

RESEARCH DIALOGUE

Issue no. 101

JUNE 2011

SENIOR FACULTY SATISFACTION: PERCEPTIONS OF ASSOCIATE AND FULL PROFESSORS AT SEVEN PUBLIC RESEARCH UNIVERSITIES

Cathy Ann Trower, Ph.D.¹

Research Director, Collaborative on Academic Careers in Higher Education (COACHE)

Harvard Graduate School of Education

TIAA-CREF Institute Fellow

ABSTRACT

The engagement, productivity, and vitality of the faculty are extremely important to the success of academic institutions in fulfilling their missions. This paper presents data from a survey of 1,775 tenured associate and full professors at seven public universities, showing that many are frustrated about leadership turnover and the corresponding shifts in mission, focus, and priorities, and also about salary. In addition, associate professors are less satisfied than full professors on critical factors such as support for research, collaboration, and clarity of promotion, and women are less satisfied than men on numerous dimensions including mentoring support for research and interdisciplinary work, and clarity of promotion.



FINANCIAL SERVICES
FOR THE GREATER GOOD®

¹ I am grateful for the support of the TIAA-CREF Institute to write this paper.

The views and opinions in this paper are solely those of the authors and do not necessarily represent those of TIAA-CREF or the TIAA-CREF Institute.

INTRODUCTION

During the fall of 2010, the Collaborative on Academic Careers in Higher Education (COACHE) conducted a pilot survey of over 1,700 associate and full professors, with tenure, at seven public research universities. The purpose of the pilot was to help those institutions understand their tenured faculty by measuring their satisfaction with several key areas: support for teaching, research, and service; policies, salary and benefits; collaboration; leadership; mentoring; departmental engagement; appreciation and recognition; and also to test the survey's viability prior to national rollout in 2011.

COACHE is a consortium of over 150 four-year colleges and universities interested in faculty work-life issues and satisfaction. COACHE measures, reports, and provides policy and practice advice for improving the faculty workplace in order to help institutions recruit and retain top faculty talent.

The population under study is extremely important for several reasons. First, there were 151,649 full professors and 127,016 associate professors among the full-time instructional staff at Title IV degree-granting institutions in the United States in 2009-10 (Knapp, Kelly-Reid, and Ginder, 2010), representing 48 percent of the full-time faculty. Second, full and associate professors are the highest paid faculty, on average. The average salary for full-time, full professors was \$109,843; for associate professors it was \$76,566 (AAUP 2010). Third, very few faculty at the full and associate professor level leave their institutions of employ. A comprehensive study of the 18-year period of 1971-72 to 1988-1989 showed that retention rates for full and associate professors were 90 to 92 percent (Ehrenberg, Kasper, and Rees 1991). In 2002, only 7 percent of all full-time faculty left their institutions (Neville and Bradburn 2006). Fourth, for a variety of reasons including the economy and declining portfolio values, many senior faculty plan to retire later in life; nearly one-third of those polled in a recent TIAA-CREF study said that they expected to work until at least age 70, compared with 24 percent of all U.S. workers (Yakoboski 2010). Finally, by granting tenure to associate and full professors, institutions are making what amounts to a lifetime commitment to these faculty members, barring extreme circumstances for which an institution could terminate the employment contract (e.g., incompetence, moral turpitude, gross neglect of duties). Therefore, it is in an institution's best interest to ensure that its associate and full professors are satisfied and productive members of the academic community. If tenured faculty members become dissatisfied, despondent, or delinquent, the consequences can be quite dire—for students, fellow faculty members, staff, administrators, as well as departmental and institutional reputations.

DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS OF SURVEY RESPONDENTS

A total of 1,775 associate and full professors at seven universities completed the survey (Table 1). All have tenure and were employed full-time at their institutions in the fall of 2010 when the survey was administered. Women represented 33 percent of the total respondents including 42 percent of the associate professors and 25 percent of the full professors. Among associate professors, 52 percent of the respondents have been employed at their institutions at that rank for 5 years or less, 25 percent from six to ten years, and 24 percent for more than ten years. Among full professors, 34 percent have been employed at their institutions at that rank for five years or less, 42 percent for six to ten years, and 23 percent for more than 15 years. The distribution of all faculty respondents by race is as follows: 82 percent white, non-Hispanic, 9.5 percent underrepresented minorities² (including black or African American, Hispanic or Latino, and Native American or American Indian), and 8 percent Asian, Asian American, or Pacific Islander. The vast majority (96%) of all faculty respondents were U.S. citizens.

2 Because this is a pilot, with a small population compared to our national surveys, we are unable to analyze the race data separately by group.

TABLE 1
SURVEY RESPONDENTS DEMOGRAPHICS

ASSOCIATE PROFESSORS	ALL	%	WOMEN	%	MEN	%
Number of respondents	865	49	363	42	502	58
In rank five years or less	326	52	143	44	183	56
In rank between 6 and 10 years	157	25	68	43	89	57
In rank more than 10 years	150	24	66	44	84	56
White, non-Hispanic	683	79	283	41	400	59
Asian American, Asian, or Pacific Islander	82	9	26	32	56	68
Underrepresented minority	100	12	54	54	46	46
U.S. Citizen	717	94	315	44	401	56
Non-U.S. Citizen	47	6	16	34	31	66
FULL PROFESSORS	ALL	%	WOMEN	%	Men	%
Number of respondents	910	51	228	25	682	75
In rank five years or less	235	34	75	32	160	68
In rank between 6 and 10 years	290	42	77	27	213	73
In rank more than 10 years	161	23	29	18	132	82
White, non-Hispanic	776	85	207	27	569	73
Asian American, Asian, or Pacific Islander	64	7	9	14	55	86
Underrepresented minority	70	8	12	17	58	83
U.S. Citizen	794	97	204	26	590	74
Non-U.S. Citizen	23	3	4	17	19	83

NOTE: Some data was not reported for rank and citizenship.

MARITAL AND FAMILY SITUATION OF SURVEY RESPONDENTS

The majority of associate (82 percent) and full (85 percent) professors were married, in a civil union, or living with a partner. Nine percent of associate professors were single compared with 6 percent of full professors; 9 percent of associate professors and full professors were divorced, separated, or widowed (Table 2). Overall, women were more likely than men to be single (13 percent versus 5 percent), more likely to be divorced, separated, or widowed (13 percent versus 7 percent), and less likely to be married, in a civil union, or cohabitating (74 percent versus 88 percent).

TABLE 2
MARITAL STATUS

ASSOCIATE PROFESSORS	ALL	%	WOMEN	%	MEN	%
Single	69	9	44	64	25	36
Married or in a civil union	581	79	215	37	366	63
Unmarried, living with partner	22	3	11	50	11	50
Divorced, separated, or widowed	64	9	38	59	26	41
FULL PROFESSORS	ALL	%	WOMEN	%	MEN	%
Single	49	6	21	43	28	57
Married or in a civil union	646	82	145	22	501	78
Unmarried, living with partner	22	3	6	27	16	73
Divorced, separated, or widowed	68	9	26	38	42	62

The majority of associate (79 percent) and full (70 percent) professors had a spouse or partner who was employed at the time of the survey; of those, about a third of associate and full professor's spouses were employed at the same institution. Twenty six percent of full professors compared with 14 percent of associate professors had a spouse or partner who was unemployed and not seeking employment. Most partnered men and women associate and full professors had a dual career

situation, although male full professors were the most likely to have a spouse or partner who was not employed and not seeking employment (Table 3).

TABLE 3
EMPLOYMENT STATUS OF SPOUSE/PARTNER

ASSOCIATE PROFESSORS	ALL	%	WOMEN	%	MEN	%
Not employed and not seeking employment	82	14	20	24	62	76
Not employed but seeking employment	37	6	8	23	29	77
Employed at this institution	131	23	65	50	66	50
Employed elsewhere	322	56	119	37	203	63
FULL PROFESSORS	ALL	%	WOMEN	%	MEN	%
Not employed and not seeking employment	166	26	17	10	149	90
Not employed but seeking employment	22	4	2	9	20	91
Employed at this institution	144	23	47	33	97	67
Employed elsewhere	295	47	75	25	220	75

In terms of dependents, 45 percent of respondents (39 percent of associates and 52 percent of full professors) had none. Male full professors were by far the most likely to have no family care responsibilities (Table 4).

TABLE 4
FAMILY SITUATION

ASSOCIATE PROFESSORS	ALL	WOMEN	MEN
Infants, toddlers, or pre-school children at home	108	41	67
Elementary, middle, or high school age children at home	291	106	185
Children 18 or over at home	74	31	43
Elders for whom you provide care for more than 3 hours per week	54	32	22
A disabled or ill family member	56	29	27
None of these responsibilities	288	134	154
FULL PROFESSORS	ALL	WOMEN	MEN
Infants, toddlers, or pre-school children at home	25	2	23
Elementary, middle, or high school age children at home	219	47	172
Children 18 or over at home	111	22	89
Elders for whom you provide care for more than 3 hours per week	62	24	38
A disabled or ill family member	72	20	52
None of these responsibilities	409	107	302

GLOBAL SATISFACTION

The COACHE survey asks respondents several questions about their global satisfaction in including, “If you had a chance to do it all over, would you again choose an academic career?” and “If you had a chance to do it all over, would you again choose to work at this institution?” While the majority of associate and full professors would again choose an academic career (84 percent and 89 percent, respectively), the average rating for associate professors was statistically significantly lower than the average rating among full professors (4.32 v. 4.52 on a 5-point scale). Importantly, far fewer associate and full professors (59 percent and 63 percent, respectively) would again choose to work at their institution; again, the average rating for associate professors (3.48) was statistically significantly lower than for full professors (3.64).

TABLE 5
AGAIN CHOOSING YOUR INSTITUTION AND AN ACADEMIC CAREER

ASSOCIATE PROFESSORS	ALL		WOMEN		MEN	
	% Agreeing	Mean	% Agreeing	Mean	% Agreeing	Mean
If I had it to do all over, I would again choose to work at this institution.	59	3.48	56	3.49	61	3.53
If I had it to do all over, I would again choose an academic career.	84	4.32	82	4.26	86	4.36
FULL PROFESSORS	ALL		WOMEN		MEN	
	% Agreeing	Mean	% Agreeing	Mean	% Agreeing	Mean
If I had it to do all over, I would again choose to work at this institution.	63	3.64*	61	3.61	63	3.67
If I had it to do all over, I would again choose an academic career.	89	4.52*	88	4.49*	89	4.54*

Scale: 1 = Strongly disagree; 2 = Somewhat disagree; 3 = Neither Agree nor Disagree; 4 = Somewhat agree; 5 = Strongly agree

* Full professors rated the item significantly higher than associate professors.

Better pay. An open-ended survey question asked respondents the “number one thing that you, personally, feel your institution could do to improve your workplace.” While pay, technically, has nothing to do with improving the workplace, the most frequent response to this question (261 responses, 16 percent) was to increase salaries. Faculty noted that, while institutions are increasing student enrollment and ratcheting up research expectations, salaries have remained flat in recent years, which exacerbates the issue.

Representative quotes about pay include:

- We’re continually asked to do more (research, teaching, collaboration, outreach) with less (lower benefits, frozen salary--reduced, if you include furlough days, no release time, little conference/travel support, etc.). We’re told the things we do are valued, but we get no evidence of it or support for our initiatives.
- Pay faculty more. The university spent money on a study that showed that we were making less than the 25th percentile in our fields, and a raise over four years was recommended. The institution failed to follow through with this, but...they subsidized our losing football team.
- The university should provide a consistent 12-month salary rather than require professors to relentlessly pursue that elusive additional three months of summer salary. That way we could strategically propose research that is valuable and viable, rather than having to desperately try for everything that comes along in order to be fully funded.
- Reward the outstanding people, increase their pay without forcing them to look for outside offers; we need more aggressive merit-based pay.
- I love [my institution], but I know that if I applied elsewhere, my starting salary as an Associate Professor in my field would immediately net me a minimum \$15,000 to \$20,000 salary increase. Family and a great school system keep me here, but it’s hard to stay motivated (and focused) when you worry about how you will pay the bills next month....and I do...almost every month.

Associate professors were significantly less satisfied with salary than full professors (average rating 2.51 versus 3.03 on a 5-point scale); women were less satisfied with salary than men at both ranks, though not statistically significantly so (Table 6).

TABLE 6
SALARY SATISFACTION

ASSOCIATE PROFESSORS	ALL		WOMEN		MEN	
	% Satisfied	Mean	% Satisfied	Mean	% Satisfied	Mean
	28	2.51*	26	2.50*	30	2.55*
FULL PROFESSORS	ALL		WOMEN		MEN	
	% Satisfied	Mean	% Satisfied	Mean	% Satisfied	Mean
	45	3.03	41	2.90	46	3.10

Scale: 1 = Very dissatisfied; 2 = Dissatisfied; 3 = Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied; 4 = Satisfied; 5 = Very satisfied

* Associate professors significantly less satisfied than full professors.

Stable leadership and mission. After salary, the next most common response (243 mentions, 14 percent) to the question about making one change to improve the workplace was having stability in presidential and provostial leadership, and corresponding stability of mission and strategy. Many faculty members believe their senior leaders use their institution as a “stepping stone” to a more prestigious university. Senior faculty members also mentioned the institution’s direction as overly focused on science, technology, engineering, and math (STEM) fields and athletics. Similarly, a number of faculty disagreed with their senior leadership’s push to become a “top-tier” research university, feeling that their institution’s strength was in teaching and that they should focus on this rather than trying to change their identity. Better communication and transparency from the top leadership was also desired.

On this topic, faculty wrote the following:

- Create an environment for a stable long term President and Provost so there is not constant administrative change (e.g., new initiatives, new goals, adjusted strategic plans, revised policies, and varying levels of control on budgets). More time is spent on adjusting and meeting the “new” initiatives rather than moving forward with some college/departmental autonomy to ‘get things done’.
- Provide some stability in administration. The institution has experienced significant change in administration over the past ten years. Those who come here act as if we are broken and in need of drastic changes to policies, procedures, and traditions. This makes us look like we are always in the middle of an identity crisis. Some changes of the new administrations have created a lack of trust, leading to a lack of loyalty to the institution.
- We are doing about the best we can with the limited resources at our disposal. But, more communications from the President and Provost about the University’s mission and strategies might be helpful to maintaining a strong sense of community. Perhaps, each month they could post a short video about mission/strategies on our website.

There are a number of survey items where faculty rated issues of shifting institutional priorities, the impact these changes have on them, and the support of their deans and chairs in adapting. Three quarters of associate and full professors agreed that institutional priorities have changed in ways that affect their work. Far fewer associate and full professors felt that the institution’s priorities are stated consistently across various levels of leadership and fewer still felt that those priorities are acted upon consistently. In terms of support in adapting to the shifting sands, associate and full professors alike felt that more comes from their chairs than from their deans (Table 7).

TABLE 7
PERCEPTIONS OF INSTITUTIONAL PRIORITY CHANGES AND LEADERSHIP

	% AGREEING	
	ASSOCIATE PROFESSORS	FULL PROFESSORS
In the past 5 years, my institution's priorities have changed in ways that affect my work in my department.	76%	75%
My institution's priorities are stated consistently across all levels of leadership.	36%	40%
My institution's priorities are acted upon consistently across all levels of leadership.	29%	32%
In adapting to the changing priorities, I have received support from my dean or division head.	38%	41%
In adapting to the changing priorities, I have received support from my department head or chair.	55%	50%

Support for research. Many faculty members (220, 14 percent) felt that their institution should provide better support and funding for research if they want to move up in the rankings. Faculty mentioned wanting course releases, graduate student assistants, grant assistance, and formal sabbaticals. One respondent commented:

The administration needs to recognize that research is a passion for a lot of faculty, that this passion is to be respected and supported, and that creativity in research is to be encouraged, including all aspects—from proposal formation to implementation to fiscal assistance.

Perhaps not surprisingly, because associate professors presumably need strong research programs to advance in rank, they were significantly less satisfied than full professors with all but one of the research survey items; both groups rated institutional support for managing externally funded grants, post-award, low. Professors were most satisfied with the influence they have over their own research program and least satisfied with the availability of course release time to spend on research (Table 8).

TABLE 8
SATISFACTION WITH RESEARCH FACTORS

	ASSOCIATE PROFESSORS		FULL PROFESSORS	
	% Satisfied	Mean	% Satisfied	Mean
Influence you have over the focus of your research	85%	4.26*	90%	4.41
Portion of your time spent on research	49%	3.17*	64%	3.60
Institutional support for traveling to present papers or conduct research	45%	3.14*	54%	3.32
Quality of graduate students to support your work	42%	3.05*	49%	3.21
Amount of external funding you are expected to find	35%	3.01*	43%	3.21
Institutional support for securing graduate student assistance	35%	2.87*	40%	3.04
Institutional support for obtaining externally funded grants (pre-award)	32%	2.83*	39%	3.04
Institutional support for managing externally funded grants (post-award)	29%	2.75	32%	2.85
Availability of course release time to focus on your research	23%	2.47*	32%	2.80

Scale: 1 = Very dissatisfied; 2 = Dissatisfied; 3 = Neither Satisfied nor Dissatisfied; 4 = Satisfied; 5 = Very satisfied

* Associate professors significantly less satisfied than full professors.

Better facilities and staff support. Just behind research support in number of mentions (206 responses) for needed improvement was the availability and size of offices, labs, and classrooms. The age of facilities was also an issue for many. Faculty referred to parking, lab equipment, and technology (used in both teaching and research) as improvements that could be made. Some faculty members wanted more administrative staff support, especially with regard to grants. Others were overwhelmed with “bureaucratic paperwork,” desiring more training for and experience of their administrative support staff.

- Stop delegating excessive tasks to faculty that are really clerical or administrator/chair tasks. The consumption of faculty time towards tasks that, at most other universities, would be done by clerical staff or administrators or chairs, eats up valuable faculty time that should be going towards research successes.
- Have all the support services (e.g., research offices, budgeting, purchasing, legal) revise their mission from servicing the university to servicing the faculty. There are too many things that are set up to act as roadblocks and hindrances to research rather than facilitating it. I spend more time making sure things don't get lost in the system than it takes to write the proposals and do the research.

BROAD THEMATIC AREAS

The survey examined the workplace for associate and full professors along a number of dimensions elicited from faculty members during focus group research. Using principle factor analysis and principle component analysis, those survey items were grouped to form meaningful constructs (Table 9)—items that fit together well in the minds of survey-takers.

Associate professors were most satisfied with support for teaching, departmental collegiality, departmental leadership, and collaboration, and are least satisfied with support for interdisciplinary work, mentoring, personal and familial support, division leadership, research support, and appreciation and recognition. Full professors were most satisfied with promotion clarity and expectations (after all, they have achieved promotion); and like assistant professors, they give high marks to support for teaching, departmental collegiality, and collaboration. The lowest rated areas for full professors were the same as for associates, just in a slightly different order.

TABLE 9
OVERALL SATISFACTION WITH KEY CONSTRUCTS

	ASSOCIATE PROFESSORS Mean	FULL PROFESSORS Mean
Support for teaching	3.71*	3.84
Departmental collegiality	3.70	3.79
Departmental leadership	3.56	3.46
Collaboration	3.48*	3.65
Health and retirement benefits	3.44*	3.55
Departmental engagement	3.43	3.52
Department quality	3.41*	3.53
Facilities and clerical support	3.40*	3.51
Promotion clarity and expectations	3.36*	4.08
Senior leadership	3.19*	3.33
Support for service	3.16*	3.32
Appreciation and recognition	3.14*	3.34
Support for research	3.10*	3.31
Division leadership	3.09	3.18
Personal and familial support	3.01*	3.19
Mentoring	2.98*	3.28
Support for interdisciplinary work	2.51*	2.72

* Constructs rated statistically significantly lower by associate professors than by full professors

The next two sections focus on the areas of concern for both associate and full professors.

SUPPORT FOR INTERDISCIPLINARY WORK

Work that spans disciplinary lines is becoming increasingly important at research universities and many faculty members are keen to do such work. However, numerous barriers inhibit interdisciplinary scholarship, as found in this study (Table 10). As with most other variables measured, associate professors are significantly less satisfied than full professors with various aspects of interdisciplinary work.

TABLE 10
SUPPORT FOR INTERDISCIPLINARY WORK

	ASSOCIATE PROFESSORS		FULL PROFESSORS	
	% Agreeing	Mean	% Agreeing	Mean
Campus facilities are conducive to interdisciplinary work	21%	2.46*	26%	2.62
Interdisciplinary work is rewarded in the merit process	23%	2.46*	29%	2.71
Budget allocations encourage interdisciplinary work	23%	2.47*	25%	2.60
Interdisciplinary work is rewarded in the promotion process	26%	2.53*	32%	2.80
My department understands how to evaluate interdisciplinary work	30%	2.66*	35%	2.85

Scale: 1 = Strongly disagree; 2 = Somewhat disagree; 3 = Neither Agree nor Disagree; 4 = Somewhat agree; 5 = Strongly agree

* Associate professors significantly less satisfied than full professors.

MENTORING

Few would argue that mentoring is not crucial to faculty success, especially for assistant professors seeking to become associates and for associates seeking to become full. The survey asked respondents to say how important mentoring from various people (in the department, outside the department, and outside the institution) was to their success. Associate professors rated all three types of mentors as significantly more important to their success than did full professors, which is not surprising because, in part, full professors have reached the highest rung on the promotion ladder and may no longer feel the need for a mentor. Most important of all is having a mentor or mentors inside one's department, followed by having a mentor outside the institution. Slightly more than half of associate professors and 44 percent of the full professors felt that having a mentor outside their department (but at their institution) was important to their success (Table 11).

TABLE 11
IMPORTANCE OF HAVING A MENTOR

	ASSOCIATE PROFESSORS		FULL PROFESSORS	
	% Important	Mean	% Important	Mean
Inside your department	85%	4.20*	77%	3.94
Outside your institution	62%	3.63*	55%	3.43
Outside your department	53%	3.47*	44%	3.22

Scale: 1 = Very unimportant; 2 = Unimportant; 3 = Neither Important nor Unimportant; 4 = Important; 5 = Very important

* Associate professors rated the item as significantly more important than full professors.

But importance is relative. In this case, gender makes a big difference in attitudes about the importance of mentoring; there were enormous differences by gender comparing all men to all women and comparing associate men and women and full professor men and women (Table 12). Looking at associate professors first, it is clear that having a mentor or mentors inside one's department is very important to women and men alike. But women are much more likely than men to rate having a mentor outside the institution as being important (77 percent compared to 51 percent, respectively). And while somewhat less important than someone outside the institution serving as a mentor, women value someone outside their department and felt such a mentor was important to their success more than men (66 percent of women compared with 44 percent of men).

TABLE 12
IMPORTANCE OF HAVING A MENTOR

ASSOCIATE PROFESSORS	WOMEN		MEN	
	% Important	Mean	% Important	Mean
Inside your department	89%	4.37	82%	4.11
Outside your institution	77%	3.97*	51%	3.38
Outside your department	66%	3.78*	44%	3.26
FULL PROFESSORS	WOMEN		MEN	
	% Important	Mean	% Important	Mean
Inside your department	85%	4.22	74%	3.87
Outside your institution	71%	3.85*	49%	3.27
Outside your department	61%	3.66	38%	3.09

Scale: 1 = Very unimportant; 2 = Unimportant; 3 = Neither Important nor Unimportant; 4 = Important; 5 = Very important

* Women rated the item as significantly more important than men.

The drop in mentor importance from associate to full was greater for men than for women, indicating that women value mentors of all types throughout their faculty careers. It is also possible that there are variations in the distribution of men and women by discipline and that faculty in some disciplines require or desire less mentorship.

The survey also asks a series of questions about how much formal mentoring is being done and how effective it is. In the past five years, two thirds of associate professors and three quarters of full professors reported having mentored tenure-track faculty members in their department. Males at both ranks were more likely than females to report having served in this capacity. There is far less mentoring of tenure-track faculty outside of one's home department; 22 percent of associates and 26 percent of full professors report such mentoring. Thirty five percent of full professors and 22 percent of associate professors reported having mentored a tenured member of their department in the past five years. Male full professors were much more likely than female full professors to report having done such mentoring (70 percent v. 30 percent). Only 14 percent of full professors and 5 percent of associates said they have mentored a tenured professor outside of their home department. For those who reported having mentored someone, Table 13 shows the corresponding percentages of men and women associate and full professors.

TABLE 13
MENTORING BY GENDER AND RANK

In the past five years, at this institution, I have served as either a formal or informal mentor to:	ASSOCIATE PROFESSORS		FULL PROFESSORS	
	% Men	% Women	% Men	% Women
Pre-tenure faculty in my department	54%	46%	72%	28%
Tenured faculty in my department	56%	44%	70%	30%
Pre-tenure faculty outside my department	54%	56%	68%	32%
Tenured faculty outside my department	51%	49%	67%	33%

Survey respondents provided ratings of the mentoring they have received. Associate and full professors alike rate highest the mentoring they receive from someone outside their home institution; at both ranks, nearly two thirds of faculty members say they have received effective or very effective mentoring from someone outside their institution. Women associate and full professors rated the effectiveness of mentors outside their institution significantly more effective than men associate and full professors (Table 14).

TABLE 14
EFFECTIVENESS OF MENTOR TO MENTEE

ASSOCIATE PROFESSORS	ALL		WOMEN		MEN	
	% Effective	Mean	% Effective	Mean	% Effective	Mean
Outside your institution	65%	3.73	72%	3.87*	59%	3.60
Inside your department	58%	3.42	60%	3.43	57%	3.42
Outside your department	49%	3.32	54%	3.41	44%	3.26
FULL PROFESSORS	ALL		WOMEN		MEN	
	% Effective	Mean	% Effective	Mean	% Effective	Mean
Outside your institution	66%	3.75	80%	4.06*	60%	3.63
Inside your department	64%	3.61+	64%	3.59	64%	3.63
Outside your department	49%	3.37	58%	3.60	46%	3.31

Scale: 1 = Very ineffective; 2 = Somewhat ineffective; 3 = Neither Effective nor Ineffective; 4 = Effective; 5 = Very effective

* Women rated the item as significantly more effective than men.

+ Full professors rated the item as significantly more effective than associate professors.

Finally, concerning mentoring, respondents rated the effectiveness of mentoring, in general, for tenure-track/assistant and associate professors, as well as institutional support for faculty to be good mentors. Full professors rated all three significantly higher than associate professors (Table 15).

TABLE 15
EFFECTIVENESS OF MENTORING

ASSOCIATE PROFESSORS	ALL		WOMEN		MEN	
	% Agreeing	Mean	% Agreeing	Mean	% Agreeing	Mean
There is effective mentoring of pre-tenure faculty in my department.	47%	3.01	47%	3.06	48%	3.00
There is effective mentoring of tenured associate professors in my department.	14%	2.05	12%	1.91	16%	2.17*
My institution provides adequate support for faculty to be good mentors.	14%	2.17	14%	2.15	14%	2.22
FULL PROFESSORS	ALL		WOMEN		MEN	
	% Agreeing	Mean	% Agreeing	Mean	% Agreeing	Mean
There is effective mentoring of pre-tenure faculty in my department.	61%	3.44+	63%	3.42	61%	3.48
There is effective mentoring of tenured associate professors in my department.	33%	2.76+	35%	2.68	32%	2.81
My institution provides adequate support for faculty to be good mentors.	22%	2.51+	19%	2.41	22%	2.56

Scale: 1 = Strongly disagree; 2 = Somewhat disagree; 3= Neither Agree nor Disagree; 2 = Somewhat agree; 1 = Strongly agree

* Men rated the item significantly higher than women.

+ Full professors rated the item significantly higher than associate professors.

CONCLUSION

The overarching conclusions to be drawn from this study, so far (there is still much analysis to be done), are these:

1. Associate professors, on average, reported less job satisfaction relative to full professors. In the main, associate professors are much less satisfied with their workplace than full professors, rating 71 percent of survey items lower; therefore, associate professors could be at risk by leaving for another academic institution or for a job outside the academy. If they stay in their present positions and remain unsatisfied or disgruntled, there are implications for quality, community, collegueship, engagement, reputation, and productivity.
2. Women faculty, on average, reported less job satisfaction than men. While there were no gender differences reported for 57 percent of survey items, women rated 40 percent of items significantly lower than men. On only 4 percent of items did women report significantly higher ratings than men. Importantly, males rated all eight promotion items, all five support for interdisciplinary work items, five of nine research support items, and five of nine personal and familial support items, significantly higher than women.
3. Dissatisfaction with salary looms large and may have deleterious effects. Just over one third of survey respondents reported satisfaction with their salary. Better salaries were mentioned by 16 percent of the nearly 1,700 faculty members who supplied a response to the survey item, "Please use the space below to tell us the number one thing that you, personally, feel your institution could do to improve the workplace." The second most frequent response to the question, "If you were to leave your institution, what would be your primary reason?" was "to improve salary and benefits;" number one was "to retire." For those who sought and received outside offers, the number one adjustment to stay put was a salary increase. For those who have not sought outside offers, but presumably could at some point, the number one reasons cited for doing so would be to increase salary.

The good news is that there is much that administrators can do to make their workplaces better for associate and full professors. While some might wish to brush off the views of senior faculty, thinking, "Aren't they always unhappy about something?," the most enlightened will seize the feedback provided by their associate and full professors and think about actions they can take to make their campuses the most vibrant communities possible—in good times and in lean times. After all, a great deal of what senior faculty want doesn't have a significant budget impact - including clarity and consistency of mission and purpose; clarity of criteria for promotion; supportive cultures for interdisciplinary work, collaboration, and mentoring; policies and practices that support work-life integration; and appreciation for all the work faculty do in the realms of teaching, research, service, and outreach.

REFERENCES

- American Association of University Professors. 2010. No refuge: 2009-10 report on the economic status of the profession. *Academe*, March-April, 96(2). Washington, DC: AAUP. Retrieved January 31, 2010 from <http://www.aaup.org/AAUP/pubsres/academe/2010/MA>.
- Ehrenberg, R., H. Kasper, and D. Rees. 1991. Faculty turnover at American colleges and universities: Analyses of AAUP data. *Economics of Education Review* 10(2): 99-110.
- Knapp, L.G., J.E. Kelly-Reid, and S.A. Ginder. 2010. *Employees in Postsecondary Institutions, Fall 2009, and Salaries of Full-Time Instructional Staff, 2009-10* (NCES 2011-150). U.S. Department of Education. Washington, DC: National Center for Education Statistics. Retrieved January 31, 2011 from <http://nces.ed.gov/pubsearch>.
- Neville, S.C. and E.M. Bradburn. 2006. *Institutional policies and practices regarding postsecondary faculty: Fall 2003*. Report No. 157. Washington, DC: National Center for Education Statistics.
- Yaskoboski, P.J. 2010. Retirement confidence on campus: The 2010 higher education retirement confidence survey. *Trends and Issues*. June 2010. New York, NY: TIAA-CREF Institute.