

Results of AFT-AAUP Climate Survey

To assess the concerns of its members and their perceptions of the work environment, AFT-AAUP undertook a survey of Rutgers tenure and tenure-track faculty (TT), non-tenure track faculty (NTT), part-time lecturers (PTL), and teaching/graduate assistants (TA), during the spring of 2017. The survey was sent via email by AAUP-AFT (hereafter, AAUP) to faculty and staff members holding these positions on the Newark, Camden, and New Brunswick campuses. The invitation to take the survey included a cover letter from the Union requesting participation and guaranteeing anonymity. The survey was available from March 8, 2017 to May 5, 2017. Several reminders were sent during this time to encourage completion. The instrument was administered online using Qualtrics. Skip-logic guided users to a survey designed for their title and rank. Responses were anonymous; no identifying information was collected.

Some questions were similar across ranks, such as items that asked respondents how often they witnessed or experienced racism or sexism in their environment. Other questions asked specifically about the conditions for fairness and equity in a specific rank, e.g., whether a PTL would prefer a long-term contract. Analysis of the data was conducted by staff at the Rutgers Center for Women and Work. Significant results are summarized below.

Sample & Response Rates

The total population of potential respondents was 7,741. 1,765 responded, an overall response rate of about 23%. The eventual sample approximates proportions of the population by rank (particularly for full professors and TAs), as illustrated in Table 1. Associates and Assistants are overrepresented, PTLs underrepresented. As Table 2 indicates, women are significantly overrepresented in the sample. This is not surprising, as women tend to be overrepresented among survey respondents generally. It may also mean that women are simply more concerned about campus climate issues and inequities than men. It is worth noting that 536 respondents declined to give information on this item. Additionally, though the item on the survey allowed respondents to check from among the options: “male,” “female,” “transgender,” “gender non-conforming,” or “Agender,” relatively few respondents chose only these last three options. This category is unfortunately too small to allow statistical comparisons.

	N in population	% of population	N in sample**	% of sample
TT - Full and above	1027	13.3%	218	12.6%
TT – Associate	663	8.6%	203	11.7%*
TT – Assistant	419	5.4%	147	8.5%*
NTT	961	12.4%	276	15.9%*
PTL	3032	39.2%	557	32.1%*
TA/GA	1639	21.2%	335	19.3%
TOTAL N	7741	100%***	1736	100%***

* Difference in proportions significant at $p < 0.05$

**N=29 respondents were missing data on this item

***Total does not sum to 100% due to rounding

	N in population	% of population	N in sample**	% of sample
Women	3555	45.9%	775	63.1%*
Men	4186	54.1%	454	36.9%*
TOTAL N	7741	100%	1229	100%

* Difference in proportions significant at $p < 0.05$

**N=536 respondents were missing data on this item

Analysis of the data focuses comparisons by sex (women/men), by faculty group, and by race/ethnicity, using appropriate statistical tests for differences between groups. A substantial minority of respondents declined to provide answers on two of these items: 536 (30%) did not identify their gender, and 710 (40%) declined to provide information about race/ethnicity (only 1.5% declined the item on faculty group). This missing data means these respondents are not included in relevant analyses of group differences. It is likely that this non-response is not random, but reflects concerns about anonymity.

To create categories large enough and meaningful for the purposes of analysis, race/ethnicity information for the 1,055 faculty who identified a racial category has been recoded to make comparisons between white faculty (73% of the sample), U.S. traditionally underrepresented minority group (URM) faculty (14% - African-Americans, Hispanics, Native Americans, and those who chose multiracial or biracial), Asian/Indian faculty (12%), and international faculty. The survey did not ask respondents whether they had immigrated to the US for work, however, so the latter category was comprised of those who entered a country name in answering the item on race/ethnicity. Ultimately this group proved to be too small for analysis. It is likely that many faculty from outside the U.S. entered other racial designations, and so are included in these categories.

RESULTS

Full sample items

There were six items that asked respondents about their experiences of sexism and racism during their professional careers at Rutgers. These questions are listed in Table 3, which also includes comparisons by faculty groups. As the table indicates, women were significantly more likely than men to answer “yes” on all of these items. The same holds for the comparison between tenured/tenure track faculty versus NTTs, PTLs, and GA/TAs. TT faculty were significantly more likely to report experiencing and witnessing racism and sexism. There are also significant differences between white and URM and Asian/Indian faculty; the latter two groups were significantly more likely to have experienced overt and covert racism, and URM faculty were more likely than either their white or Asian/Indian have witnessed racial discrimination.

The survey also included items asking those who had personally experienced sexism or racism whether they had reported the incident to a department chair, dean, or other administrator and if so whether they were satisfied with the result. In all, 36% of faculty reported sexist incidents, of these, about a third were satisfied with the response. For incidents of racism, 34% reported, 22% were satisfied with the response.

Table 3. Sexism/racism items

	Sample	Gender		Race/ethnicity			Faculty group	
	Percent "yes"	% men "yes"	% women "yes"	% white "yes"	% URM "yes"	% Asian/ Indian "yes"	% Tenured or TT "yes"	% NTT, PTL, or GA "yes"
In my professional career at Rutgers, I have experienced unwanted sexual comments, attention, or advances from colleagues, superiors, or others. (N=1384)	7.7%	N/A	11.2% ^{*a}	8.7%	7.7%	N/A	13.0%	5.3% ^{*d}
During your time at Rutgers have you experienced covert or less obvious forms of sexist treatment? (N=1357)	20.1%	5.6%	39.1% ^{*a}	28.0%	30.7%	24.2%	45.4%	17.4% ^{*d}
In my professional career at Rutgers, I have witnessed colleagues receive unwanted sexual comments, attention, or advances from colleagues, superiors, or others. (N=1366)	8.9%	6.8%	14.2% ^{*a}	12.9%	9.9%	10.0%	16.2%	9.4% ^{*d}
In my professional career at Rutgers, I have experienced overt racist comments and discrimination from colleagues, superiors, or others. (N=1360)	6.9%	4.9%	10.6% ^{*a}	4.9%	17.5% ^{*b}	15.4% ^{*b}	14.4%	6.4% ^{*d}
During your time at Rutgers have you experienced covert or less obvious forms of racist treatment? (N=1348)	10.7%	10.4%	15.7% ^{*a}	7.9%	33.8% ^{*b}	26.9% ^{*b}	18.5%	11.9% ^{*d}
In my professional career at Rutgers, I have witnessed overtly racist comments and discrimination against colleagues from other colleagues, superiors, or others. (N=1343)	12.2%	8.9%	19.9% ^{*a}	15.1% ^{*c}	23%	12.3% ^{*c}	22.7%	13.1% ^{*d}
N**	1384	454	775	766	143	130	432	950

N/A indicates 10 or fewer respondents in cell

* difference significant @p<0.05

**N's vary slightly by item.

^a significant difference from men at p<0.05, independent samples t-test

^b significant difference from white faculty at p<0.05, one-way ANOVA, Fisher's LSD post hoc comparison

^c significant difference from URM faculty at p<0.05, one-way ANOVA, Fisher's LSD post hoc comparison

^d significant difference from tenured or TT faculty at p<0.05, independent samples t-test

Tenured and Tenure Track Faculty

Among the 1,736 respondents who participated in the survey and who provided information on their position, 568 were TT faculty. 388 provided information on gender (139 men and 249 women) and 336 provided information on race/ethnicity (272 white, 36 URM, and 48 Asian/Indian).

There were a number of questions directed only to TT faculty. The first was a series of items tapping department climate. These appear in Table 4, below. The response set for these items (and for similar items below) was 1=strongly agree, 2=agree, 3=not sure/don't know, 4=disagree, 5=strongly disagree.

Table 4. Department climate items	Sample	Gender		Race/ethnicity			Rank		
	% "Strongly agree" or "agree"	% men SA or A	% women SA or A	% white SA or A	% URM SA or A	% Asian/Indian SA or A	% Asst SA or A	% Assoc SA or A	% Full SA or A
I receive the same commendations for significant achievements as other faculty in my department. (N=456)	50.4%	63.4%	45.8% ^a	56.3%	44.5% ^b	39.3% ^b	40.9%	50.0%	57.1%
I have found a supportive environment for my academic work in my department. (N=457)	78.1%	83.5%	75.9%	80.2%	75.0%	78.5%	86.1%	75.7% ^e	75.1%
Overall, I have found a supportive environment for my academic work at Rutgers. (N=452)	72.6%	74.6%	72.7%	76.6%	77.1%	64.3%	73.9%	74.9%	69.6%
I have access to informal information networks in my department as it applies to my career advancement. (N=454)	67.8%	72.8%	66.1%	73.0%	54.2% ^b	46.4% ^b	77.4%	61.6% ^e	67.4%
My colleagues share professional information about tenure and promotion with me. (N=456)	78.1%	81.3%	76.6%	81.1%	66.7% ^b	75.0%	82.6%	76.2%	76.9%
I have been adequately mentored. (N=455)	51.2%	59.1%	47.8% ^a	53.0%	52.8%	39.3%	52.2%	54.6%	47.4%
N**	455	139	249	272	36	28	115	164	177

^a significant difference from men at p<0.05, independent samples t-test

^b significant difference from white faculty at p<0.05, one-way ANOVA, Fisher's LSD post hoc comparison

^e significant difference from assistant professors at p<0.05, one-way ANOVA, Fisher's LSD post hoc comparison

There were several significant differences between groups across these items. Specifically, women were significantly less likely than men to believe they receive equal commendations for their achievements (45.8% v. 63.4%) and to have been adequately mentored (47.8% v. 59.1%). URM and Asian/Indian faculty were less likely than their white counterparts (44.5%, 39.3% and 56.3%, respectively) to believe they receive equal commendations, or that they have access to informal information networks that assist with career advancement (73.0% of white faculty believe they have access, versus only 54.2% of URM faculty and 46.4% of Asian/Indian faculty). Similarly, URM faculty were less likely than white faculty to perceive that their colleagues share information about promotion and tenure. There were two differences by rank. Associate professors were less likely than assistant professors (75.7% v 86.1%) to perceive a supportive environment for their academic work in their departments or to believe they have access to informal information networks (61.6% v. 77.4%).

There were three items tapping respondents' comparisons of their own promotions and salaries to those of their colleagues in their departments and schools, and one item asking whether respondents believe that merit-based salary increases are awarded with considerations for equity. There were significant gender (but not race/ethnicity or rank) differences on all four of these items. Women (48.2%) were less likely than men (63.0%) to perceive that "My promotions have

been comparable with my school-level colleagues at similar stages of professional development.” Women were also more likely than men to perceive that their salaries are lower or significantly lower than colleagues of similar rank in their departments (47.5% v. 35.2%) and schools (56.0% to 42.1%), and less likely than men to believe merit salary increases consider equity (61.8% v. 71.7%).

Three items focused on outside offers – whether a respondent had received an offer, whether Rutgers responded with a counteroffer, and how satisfied the respondent was with the counteroffer. All of these respondents remained at Rutgers, obviously, so these responses should be interpreted in that light. Assistant and associate professors were less likely than full professors to have received offers (24.0%, 36.4% and 51.5%, respectively). Only 21.4% of Asian/Indian faculty reported receiving offers, versus 40.7% of white faculty and 41.7% of URM faculty. There were no significant differences by gender. For those who received offers (N=166), there were differences in reporting counteroffers by both race/ethnicity and rank (though not gender). URM faculty (86.7%) were significantly more likely than white faculty (51.9%) to report that they received counteroffers (the number of Asian/Indian faculty was too small for comparison). Similarly, associate professors (72.2%) and full professors (52.4%) were significantly more likely than assistants (28.0%) to report counteroffers. For those who received offers, there was no difference in levels of satisfaction between groups – 76.0% strongly agreed or agreed that the counteroffer was competitive.

There were several diversity-related items focusing on hiring and promotion, curriculum, and work with disadvantaged groups, all of which exhibited significant differences by gender and race/ethnicity, but not rank. Respondents were asked in two items whether their departments support female faculty and faculty of color in hiring and promotion. On the item concerning female faculty there were differences by gender and race/ethnicity; women were significantly less likely to believe this than men (77.8% v. 89.8%), and URM faculty less likely than white or Asian/Indian faculty (66.7% v. 84.7% for whites, 82.1% for Asian/Indian faculty). On the item about support for hiring faculty of color, URM faculty (55.3%) were significantly less likely than their white counterparts (70.0%) to perceive such support.

Two items on curriculum asked respondents whether their department’s curriculum is conscious and inclusive of gender and of race. There were no significant differences on the gender item. On the race item, URM faculty were significantly less likely than white faculty to see their curriculum as inclusive (70.6% v. 87.2% of white faculty, 75.0% of Asian/Indian faculty). Finally, respondents were asked whether “at least a portion of my work involves public engagement with socially disadvantaged groups,” and whether this engagement is valued in tenure and promotion decisions. Women (58.2%) were more likely than men (44.5%) to say their work involves social disadvantaged groups. URM faculty (69.4%) were also significantly more likely than Asian/Indian faculty (42.9%) to answer “yes” to this question (53.1% of white faculty also answered “yes”). Though the sample size is small (N=191), about 60% of those who do this work agree that it is valued.

The final items in this section were a series of questions about various aspects of service asking respondents whether they perceive that men do more, women do more, or that service is divided

equally. These items appear in Table 5. There were significant group differences for gender in all seven items. In every instance, women were significantly less likely than men to believe that service is divided equally. There is one difference by race/ethnicity – URM faculty were less likely than white faculty to believe men and women do equal administrative service.

Table 5. Division of service	Sample			Gender		Race/ethnicity		
	% Equal	% men more	% women more	% men "Men and women equally"	% women "Men and women equally"	% white "Men and women equally"	% URM "Men and women equally"	% Asian/Indian "Men and women equally"
Do male and female faculty in my department do an equal share of service in relation to: - Student service (N=364)	58.8%	2.0%	39.2%	81%	45.5%**	57%	47%	70%
Administrative service	53.1%	9.3%	37.7%	78%	38.7%**	54%	36.1% ^b	56%
Diversity service	56.7%	1.3%	42.0%	76%	45.6%**	54%	53%	70%
Community service	64.6%	2.4%	33.0%	87%	51.2%**	65%	59%	58%
University service	65.6%	7.3%	27.1%	85%	53.7%**	66%	50%	70%
Department service	59.8%	4.7%	35.5%	84%	45.5%**	60%	52%	59%
Extension service	76.0%	4.2%	19.8%	94%	64.9%**	76%	38%	83%
N**	403	403	403	133	231	255	34	27

^a significant difference from men at p<0.05, independent samples t-test

^b significant difference from white faculty at p<0.05, one-way ANOVA, Fisher's LSD post hoc comparison

Non-Tenure Track Faculty

Among the 1,736 respondents who participated in the survey and who provided information on their position, 276 were NTT faculty. 186 provided information on gender (60 men and 126 women) and 161 provided information on race/ethnicity (130 white, 17 URM, and 14 Asian/Indian).

There were a number of climate-related questions asked of NTT faculty. These appear in Table 6. There were no significant differences by race/ethnicity on these items (though sample sizes for URM and Asian/Indian NTTs are very small), but there were several by gender. On every item, with the exception of the question on having asked for a TT position, women were less positive than men.

Like TT faculty, NTT faculty were asked about their salaries compared to similar others in their department and school, whether they had received an offer from another university, whether Rutgers had responded, and how happy they were with the counteroffer. Women were more likely than men to believe that their salaries were lower or significantly lower in their departments (41.8% v. 24.5%) and schools (55.3% v. 18.4%). There were no significant group differences on the other items. About 17% of NTTs had received outside offers, 47% had gotten counteroffers, and 53% perceived the offer to be competitive.

Table 6. NTT Climate items

	Sample	Gender		Race/ethnicity		
	% "Strongly agree" or "agree"	% men SA or A	% women SA or A	% white SA or A	% URM SA or A	% Asian/Indian SA or A
In hiring and promotion, my colleagues in my department support female NTT faculty. (N = 222)	66.8%	70.0%	60.0%* ^a	63.5%	64.7%	57.1%
In hiring and promotion, my colleagues in my department support NTT faculty of color. (N=221)	51.1%	60.3%	42.0%* ^a	48.1%	47.0%	50.0%
Merit increases were awarded to NTT faculty in my department per the language in our last Union contract. (N=225)	51.4%	56.7%	47.2%* ^a	53.3%	29.4%	57.1%
I am invited to participate in faculty meetings in my department. (N=225)	77.1%	90.0%	70.6%* ^a	75.4%	76.5%	71.4%
I have found a supportive environment for my academic work in my department. (N=225)	73.8%	86.5%	67.2%* ^a	76.0%	64.7%	85.7%
I have found a supportive environment for my academic work at Rutgers. (N=221)	64.7%	81.4%	54.8%* ^a	68.0%	52.9%	57.1%
My promotions in my department have been comparable with my school-level colleagues at similar stages of professional development. (N=223)	30.3%	42.4%	21.5%* ^a	28.7%	29.4%	28.5%
I have been adequately mentored in my department. (N=222)	50.9%	64.4%	42.7%* ^a	48.8%	52.8%	78.5%
I have sought a tenure-track position in my department and found the dean's office to be receptive to my proposal. (N=192)	3.7%	7.2%	1.9%	3.6%	0.0%	7.7%
N**	225	60	125	129	17	14

^a significant difference from men at p<0.05, independent samples t-test

Part-time Lecturers

Among the 1,736 respondents who participated in the survey and who provided information on their position, 557 were PTLs. 414 provided information on gender (174 men and 240 women) and 340 provided information on race/ethnicity (238 white, 62 URM, and 40 Asian/Indian).

PTLs also answered climate-related questions. These items are in Table 7. There were two significant gender differences on these items. Women were less likely than men to feel respected by their dean (49.4% v. 60.4%), and less likely to feel supported overall (61.9% v. 73.6%). Significant differences by race/ethnicity appear for every item and all reflect more positive perceptions by URM PTL faculty as compared to their white (and in some cases Asian/Indian) counterparts.

There were also several items about working conditions, but few differences by gender or race/ethnicity. About 63% of PTLs would like NTT positions, and 87% would prefer long-term contracts. URM PTLs (57.6%) were significantly more likely than white (42.9%) or Asian/Indian (46.0%) PTLs to want TT positions. Only 32% of PTLs report being assigned teaching assistants or graders in large enrollment courses, and fewer than 3% report being paid for work outside their regular coursework (writing letters, supervising student work, etc.).

Table 7. PTL Climate items

	Sample	Gender		Race/ethnicity		
	% "Strongly agree" or "agree"	% men SA or A	% women SA or A	% white SA or A	% URM SA or A	% Asian/Indian SA or A
I am treated with respect by faculty in my department. (N=470)	79.4%	79.2%	78.6%	78.9%* ^c	88.7%	70.0%* ^c
I am treated with respect by the dean's office at my school. (N=468)	53.8%	60.4%	49.4%* ^a	48.7%	72.6%* ^b	57.5%
I have found a supportive environment for my academic work in my department. (N=468)	60.3%	59.2%	60.1%	56.5%* ^c	72.6%	50.0%* ^c
I have found a supportive environment for my academic work at Rutgers. (N=463)	49.9%	49.1%	49.4%	42.4%	71.0%* ^b	51.2%
Overall, I have been adequately supported. (N=469)	67.2%	73.6%	61.9%* ^a	65.4%* ^c	79.0%	57.5%* ^c
N**	470	173	239	237	62	40

^a significant difference from men at p<0.05, independent samples t-test

^b significant difference from white faculty at p<0.05, one-way ANOVA, Fisher's LSD post hoc comparison

^c significant difference from URM faculty at p<0.05, one-way ANOVA, Fisher's LSD post hoc comparison

There were also several items about working conditions, but few differences by gender or race/ethnicity. About 63% of PTLs would like NTT positions, and 87% would prefer long-term contracts. URM PTLs (57.6%) were significantly more likely than white (42.9%) or Asian/Indian (46.0%) PTLs to want TT positions. Only 32% of PTLs report being assigned teaching assistants or graders in large enrollment courses, and fewer than 3% report being paid for work outside their regular coursework (writing letters, supervising student work, etc.).

There were two other significant differences in this section of the survey, both by race/ethnicity, and both again reflect more positive perceptions for URM PTLs. URM respondents (59.3%) were more likely to believe there is opportunity to advance their careers at Rutgers than white (25.4%) and Asian/Indian (33.3%) PTL's. URM respondents were also more likely to perceive that they are equally likely to be assigned to large-enrollment undergraduate courses when compared to their full-time colleagues (82.8% v. 65.4%; 66.7% of Asian/Indian faculty gave the same answer).

The significantly more positive perceptions expressed by URM PTL faculty are unanticipated, particularly given the findings in the rest of the survey. Further analysis revealed that a disproportionate number of URM PTL's in the sample – about 25% - teach in the School of Social Work. There is no similar concentration of white or Asian/Indian PTLs in any department or School. Hence the very positive evaluations reported by URM PTLs are likely due to their particular experiences in Social Work.

Graduate/Teaching Assistants

Among the 1,736 respondents who participated in the survey and who provided information on their position, 335 were TAs or GAs. 239 provided information on gender (81 men and 158

women) and 200 provided information on race/ethnicity (124 white, 28 URM, and 48 Asian/Indian).

GA/TA respondents were also asked a number of climate-related questions. These items are listed in Table 8. There were two one significant group differences. One appears in the item asking whether the respondent perceive their department “shows an active commitment to graduate student diversity.” Women (58.2%) were less likely to believe this than men (72.9%). The other appears in the item on mentoring. Asian/Indian students (51.3%) were significantly less likely to believe they have been adequately mentored than their URM (71.4%) counterparts (70.9% of white students agreed).

Table 8. GA/TA Climate items	Sample	Gender		Race/ethnicity		
	% "Strongly agree" or "agree"	% men SA or A	% women SA or A	% white SA or A	% URM SA or A	% Asian/Indian SA or A
My department shows active commitment to graduate student diversity. (N=263)	65.0%	72.9%	58.2%* ^a	62.1%	67.8%	60.3%
I am treated with respect by my advisor. (N=263)	91.3%	83.2%	91.7%	91.9%	96.4%	89.6%
I receive the same commendations for significant achievements as other TA/GAs in my department and my accomplishments are highlighted in ways similar to others. (N=263)	62.0%	61.7%	60.7%	66.1%	60.8%	64.6%
I have found a supportive environment for my academic work in my department. (N=263)	83.3%	88.9%	79.7%	79.8%	92.9%	85.5%
I have found a supportive environment for my academic work at Rutgers. (N=263)	74.5%	80.3%	70.9%	77.5%	71.4%	68.8%
I have been adequately mentored. (N=263)	68.4%	66.6%	67.7%	70.9%	71.4%	51.3%* ^c
I am treated with respect by faculty in my department. (N=261)	91.2%	90.1%	91.1%	91.1%	96.3%	89.6%
N**	263	65	122	95	24	37

^a significant difference from men at p<0.05, independent samples t-test

^c significant difference from URM faculty at p<0.05, one-way ANOVA, Fisher's LSD post hoc comparison

Conclusions

This is a complex set of results that defies any simple summary. There were many items on which there were relatively high levels of satisfaction. For example, upwards of 70% of TT faculty and GA/TAs perceived a supportive environment for their academic work in their departments and at Rutgers; the same was true for half of NTTs and PTLs.

Differences between groups of faculty were concentrated in two areas: discrimination/diversity and working conditions. In general, both women and URM faculty experienced more discrimination; they were more likely to directly experience racism or sexism or to have witnessed discrimination. Women and URM faculty were less likely to believe their departments supports women and faculty of color in hiring and promotion or that their department's curriculum is attentive to race.

Women and URM faculty (and in some cases, Asian/Indian) faculty also perceived their working conditions more negatively – with salaries lower and promotions slower than comparable peers and less access to informal networks and mentoring. TT women in particular identified unequal

service burdens as an issue in their departments, NTT women reported consistently more negative perceptions of their departments than their male counterparts.

Though the response rate for this survey, 23%, is not outside the norm for internet surveys, it is probable that non-response was not random. Those most fearful of being identified by providing demographic information likely did not respond, which could mean these the group differences reported here are conservative. It could also be the case that those least satisfied with their working conditions were more likely to respond, which would have magnified differences between groups. It is probable that both were the case to some degree. It is worth noting, however, that the patterns of difference reported here mirror those in other faculty climate surveys conducted at other universities.