 2, 3, 4=&gt;3] do you teach?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AHSS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STEM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AHSS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In comparison to colleagues in my department, I serve on [more (1), about the same (0), less (-1), don't know(omitted)] total committees.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In an average year, how many Graduate Classes [0, 1, 2, 3, 4=&gt;3] do you teach?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My TEACHING LOAD is [higher (1), about the same (0), lower (-1)] relative to colleagues IN MY DEPARTMENT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STEM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>