



ADVANCE Program
for Faculty Equity and Diversity

535 Administration Building
University of California, Irvine
Irvine, CA 92697-1000
(949) 824-2798
Fax: (949) 824-2513
<http://advance.uci.edu>

September 23, 2009

Subj: Report on 2009 Faculty Climate Survey

The 2009 report on the Faculty Climate Survey is now available on the ADVANCE home-page (<http://advance.uci.edu/>). Administered in Spring 2009, this survey is the third and final survey funded by the NSF ADVANCE award to UCI. The UCI ADVANCE program commissioned an external consultant to analyze and report on the data. A summary of survey highlights and description of campus resources to promote an inclusive faculty culture follow.

Faculty Climate Survey Highlights

233 out of 1,058 regular rank faculty participated for an overall response rate of 22%. Based on voluntary gender designations provided by 216 respondents, the estimated response rates are 44% for women and 56% for men with 95 women respondents and 121 men respondents. The 50 question instrument focused on the quality of work-life in relation to several indicators of career satisfaction. These are departmental support, workload, and work-family issues; workload composition of research, teaching and service; and departmental and campus climate.

The responses to the 2009 survey point to differences between women and men faculty regarding work-life, though with a small number of areas with statistically significant results. Women faculty respondents reported a higher incident of receiving departmental course release and support for research or travel from the department than men. Unfavorable gender differences that were reported in the 2002 and 2004 surveys that concerned managing teaching load, time supervising graduate students, availability of extra space, and service activities appear to be resolved. In the most recent survey, however, women faculty registered significantly less satisfaction with salary and time available for research as well as reported four additional hours on average for undergraduate teaching than male faculty.

In reference to climate (departmental and campus), statistically significant gender differences were more common. Across all schools women faculty observed more incidents of inappropriate gender-based references to personal life and experienced more

incidents of harassment, intimidation, or assault from staff than male faculty. They experienced both more incidents of inappropriate references to their personal life and inappropriate references to their appearance than men did. These gender differences extend to qualifications related questions or disparaging remarks from students and faculty as well as a higher incident of discouragement from participation at meetings by colleagues and administrators. Women also experienced more incidents of inappropriate race- or ethnicity-based references to their personal life.

Campus Resources that Promote an Inclusive Faculty Culture

Institutional transformation is a work-in-progress. There are resources available to the faculty and other campus employees to promote an inclusive faculty culture. These include the UCI ADVANCE programming Institutional Transformation seminar series, Work-Life Balance Forums, and ADVANCE brochure series that addresses work-life balance, career advising, diversity in the review process, and guidelines for chairs and directors. The following campus offices not only provide certificate training for individual faculty but also confidential consulting for academic units.

The Office of Equal Opportunity and Diversity

- Diversity Development Program
- Departmental In-service Training
- Cultural Awareness Workshop
- Sexual Harassment Prevention Training

The Office of the Ombudsman

- Mediation and Conflict Resolution Program
- Departmental In-Service for Mediation and Conflict Resolution

Let's build a great university together!

Douglas M. Haynes
Director, ADVANCE Program
Associate Professor

INTRODUCTION

This report summarizes results derived from the third administration of a survey that gathers data on various dimensions of faculty work at The University of California-Irvine (UCI). Previous administrations of the survey occurred during the fall quarters of 2002 and 2004. Since the inaugural edition, the survey has grown in length with successive additions of items that seek to probe issues and content at deeper and broader levels. In general, these surveys are one of several methods through which personnel in the Advance Program are assessing the extent to which UCI is transforming itself and advancing gender equity in accordance with goals and objectives linked to an Institutional Transformation grant awarded by the National Science Foundation in the fall of 2001.

This latest survey administration during the Spring Quarter of 2009, like earlier administrations, examines a variety of variables focusing on the quality of work life. Common among those administrations are specific sections that elicit responses from ladder faculty using a variety of measurement scales. Those sections include items that aim to record faculty member levels of satisfaction with departmental support, workload, and work-family issues; the volume of and trend in the composition of their workloads in terms of teaching, research, and service activities; the incidence among their various forms of support; and, the extent of work climate-related incidents with regard to their interactions with other faculty and with students and staff.

Latest additions to the current version include items and questions that aim to measure the advancement of ladder faculty; the nature and scope of their scholarly productivity; the dollar volume in their UCI-related grant and contract awards and in their various annual income producing activities and their other engagements outside UCI; their career advancement

opportunities with other colleges and universities; and, a variety of background-related and demographic variables.

Data Collection & Analyses

Data collection procedures involved making the survey available for completion via electronic means over a period that began in April and closed in June with scheduled reminders sent to prospective respondents. Responsiveness of the faculty body to those data collection efforts yielded valuable data. An extensive survey-generated database emerged that contains approximately 300 variables capturing faculty member responses to a set of about 50 questions.

This report describes their responses in aggregate form using various statistical procedures. Most of the analyses of that data involve calculations of descriptive statistics including means and standard deviations. In addition, they involve testing for gender-based differences in those means through nonparametric independent samples test procedures. The reader will find specific references to those differences when there is statistical evidence of such and general statements about the overall situation in the narratives accompanying each table. To a lesser extent, some of the analyses involve testing for variables that correspond with respondent's familiarity with the Advance Program.

As they consider the results from those statistical analyses and the tabulations contained in this report, readers need to be mindful that the intent of this report is to provide evidence of effectiveness and to summarize challenges related to the NSF grant-funded and the University-supported Advance Program. Overall, in terms of the results for which there are statistically significant gender-based differences, the reader will find most of those differences are comparatively less favorable for women faculty than men faculty; most differences are relatively

small in a numeric sense. Readers will also note that some of those results are unique to the present time and some appear to be consistent across time.

This report also summarizes some changes over time and it highlights some areas of recent improvement and those needing further attention. In making frequent references to the 2002 and 2004 surveys, the report focuses a great deal of attention on findings in which there are statistically significant differences (at the .05 level) in responses between men and women respondents. Furthermore, any comparisons of survey findings across time need to take into account the fact that current and previous samples contain different respondents and that the sample may or may not approximate a true cross section of UCI's faculty. Moreover, readers should exercise caution when considering possible relationships that may exist among the numerous items. In addition, readers should also avoid generalizing the findings from this study to the University overall due to the uncertain degree of correspondence between the population and the nonrandom sample of survey respondents from that population

Sample Characteristics

The Advance Program's orientation to gender equity appears to influence who responded to the survey. In terms of the survey sample composition, 44 percent are women ladder rank members of the faculty and 56 percent are men ladder rank faculty. In contrast, the composition of the population from which those respondents come is 30 percent women and 70 percent men. Furthermore, the results from t-tests provide some evidence that the sample composition is remarkably different from that of the population on gender. Those differences are statistically significant at the .05 level.

Out of 1,058 ladder rank faculty members (741 men and 317 women) that comprise the target population, the total number of respondents to this survey is 233 faculty members from

which 229 individuals completed the survey and provided useable data. The overall response rate is approximately 22 percent. Based on the 216 individuals who disclosed their gender, the estimated response rates are 44 percent for women and 56 percent for men with 95 women respondents and 121 men respondents.

Response rates for previous surveys were slightly higher in relation to this latest administration though each appears consistent with rates for survey-based research. Furthermore, a variety of factors including the addition of new items can explain the aforementioned response rates though such explanations are beyond the scope of this report. Casting aside any undue concerns regarding those response rates, it is important to note that the nature of the report in hand is descriptive in nature and it summarizes the results from nonparametric statistical procedures. In this summary of those responses, the reader will notice there are a number of statistically significant findings that are unique to this 2009 survey and in common with results from the 2002 and/or 2004 surveys.

Some rather important statistical findings focus on the presence of rank among respondents. As the first row of Table 1 indicates, the largest segment of the respondent sample is comprised of 109 full professors of which 66 are men and 23 are women. As additional data from this table come under consideration, evidence emerges attesting to the fact that the sample contains a disproportionate amount of women faculty members. For example, the bottom row of Table 1 informs us the presence of women faculty amounts to 44 percent of the sample and 30 percent of the population. Results from statistical test procedures (Chi-Square, for instance) provide evidence that significant differences (at the .05 level) exist between actual and expected values. In other words, those results indicate the degree to which there is an overrepresentation of women in the 2009 survey.

Table 1: Gender within Rank of Respondents

	<u>Men</u>		<u>Women</u>		<u>Total</u>	
	No.	Row %.	No.	Row %	No.	Row %
Full Professor	66	61%	43	39%	109	100%
Associate Professor	37	56	29	44	66	100
Assistant Professor	18	44	23	56	41	100
Total	121	56%	95	44%	216	100%

Taking into account for the moment both rank and gender, the evidence informs us that sample overrepresentation occurs in terms of women faculty members who are Assistant Professors or Full Professors. Considering rank without reference to gender, the evidence informs us that the sample is representative of population in terms of Full Professors; for instance, 109 of the 216 respondents as noted in Table 1 are professors (50 percent of the sample versus 53 percent of the population). However, sample underrepresentation occurs in terms of the presence of Assistant Professors; for instance, 41 out of 216 respondents (19 percent) hold that rank whereas 26 percent of the population hold that rank. In addition, sample overrepresentation occurs in terms of the presence of Associate Professors; for instance, 66 out of the 216 respondents (31 percent) hold that rank whereas 21 percent of the population hold that rank.

In sum, the sample lacks correspondence with the population on several important dimensions taking into account the gender equity thrust of the Advance program. It is important to note there is no statistically significant correlation between gender and rank of the

respondents. All said it is very likely that a great deal of bias may exist in the data from respondents given the aforementioned characteristics of respondents to the 2009 survey in relation to the population. In reviewing the results contained in this report, readers need to be mindful of that possibility. Moreover, it is possible that respondent perspectives vary according to whether they completed the survey in 2002 and 2004 or for the first time since their hire in 2006; in other words, the former group are more likely to attach institutional memories to their responses and comments than are those in the latter group. As they progress this report, readers will find references to those characteristics and will begin to notice how that data shapes the organization and content of this report.

Report Overview

This report replicates many of the formats, the tables, and the methods generally associated with summaries of earlier surveys. However, for reasons related to the composition of the sample, it deviates from those summaries in at least four ways. Aside from the aforementioned detailed analyses of the sample's composition, the first deviation is that the analyst minimizes the use of inferential statistical procedures, which reflects both the nonrandom nature of the survey sample and unfounded assumption that sample and population variances are equal.

Second, this report improves presentations of table content by placing the women-specific results to right of that for men, which helps in highlighting gender-based statistically significant differences and the corresponding notations; earlier reports put women-based results to the left.

The third deviation is the omission and avoidance of indexes. Previous reports contained constructions of section specific indexes based on additions of data from variables found

correlated with each other, which provides little additional information especially when each edition of the survey grew in terms of the number of questions, items, or variables. Rationale for index omissions also reflects an overriding need for more precise and valid methods for constructing indexes. In essence, statistical procedures such as factor analysis and principal component analysis would be most beneficial when the number of items varies little across time.

The fourth deviation is this report's omission of cohorts constructed from sample data based on gender and year of hire. In term of this last departure from one or both past reports, this consultant asserts that cohorts are most meaningful when constructed as part of a data collection strategy that involves a random, stratified, or some other purposeful sampling technique. In general, the survey dataset may contain a great deal of sampling bias, as alluded to earlier with specific references to gender composition of the sample and the population and to some forthcoming observations about sample characteristics. More specifically, statistically significant differences also exist on the year of hire between what survey respondents of the sample report and what we know about the career ladder population. For instance, the average number of years of service for the population is 13 years, which differs significantly and statistically according to gender; women have four fewer years of service than do men.

The 203 respondents who reported on year of hire inform us that the average number of years of service to UCI is two years less than that known about the population, which is also statistically significant at the .05 level. This finding also holds true also for men respondents on comparisons with the men population, but does not hold true for such comparisons of women. In other words, average years of service are different between men respondents and the population of men but the average is consistent between women respondents and the population of women. In sum, the survey sample fails to lend itself to cohort-based analysis.

This lack of representativeness between the sample and the population in terms of faculty hire date and gender composition essentially disfavors continuation of cohort-based analyses. Additional rationale against cohort-based analyses relates to the rank and organization unit compositions of the sample. In short, it is likely that any sample-based cohort from this survey data will include an inordinate amount of women in some groups than others. Turning the attention of readers to the presence of women and men respondents within rank, this report begins its presentation of survey specific data in the section that follows this section.

As the reader moves into that section, one will find frequent references to the details found in the back section of this report. Appendices A and B provide information regarding characteristics of the sample and the population. The sample is also overrepresented by faculty from the Humanities; distribution of respondents by school is available in Appendix A. Appendix B provides summary data on that distribution and a subsequent appendix organizes the comments of respondents to open-ended questions according to gender within the aforementioned groups.

The remainder of this report describes the results of responses to the numerous items of this survey. Pagination from this point forward coincides with survey sections for which the purpose is to highlight and to separate those distinct sections and their corresponding results. In addition, some readers will find the isolation of results to one or more colleges or schools useful. That information appears in the summary of findings section of this report. Respondent orientation to the Advance program is a good place to begin the discussion of results.

RESULTS & DISCUSSION

Familiarity with ADVANCE Program

Respondents were asked (Question 51 or Q51): “In general, how familiar would you say you are with the aims and goals of the NSF ADVANCE Program?” As Table 1 indicates, most respondents report they are “Somewhat familiar” with the purposes of the Advance program. Overall, as the reader may gather from the last row and the notes of Table 1, women faculty reported a significantly higher level of familiarity with the Advance Program than did men faculty. Furthermore, this current finding is consistent with the results from the 2004 survey.

Table 2: Level of Familiarity with Advance Program, Percentages Overall and by Gender

	All	Men	Women
Very high familiarity	28%	21%	36%
Somewhat familiar	39	41	39
Not very familiar	18	18	17
Not familiar at all	15	20	9
Total	100%	100%	100%
Averages	2.81	2.62	3.01*

Notes: *N* is sample size. Asterisk (*) indicates response difference between men and women is statistically significant at the .05 level. Scale for calculation of average familiarity is as follows: *Very high* = 4; *Somewhat high* = 3; *Somewhat low* = 2; *Very low* = 1

Job Satisfaction & Departmental Support

Data from this section of the survey, as represented by the next four tables, captures respondent satisfaction levels regarding departmental support, workload, work-family issues, and overall. For each of those four areas, survey respondents were asked (Q1) “How satisfied have you been with each of the following aspects of employment at UC Irvine?”

Table 3: Departmental Support Averages, Responses Overall and by Gender

Item	<u>All Respondents</u>			<u>Men</u>	<u>Women</u>
	<i>N</i>	Mean	<i>SD</i>	Mean	Mean
Support from colleagues	216	3.18	0.96	3.24	3.11
Accessibility of Department Chair	212	3.41	0.92	3.48	3.32
Feedback on your research	205	2.86	0.92	2.92	2.80
Feedback on your publication record	205	2.95	0.91	2.98	2.93
Feedback on your teaching record	208	2.94	0.88	2.96	2.95
Feedback on your service to: the external community	179	2.84	0.91	2.91	2.79
UCI	203	2.92	0.93	2.96	2.88
Available equipment	205	2.72	0.99	2.81	2.62
Available space	211	2.76	0.99	2.83	2.67
Finding qualified Research Assistants	190	2.49	1.01	2.49	2.51
Opportunities to teach courses of your choice	212	3.28	0.88	3.25	3.33
Mentoring opportunities	205	3.18	0.88	3.16	3.23

Notes: *N* is sample size and *SD* is sample standard deviation. Response scale is *Very Satisfied* = 4; *Somewhat Satisfied* = 3; *Somewhat Dissatisfied* = 2; and, *Very Dissatisfied* = 1.

The two highest overall ratings for satisfaction are accessibility to department chair and choice of courses. However, women respondents report lower levels of satisfaction than do men

respondents on all items except for the last three items in Table 3; two of those items in that set of three also bear the highest and the lowest averages overall. Though all differences lack statistical significance, the item “Finding qualified Research Assistants” was statistically significant in the 2004 survey. Furthermore, the absence of a statistically significant difference in the current data suggests a resolution on that departmental support matter. Moreover, the absence of statistically significant results indicates women and men faculty are comparably satisfied with all the departmental support items listed in Table 3.

This and other sections of the survey also sought comments from respondents. Those comments are listed verbatim beginning in Appendix D.1. Readers will find those comments organized in various ways. It is important that readers keep in mind that the main purpose for their provision is to add some qualitative context to this report and to provide data with which to construct new items or refine existing items as they may relate to future surveys.

The next three tables and sections of this report continue as summaries of data collected from respondents in asking the question (Q1) “How satisfied have you been with each of the following aspects of employment at UC Irvine?” As the readers review those tables and their contents, they will find a few statistically significant findings that essentially provide evidence of gender-based differences with regard to satisfaction levels overall and those related to job and workload activities. Some of those findings may correlate with the school or college affiliations of respondents; that is, the findings are isolated in terms of their unit-specific origin. In addition to the references to the applicable results from past surveys and to respondent familiarity with the Advance Program, the narrative belonging to each table mentions those units and a summary of those instances are available in the Findings and Recommendations section (see pp. 38-43).

Job Satisfaction & Workload Activities

Table 4: Workload Satisfaction Averages, Overall and by Gender

Item	<u>All Respondents</u>			<u>Men</u>	<u>Women</u>
	<i>N</i>	Mean	<i>SD</i>	Mean	Mean
Manage your teaching load effectively	213	3.06	0.84	3.13	2.97
Serving on departmental committees	208	3.03	0.80	3.03	3.05
Serving on school committees	181	3.09	0.73	3.13	3.04
Serving on university committees	178	3.04	0.78	3.04	3.01
Advising graduate students	206	3.27	0.74	3.32	3.20
Time available for research	216	2.60	0.91	2.69	2.46*
Time available for writing	210	2.49	0.93	2.55	2.38
Time available for service to the community	188	2.71	0.89	2.73	2.65

Notes: *N* is sample size and *SD* is sample standard deviation. Asterisk (*) indicates response difference between men and women is statistically significant at the .05 level. Response scale is *Very Satisfied* = 4; *Somewhat Satisfied* = 3; *Somewhat Dissatisfied* = 2; and, *Very Dissatisfied* = 1.

Respondents assign the highest overall ratings of satisfaction to graduate student advising. Like many other findings, women respondents reported lower levels of satisfaction relative to men respondents on all of the items listed in Table 4. Furthermore, women rate satisfaction with time available for research lower than do men. Moreover, this finding is unique generally to the current survey administration and specifically to respondents who reported that they did not complete the 2002 and 2004 surveys. In addition, it is worth noting that the item “Manage your teaching load effectively” was statistically significant in the 2004 survey, but is no longer; some respondents provided comments, which are available in Appendix D.2.

Work-Family Issues

Respondents were asked (Q1) “How satisfied have you been with each of the following aspects of employment at UC Irvine?” The highest rating of satisfaction overall is attached to maternity leave. Women respondents reported lower levels of satisfaction than did men on all the items listed in Table 5, but those levels lack statistical significance. In addition, it is worth noting that the item “Balancing family obligations with work responsibilities” was statistically significant in the 2004 survey, but it is not in this survey. Also worthy of mention here are the low number of responses to the second and third items listed in this table and the comments from some respondents that are available in Appendix D.3. Overall, for faculty that did respond, the childcare is clearly a high priority.

Table 5: Work-Family Satisfaction Averages, Overall and by Gender

Item	<u>All Respondents</u>			<u>Men</u>	<u>Women</u>
	<i>N</i>	Mean	<i>SD</i>	Mean	Mean
Balancing family obligations with work responsibilities	199	2.79	0.91	2.87	2.70
Access to child care facilities	73	2.84	1.07	3.00	2.67
Adequate maternity leave	55	3.11	0.88	3.24	2.96
Support for family obligations	148	2.89	0.90	2.99	2.75

Notes: *N* is sample size and *SD* is sample standard deviation. Response scale is *Very Satisfied* = 4; *Somewhat Satisfied* = 3; *Somewhat Dissatisfied* = 2; and, *Very Dissatisfied* = 1.

Job Satisfaction Overall

In terms of the highest rating, respondents are most satisfied with job security per the contents of Table 6. Women respondents reported lower levels of satisfaction than men on all items in this section. Furthermore, women are significantly less satisfied with their salaries than are men. Moreover, this finding is unique to the current administration of survey though the item appears in a previous survey. The same appears to hold true for general satisfaction with job at UCI. More interestingly, this finding is unique generally to the current survey administration and specifically to respondents who reported that they did not complete the 2002 and 2004 surveys. The item “Job security” was statistically significant in the 2002 survey and the item “Your benefits” was in the 2004 survey; some respondents provided comments, which are available in Appendix D.4.

Table 6: General Job Satisfaction Averages, Overall and by Gender

Item	<u>All Respondents</u>			<u>Men</u>	<u>Women</u>
	<i>N</i>	Mean	<i>SD</i>	Mean	Mean
Job security	214	3.55	0.77	3.61	3.48
Salary	214	2.57	0.96	2.69	2.41*
Spouse or partner employment opportunities in geographic area	153	3.04	1.04	3.03	3.05
Your benefits (medical, retirement, etc)	214	3.26	0.70	3.31	3.19
Your job at UC Irvine generally	215	3.15	0.81	3.31	2.97*

Notes: *N* is sample size and *SD* is sample standard deviation. Asterisk (*) indicates response difference between men and women is statistically significant at the .05 level. Response scale is *Very Satisfied* = 4; *Somewhat Satisfied* = 3; *Somewhat Dissatisfied* = 2; and, *Very Dissatisfied* = 1.

Support Received During Employment at UCI

Respondents were asked (Q6) “At any time during your employment at UC Irvine, have you been provided with:” The highest average incidence overall occurs with support for research or travel item, which is the third item listed in Table 7. In addition, the “Support for research or travel...” item is statistically significant indicating 83 percent of women report department support in contrast to the 68 percent of men reporting the same; nevertheless, about three quarters of respondents indicate they receive departmental or school support for research or travel. The first item was statistically significant in the 2002 survey and it is again this time.

Table 7: Types and Average Incidences of Support Received, Overall and by Gender

Item	<u>All Respondents</u>			<u>Men</u>	<u>Women</u>
	<i>N</i>	Mean	<i>SD</i>	Mean	Mean
Course release from your department	201	0.63	0.49	0.55	0.74*
Committee relief from your department	199	0.26	0.44	0.25	0.28
Support for research or travel from your department or school	203	0.75	0.43	0.68	0.83*
Extra space beyond the norm set by your department	198	0.20	0.40	0.45	0.34
Summer salary from your Department or school	192	0.35	0.48	0.40	0.31
An employment offer for your spouse or partner	140	0.21	0.41	0.17	0.28

Notes: *N* is sample size and *SD* is sample standard deviation. Asterisk (*) indicates response difference between men and women is statistically significant at the .05 level. Scale is *Yes* = 1; 0 = *No*.

Women respondents report a higher incidence of receiving departmental course release than do men respondents. Seventy four percent of women received course release; for men, it was 55 percent. The “Extra space...” item, which was statistically significant in both the 2002 and the 2004 surveys, appears resolved; some respondents provided comments, which are available in Appendix D.5.

Support Received at Time of Hire

Respondents were asked (Q5) “When you were hired by UC Irvine, did you receive any of the following forms of support?” The highest incidence overall occurs with campus housing with almost three quarters of all respondents reporting receipt of campus housing at time of hire. The lowest incidence occurs with regard to monetary housing allowance. For the most part, results are mixed at the overall level and across men and women with none of the items statistically significant in this or the 2002 and 2004 surveys. That lack of consistency seems to suggest there were improvements in gender equity; some respondents provided comments, which are available in Appendix D.6.

Table 8: Types and Incidences of Support Received at Time of Hire, Overall and by Gender

Item	<u>All Respondents</u>			<u>Men</u>	<u>Women</u>
	<i>N</i>	Mean	<i>SD</i>	Mean	Mean
Campus housing	190	0.73	0.45	0.70	0.75
Monetary housing allowance	194	0.21	0.41	0.22	0.20
Mortgage origination program loan	189	0.61	0.49	0.58	0.67
A reduced teaching load during your first year of employment	202	0.70	0.46	0.65	0.75
An adequate start-up package	203	0.65	0.48	0.61	0.70
An employment offer for your spouse or partner	145	0.23	0.42	0.19	0.28

Notes: *N* is sample size and *SD* is sample standard deviation. Response scale is *Yes* = 1; 0 = *No*

Faculty Workload: Weekly Instructional & Student Supervision Activities

Respondents were asked and provided (Q2 and Q3) “In a typical week when school was in session, approximately how many hours were you engaged in the following...activities per week? (Please indicate in the space provided below). Please indicate whether you think this number is greater than, less than, or about the same, compared to the time you spent in previous years.”

Table 9: Average Weekly Hours in Teaching and Supervising, Overall and by Gender

Item	<u>All Respondents</u>			<u>Men</u>	<u>Women</u>
	<i>N</i>	Mean	<i>SD</i>	Mean	Mean
Undergraduate teaching	191	11.31	8.86	9.60	13.54*
Graduate teaching	190	8.82	7.00	8.42	6.92
Supervising undergraduates	191	3.02	2.95	2.78	3.38
Supervising graduates	190	8.24	7.21	8.04	8.66

Notes: *N* is sample size and *SD* is sample standard deviation. Asterisk (*) indicates response difference between men and women is statistically significant at the .05 level.

Of the four activities listed in the table, respondents report spending the least amount of time on supervising undergraduates and largest amount of time per week on undergraduate teaching. More important are the statistically significant differences that exist between men and women on that teaching activity. Women faculty members spend about four additional hours per week than do men faculty. The last item in Table 9 was statistically significant in the 2002 and 2004 surveys, with women reporting a higher amount of hours supervising graduate students than did men. However, that is no longer the case according to the most recent survey results. In terms of the comparisons to previous years, respondents reported the amounts of time devoted each week to those activities is “about the same.” In addition, some respondents provided comments, which are available to the reader for review in Appendix D.7.

Faculty Workload: Weekly Service Activities

Respondents were asked and provided (Q4) “ In a typical workweek when school was in session, approximately how many hours did you spend engaged in committee service? Please indicate whether you think this number is greater than, less than, or about the same, compared to the amount of time you spent in previous years.”

Table 10: Average Weekly Committee Service Hours, Overall and by Gender

Item	<u>All Respondents</u>			<u>Men</u>	<u>Women</u>
	<i>N</i>	Mean	<i>SD</i>	Mean	Mean
Department service	188	4.07	5.94	4.03	3.81
School service	181	2.48	5.10	2.64	2.32
Campus-wide service	181	2.46	4.02	2.68	2.25
University service	177	1.17	2.88	0.95	1.48
Service to discipline	181	4.59	4.33	4.21	4.95

Note: *N* is sample size and *SD* is sample standard deviation.

The largest amount of time in service was devoted to the academic discipline. Absent are statistically significant differences among this list of service activities. Differences that existed in the 2004 surveys on all those service activities are absent from this current data. In terms of the comparisons to previous years, most respondents reported the amounts of time devoted each week to those activities remains “about the same.”

Climate: Interactions with Faculty, Staff & Students

Respondents were asked (Q28 – Q39) “During the last academic year, approximately how many times, if ever, have you experienced any of the following behavior from (a) students, (b) faculty, and/or (c) staff? By students, we mean either your own student or other students you have encountered on campus. Please count multiple incidents involving same person as separate incidents. Check the box that applies.”

Table 11: Average Ratings of Climate, Overall and by Gender

Item and Source	<i>N</i>	Mean	<i>SD</i>	Men	Women
Questions or remarks about qualifications					
From Students	203	1.21	0.61	1.14	1.30*
From Faculty	205	1.48	0.83	1.34	1.64*
From Staff	205	1.08	0.34	1.08	1.09
Inappropriate references to your personal life					
From Students	204	1.13	0.38	1.08	1.19
From Faculty	206	1.25	0.60	1.13	1.38*
From Staff	203	1.08	0.31	1.06	1.11
Inappropriate references to your appearance					
From Students	205	1.14	0.46	1.09	1.21
From Faculty	204	1.11	0.44	1.05	1.19*
From Staff	203	1.07	0.33	1.07	1.08

Uninvited use of nicknames or belittling terms

From Students	202	1.13	0.46	1.16	1.10
From Faculty	202	1.11	0.43	1.06	1.19*
From Staff	201	1.02	0.17	1.00	1.05*

Inappropriate references to your age

From Students	202	1.10	0.41	1.06	1.16*
From Faculty	204	1.17	0.51	1.07	1.30*
From Staff	201	1.08	0.37	1.06	1.13*

Overbearing, intimidating, or offensive verbal behavior

From Students	202	1.21	.052	1.14	1.30*
From Faculty	204	1.55	0.91	1.44	1.71
From Staff	201	1.08	0.39	1.08	1.08

Unusually disruptive or inappropriate behavior in your classroom

From Students	203	1.38	0.69	1.29	1.48
From Faculty	202	1.00	0.70	1.01	1.00
From Staff	198	1.00	0.00	1.00	1.00

Negative comments about your spouse or partner

From Students	194	1.00	0.00	1.29	1.48
From Faculty	193	1.00	0.00	1.01	1.00
From Staff	194	1.00	0.00	1.00	1.00

Unwanted romantic or sexual attention #					
From Students	202	1.02	0.16	1.04	1.01
From Faculty	202	1.01	0.10	1.01	1.01
From Staff	201	1.01	0.16	1.01	1.02
Physical intimidation					
From Students	201	1.03	0.21	1.04	1.03
From Faculty	200	1.03	0.20	1.01	1.06
From Staff	201	1.00	0.71	1.01	1.00
Physical or sexual assault					
From Students	202	1.00	0.00	1.00	1.00
From Faculty	200	1.00	0.00	1.00	1.00
From Staff	197	1.00	0.00	1.00	1.00
Other type of harassment, intimidation, or assault you are too embarrassed to admit					
From Students	203	1.04	0.28	1.02	1.07
From Faculty	202	1.12	0.48	1.09	1.17
From Staff	201	1.02	0.17	1.00	1.05*

Notes: *N* is sample size and *SD* is sample standard deviation. Asterisk (*) indicates response difference between men and women is statistically significant at the .05 level; # indicates item is new addition to survey. Response scale is as follows: *Never* = 1; *1-2 times* = 2; *3-4 times* = 3; *5 times or more* = 4.

In general, women reported a higher incidence of remarks than did men on any given item. The highest statistically significant incidence occurs with remarks about qualifications, which came from the faculty. Of the 11 statistically significant differences, 8 originated from members of faculty (5) and staff (3) and 3 from the body of students. It is important to note that some items in this section of the current survey are actually subdivisions of items from the previous surveys.

Furthermore, the results for those items in their earlier compound form presented statistically significant differences between men and women. Moreover, though it is possible that respondents interpret those forms in different ways the consistencies in findings on these items across surveys certainly warrants deeper analyses. As those analyses and findings pertain to a few colleges or schools, their provision are in summary form in the last section of this report.

Climate: Interactions with Colleagues or Administrators

Respondents were asked (Q40 – Q43) “Since Fall 2007, how often were you...” Women respondents report higher levels of incidence on all items in Table 12 relative to those reported by men respondents. The highest statistically significant incidence reported by women faculty members occurs on the item referring to exclusionary processes, which is the second entry in the table above. The third item was also statistically significant in the 2004 survey. The summary section of this report refers to those statistically significant findings and isolates them according to college or school.

Table 12: Climate in Relation to Colleagues or Administrators, Overall and by Gender

Item	<i>N</i>	Mean	<i>SD</i>	Men	Women
Asked to take on additional or ad hoc responsibilities without financial compensation (teaching in place of absent colleagues, transporting job candidates, proctoring, etc.).	200	2.42	1.08	2.46	2.37
Excluded from key processes (policymaking or decision making meetings or committees you felt were important).	199	1.80	1.05	1.67	1.95*
Discouraged from participation at meetings by colleagues or administrators (by ignoring, interrupting, being critical).	202	1.46	0.85	1.35	1.58*
Asked to do something you felt was stereotypical of your gender #	200	1.50	0.89	1.19	1.88*

Notes: *N* is sample size and *SD* is sample standard deviation. Asterisk (*) indicates response difference between men and women is statistically significant at the .05 level; Pound (#) indicates item is new addition to survey. Response scale is: *Never* = 1; *1-2 times* = 2; *3-4 times* = 3; *5 times or more* = 4.

Climate: Departmental-related Personnel Activities

Respondents were asked (Q45-Q48) “During processes involving hiring, reappointment, tenure or promotion in your department, have you noted the following behavior on the part of colleagues referring to an individual under consideration? Please indicate whether any observed behaviors were based on the GENDER or RACE/ETHNICITY of the individual under consideration.”

Table 13: Colleague Personnel-related Behaviors, Overall and by Gender

Item and Nature	<i>N</i>	Mean	<i>SD</i>	Men	Women
Inappropriate references to one’s personal life					
Gender specific	202	1.42	0.72	1.22	1.67
Race / Ethnicity specific	202	1.23	0.58	1.15	1.33*
Inappropriate references to one’s appearance					
Gender specific	203	1.17	0.44	1.09	1.28*
Race / Ethnicity specific	201	1.04	0.20	1.03	1.06
Disparaging remarks about qualifications #					
Gender specific	201	1.31	0.69	1.14	1.53*
Race / Ethnicity specific	202	1.22	0.62	1.17	1.30
Discouragement or demoralization about the possibilities for advancement #					
Gender specific	201	1.30	0.63	1.09	1.57*
Race / Ethnicity specific	199	1.20	0.63	1.19	1.23

Notes: *N* is sample size and *SD* is sample standard deviation. Asterisk (*) indicates response difference between men and women is statistically significant at the .05 level. Pound (#) indicates item is new addition to survey. Response scale is: *Never* = 1; *1-2 times* = 2; *3-4 times* = 3; *5 times or more* = 4.

The first two items in Table 13 were statistically significant in the 2002 survey and the gender-based components of those two items were statistically significant in the 2004 survey. Certainly, these findings suggest more work remains within departments in order to engender greater levels of professionalism and appreciation for diversity in localized personnel matters. The summary section of this report refers to those statistically significant findings and isolates them according to college or school.

Gender on Campus

Respondents were asked to complete items concerning their thoughts about the opportunities available to women at UCI, their opinions about how high of a priority gender equity should be at UCI, and the volume of their contact with Equity Advisors. Separate tabulations of Questions 44, 49 and 50 are available here due to the variety in response scales and the apparent centrality of item importance to the Advance Program. In addition to the references to previous survey results that were statistically significant at the time, readers will also find isolation of current results to specific schools in cases for which there are statistically significant differences between men and women.

Table 14: Incidence of Affirmation with Opportunity Equivalence, Overall and by Gender

	<i>N</i>	Mean	<i>SD</i>	Men	Women
Q44: Overall, do you think that women faculty at UCI have the same opportunities as men UCI faculty?	198	0.56	0.50	0.77	0.29*

Notes: *N* is sample size and *SD* is sample standard deviation. Asterisk (*) indicates response difference between men and women is statistically significant at the .05 level. Response scale is *Yes* = 1 and *No* = 0

Responses to Question 44 in this survey and to the same question in the 2004 survey are consistent in that they reveal statistically significant differences between women respondents and men respondents. In 2004, 77 percent of men and 35 percent of women answered affirmatively to this question. Current findings are also statistically significant at the .05 level, with same percentage of men answering this question in the affirmative.

In contrast to the 2004 results, a smaller percentage (29 now versus 35 earlier) of women currently affirm opportunity equivalence though the current sample size (198) remains almost the same as that of the 2004 survey (197). Overall, 56 percent of the faculty answered in the

affirmative this time and it was 64 percent in the 2004 survey. Isolation of the results from the current survey finds a high level of disagreement or low level of affirmation overall present in the Humanities.

Table 15 reports the results of responses to Question 49, which is the second of three questions in this gender on campus section. Statistically significant differences between men and women were found among the 206 respondents to this question in the 2004 survey. As the reader can see, responses to the current survey also differ statistically and significantly according to respondent's gender and their priorities correlate positively with Advance program familiarity.

Table 15: Assignment of Priority to Gender Equity, Overall and by Gender

Question	<i>N</i>	Mean	<i>SD</i>	Men	Women
Q49: In your opinion, how high or low a priority should gender equity be at UCI?	203	3.44	0.72	3.27	3.65*

Notes: *N* is sample size and *SD* is sample standard deviation. Asterisk (*) indicates response difference between men and women is statistically significant at the .05 level. Response scale is: 4 = *very high*; 3 = *somewhat high*; 2 = *somewhat low*; and 1 = *very low*.

With a conversion of the rating frequency distribution from the results, as reported on page 15 in the 2004 report, to obtain a comparable arithmetic mean, observable is a higher level of priority currently assigned by respondents to gender equity at UCI. By application of that conversion, the average rating overall for 2004 was 3.28. In comparison, the overall faculty average for 2009 is 3.44, which is higher than that for 2004. In terms of gender-based differences in the current rating, the average rating from women respondents is observably higher at 3.65 than their estimated mean for 2004 (3.44); note that it is currently at 3.27 for men respondents. Isolation of the current results from the current survey finds a low level of priority overall present in the business school.

Table 16 reports the results from responses to the last of three questions in this section. Question 50 asks “How much contact have you had with the Equity Advisors in your school?”

Table 16: Frequency of Contact with Equity Advisors, Overall and by Gender

Frequency	2004	2009		
	Overall	Overall	Men	Women
Weekly	4%	1%	3%	0%
1-3 times per month	4	6	7	3
About once per quarter	21	24	23	24
Seldom / Very little	33	38	29	50
None	31	21	26	15
Not applicable	6	10	12	8
Totals	100%	100%	100%	100%
<i>N</i>	207	216	121	95

In the 2004 survey, frequency of contact with Equity Advisors was significantly and statistically associated with the respondent’s gender at the .05 level according to the results of a Chi-square test; the data under the 2004 column is from Table 11 of that report. In this survey, however, there are no statistically significant differences between men and women on their frequency of contact with Equity Advisors (EA). Furthermore, comparisons between those two years from a descriptive point of view suggest contact became more frequent over time.

This is observable both overall and by gender. Comparing the overall levels for 2004 and for 2009, the reader can see a greater incidence of contact in data on lines two through five of Table 16; only the “Weekly Contact” response item decreased between those two years. Comparing the current results with those found on page 13 of the 2004 report, it is observable that: 37 percent of men and 19 percent of women in 2004 reported no (“None”) contact with Equity Advisors, which decreased to 26 percent and 15 percent respectively in 2009; quarterly contact (“About once per quarter”) increased from 18 percent to 23 percent for men though it decreased slightly from 28 percent to 24 percent for women. Apparently, faculty are utilizing EAs more frequently over time regardless of their gender.

Scholarly Productivity

Respondents were asked and provided (Q7) “How many of each of the following have you presented/published since the Fall of 2007? For publications, please include only works that have been accepted for publication. Count multiple presentations/publications of the same work only once.”

Table 17: Publication Characteristics, Average Numbers Overall and by Gender

Item	<i>N</i>	Mean	<i>SD</i>	Men	Women
Articles published in refereed professional or trade journals					
Total past year	193	4.50	4.21	5.21	3.70*
Total in career	180	51.10	58.92	65.92	32.52*
Scholarly books published with a University Press					
Total past year	112	0.39	0.79	0.21	0.67*
Sole authored	71	1.68	3.57	0.29	0.90*
Published reviews of books, articles, or creative works					
Total past year	119	1.25	2.22	0.76	1.96*
In your career	114	15.05	55.55	5.89	26.08*
Sole-authored	68	1.79	3.15	0.97	2.90*
Chapters in edited volumes					
Sole-authored	94	1.50	2.66	0.98	2.11
Textbooks, edited books, monographs					
Sole-authored	66	0.32	0.77	0.19	0.59*
Articles published in top three journals in field during career	174	20.29	36.91	26.76	12.36*

Notes: *N* is sample size and *SD* is sample standard deviation. Asterisk (*) indicates differences are statistically significant at .05 level. No adjustments in data for rank and/or length of service.

The largest volume of overall scholarly activity is article publication. On average, respondents reported that have published about 51 articles over the course of their careers. A great deal of variation exists according to gender. Men published about twice as many as females, which is a statistically significant finding. However, women are more active than are men in many of other types of scholarly activities. Some of these results are found to differ with regard to colleges and/or schools, as the reader will see in the summary section of this report.

This narrative directs attention of readers to respondent's scholarly activity that receives funding from internal and external sources. The full range of funding sources and the incidence of their recent receipt appears in Table 18. These findings are unique to the 2009 survey and to some schools within UCI; in addition, they receive attention in the summary- and commentary-oriented sections of this report.

Respondents were asked (Q10) "Have you received research funding from any of the following sources since Fall 2007?"

Table 18: Proportions with Affirmative Answer to Question 10, Overall and by Gender

Funding Source	<i>N</i>	Mean	<i>SD</i>	Men	Women
UC Irvine	193	0.51	0.50	0.44	0.61*
UC-wide	187	0.23	0.42	0.24	0.23
Foundation or other nonprofit organization (#)	185	0.39	0.49	0.40	0.38
For-profit business or industry in the Private sector	165	0.19	0.40	0.25	0.11*
Federal government	186	0.61	0.49	0.64	0.56
Other	129	0.17	0.38	0.14	0.22

Notes: *N* is sample size and *SD* is sample standard deviation. Asterisk (*) signifies difference between men and women respondents is statistically significant at the .05 level. Pound (#) indicates item is new addition to survey.

In terms of statistically significant findings, a larger percentage of women respondents (.61 or 61 percent) receive research funding from UC Irvine in comparison to men (44 percent); the lowest percentages overall for this source are associated with the School of Social Ecology. The opposite holds true in terms of research funding from for-profit businesses or industry; 25 percent of men receive funding from that source in contrast to the 11 percent for women; the highest percentages overall for this funding source are found in the health, information, and computer sciences units and the smallest are in the humanities and social ecology units. As a parting comment regarding statistically significant findings as they relate to funding sources, unclear is whether internal funding from UC Irvine is designated as seed money; if so, diversification in research funding sources are likely to increase for women in the future.

In terms of descriptive statistics, 61 percent of respondents overall report they received federal funding for their scholarly activities since the fall quarter of 2007. Men place slightly above that overall average at 64 percent and women lower at 56 percent. The lowest percentage overall (11%) is associated with other sources, which apparently includes state and local government agencies and other sources possibly noted in the comments section near the end of this report. For the sake of brevity, readers should note that from this point forward to the findings summary this report emphasizes results that provide evidence of statistically significant (1) differences between men respondents and women respondents on the survey items as listed and/or (2) some additional correlations of the survey items with Advance Program familiarity.

Outside Activity-related Income

Respondents were asked (Q12) “For the current calendar year, please estimate your yearly gross income before taxes from each of the sources listed below. If you received no income from a source, check ‘not applicable.’”

That list in its entirety contains the following sources: Employment at another academic institution; Speaking fees, honoraria; Self-owned business (other than consulting); Legal or medical services or psychological counseling; Outside consulting, business consulting, or freelance work; Royalties or commissions; and, Other.

The only statistically significant finding is the positive correlation between Advance program familiarity and the average dollar amount of the “Speaking fees, honoraria” item, which strikes the consultant purely as a mere coincidence and simply a reflection of a characteristic associated with a few respondents. The overall average for that activity, as reported by 106 respondents, amounts to \$783.96; the average for women respondents is \$639.51 and for men respondents it is \$914.41. However, this difference was not statistically significant.

Employment Opportunities

Respondents were asked (Q15) “Have you been invited to apply for one or more positions at another college or university?”

The average incidence of affirmative answers for that activity because of its significant correlation with Advance program familiarity. The overall average, as reported by 201 respondents, amounts to 61 percent; average for women respondents is 68 percent and for men respondents it is 66 percent. This difference was not statistically significant.

Future Employment

Respondents were asked (question number is unknown, unstated on survey; follows Q51) “If you were to leave your current position at UC Irvine to accept another position inside or outside academia, how important would each of the following be in your decision?”

Women, in general, attached greater levels of importance to all the factors listed in Table 19. Overall and for women and men, the item with the highest average level of importance attached to it is collegial environment. Unclear is whether respondents view the UCI environment in unfavorable light. The item with the lowest level of importance, overall and for women and men, is the absence of pressure to publish, which is statistically insignificant in terms for gender-based differences and is correlated with Advance program familiarity.

Table 19: Decision Factor Importance, Overall and by Gender

Items	<i>N</i>	Mean	<i>SD</i>	Men	Women
Salary level	199	2.58	0.57	2.57	2.60
Tenure-track/tenured position	188	2.79	0.53	2.71	2.89*
Opportunities for advancement	191	2.57	0.65	2.48	2.68*
Benefits	196	2.64	0.58	2.58	2.71
No pressure to publish	182	1.30	0.55	1.27	1.34
Greater opportunity to do research	197	2.57	0.63	2.47	2.68*
Good research facilities and equip.	188	2.54	0.66	2.46	2.64*
Diverse faculty	195	2.17	0.73	2.04	2.33*
Mentoring	182	2.01	0.73	1.87	2.17*
Collegial environment	198	2.82	0.42	2.75	2.91*

Notes: *N* is sample size and *SD* is sample standard deviation. Asterisk (*) signifies difference between men and women respondents is statistically significant at the .05 level; items without asterisk are included by virtue of their significant correlation with Advance program familiarity. Response scale is: *Very important* = 3; *Somewhat important* = 2; *Not important* = 1.

Personal Background

In this section of the survey, respondents provided data for numerous questions including those appearing in Table 20; note the omission of some questions from that table is due to the absence of statistically significant findings. In short, the questions that appear in Table 19 seek information from respondents on various characteristics of their household including size and composition. In addition, they seek information about childcare arrangements, weekly duties, and education attainment levels of their parents and spouses or partners.

Table 20: Personal Background Characteristics, Overall and by Gender

Question or Item	<i>N</i>	Mean	<i>SD</i>	Men	Women
Q20. During the last academic year, number of persons in your household, including self	198	2.71	1.28	2.87	2.47*
Q22. Currently residing with a spouse or partner?	205	0.80	0.41	0.86	0.71*
Q24. Percentage of childcare duties you are responsible for assuming a regular work week	85	47.15	24.03	35.21	61.61*
Q26. Number of hours in a workweek conducting household duties (cooking, yard work, cleaning, shopping, household repairs, etc.)	188	14.54	8.71	13.20	16.27*

Notes: *N* is sample size and *SD* is sample standard deviation. Asterisk (*) signifies difference between men and women respondents is statistically significant at the .05 level.

As the reader can see, the differences between men and women in household size are statistically significant. Observing the data presented in Table 20, the reader can see the relatively smaller household size (2.47 persons) for women respondents (Q20); the relatively smaller percentage (71 percent) of women affirming residence with a spouse or partner (Q22); the relatively larger

percentage (62 percent) of weekly childcare duties shouldered by women (Q24); and, the larger amount of time (16 hours) women devote to household duties (Q26). In sum, women and men differ significantly and substantively on their tasks outside the work place. Additional references to these findings appear in the next section, with isolation to the respective colleges and/or schools.

FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This second to last section of the report narrative serves to summarize findings from the 2009 survey that are statistically significant. With a primary focus on evidence of differences between women and men respondents and a secondary focus on isolation of those findings at the overall level to schools within UCI, it presents the current findings according to their consistency with previous findings. Furthermore, some findings in the current set of data also appear in the 2002 survey, the 2004 survey, or both. It is worth noting that many of those commonalities prevent the analyst from presenting detailed historical analyses because the additional items, which resulted from separating compound items present in the earlier surveys, represent items and questions that lack comparability with their earlier aggregate forms. Moreover, in many instances, the findings connect to those from the previous surveys or they stand alone being specific to the current survey.

Whatever may be applicable in terms of history, disaggregation of the findings also occurs in order to isolate them according to school(s) within UCI. Constructing dummy variables and using correlation analysis as a method to associate the findings with specific units, the rationale for those specifications and isolations is to provide University leadership and others with customized-information they can use in developing policy levers, strategies, and methods with which to focus future efforts with respect to gender equity-related outcomes.

By way of a preview, the organization for this summary of current statistically significant findings can be associated with a specific college or school. In addition, there are groupings in terms of their favorability to women and in terms of their consistency with findings from previous surveys. The listing begins with the findings unique to the current survey (2009) administration and then to commonalities between the current findings and those from the past.

Results Unique to 2009 Survey

Favorable

- Women received higher level of departmental support for research and travel than did men. Isolation of this result finds the lowest levels of support overall are present in the Biological Sciences, the Health Sciences, and Information and Computer Sciences.
- Women received more research funding from UCI than did men. Isolation of this result finds the lowest overall amounts of funding are present in Social Ecology.
- Women published more scholarly books through a university press in total last year than did men. Isolation of this result finds the highest overall amounts of those publications are present in the Humanities and the Social Sciences and the lowest amounts are present in the Physical Sciences.
- Women published more reviews of books, articles, or creative works in total last year than did men. Isolation of this result finds the highest overall amounts of those publications are present in the Arts and the Humanities and the lowest overall amounts are present in the Biological Sciences and the Physical Sciences.
- Women published more sole-authored reviews of books, articles, or creative works since Fall 2007 than did men. Isolation of this result finds the highest overall amounts of those publications are present in the Arts and the Humanities and the lowest overall amounts are present in the Physical Sciences.
- Women published more reviews of books, articles, or creative works in their career than did men. Isolation of this result finds the highest overall amounts of those publications are present in the Humanities and the lowest overall amounts are present in the Biological Sciences and the Physical Sciences.
- Women published more sole-authored scholarly books through a university press since Fall 2007 than did men. Isolation of this result finds the highest overall amounts of those publications are present in the Arts and the Humanities and the lowest overall amounts are present in the Physical Sciences.
- Women published more textbooks, edited books, monographs that are sole-authored than men. This finding overall holds true across all schools or colleges.

Unfavorable

- Women received less funding from private sector for-profit business or industry than did men. Isolation of this result finds more of that funding overall present in the Information and Computer Sciences and the Health Sciences and less overall in the Humanities and Social Ecology.

- Women published fewer articles in top three journals of their field during their career to date than did men. Isolation of this result finds the most articles overall present in the Biological Sciences and the Physical Sciences and the fewest articles overall present in the Humanities and the Social Sciences.
- Women are less satisfied with salary than are men. Isolation of this result finds the highest overall levels of satisfaction are present in the Arts and the Physical Sciences and the lowest overall levels are present in the Humanities.
- Women are generally less satisfied with their jobs at UCI than are men. Isolation of this result finds the highest overall levels of satisfaction are present in the Physical Sciences and Social Ecology and the lowest overall levels are present in the Humanities.
- Women spend more hours per week in undergraduate teaching than do men. Isolation of this result finds the most hours overall are present in the Humanities and the Physical Sciences and the lowest hours overall are in the Biological Sciences, the Health Sciences, and Business.
- Women published fewer articles in refereed professional or trade journals last year than did men. Isolation of this result finds more publications overall present in the Physical Sciences, the Health Sciences, and Engineering and fewer publications overall present in the Humanities and the Social Sciences.
- Women published fewer articles in refereed professional or trade journals in their career to date than did men. Isolation of this result finds more publications overall present in the Biological Sciences, the Physical Sciences, and Health Sciences and fewer publications overall in the Arts, the Humanities, and the Social Sciences.
- Women experienced more incidents of uninvited use of nicknames or belittling terms from faculty than did men. Isolation of this result finds the highest incidence present in the Humanities.
- Women experienced more incidents of uninvited use of nicknames or belittling terms from staff than did men. Isolation of this result finds the highest incidences are present in Education and the Physical Sciences.
- Women experienced more incidents of inappropriate references to age from students than did men. This finding overall holds true across all schools or colleges.
- Women experienced more incidents of inappropriate references to age from faculty than did men. Isolation of this result finds highest incidence overall present in the Humanities.
- Women experienced more incidents of inappropriate references to age from staff than did men. Isolation of this result finds highest incidence overall present in the Humanities.

- Women experienced greater levels of exclusion from key processes than did men. This finding overall holds true across all schools or colleges.
- Women experienced more requests stereotypical of gender than did men. Isolation of this result finds the most requests overall are present in the Humanities and the least requests overall in the Health Sciences.
- Women experienced more incidents of discouragement or demoralization about career advancement possibilities in departmental personnel-related activities than did men. Isolation of this result finds highest incidence overall present in the Humanities.

Other

- Women resided in smaller households last year than did men. This finding overall holds true across all schools or colleges.
- Women tended to reside alone rather than with spouses or partners in comparison to men. This finding overall holds true across all schools or colleges.
- Women carry larger portions of childcare responsibilities during a regular workweek than did men. Isolation of this result finds largest portions overall are present in the Humanities.
- Women devoted more hours during a regular workweek to household duties than did men. Isolation of this result finds smallest portions overall are present in Engineering.
- In terms of their prospecting for future non-UCI employment, women attached higher levels of importance to opportunities for advancement than did men. This finding overall holds true across all schools or colleges.
- In terms of their prospecting for future non-UCI employment, women attached higher levels of importance to greater opportunity to do research than did men. This finding overall holds true across all schools or colleges.
- In terms of their prospecting for future non-UCI employment, women attached higher levels of importance to good research facilities and equipment than did men. Isolation of this result finds high level of importance overall are present in Engineering.
- In terms of their prospecting for future non-UCI employment, women attached higher levels of importance to diverse faculty than did men. Isolation of this result finds high levels of importance overall are present in the Humanities and low levels overall are present in the Physical Sciences.

- In terms of their prospecting for future non-UCI employment, women attached higher levels of importance to mentoring than did men. Isolation of this result finds a high level of importance overall is present in Education and a low level of importance overall is present in the Arts.
- In terms of their prospecting for future non-UCI employment, women attached higher levels of importance to collegial environment than did men. This finding overall holds true across all schools or colleges.

Consistency of 2009 Differences with Previous Surveys

Favorable Results

- Women are more familiar than are men with the aims and goals of the NSF ADVANCE program. This finding is consistent with the 2004 survey and, for 2009, holds true across all schools or colleges.
- Women experienced a greater incidence of department-generated course release than did men. This finding is consistent with the 2002 survey. Comparison of those results the current results finds the average incidence increased from 51 percent to 63 percent overall, increased from 47 percent to 55 percent for men, and increased from 61 percent to 74 percent for women. The largest gain occurred for women though isolation of the results for 2009 finds lowest levels of incidence are present in the Biological Sciences and the Health Sciences.

Unfavorable Results

- Women observed more departmental personnel-related incidents of inappropriate gender-based references to personal life than did men. This finding appears to be common across all three surveys though indeterminate due to changes in the item's content; separation of the compound item occurred in 2009. Results from the current survey hold true across all schools or colleges.
- Women experienced more incidents of harassment, intimidation, or assault from staff members that they are too embarrassed to admit than did men. This finding appears to be consistent with the 2004 survey though indeterminate due to changes in the item's content; separation of the compound item occurred in 2009. Results from the current survey hold true across all schools or colleges.
- Women experienced a higher incidence of discouragement from participation at meetings by colleagues or administrators than did men. This finding appears to be consistent with the 2004 survey though indeterminate due to changes in the item's content; separation of the compound item occurred in 2009. Isolation of results find high levels of incidence overall are present in the Humanities and Engineering.

- Women tended to disagree that they face same opportunities as men UCI faculty. This finding is consistent with the 2004 survey though the incidence of agreement decreased from 64 percent to 56 percent overall, remained the same at 77 percent for men, and decreased from 35 percent to 29 percent for females. Isolation of the results from the current survey finds a high level of disagreement overall present in the Humanities.
- Women observed more departmental personnel-related incidents of gender-based disparaging remarks about qualifications than did men. This finding appears to be consistent with the 2004 survey though indeterminate due to changes in the item's content; separation of the compound item occurred in 2009. Isolation of results finds high levels of incidence overall are present in the Humanities.
- Women are less satisfied than are men with time available for research. This finding is consistent with the 2002 survey. Average satisfaction levels decreased from 2.63 to 2.59 overall, decreased from 2.78 to 2.69 for men, and increased from 2.31 to 2.46 for women. Isolation of this result finds a high level of satisfaction overall is present in the Health Sciences and a low level of satisfaction overall is present in the Humanities.
- Women experienced more incidents of qualifications-related questions or disparaging remarks about from students and faculty than did men. This finding is consistent with the 2002 survey though indeterminate due to changes in the item's content; separation of the compound item occurred in 2009. Isolation of results finds a high incidence of remarks overall is present in the Humanities.
- Women experienced more incidents of qualifications-related questions or disparaging remarks about from students and faculty than did men. This finding is consistent with the 2002 survey though indeterminate due to changes in the item's content; separation of the compound item occurred in 2009. Isolation of results finds a high incidence of remarks overall is present in the Humanities and a low incidence in the Biological Sciences.
- Women experienced more incidents of inappropriate references to their personal life from faculty than did men. This finding is consistent with the 2002 survey though indeterminate due to changes in the item's content; separation of the compound item occurred in 2009. Results from the current survey hold true across all schools or colleges.
- Women experienced more incidents of inappropriate references to their appearance from faculty than did men. This finding is consistent with the 2002 survey though indeterminate due to changes in the item's content; separation of the compound item occurred in 2009. Isolation of this result finds a high level of incidence overall is present in the Humanities.

- Women experienced more incidents of overbearing, intimidating, or offensive verbal behavior from students than did men. This finding is consistent with the 2002 survey though indeterminate due to changes in the item's content; separation of the compound item occurred in 2009. Isolation of this result finds a high level of incidence overall present in the Humanities.
- Women experienced more incidents of inappropriate race- or ethnicity-based references to their personal life. This finding is consistent with the 2002 survey though indeterminate due to changes in the item's content; separation of the compound item occurred in 2009. Isolation of this result finds a high level of incidence overall present in Education and low levels of incidence overall present in the Health Sciences and Humanities.

Other Results

- In their employment prospects beyond UCI, women attach a higher level of importance than did men on seeking a tenure-track / tenured position. This finding is consistent with the 2002 survey. Isolation of this result finds a low level of importance in the Information and Computer Sciences.
- There are observable increases since 2004 in the level of priority attached to gender equity at UCI. In both 2004 and 2009 surveys, women attached a higher level of priority to gender equity at UCI than do men. Isolation of the results from the current survey finds a low level of priority overall present in the business school.

Recommendations

The aforementioned findings provide a basis for the set of recommendations listed in this final section of the report narrative, which are as follows:

- Develop diversity appreciation events and orientation programs that enhance awareness to potentially offensive or unprofessional behaviors. The results seem to warrant efforts that target especially faculty in the Humanities.
- Evaluate whether Advance Program raises sensitivities of varied audiences to gender equity. As a related issue, there is an apparent need to decide on appropriate emphasis through which to distinguish comments offered by those who repeatedly complete the survey from those hired since last administration of survey.
- Develop shorter or more concise, specifics-focused surveys for its administration to a random sample drawn from the faculty population. Sampling designs other than the convenient sample approach taken in this administration of the survey may help to reduce any respondent bias and/or to improve greater correspondence between the sample and the population.
- Consider comments and the results of suggested factor analytic study in constructing and validating subsequent survey(s). There is a need to settle on survey contents and to develop separate surveys thereby decreasing its overall length. Factor analytics will help to discern contents and structure as well as the divergent or convergent features of survey.

APPENDICES

A: Respondent Primary Affiliation

B: Respondent Participant Status

C: Advance Program Familiarity Correlates

D: Respondent Comments & Answers to Open-ended Questions

Appendix A:
Primary Affiliations of UCI Faculty Members & Survey Respondents

	Population			Survey Sample		
	No.	Pct. Total	Pct. Women	No.	Pct. Total	Pct. Women
Arts	62	6%	39%	35	15%	41%
Biological Sciences	95	9	27	17	7	25
Business	43	4	37	7	3	57
Education	17	2	65	5	2	80
Engineering	98	9	9	14	6	14
Humanities	166	15	45	35	15	68
Health Sciences	15	1	47	29	12	39
Info. & Computer Sciences	60	6	25	10	4	20
Medicine, Basic Sciences	59	6	24	0	0	0
Medicine, Clinical Sciences	113	11	23	0	0	0
Physical Sciences	132	12	17	28	12	32
Social Ecology	64	6	44	20	9	58
Social Sciences	134	13	32	33	14	49
Totals	1058	100%	30%	233	100%	44%

This table serves multiple purposes. First, it describes faculty member distributions of the population and the sample across UCI's schools. In terms of those distributions, observable is the statistically significant (.05 level) overrepresentation with regard to the Arts: 6 percent of the faculty population is from the Arts whereas 15 percent of the survey sample is from that school. Second, the tabulation describes the presence of women faculty within UCI's schools. In terms of that presence, observable is the statistically significant overrepresentation with regard to the Humanities: 45 percent of that school's population are women faculty whereas 68 percent of that school's survey sample are women faculty. Third, also statistically significant and observable is the fact that 30 percent of UCI's faculty population is comprised of women whereas 44 percent of the survey sample is comprised of women. All told, the sample consists of disproportionate number of women overall and from the Humanities and faculty overall from the Arts. Those overrepresentations elevate concerns held by this research consultant about the extent to which the results of this survey reflect respondent's biases and/or preconceptions.

Appendix B:
Respondent Participation Status

	Number	Percent of Sample
<hr/>		
Respondents reporting participation in previous ADVANCE surveys		
2002 Survey	3	1.3
2004 Survey	27	11.6
Both 2002 and 2004 Survey	43	18.5
Neither - First time participant	93	39.8
Status Unknown	67	28.8
Totals	233	100.0

Appendix C:

C1. Respondent Familiarity with Advance Program: Correlations with Survey Items Exhibiting Significant Gender-based Differences

Question Number & Item	Correlation	Sig	Table
Q6. Departmental course release	.27	.00	7
Q31. Belittling or nickname use by faculty	.16	.03	11
Q33. Offensive comments by students	.18	.01	11
Q45. Personnel activity-related remarks about personal life that are ethnicity- or race-based	.14	.05	13
Q46. Personnel activity-related remarks about appearance that are gender-based	.22	.00	13
Q48. Personnel activity-related discouragement or demoralization about advancement that are gender-based	.20	.01	13
Q49. Priority level attached to gender equity	.16	.02	15

Notes: Spearman correlation coefficients; table number is that found elsewhere in this report.

Tabulations of the six items listed in this appendix appear in other sections of this report; see tables for response scales. Furthermore, the analysis finds those items as differing statistically, significantly by respondent gender. In addition, they correlate with respondent orientation to the Advance Program; readers may review additional details for any item listed above by visiting the enumerated table. Based on these findings, the Advance Program and its gender equity priority appear to be sensitizing women faculty members to career advancement issues such as departmental-based course release and to diversity appreciation through reported incidents of inappropriate and/or unprofessional remarks from colleagues during personnel-related activities.

Listed on the following page are the items that correlate, in general, with respondent familiarity to the Advance Program. Those results cast suspicion on differences that may exist according to respondent rank and years of service at UCI. The aforementioned lack of sample representativeness along those variables in addition to weak correlations, as seen above and below in this appendix, raises questions including those related to meaningfulness of results. For instance, it is difficult or nearly impossible to reconcile statistically significant differences that exist according to respondent gender and respondent general lack of familiarity with the Advance Program. Most importantly, explanations for that gap are beyond the scope of this project and the data from this survey. Comments to the open-ended may be the most useful.

**C2. Respondent Familiarity with Advance Program:
Spearman Correlations with Survey Items in General**

Question Number & Item	Correlation	Sig.
Q1. Departmental feedback on service	.19	.01
Q1. Mentoring opportunities	.23	.00
Q2b. Trend in hours teaching graduate students	-.27	.00
Q4b. Weekly school service hours	.21	.01
Q7. Number of sole-authored chapters in edited volumes	.24	.02
Q12. Income from speaking fees, honoraria	.21	.03
Q15. Applied for employment at another college or university	.14	.05
Q45. Inappropriate personnel-related gender-based references to personal life	.24	.00
Q47. Disparaging personnel-related remarks about qualifications that are race- or ethnicity-based	.15	.04
Q49. Rating of priority for gender equity at UCI	.17	.01
Q51. Relevance of _____ to a prospective job:		
Salary level	.20	.01
Benefits	.15	.04
Assistant Professors	-.21	.00
Women respondents	.19	.01
Years of service at UCI	.23	.00
2002 & 2004 survey completers	.35	.00
First time survey completers who were hired since 2006	-.40	.00

Multiple year completers are much more familiar than are first time, new hire completers.

Appendix D:

Listing of Comments by Survey Participation within Section

In an effort to gain insights relevant to future survey constructions and to distinguish between various respondent perspectives, this section provides a listing of comments (250 character limit due to software package parameters) from the open-ended-items in each section of the current survey; they are copied intact and pasted below.

Organized in two basic groups those sections correspond with respondent participation status and by gender. One group is comprised of faculty who completed both the 2002 and the 2004 surveys. The other group is comprised of faculty who completed the survey for the first time in 2009 and who began service at UC Irvine during or after Academic Year 2005-06.

As the reader will notice, separation of the comments also corresponds with gender of respondent. Interpretations of the comments in this compilation reside entirely with the reader. Some deletions of text, as noted wherever applicable, occurred with the intent to conceal personally identifiable information. One hundred eleven out of the 233 respondents (approximately 48 percent) provided one comment or more.

D.1: Job Satisfaction & Departmental Support

(Variable named: Q1CommentsA)

2002 and 2004 Survey Completers

Men Respondents

1. A small clique of senior professors dominates decision making in my department _____. They allocate resources to maximize their own personal interests. Students, other faculty, and the university community suffer because of the dominance of this...
2. Dissatisfied at lack of classroom space on campus in general, and lack of good quality medium to large lecture halls; most of the present ones are odd rooms in shape and ambience; the students notice this
3. I have been fortunate in having excellent colleagues as chair. Even when there were not at their best, other colleagues supported my best interests.
4. I think the mode of review of one's research is too superficial, focusing on ISI impact factors etc. and never actually dealing with the person's ideas. M.P. forums are conducted without people actually reading the person's papers.
5. Mentoring for faculty does not exist in EECS.
6. Perhaps this use of an engineering metaphor is not appropriate.

7. regressive and backward looking administration at department, school, and cohs levels
8. Space is a big concern; we lack adequate lecture halls and instructional space; we lack adequate communal space and meeting space. There is also inadequate funding for graduate students, which translates into inadequate opportunities to hire RAs.
9. The Chair does not follow a systematic process and often forces individual faculty members to do things without proper communication. Many faculty feel potential revenge if they speak out or take positions that may be contrary to the Chair. The Cha...
10. There seems to be a big gap between Very Satisfied and Somewhat Satisfied. For example what if you are Satisfied...
11. These questions reference overall experience at UCI in the instructions. The answers, for me change radically over time. The responses make sense only when pegged to a particular time, e.g currently .
12. UCI is a difficult place to attract good postdocs, and the quality of the graduate students is acceptable, but not very good.

Women Respondents

1. Although I am at the top of the scale, I cannot get tutoring in the new computer stuff; our School only has people to help with hardware problems, not software learning, and I am always trying to catch up, learn new skills, without help. I am bad at...
2. Departmental support varies tremendously among departments, due in good part to the personalities and gender generational composition of units rather than structural forces. ALSO the answers to these questions, even for just me, would vary from year...
3. Feedback comes from several sources. One may be satisfied with feedback from one's department but be dissatisfied with feedback from CAP. My dissatisfaction noted above is with CAP, not my department or school.
4. Have experienced a hostile, chilly, corrupt work climate.
5. I didn't answer the question about Mentoring, because I was not sure if it was asking about mentoring for me or opportunities for me to mentor.
6. I'm not sure what you mean by mentoring opportunities. My department does not admit graduate students in my sub field so I do not have the opportunities I would like to work with grad students. I have participated in the ADVANCE mentoring program.
7. It was totally unacceptable that so little help was offered to faculty that had to move out of Steinhaus Hall to temporary quarters for renovations. Faculty were inappropriately told to use their techs often paid on federal funds to help them mo...

8. No neutral what I want to say under mentoring. Didn't seek mentor so am not satisfied nor dissatisfied. Don't recall what dates and surveys I responded to. Questions, nearly totally identify me; down to 2 women hired in Merage that day.
9. Replacement or repair of aging equipment in SOTA has reached a critical point due to radical underfunding of the school in this area. It is already affecting curriculum and beginning to undermine faculty and graduate student research...
10. School support has been excellent; the problems are in the EVC s office.
11. SOH does not have access to research assistants despite the university s emphasis on research. And of course, humanities scholars are not paid for research during the summers, when the bulk of our research has to occur, especially in English, we te...
12. The Department is great; the Dean is great; central administration does not care about social science at all, only the hard sciences and professional schools.
13. There is VERY little research equipment infrastructure provided for shared use. Far worse than competing institutions.
14. UCI is being run like a corporation and it does not service educational needs, nor those of its professors. And it makes for a climate of commerce not of intellectual exchange. This campus seems hostile; presently hostile to its mission, its stude...
15. While I believe my achievements have been recognized by CAP; I do not feel they have been valued by my department.

First-time Completers Hired Since 2006

Men Respondents

1. I am very dissatisfied with the Universities commitment to not allow primate research on campus.
2. office space for faculty in my department has been problematic
3. support from staff; very dissatisfied
4. UCI doesn't value professional editorial work which is considered merely service; though it is vital for the profession.

Women Respondents

1. Colleagues have been nice and supportive and accommodating on a 1:1 basis, but the department has been a disorganized and ignoring junior faculty. There is no bad intention but also no central planning to relieve junior faculty from unnecessary burde...
2. Science and engineering departments prevent students with other majors from using computer programs and laboratories in the sciences and engineering. Hence discouraging students in other majors from exploring science and engine...
3. Since all assignments in my dept. are made by the chair and the associate chairs, who ignore my requests to participate on committees or take on other responsibilities; other than teaching, I have not been able to contribute to the UCI community to t...
4. Tech support for classrooms that are not SMART classrooms is APPALLING
5. There is no space allocated for classrooms and an inadequate research infrastructure

D.2: Job Satisfaction & Workload
(Variable named: Q1CommentsB)

2002 and 2004 Survey Completers

Men Respondents

1. A four course teaching load is strongly needed to make this a first class research institution.
2. I have had a heavy load of other duties recently and it has been a problem with my research program.
3. I think service to the community is important but the previous dean has not only not encouraging faculty to participate more but actually penalize those good citizens who do more than their share of service. There have been at least two such faculty...
4. In my department, the chair give service assignments with minimum input from the faculty
5. It is a constant juggling act. I am getting better at it, but I think it is the nature of the structure of labor and reward. Teaching and service matter to me. I do no think that they diminish my research, but enhance the UCI experience.
6. Service means nothing in the academic personnel process. Over and over again, faculty who refuse to do meaningful or competent work in service advance if they continue to do adequate research. There are only moral incentives for service, and for t...

7. Since I arrived at UC Irvine in 1999, I have done nearly 80% of the undergraduate advising in the economics department. This is not an exaggeration. If you look at the number of independent study courses taught by economics faculty, you will see that...

8. Teaching loads are too high and mentoring of students is not rewarded or counted toward the normal teaching load. Our sister UCs all have lower teaching loads. Service is generally not compensated with teaching reductions. Staff are overstretched.

9. There is not enough time available for all faculty to do all of these things. It does not seem realistic to apply the same criteria to all faculty given the diversity of experiences, interests, and goals.

10. These questions are absurd. What does it mean to ask about satisfaction and serving on departmental committees. Are you asking about whether people are satisfied that they have to serve on committees, satisfied with the committees they serve on, or...

11. Time availability is greatest source of dissatisfaction.

Women Respondents

1. Administrative work creep is an ever growing problem given that the reward system is really not predicated on doing such work.

2. Ditto previous comment about time period covered.

3. I don't advise graduate students as primary supervisor often; we don't offer the languages for my field...

4. I struggle with being an effective teacher, responsive to students, planning targeted curriculum learning about and optimizing emerging technologies AND keeping teaching inside the box. I like teaching, but I don't feel I can do it well and still...

5. It's unclear what these categories in the survey really mean. I have served on numerous committees, but am very unsatisfied, because the levels of service required of women at UCI is simply unsustainable, unfair, and harmful.

6. Never enough time for research.

7. Please see first comment. Research in the Humanities is done on our own time, for free.

8. The move for renovation created much extra work and did not result in any better workspace. Renovations did not take care of previous contaminated ventilation system of the building, resulting in further displacement.

9. The pace seems to increase every year. The committee responsibilities, administrative duties bureaucracy and other commitments sap away time and energy to do what is most important research and teaching graduate students; I'm in SOM . It isn't a...

10. The School of Humanities teaching load should be revised to require ladder faculty to teach 4 courses, not 5 per year. This would bring it into line with other UC campuses such as Davis and UCLA, and it would make for more efficient use of research...

First-time Completers Hired Since 2006

Men Respondents

No comments made by respondents

Women Respondents

1. Again, lack of resources is a problem
2. We need more faculty in order to meet the needs of our graduate students.

D.3: Job Satisfaction & Work-Family Issues
(Variable named: Q1CommentsC)

2002 and 2004 Survey Completers

Men Respondents

1. My chair and colleagues have been very accommodating during two recent family health crises.
2. My department chair seems to know very little about leaves available to new parents, especially if the primary care giver is men .
3. Our family had a baby during my first year at UCI 2002 . Not a single person suggested that I could take any time away from my work; there was zero encouragement to balance work and family.
4. Providing for my childrens UC education has been extremely difficult on the UCI salary, and an ever present worry.
5. The academy is still a place for single or married men with stay at home spouses. Or those who have the means to pay for household services.

6. The child rearing leave has restrictions. I guess it is better than nothing, but the requirements of number of hours before made it difficult to schedule the leave when you need it. Childcare facilities have a very long wait list and I could not tak...
7. There are insufficient spots in the excellent campus childcare, particularly in the infant toddler center and the extended day center.
8. These negative comments pertain to the total lack of support for these kinds of issues when I was a younger person before 1980.

Women Respondents

1. Balancing work and family is a challenge for all people. UCI plus universities in general is/ are better than most jobs on this category.
2. I am satisfied with the current policy. I was EXTREMELY dissatisfied in 2005 when my department chair pressured me to take on a major service task that coincided with my summer due date. It was a struggle to get reasonable maternity leave.
3. I am somewhat satisfied by my balancing of family obligations because I personally make that a priority. Still, this takes a toll on my ability to handle all tasks and advance as I would need. There is no question in my mind that men can advance fas...
4. I don't have young children any more but that doesn't mean that support for child and family obligations are in any way satisfactory here. The parental leave program has been distorted by the EVC's offive to apply to anyone with children, even father...
5. I have had to travel for departmental purposes, and for research purposes, almost entirely on my own dime. With a now 18 month old child who nurses; this means three plane tickets for every trip; her caregiver, my husband, also has to come if I go t...
6. I was very UNSATISFIED when I had a child and there were no openings for infant toddlers on campus. Now I have an older child got into a childcare program, and I couldn't be happier. The infant care history was difficult though, and I urge the camp...
7. Limited institutional support of elder care issues.
8. Maternity leave viewed as research time time without having to perform teaching, service obligations.
9. The university still operates on a men model and needs more flexibility for women roles.

First-time Completers Hired Since 2006

Men Respondents

1. I love my job, but as a new investigator, I feel the workload is rather heavy due in part to limited available funds for lab personnel. I hope to acquire federal funding to hire additional personnel but outside funding has been very difficult to obtain...
2. Not sure what the last question refers to.

Women Respondents

1. long waitlists; 1 year, on daycare on campus.

D.4: Job Satisfaction in General
(Variable named: Q1CommentsD)

2002 and 2004 Survey Completers

Men Respondents

1. A lower teaching load and more financial support for research would greatly help me to do a better job of sustaining the University's core mission. Otherwise, the basics of employment, salary, benefits, etc. are great.
2. I am leaving UCI for another university in a few weeks.
3. I enjoy my job at UC Irvine, although the selfish attitudes of many of my senior colleagues is often frustrating and disheartening.
4. I think the benefits are generally good, and I think the university housing for faculty is very highly appreciated. However, the university has been very unhelpful when it comes to assisting faculty with immigration issues. Sometimes it is the faculty...
5. My job at UCI could be much better if junior faculty were treated as full citizens and if we had a more collegial atmosphere in my department.
6. My microenvironment is fine. I am free to do what I want to do and need to do if I can pay the whole freight. All initiatives in education and training have been squashed.
7. Poor performance of CAP; many selfish colleagues who play the game thereby doing minimal and mediocre teaching and administration, service in favor of their own research. This will not change until CAP recognizes excellence in teaching and service...
8. Some of the opinions above might change drastically if salary cuts are imposed.

9. UC Irvine is a great university, but one gets the sense that the faculty are under appreciated and expected essentially to service undergraduate workload rather than develop their own research careers.

10. UCI is very unsupportive to help my wife, who was formerly a professor and is Orange County's leading specialist for autism to find appropriate professional activities, even though on the level below becoming a faculty member.

11. When I joined UCI, I turned down two other offers. I think it is an excellent, though imperfect institution whose faculty and administration genuinely try to do the right thing.

Women Respondents

1. As the years go by, my salary falls below new hires at the asst prof level, which is unsatisfactory. This is also lower in my dept than others across the campus.

2. Change in dept leadership has made enormous difference in my job satisfaction. Now feel bullied and consequently uninterested in contributing to Dept University.

3. Currently lucky to have stable employment. Inequities in salary by gender continue within the School.

4. For many years, I was underpaid. I consistently outperformed my colleagues with respect to number of publications and the quality of their venues, but was not accelerated during merits. Finally, when I went up for Full Professor, CAP proposed to my...

5. How will the results of this survey be used for making improvements in the UCI climate

6. I believe that the retirement system for the Health Sciences Compensation Plan, APU scheme in particular, is extremely unfair and disadvantages those who try to uphold ethical principles. This system is rife with unfair exceptions that disadvantage...

7. In the current climate, I'm concerned about health benefits, and about increasing burdens on me and more junior people to pay into the retirement fund. I m also concerned about the inequities in salary within dept, school, and university. If there...

8. Inability to find suitable employment in this area has led to the breakup of marriages among UCI faculty. This is a serious, yet inadequately recognized problem.

9. My dissatisfaction with benefits has to do with the larger UC issues with the retirement system and the state's unwillingness to resume contributions on the university s behalf.

10. Not enough time to do all things expected of me in my job.

11. Salary is ok only because of summer salary provided by federal grants. UCI salary is not commensurate with number of hours we need to put into work during academic year and in summer. Also, salary varies depending on political weight.
12. The central administration is composed of people who care first about their own careers and only secondly about UCI.
13. The combination of research resources, good students, supportive colleagues, and comfortable place to live add up to high job satisfaction; although there elements of my job, such as teaching research balance, that I would like to improve.
14. The Humanities at UCI once enjoyed a stellar reputation. It now seems to be regarded by the central administration as a service provider. Morale is pretty low.
15. The job is great.
16. The salaries are much lower than every colleague of mine I know and comparable people, I see salaries when I review grants for NIH and they are very low here.
17. The university policy to give only 75 percent of a merit increase to anyone off step is counterproductive at multiple levels and downright insulting. Because it applies to everyone, no matter how little off step; it does nothing to advance equity.
18. There are salary inequity in my area.
19. When I was first hired; long ago, there was no support for spousal employment.

First-time Completers Hired Since 2006

Men Respondents

1. Benefits are hard to manage, change, or adjust. This should be available on the web.
2. Keeping my job depends on getting tenure. Based on conversations with my colleagues tenure depends largely on obtaining federal funding. This seems reasonable to me. However, because the NIH funding rate has been very low in recent years, particul...
3. meager merit raise doesn't come close to keeping up with a very high cost of living here

Women Respondents

1. Current budget cuts and the likelihood of salary cuts are a source of school and colleague and personal stress as well as dissatisfaction.
2. Dissatisfaction with my job stems from absence of communication with chair and disregard by others within the circle of dept. governance. Dissatisfaction with salary results from decision made by previous dean of the school based on faulty assumption
3. The academic environment is not what it should be.

D.5: Types of support received during your employment at UCI
(Variable named: Q6Comments)

2002 and 2004 Survey Completers

Men Respondents

1. Gee wonder why I am leaving
2. I think the startup package was reasonable for me although I did not negotiate and did not know about the complete picture of what was normally offered. mop has been terrific. start up was embarrassingly small.
3. My starting salary as it turns out was lower than other new hires which raises a bit of an equity issue but I understand I just do not bargain as well or as vigorously .
4. My wife chose not to accept the offer from UCI to avoid working in the same institution.
5. My wife s employment offer did not quite match what we negotiated. My wife s prospects vanished after two years she is an academic and after a couple more years we divorced there were other reasons . My start up package was great however.
6. One point of dissatisfaction is that a downpayment assistance was granted to others who asked for it . For those who did not know to ask it was not offered. This might be unfair.
7. Souse partner was not hired as a benefit to me. This was before UCI had such policies.
8. Spouse partner was hired on own merits through separate search.
9. Start up packages have gotten much more generous over the years and this is a good thing.
10. The start package housing mattered a great deal because my wife and I could not rely of family assistance.

Women Respondents

1. I was not informed that equipment I purchased with start up funds to set up a new lab would not necessarily ever be upgraded due to severe underfunding in SOTA of technology upkee"
2. Although MOP was promised in the hire letter it was later denied to me under unfair and discriminatory circumstances. It was later reinstated upon being challenged. The experience was highly negative and alienating.
3. Excellent support. Outstanding in comparison to other places at which I interviewed.

4. Hired initially as a lecturer research scientist. When position was changed to ladder rank faculty initial offer was no setup eventually received only 10K men faculty in same area 8 yr earlier got 100K
5. I don t think I had a reduced teaching load but don t remember...many of these things were not offered in 1971 and the one I requested for my spouse was ridiculed.
6. I have absolutely no complaints about UCI trying to support the spousal recruitment effort. I think UCI leads in this area.
7. I have never received any monies toward research other than miniscule travel grants other professors receive upwards of 5 to 8 thousand dollars per year for research funds.
8. I received no startup funds.
9. In 1982 only the apartments Las Lomas were there and I lived there two years. There was not a start up package. Don t recall if there was a course release I don t think so.
10. Most of these programs were not in place.
11. My spouse was hired three years after I was after we received other offers but not when I was first hired although I had another offer at the time .
12. Start up packages were not offered for social scientists in Social Ecology when I was hired.
13. The employment offer for my husband was temporary a two year visiting professorship which was renewed one time. This was inadequate and unjustified given his admirable publication record and status in the profession.
14. The University should do more to support research and graduate teaching of faculty. Specifically guaranteeing 2 years of support for incoming doctoral students and funding more shared equipment resources for the sciences.
15. They were great about not burdening me with departmental service when I started.
16. When I was hired start up packages in my field were very low. They are much higher now.

First-time Completers Hired Since 2006

Men Respondents

1. I took a salary cut compared to my previous job and my salary has stayed the same for 4 years.
2. My start up package was less than what other department members I know received.
3. The lack of a position for my spouse who gave up a tenure track job elsewhere to move here is a huge stressor.

Women Respondents

1. University Hills is one of the absolute best things about UCI.
2. Was lied to about start up packages
3. Without a spousal offer my job at UCI has been significantly difficult. I am also troubled that the spousal hiring program will be terminated before I can make another attempt to have my spouse hired at UCI.

D.6: Types of support received when hired at UCI

(Variable named: Q5Comments)

*2002 and 2004 Survey Completers**Men Respondents*

1. I changed departments; my first department was very supportive.
2. I like to acknowledge the ongoing mentorship and career advising that I have received from select senior colleagues.
3. My spouse received employment at UCI, but it was accomplished independently of my appointment.
4. My spouse's employment was obtained independently of me, despite promises from my dept. chair and others that she would be hired. This bred tremendous distrust. Ultimately, after all these promises fell through, she found her own job on campus.
5. We play musical chairs in my department with the additional space allocated to various faculty members, sharing it with others or giving up space to our colleagues for new activities or ventures.

Women Respondents

1. Course release and committee relief were supplied in a few instances by my department only under coercion by Dean, granting agency. Most ongoing service and committee work are generally not-compensated with teaching and other relief.
2. Course releases and summer salary were provided only in conjunction with an administrative role.
3. Employment for spouse; he gave up security of employment as a lecturer at another UC to come be a lecturer here.
4. Have never received travel support from my department or school and research support is from funding generated by my clinical productivity.

5. I need more office space for my books and papers
6. I have had course release and twice summer salary, but earned through outside grants and or sabbatical credits. I also had summer salary from my school to match a retention offer.
7. Per employment offer; please see comments above.
8. relief from clinical duties
9. Summer salary was for teaching summer school
10. Temporary employment offer only for spouse
11. The space issue has been a huge program for me. We are moving to a new building and hopefully many of my problems will be solved soon.
12. We are not divided into departments in Merage. So the answer refers to the school. I got a course release when associate dean, journal editor; and when granted a faculty career development award that is a campus level award but the school is for...

First-time Completers Hired Since 2006

Men Respondents

1. I have taught summer courses if that s what you mean by summer salary. Also all the questions below are geared towards scholars. I am in the arts and my output is very different so much of this below is not really relevant.
2. My spouse is now a graduate student at UCI this is only somewhat connected to my employment here.
3. Summer salary was part of the start up and none other offered.

Women Respondents

1. I had a start up package for travel as well as a grant; hence, I did not ask the department for support for travel or research.
2. sabbatical credit
3. some temporary part time teaching for spouse

D.7: Workload-related - Teaching
(Variable named: Q4Comments)

2002 and 2004 Survey Completers

Male Respondents

1. I am a journal editor and that takes some time each week. These numbers are very rough estimates.
2. I am leaving this blank because it is not meaningful to ask about a typical week because there is no such thing. Time availability is the greatest source of dissatisfaction. Being a professor takes WAY too much time.
3. I compensate for the time crunch by working later into the evening and on the weekends. This activity is late because I take my parental responsibilities seriously.
4. I have no idea how much time I spent on any of this. In the field of time allocation research there is pretty good evidence that nobody can remember this information with any degree of accuracy. If you want to get these data, you have to conduct obse...
5. I took on new administrative responsibilities this year and received release from formal teaching responsibilities in return.
6. Time spent on teaching reflects the fact that I don't teach an undergraduate and graduate course in every quarter. When I'm teaching either kind of class, I spend about 5 hours per week unless it's a rare new preparation when the time is greater.

Female Respondents

1. More refereeing, grant reviewer activities.
2. see comments above. University duties and committees and advising students how to navigate the system and writing grants just to get equipment here at UCI or getting students funded to do research is seriously crowding out the other important st...
3. Sorry, but it is impossible to answer these questions. There is no typical workweek. Every quarter is different.
4. The undergraduate teaching hours very much vary by quarter and what I'm teaching I was teaching a large course, as does the graduate load; didn't teach one this quarter. Service also varies widely depending on NIH grant load.

5. These are difficult to estimate; since during this time, I have moved into several different significant service roles. Each has given different amounts of teaching release. This year I taught 2 courses in one quarter, and none in the other quarter...
6. These categories are difficult to report accurate numbers for as it can vary from year to year and week to week. There is no typical week. In general, departmental and school wide service which is unremunerated financially or through teaching rel...
7. These questions are posed as though they're divisible, when often they aren't.
8. Undergraduate teaching varies from 10-15 hrs for one class to 30 hours when teaching two classes.
9. You did not ask about time in research

First-time Completers Hired Since 2006

Male Respondents

1. I only teach winter quarter; so not sure how to answer the above; they are all likely wrong
2. It s very hard to calculate how to answer these questions because there is no typical week. In general, though based on speaking with many faculty across campus, I think my teaching load is higher than the average on campus.

Female Respondents

1. I organized grad admissions in my department this year and it was a massive undertaking.
2. Numbers for 2 are when teaching 1 course that quarter

D.7: Workload-related – Service
(Variable named: Q4Comments)

2002 and 2004 Survey Completers

Male Respondents

1. I chair a department. The count here represents hours spent at meetings etc.
2. serving as department chair with heavy dept school campus involvement
3. Shared governance is broken at UCI. It is not shared if 10% of the faculty perform 90 % of the work...

4. Sometimes it is not clear what counts as service and what doesn't. we get asked to do demo for visitors often, but there is not an official title; we just do these as faculty volunteers. It is almost the same set of people who always get called on...

5. The high service is committee work and editing.

Female Respondents

1. I am a School administrator, which explains both my greater involvement in School service and my lesser involvement in teaching.

2. I am providing a weekly average. Departmental meetings are once or twice a month and last 2 hours. I served on the Committee for Faculty Welfare the Committee for a minor in Civic Engagement the advisory board of the Critical Theory Emphasis the...

3. I have a small child so service has been less

4. I was chair of my department for three years from July 2005 to June 2008 during a period of significant transformation and growth. As chair, I was also required to attend many School meetings and served on a dean's search committee one of the years

5. I was ill during the past 12 mos. so this is not normal service for me.

13. This varies a lot by quarter. This is really not a good measure of the faculty service to the University and does not take into consideration the large amount of extra work that people that run labs in Biological Sciences have.

First-time Completers Hired Since 2006

Female Respondents

1. I am currently editor of a professional journal; hence, I spend a lot of time in service to the profession.

2. I did perform minor dept. service, for which I volunteered.

D.10: Familiarity with NSF ADVANCE program
(Variable name: Additional Comments for Q51Comments)

2002 and 2004 Survey Completers

Men Respondents

1. Although I think gender equity is important I do not think that more time should be devoted to promoting it. It should be a normal part of every activity.

2. I'm surprised that the survey didn't include any questions about email as this is the major form of communication on campus and also a source of inappropriate behavior.
3. I see no evidence that the University follows through on any ADVANCE recommendations in a substantial way. There is plenty of talk.
4. I was an equity advisor myself for two years, and saw firsthand examples of the good it can do.
5. It is problematic that the questions above ask about gender and race ethnicity, but fail to mention sexual orientation, particularly given that the State of California has just banned same sex marriage and thus that discrimination on the basis of sex...
6. Once again above answers reflect the fact that i am chair of the department. I can see other members of my department, especially women ones, providing a somewhat different response to these questions.
7. The goals of ADVANCE were expanded to include diversity in July 2006. The campus is making progress but we are not there at there yet. It is better to see institutional transformation as a continuum because the campus and context is regularly chang...
8. The main route of discrimination is the implicitly higher standard set for minorities e.g. for tenure review or teaching reviews . It's subtle and informal yet very real. In my case, I had to publish almost twice what other assistant professors...
9. UCI equity and equity advisor system is a bad joke. Equity problems, at least those experienced by men, are repeatedly postponed and ultimately not addressed.

Women Respondents

1. ADVANCE is terrific
2. I don t think the central administration truly cares about gender equality; only about the appearance of caring.
3. i have spoken with the equity advisor in my school. the experience was very discouraging.she had little relevant information and no power to advocate for me.
4. I must seem very boring. I have no complaints. i have always been treated with courtesy by others. Seems a very professional environment.
5. I think my department and school may be better than most regarding gender equality. I rated the above based on my department and school. I think it is worse from rumors I have heard for others in different schools.

6. Not an effective program since some issues are never addressed by ADVANCE program; seldom are brought up to the Equity Advisor and are kept internal within the department or school...
7. Surveys and statistics are hopelessly blunt instruments for judging gender discrimination in an environment, like SOH, where women are prominent and nearly 50-50 though not in senior positions. The fact that SOH was chosen to have a dean who repre...
8. The Advance chairs are invisible.
9. The equity advisors for the School of Humanities have been outstanding in performing their duties. The problem lies with the structure of demands caused by administrative duties such as chairing when only at the rank of associate professor and by tea...
10. The prgram and survey appear biased to expect problems rather than to allow answers to indicate no problems...
11. The questions about s of research publications would take a long time to answer. Suffice to say that my publication record is very strong, and my grant success higher than average in the school.
12. Things have improved greatly but the salary inequities still remain; see the surveys.

First-time Completers Hired Since 2006

Men Respondents

1. Gender equity is a very important issue but I'm not convinced that it has ever been assessed in an appropriate manner at UCI. For example, a recent UCI report on salary disparities used seriously flawed statistical methods.

Women Respondents

1. I am an ADVANCE advisor.
2. I appreciate the emails and wish I had been able to attend some of the workshops and presentations this year.
3. I feel that some of the SOM faculty are not open to the contributions of other disciplines. I have been aware that I am women more since coming to UCI than at any other time in my career. The administrative structure of the College of Health Scien...
4. I find that campus staff and sometimes other faculty are surprised to meet a black women professor and sometimes seem to find it difficult to believe that I could have the qualifications I do, in fact, have. I think diversity training should be man...
5. I have read the NSF program guidelines. UCI is out of compliance.

D.11: At end of survey following section on “Future employment”

2002 and 2004 Survey Completers

Men Respondents

1. About a third of the way through the survey I realized it would take over an hour to obtain and provide the extremely detailed data requested. Sorry, but I have far too much work to do to have time for that. I hope that someone realizes that the on...
2. GReat questions about home responsibilities. However, please do not assume that my gender role fits my sex. I am of a cohort raised by a single mother and educated at the height of feminism in the 80s and thus might best be assessed differently tha...
3. I did not answer the questions about hours worked at various tasks in a typical week because my teaching changes from quarter to quarter and changes from graduate to undergraduate. In other words, there is no typical week.
4. i might leave because the environment is so parochial and backwards
5. I think there is another very important point, which is staff support. We have poor staff support. I mean the good staff overwork and are underpaid, but we are also stuck with some not so good staff who probably can't get hired anywhere else. We'v...
6. I would be most likely to move to a job with lower teaching load and more financial support for research.
7. If I were to consider an appointment or another position it would be in my retirement
8. In the current environment I am expecting a 10 to 20% loss of the best people at UC Irvine due to poaching from other universities that can pay a competitive salary. We are already seeing signs of this in my school.
9. The main thing would be to find a university that exhibited less hierarchy, less discrimination of minorities and junior faculty and more fairness. In the past, my department treated junior faculty differently... the current chair is a lot better
10. UCI really needs to get the salary system resolved. Too many faculty are paid off scale, leaving those few who are on scale to bear the pain. What is the purpose of a step system if more than 75% of the faculty, at least in my school, are off scale
11. Until the budget crisis, I genuinely did not entertain the possibility of relocating. I think the present crisis will cause my colleagues to think carefully about whether UC can support the long term professional and personal needs. There is only so...

12. Your text boxes are frustrating because they eat all punctuation in Safari, apostrophes commas, parentheses all disappeared after I typed them.

Women Respondents

1. Apologies for an incomplete form. Time is a constraint.
2. I am about to retire; not seeking another job.
3. I am extremely unlikely to move. I love it here.
4. I am not sure how effective these surveys or the program are given the lack of improvement; according to the most recent statistics of women faculty over time.
5. I don't have time to compile publication and funding stats today, so those are blank. Overall, I am very satisfied at UCI and I have seen positive changes in the last 5 years. My, 5 times or more, negative experiences above were from a single faculty...
6. If I were to leave, the most important thing in another academic job would be respect for my discipline Humanities in general; more specifically, study of the past, not the present, which I feel is deeply and systemically lacking here. I would also...
7. It is insulting that this survey was not updated to reflect the new programs that have been opened in the College of Health Sciences, Nursing Science, Public Health, Pharmaceutical Sciences. It is for this reason that I am not completing this survey...
8. It is sad to me to have spent so many years at this institution without a collegial environment in my department. Also, having worked hard to help improve the situation for women and minorities at UCI I do not see that we have made any substantive...
9. maintaining collegial relationships.
10. Many of these questions were not answerable in any meaningful fashion because they covered too large a span of time. The survey should be redesigned to focus on a particular quarter or other small unit of time. I urged the same thing the last time.
11. The way the question is framed it is hard to answer; greater opportunity to teach or research is not important since we have a lot of opportunity for that here, don't need more. But, if it were less opportunity to do that, I wouldn't pursue that job.
12. This is not an effective survey. The confidentiality is questionable and many of the questions feel as identifiers of whom the person that answers is. I have tried to give more comments but this keeps cutting my opinions off...useless.

First-time Completers Hired Since 2006

Men Respondents

1. i believe the survey should not only ask for witnessed discrimination during personnel cases but also on the witnessed discrimination against minorities protected or not that contribute to a negative working climate; for example, several individual...
2. I'm a senior person. My area is substantially understaffed relative to other areas in the school which makes a great deal of extra administrative work for me. I might move to a place that offered less administration.
3. The opportunity to help grow a new school could be quite important, as it helped attract me to UCI.

Women Respondents

1. Equity advisers in humanities need to be selected without input from dean and her adviser who actively have campaigned lied gossiped against more successful women and done little or nothing for African American women; UCI is out of compliance with NSF
2. I feel that the burden of mentoring graduate students and junior faculty is a heavy one. I can imagine leaving Irvine for a university that offered me more support for these activities or required fewer of them.
3. I had a prolonged illness during 2008-2009 which has affected my research productivity.
4. I request that my survey responses are held in strict confidence.
5. More work needs to be done to educate the entire faculty about best practices in merit review and promotion so that gender equity can be achieved. Men and woman with equal achievements and papers and grants, etc., should receive similar reviews, esp...
6. problems with gender equity at UCI have to do with patterns of advancement and appointments to administrative positions; e.g., year before last all chairs in my school were men and all members of executive committee in my dept. are men