Executive Summary

Faculty turnover can have significant costs for a university and in extreme cases, may reflect systematic problems. For these reasons, Penn State regularly collects interview and survey data from departing tenured and tenure-track faculty members. This report summarizes the data for fiscal years 2013/14 and 2014/15. Faculty members’ impressions and experiences are very personal and contextualized and these findings are based on a small number of data points (28 surveys and 29 interviews), so generalizations must be made with extreme caution.

Key findings:

- Departing faculty are generally satisfied with their Penn State experiences.
- Faculty are most satisfied with the quality of library facilities, employee benefits, and their professional autonomy.
- Retiring faculty intend to keep their connections with the University and would like to see this encouraged and supported.
- Faculty were least satisfied with the University’s commitment to their field of study, rewards for outreach, tolerance of ethnic and cultural diversity, and spousal employment opportunities.
- Departing faculty members were split in their opinions on whether Penn State was generally moving in the right direction, their workload compared to peers, the level of support they received, and the fairness of salary increases relative to performance.
- The Sandusky scandal and its aftermath appear to continue to have some effect on faculty morale.
- Faculty benefits and health care received the highest ratings of importance.

Arguably, issues that deserve the most attention are those that faculty rate as highly important but with which they have low satisfaction. In general, faculty members rated most items as highly important. The areas of highest concern were adequate time for research and health care. Fortunately, faculty are highly satisfied with most aspects of their Penn State experience, meaning that “low satisfaction” in this context was a mean rating higher than “3” on a 5-pt. scale, with “5” being the highest level of satisfaction.

Faculty members who are departing due to a tenure denial or negative tenure expectations are underrepresented in the data and should be particularly encouraged to participate in the future.
Introduction

Since 1998, the Vice Provost for Academic Affairs has led an effort to offer every tenured and tenure-track faculty member leaving the University the opportunity to participate in an exit survey and an exit interview. This is done in conjunction with deans and chancellors at Penn State. Faculty turnover is an area of critical concern for all universities. While turnover has some positive aspects, such as allowing opportunities for professional growth and bringing fresh ideas and approaches into academic communities, it also has significant costs. “The costs of turnover; such as subsequent recruiting expenses, disruptions of course offerings, discontinuities in departmental and student planning, and loss of graduate student advisors, are borne at the individual, departmental and institutional levels” (Zhou & Volkwein, 2004). Further, in extreme cases, unusual levels of turnover may reflect serious problems at the program, college, or even institutional level. The goal of this study is to better understand the experiences of tenure-track faculty members at Penn State so that we may respond to faculty concerns. This report summarizes the interview and survey responses over the last two fiscal years (2013/14 and 2014/15).

Review of the Literature

The literature on academic work applies a variety of theoretical frameworks to the exploration of the influences on faculty careers including demographic characteristics, resources, job satisfaction, work-life balance, work environment, and compensation. Across these studies, one thing remains consistent – that the interplay between these many influences is complex and often difficult to interpret. Following is a brief overview of some of the major work in this area.

Reasons for Departure

While the literature is not robust in the area of faculty departure, there have been several rigorous explorations of this issue in the past decades. The factors that influence departure are diverse and numerous, but a number of studies attempt to explore their breadth in order to identify the most salient. In 1992, Moore and Gardner surveyed the faculty at Michigan State University and found that the top five reasons for leaving were: availability of research funds, research opportunities, reputation of the department, departmental leadership, and salary. These reasons differed from Schuster and Wheeler’s (1990) findings, which suggested eight contributors to faculty departure. In order, these were: deteriorating working conditions; compensation; weak labor markets; conflicting expectations; aging, tenured faculty members; shifting values; compressed career ladders; and faculty morale.

Satisfaction

The research literature suggests that the significance of faculty job satisfaction should not be underestimated (Daly & Dee, 2006; Smart, 1990). Low job satisfaction can imply that a faculty member has not been able to meet institutional expectations and is in the process of disaffiliating from the institution (Moore & Gardner, 1992). There are many factors that contribute to the latent concept of satisfaction, and one could argue that almost every aspect of faculty departure in the following paragraphs contributes directly or indirectly to a faculty member’s feeling of satisfaction. Hagedorn (2000) posited that life events (“triggers”) such as the birth of a child or a change in rank or tenure interact with variables

---

1 In the context of this report, the term “dean” includes the Vice President for Commonwealth Campuses who provides academic leadership on curricular matters and promotion and tenure for the 14 campuses that do not have college status, and “chancellor” for the five campus colleges (Abington, Altoona, Behrend, Berks, and Harrisburg).
such as academic work; salary; relationships with students, peers, and administrators; and institutional climate and culture, to affect satisfaction. In two separate national studies, Zhou and Volkwein (2004) and Rosser (2004) explored multiple aspects of faculty satisfaction and concluded that it was an important predictor of faculty intention to depart. Caplow and McGee (1958), in their seminal piece on faculty mobility, contended that faculty members are more likely to seek out and respond to outside offers because of dissatisfaction with their present employment situation than they are to be enticed to leave simply by better situations. This finding is similar to those of Toombs and Marlier (1981) and Gartshore, Hibbard, and Stockard (1983).

**Work Environment**

Both Matier (1990) and Moore and Gardner (1992) posited that work environment is an important issue for faculty members and a critical dimension in a faculty member’s final decision to leave. Metrics for work environment vary from study to study, but the construct is generally divided into the internal and external environment, where the internal focuses on working conditions as well as intangible and tangible benefits of the job, and the external is related to the labor market, quality of life, and family issues. Aspects of work environment found to be related to departure include workplace stress (Ryan, Healy & Sullivan, 2011), lack of faculty autonomy (Daly & Dee, 2006; Smart, 1990), and lack of communication (Daly & Dee, 2006).

**Workload and Support**

A number of aspects of workload, including the human and financial resources to support professional work, are related to faculty departure. Daly and Dee (2006) found that the feelings of not having enough time to get everything done, having to work very fast, and that workload is too heavy are negatively correlated with intent to stay. Further, they found that feelings of role conflict such as between teaching and research were also negatively related to intention to stay. Rosser (2004) explored faculty perceptions of support for their work and concluded that technical support, administrative support, and support for professional development were important in faculty retention.

**Compensation**

While the literature is not consistent in its findings on the relationship between faculty salaries, satisfaction, and departure, a number of studies (Gill, 1992; Ryan, Healy & Sullivan, 2011; and Zhou & Volkwein, 2004) have found that in addition to working conditions, salary is also important to faculty members. Daly and Dee (2006) argued that distributive justice, the belief that rewards and salary are equitable, was positively related to intent to stay, but some research suggests that the importance of compensation may vary by faculty rank (Ehrenberg, Kasper, & Rees, 1989).

**The Influence of Rank and Seniority**

Seniority and academic rank may mediate the influence of many factors on faculty satisfaction and intention to depart (Hagedorn, 2000; Zhou & Volkwein, 2004). Moore and Gardner (1992) found that the most dissatisfaction over support services was expressed by associate professors. They also found that assistant and associate professors were more interested in leaving than professors and that assistant professors who held administrative positions expressed dissatisfaction with most aspects of their careers. Perhaps most interestingly, Moore and Gardner (1992) reported that satisfaction ebbs and flows numerous times over the span of a faculty career.
Other differences by faculty rank are noteworthy. Ehrenberg et al. (1989) found that higher compensation levels did increase the retention of assistant and associate professors, but had no effect on retaining professors. Matier (1990) found that assistant professors and professors, generally males, that were involved in research were the most likely to seek outside employment offers.

**Gender**

A literature on the differences between male and female college faculty members has been emerging for several decades. In short, the findings are mixed. There exist gender-related differences, but the similarities are greater than the differences and over-simplifications are risky. This is illustrated by several thorough and rigorous studies, using complex theoretical frameworks and multivariate analytic methods, and nationally representative data. For example, a 2008 analysis found that multiple and diverse characteristics of faculty members (such as discipline, race, gender, and disability status) affected job satisfaction. In general, that analysis suggested that female faculty members were less satisfied with most dimensions of their jobs than were their male peers (Siebert & Umbach, 2008). However, those researchers also emphasized that their results were complex (noting, for example, that women in disciplines where faculty members produce a large number of articles were more satisfied with all of the dimensions of work examined in the study). Another 2008 study examined gender disparities in attrition and turnover intentions for faculty members in science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM) disciplines (Xu, 2008). Women faculty members in these fields were significantly more likely to change positions within academia and their turnover intentions were more highly correlated than those of men with dissatisfaction with research support and perceived advancement opportunities. However, women and men did not differ in their intentions to depart from academia, and both genders were equally committed to their academic careers in STEM fields.

Other studies have been more focused on particular aspects of the faculty experience. A study of 320 faculty members at 10 business schools found that the determinants of faculty perceptions of rewards for research productivity were largely similar across demographic groups and that the differences were mostly related to seniority (tenure status and rank), but that there were some gender-related differences as well (Chen, Gupta, & Hoshower, 2004). In that study, female faculty members placed somewhat greater emphasis than their male colleagues on what the authors termed intrinsic rewards, such as peer recognition and respect, than on extrinsic rewards, such as receiving tenure, promotion, or salary raises. A study on determinants of job satisfaction among faculty members at one private research university suggested that the factors are more similar than different for men and women—but that women's job satisfaction derived more from their perceptions of relational support, while men's job satisfaction resulted about equally from perceived relational support and the perceived availability of academic resources (Billmoria, et al., 2006). In a related finding, Moore and Gardner (1992) reported that female faculty members were more dissatisfied than men with work load, assignment mix, support services, and time available to conduct research, and that women, at all ranks, were more likely to be interested in leaving.

In regards to departure, Tamada and Inman (1997) found that male and female faculty members have the same rates of retention. Likewise, Brown and Woodbury (1995) found that tenure-track women separate at the same rate as tenure-track men. In contrast, Honeyman and Summers (1994) reported that women left their faculty positions in disproportionately high numbers in comparison to their male counterparts. At Penn State and its American Association of Universities peers, women receive tenure at a lower rate.
than men, but disparities in tenure rates may also be attributed to disciplinary differences (Penn State, 2015b).

Of course, there are potentially many explanations for the differences in career experiences between male and female faculty members. Moore and Gardner (1992) offered one in reporting that female faculty members are more likely to be in a dual career relationship (86% of women compared to 69% of men). And the literature is bringing more attention to issues around the intersection of gender, family responsibilities, and academic careers. Articles in *Academe* on “Do Babies Matter?” (Mason & Goulden, 2002; Mason & Goulden, 2004) and the “Bias Against Caregiving” (Drago, Colbeck, Stauffer, Pirretti, Burkum, Fazioli, Lazaro, & Habasevich, 2005) are finding evidence that babies and caregiving do matter and appear to have negative impacts on career progress for younger faculty members. As reported in the *Chronicle of Higher Education* (Wilson, 2006), there is also evidence of a possible tenure-rate gap affecting female faculty members in particular, as well as (to a lesser extent) minority faculty members (Dooris & Guidos, 2006).

**Methods**

We use two mechanisms of data collection for the Faculty Exit Study: surveys and personal interviews. For the interviews, each college or tenure-granting unit within the University appoints an individual to serve as that unit’s Exit Interview Officer. This role is commonly filled by a recently retired faculty member from the unit. Appendix A provides a listing of the Exit Interview Officers for 2013-2015. When alerted by a local Human Resources representative of the upcoming departure of a tenured or tenure-track faculty member, the Exit Interview Officer is responsible for contacting the exiting faculty member to arrange for the interview, conducting the interview, and submitting a written summary of the individual interview—with the exiting faculty member’s permission—both to the appropriate dean or chancellor and to the Office of the Provost. Exiting faculty members may choose whether or not to have their name appended to the report.

Interview responses are read and analyzed by an analyst in the Office of Planning and Institutional Assessment. A coding scheme reflecting both initial conceptions of key topics, and a more inductive, dynamic development of codes throughout the process, is used to analyze the data. The analysis follows a well-established inductive methodology for qualitative data analysis (for example, Miles & Huberman, 1994).

In addition to the interview, exiting faculty members are offered an opportunity to complete the Faculty Exit Survey. Two modes of the instrument are available: a paper version and a Web-based version. The survey questionnaire contains 45 items reflecting various facets of the faculty work environment. Respondents are asked to indicate their degree of satisfaction and also the level of importance they place on each item (detailed results for these items are included in Appendices B and C). Each item is rated on a five-point, ordinal scale. The survey questionnaire also includes a series of multiple choice and short answer questions addressing faculty members’ experiences at Penn State. Completed surveys are returned to the Office of Planning and Institutional Assessment where they are analyzed.

We believe that having two feedback mechanisms is valuable. The interview provides an opportunity for the exiting faculty member to communicate their opinions—at least indirectly—to their dean and chancellors. The interview summaries provide for a rich source of detailed qualitative data from which to gain insight. The survey provides the exiting faculty member with a convenient and anonymous
mechanism by which to express their opinion. The survey also provides a consistent, quantitative data source, which allows us to make cross-group and longitudinal comparisons.

**Results**

University Human Resources data indicates that 187 tenured or tenure-track faculty members exited the University during fiscal years 2013/14 and 2014/15. In any given year, some faculty members decline to participate in the survey while agreeing to be interviewed, and vice versa. Also, in a typical year some faculty members cannot be contacted and others simply state that they do not wish to participate in any way. The overall response rate is impossible to determine as a faculty member may participate in either the interview or the survey or both. Confidentiality among the survey responses and interview respondents further complicates the ability to develop a distinct count of responses across both instruments. Our data set for this analysis consists of 28 responses to the Faculty Exit Survey and 29 responses to the Faculty Exit Interview, yielding a 15% response rate for the survey and 16% for the interviews.

The 57 combined interview and survey responses, which likely include some individuals who are represented in both modes, for 2013/14 and 2014/15 include 29 responses (50%) that we could identify as leaving due to retirement, 20 (35%) leaving for a more attractive position elsewhere, 2 (4%) leaving due to a tenure denial, 1 (2%) counseled out, and 5 (9%) leaving for another or undetermined reason. Among those individuals leaving for other positions or for a reason other than tenure denial, being counseled out, or retirement, we were able to identify 18 interview respondents who indicated whether they had sought the position or they had been approached. Slightly more respondents indicated having sought the position (10 respondents) than reported having been approached (8 respondents).

The limited ability to differentiate survey and interview results between, for example, retirees and tenure denials has been, and remains, a limiting aspect of this project. The problem is similar for both interview and survey respondents, but it is easiest to see in the survey results. Of the 471 survey records for the eighteen years in aggregate, 214 faculty members (45%) report leaving for retirement, 156 (33%) for a more attractive position elsewhere, and only 22 (5%) because they were denied tenure or were counseled out. On the other hand, it is reliably known from other studies that about 58% of entrants to the tenure process at Penn State will ultimately receive tenure—so about 42% of the entrants to the tenure track leave, on average, without tenure (Penn State, 2015c). Although pre-tenured faculty make up only a portion of all exiting faculty, these numbers suggest substantial non-response bias in the survey and interview data. This may also indicate that a number of respondents who indicated leaving for a more attractive position were not anticipating a positive tenure outcome.

The Faculty Exit Study is a University-wide initiative and departing tenured and tenure-track faculty members at all Penn State campuses are invited to participate. University Park is Penn State’s largest campus and also the administrative hub of the University. Nearly 61% of the entire tenured and tenure-track faculty are located at the University Park campus (Penn State, 2015b). The variation in size among Penn State’s other campuses combined with the variation in response rate among those campuses makes individual campus comparisons impossible. However, the 2013-2015 responses do seem to be consistent with the proportion of faculty members between the University Park campus and Penn State’s other campuses in aggregate. We were able to identify 14 interview respondents and 13 survey respondents
from Penn State’s University Park campus and 15 interview respondents and 15 survey respondents from
Penn State’s other campuses.

Males made up the majority of responses with 14 interview responses and 18 survey responses. Females
provided 9 interviews and 5 survey responses (gender was not provided in all surveys and interview
notes). Men were slightly underrepresented (61%) among interview respondents and overrepresented
(78%) in the survey data when compared to the ratio among Penn State faculty overall, where males make
up 67% of the full-time, tenured and tenure-track faculty (Penn State, 2014).

**Generally Satisfied**

Generally speaking, faculty members leaving Penn State continue to be satisfied with their experience at
the University. Individuals leaving for other positions or for reasons other than retirement, tenure denial,
or being counseled out were asked explicitly during their interview if they were generally satisfied with
their experience at Penn State and other individuals offered comments that reflected their opinion of
their experience at Penn State even if not explicitly asked this question. We identified 11 interview
respondents who indicated that they were generally satisfied and five interview respondents who were
not generally satisfied.

The survey responses reflect similar opinions. Sixty-one percent of survey respondents indicated that they
felt they were treated fairly by the University, their college, and/or their department. Those who indicated
that they did not feel they were treated fairly commented on issues related to favoritism, salary equity,
poor departmental leadership, biased treatment, and lack of support for dual-career couples. Among the
45 items rated for satisfaction, there were 28 items for which the most frequent response was the highest
or next to the highest rating. The table in Appendix B provides the distribution of satisfaction ratings for
each of the 45 rated items on the survey questionnaire.

There were 17 items for which more than one-half of the respondents indicated the highest or next to
highest rating for satisfaction. Based on this measure, the items with which the faculty appears to be most
satisfied are:

- Quality of library facilities (89%);
- Employee benefits (71%);
- Professional autonomy (courses, research projects, service...) (68%);
- Rewards for research at the University (64%);
- Your course teaching assignments (64%);
- Quality of the local school system (64%);
- Recreational opportunities (64%);
- Opportunities to participate in departmental governance (61%);
- Opportunities to communicate with department leadership (61%);
- An academically strong department (re: disciplinary peers) (57%);
- Quality of computing facilities (57%);
- Formal recognition (such as University and college awards) (54%);
- Health care (54%);
- Your advising assignments (54%);
• Level of annual salary (54%);
• Professional development support (such as funds for conferences) (54%); and
• University services to support instructional development (54%).

This list of high satisfaction items is consistent with that reported in 2013. New entries are rewards for research, level of annual salary, and professional development support. Internal service assignments, informal recognition by colleagues, healthy social climate within the department, availability of cultural events, and social opportunities in the local community dropped off the list in the current analysis.

Demonstrating this general satisfaction, the vast majority of retirees (11 of 13) interviewed expressed their intention to maintain their relationship with the University. In general, retirees noted their desire to finish up various projects (e.g., research, student advising), to continue to take advantage of University resources such as the library, to attend University events, and to maintain connections with colleagues. Some respondents indicated a desire to remain involved, but an uncertainty about what that would look like, and others noted ways in which the University could do a better job of supporting retirees’ involvement. For example, one respondent reflected, “I would like to keep a connection. Retired faculty are a great resource and should be encouraged to come back and teach occasionally. There is an endowment for this, but it could be more widely publicized.”

**Room for Improvement**

Although satisfaction was positively skewed for almost every survey item, it is worthwhile to review the areas in which faculty showed the lowest levels of satisfaction. Several items in particular stand out. There were four areas in which at least one-third of faculty reported the lowest or second-lowest satisfaction rating: the University’s commitment to your field of study, rewards for outreach, tolerance of ethnic and cultural diversity, and spousal employment.

**University’s Commitment to your Field of Study**

Respondents were evenly divided in their satisfaction with the University’s commitment to their field of study – 39% gave it the two lowest ratings and 39% gave it the two highest. These findings illustrate a decline in satisfaction from 2013, when 28% gave it the lowest rating and 49% gave it the highest.

**Rewards for Outreach at the University**

As in previous years, faculty remain dissatisfied with rewards for outreach at the University. Over one-third (36%) of the respondents rated this item at the mid-point and 37% indicated the lowest or next to lowest rating for their satisfaction in this area.

**Tolerance of Ethnic and Cultural Diversity**

Two-thirds (36%) of respondents, up from 25% in 2013, were dissatisfied with tolerance of ethnic and cultural diversity. On a related item, 32% reported the lowest levels of satisfaction with a diverse population; this is an improvement over 2013, when 40% of respondents did so. Despite these findings, nearly two-thirds of respondents (64%) indicated that they were satisfied with the University’s efforts on behalf of racial/ethnic and gender diversity.
Spousal Employment Opportunities

Spousal employment opportunities also continue to be the lowest area of faculty satisfaction. Thirty-two percent of respondents gave it the lowest rating for satisfaction. In the interviews some faculty felt that there was an awareness of this issue, but that little or nothing was done to address it. One departing faculty member noted, “Yes, this is one of the primary reasons I am leaving. My wife did have another position [far away] but nothing was done to address our split living arrangement. Much more could have been done to address or at least to acknowledge the situation.”

Faculty Work Environment

As discussed earlier, the research literature indicates that the faculty work environment can play a significant role in a faculty member’s decision to exit from the institution. We explore some aspects of this environment here.

University Direction

Retirees were asked in their interview whether they felt Penn State is moving in the right direction. The responses were split with 12 affirmative responses and eight negative ones. Comments from those respondents who felt Penn State was not moving in the right direction mentioned concerns about the rapid growth of the University in recent years, lack of support for teaching, weak faculty governance, emphasis on quantity over quality, and overreliance on technology. In reflecting on this question, one respondent noted, “We are training more and more students to become adjunct appointments.”

Many respondents who indicated that they believed the University was moving in the right direction noted new leadership at the unit and University levels. Respondents from some of the larger campuses (e.g., Altoona and Harrisburg) indicated that they saw positive changes at their campuses. Improvements in overall quality and reputation were also noted.

Level of Assignments

Respondents had mixed opinions concerning their level of assignments compared to their peers. We identified 12 interview respondents who expressed positive statements compared to eight who expressed negative statements. Two individuals fell into both categories. Respondents commented on increasing reporting requirements, understaffing, and the impact of new initiatives on workload. The survey responses provide a slightly more positive perspective on the three related questions concerning teaching, advising, and service assignments. The percentage of respondents indicating the highest or next to highest rating for satisfaction was 39% for internal service assignments, 64% for course teaching assignments and 54% for advising assignments. Satisfaction with teaching and advising assignments is similar to 2013, but satisfaction with internal service assignments has dropped precipitously from 63% in 2013.

Level of Support

Respondents also had mixed opinions concerning the level of support they received compared to their peers. We identified 10 interview respondents who expressed positive statements concerning the level of support they received and eight interview respondents who expressed negative statements concerning the level of support. Among the areas in which faculty noted concerns were research support (at non-University Park locations), uncoordinated initiatives, pursuit of education quality, and lack of recognition for professional service. One faculty member who felt that his teaching efforts were not supported or
rewarded, noted that the message was always “research” and “you don’t get tenure from teaching.” In contrast, those who reported positive support noted friendly and professional colleagues, support for professional development, and a strong climate for research.

The survey responses were similarly mixed. The four questions on the survey most closely related to level of support are:

- Professional development support (such as funds for conferences);
- University services to support instructional development;
- University services to support grants and contracts; and
- Adequate time for research.

About half of survey respondents indicated the highest or next to the highest rating for satisfaction with professional development (54%) and instructional development (54%) support. Forty-three percent gave high satisfaction ratings for adequate time for research, but only 36% reported satisfaction with University services to support grants and contracts. In 2013, 51% were satisfied with these services.

**University Salary and Salary Increases**

As reflected in the literature, there does not appear to be a consensus around issues of salary. Faculty members’ satisfaction with the fairness of salary increases relative to performance were fairly evenly distributed across the satisfaction scale, with slightly less than one-third (32%) giving it the lowest two ratings and slightly more than one-third (36%) giving it the highest two. Salary issues did not occur frequently among the interview responses. We identified only one interview response offering comments related to salary; however four expressed disappointment related to Penn State’s unwillingness to match or surpass another offer.

**Tenure Expectations**

It was unclear in many of the interviews whether interviewees had negative expectations for tenure. Only two specifically referred to negative reviews or tenure expectations. The two items on the survey questionnaire most related to the issue of tenure expectations are validity of Penn State’s faculty performance evaluation methods and clarity of performance review processes (for P&T, salary). Survey responses on these items were mixed with 36% of respondents indicating a high degree of satisfaction with the validity of Penn State faculty performance evaluation methods and 29% indicating a low degree of satisfaction. Perceptions of the clarity of performance review processes were more positive with 43% giving this a high rating.

**Gender Issues**

As summarized in the brief literature review earlier, there is a considerable body of research on gender issues among faculty, but those findings are inconsistent. In general, there appear to be gender-related differences, but the similarities mostly outweigh the differences. Also, the literature suggests that overly simplistic interpretations can be misleading, especially because gender interacts with other factors (discipline, rank, age, and so forth) that affect faculty members’ experience and satisfaction in significant and substantive ways.
Likewise, it is risky to reach strong conclusions about gender related similarities or differences based upon the Penn State data. In addition to the interaction of gender with other variables, the Penn State data for women in particular are extremely limited. As stated earlier, there were 14 male interview respondents, 18 male survey respondents, 9 female interview respondents, and 5 female survey respondents. The low number of female participants makes interpretation of the data tenuous.

In terms of overall satisfaction scores, female survey respondents were less satisfied than their male colleagues in terms of University and college practices (2.9 compared to 3.4 on a 5-point scale), departmental life (2.6 compared to 3.7), individual considerations (3.4 compared to 3.8), and local community life (3.1 compared to 3.5). However, with only five female survey respondents, it would be unwise to generalize these findings.

Gender distinctions, however, are less clear in the more robust interview data. Overall, women reported being generally satisfied, while men were split between being satisfied and dissatisfied. None of the women interviewees explicitly discussed gender in the interviews. Women were far more likely than men to mention geography (being closer to home, spouse/partner) as an issue in their decision to depart, to feel that lack of civility was an issue with their colleagues, and discuss the effects of low morale and personnel issues. One woman asked, “How many people need to leave from a unit before someone actually wonders why?”

As in prior years, it is difficult to offer meaningful, conclusive generalizations about gender differences based on the data reviewed here. Although we focus on the differences here, it should be noted that while there may be gender equity issues embedded in the male-female differences, for the most part they are not especially explicit or apparent in the exit interview notes. If such issues are to be explored in any meaningful way, it is critical that the University find ways to encourage all exiting faculty, but particularly women, to participate in the exit interview and survey.

**Sandusky Scandal**

Nine interview respondents mentioned scandal or, specifically, the Sandusky scandal in terms of its effect on the faculty work environment. In this context, many noted a decline in morale at Penn State and the effect of scandal on the University’s reputation. One faculty member connected the scandal to declining enrollments at his campus and another faculty member commented on the increase in “red tape” and regulations that followed the scandal.

**What Matters: Faculty Ratings of Importance**

Nearly every item on the survey is important to the faculty. Of the 45 items on the questionnaire, there were 34 items for which the most frequent response was the highest rating of importance. Appendix C provides the distribution of importance ratings for each of the items on the questionnaire. There were 14 items to which more than 75% of faculty gave the highest or second highest importance rating. Based on this measure, those items that seem to be of greatest importance to the faculty are:

- Employee benefits (89%);
- Health care (89%);
- Professional autonomy (courses, research projects, service...) (86%);
- Adequate time for research (86%);
• An academically strong department (re: disciplinary peers) (86%);
• Your course teaching assignments (86%);
• Clarity of performance review processes (for P&T, salary) (82%);
• The University’s commitment to your field of study (82%);
• Salary increases that relate fairly to performance (82%);
• Professional development support (such as funds for conferences) (82%);
• Quality of library facilities (82%);
• Rewards for research at the University (79%);
• Adequate performance feedback (79%); and
• Level of annual salary (79%).

Professional development support rose in importance from 2013 when it did not make this list. Importance of rewards for teaching, opportunities to communicate with departmental leadership, balanced overall workload, validity of Penn State’s performance evaluations, healthy social climate within the department, and quality of computing facilities remained high, but declined since 2013 and were no longer ranked important enough to be included in this list.

Priority Matrix

Figure 1 plots the mean rates of importance versus satisfaction and divides the plot into four quadrants along the 4-pt. (second highest score) rating axis. Item details can be found in Appendices B and C. On average, faculty rated both their satisfaction and the importance of each item above the midpoint of the rating scales. Dividing the plot into areas of relatively high importance/high satisfaction (top right), high importance/low satisfaction (bottom right), low importance/low satisfaction (bottom left), and low importance/high satisfaction (top left) can help determine which areas need the most attention. All item descriptions, with their item number, can be found in Appendix A. Areas of high importance and high satisfaction should be monitored and maintained. Areas of high importance but low satisfaction should be prioritized for review and potential improvements. Items that were rated very high (greater than 4) in importance and relatively low (less than 4) in satisfaction were:

• 1c: Validity of Penn State’s faculty performance evaluation methods
• 1d: Clarity of performance review processes
• 1e: Rewards for research
• 1f: Rewards for teaching
• 1h: The University’s commitment to your field of study
• 2b: Balanced overall workload assignments
• 2c: Mentoring of junior faculty
• 2d: An academically strong department
• 2f: Adequate performance feedback
• 2g: Opportunities to communicate with department leadership
• 2h: Healthy social climate within the department
• 3a: Your course teaching assignments
• 3d: Professional autonomy
• 3g: Salary increases that related fairly to performance
• 3h: Level of annual salary
• 3i: Employee benefits
• 3j: Equity
• 4a: Professional development support
• 4d: Adequate time for research
• 4g: Quality of computing facilities
Employee Benefits and Health Care

Not surprisingly, given the issues surrounding benefits generally, and employee health care in particular, over the past two years, these areas were rated very high in importance by exiting faculty. More than two-thirds (68%) of survey respondents gave employee benefits the highest rating of importance and 21% gave it the next to the highest rating. Fortunately, the University appears to be performing well in this area as employee benefits was among the items rated highly for satisfaction with 71% of respondents rating their satisfaction with employee benefits as the highest rating or next to the highest rating. Health care received the same proportion of high importance ratings (highest and second highest) as benefits, however, faculty are not nearly as satisfied in that area. Only 54% gave it the two highest satisfaction ratings. In the interviews, three respondents particularly noted changes to health care benefits as an area where Penn State was performing poorly. In the context of the survey, health care is in the “Local Community Life” section. The intent of the question is focused on health care resources in the community, making it unclear if respondents are reporting on the quality of health care available in the area, or on the quality of the health care benefits provided by Penn State. Given that health care resources in the community are expanding, rather than contracting, it seems likely that the interpretation of the question may be related to concerns about health care benefits.
Professional Autonomy

Not surprisingly, given faculty culture and consistent with prior findings, professional autonomy was one of the most important items rated by faculty, with 68% giving it the highest rating and 18% giving it the second highest rating. This is consistent with Daly and Dee’s (2006) finding that a lack of faculty autonomy is related to departure. Satisfaction in this area has declined from 2013, when 77% of faculty gave it one of the two highest ratings; only 68% did so in the current analysis.

Not Everything Matters Equally

Of the 45 items on the survey, there were three areas which more than one-third of faculty gave the two lowest ratings of importance: availability of child care (43%), rewards for outreach at the University (36%), and flexibility to engage in consulting (36%). The latter two items were the only ones that received more low ratings of importance than high. The importance of child care appears to depend on faculty members’ stage of life. This item received the lowest ratings of importance from 64% of retirees and 10% of non-retirees. Sixty-two percent of non-retirees gave it the two highest ratings of importance. The disproportionate number of retirees in the survey data (57%) and among interviewees (45%) compared to the population of exiting faculty (35%) may skew the findings in other, less obvious ways.

Conclusions

The responses to the Faculty Exit Survey and Interviews over the 2013-2015 span indicate that most faculty members leaving the University are generally satisfied with their experience at Penn State. However, there are areas in which the University has room for improvement. Faculty generally see the University moving in the right direction but some express concerns about educational quality, faculty governance, and overreliance on technology. In particular, exiting faculty feel dissatisfied with the University’s commitment to their field of study, the rewards for outreach, tolerance of ethnic and cultural diversity, and spousal employment opportunities at the University. New University leadership was viewed in a positive light.

Among some of the issues that are of greatest importance to the faculty, the University generally appears to be faring well. One exception, faculty satisfaction with health care—one of the items of greatest importance to the University faculty—has decreased in recent years and should be monitored carefully given its importance to faculty.

Decreasing faculty exit interview and survey participation rates are cause for concern. The University invests heavily in recruiting and retaining faculty, and while some attrition is to be expected, the loss of productive faculty members prior to retirement is cause for concern (Penn State, 2015a). Meaningful efforts should be made to reach out to exiting faculty and to encourage them to participate in the exit process.
References


APPENDIX A: FACULTY EXIT INTERVIEW OFFICERS 2013/14 – 2014/15

Abington
Melvin C. Seesholtz
G. Steven McMillan
(Alternate)

Agricultural Sciences
Herbert Cole. Jr.

Altoona
Jeff Knapp
Kay Chick

Arts and Architecture
Donald Leslie

Beaver
Neelam Dwivedi
Keith Wilson

Berks
David Sanford

Brandywine
Cynthia Lightfoot
John Tierney

Business
Paul H. Rigby
Orie Barron

Communications
Robert D. Richards

Dickinson School of Law
Lance Cole
Thomas Place

DuBois
Jacquelyn Atkins

Earth and Mineral Sciences
Michael A. Arthur

Education
Pamela S. Wolfe

Engineering
Lynn A. Carpenter

Erie, The Behrend College
Rod Troester

Fayette, The Eberly Campus
Charles “Gib” Prettyman
JoAnn Jankoski

Great Valley
John C. Cameron

Greater Allegheny
Jay Breckenridge
Michelle Hough

Harrisburg
Linda Null
Girish Subramanian

Hazleton
Molly Wertheimer

Health and Human Development
Ingrid Blood

Hershey Medical Center/Medicine
John P. Richie, Jr.
Laura Carrell

Information Sciences and Technology
Lisa F. Lenze
Gerald Santoro

Lehigh Valley
Peter J. Behrens

Liberal Arts
James Rambeau
John H. Riew

Minority Faculty
Grace Hampton
Keith Gilyard

Mont Alto
Kevin Boon

New Kensington
Jyotsna “Josi” Kalavar

Nursing
Mona M. Counts
Carol Smith

Schuylkill
Rod M. Heisey

Science
Peter C. Jurs
Julian Maynard

Shenango
Charles Bursey
Angela Gianoglio Pettitt

University Libraries
Ann Copeland
Robert Freeborn

Wilkes-Barre
Christyne Berzsenyi

Worthington Scranton
Paul J. Perrone, Sr.

York
Lawrence R. Newcomer

For a current list of Exit Interview Officers, visit http://www.psu.edu/vpaa/exit_interview/eio_officers.htm.
# Appendix B: Distribution of Ratings for Satisfaction

Table B-1: Satisfaction with University and college practices.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>21%</th>
<th>32%</th>
<th>11%</th>
<th>21%</th>
<th>7%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities to participate in University governance.</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities to participate in college governance.</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Validity of Penn State’s faculty performance evaluation methods.</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarity of performance review processes (for P&amp;T, salary).</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rewards for research at the University.</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rewards for teaching at the University.</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rewards for outreach at the University.</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The University’s commitment to your field of study.</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal recognition (such as University and college awards).</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table B-2: Satisfaction with departmental life.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>0%</th>
<th>11%</th>
<th>25%</th>
<th>36%</th>
<th>7%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities to participate in departmental governance.</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balanced overall workload assignments in the department.</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentoring of junior faculty.</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An academically strong department (re: disciplinary peers).</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sufficient support for high quality graduate students.</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>No response</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequate performance feedback.</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>14% 29% 18%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities to communicate with department leadership.</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>11% 14% 46%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healthy social climate within the department.</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>32% 21% 14%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informal recognition by colleagues for good work.</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>32% 14% 21%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table B-3: Satisfaction with individual considerations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>No response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Your course teaching assignments.</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>14% 21% 43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your advising assignments.</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>29% 21% 32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your internal service assignments.</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>43% 14% 25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional autonomy (courses, research projects, service...)</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>14% 25% 43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal money to initiate research activities.</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>32% 18% 21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexibility to engage in consulting.</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>36% 18% 21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salary increases that relate fairly to performance.</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>25% 11% 25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of annual salary.</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>14% 32% 21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee benefits.</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>11% 36% 36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equity (ethnic, gender, age, disability, sexual orientation...)</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>21% 21% 29%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table B-4: Satisfaction with support services and resources.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service Provided</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>No response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professional development support (such as funds for conferences)</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University services to support instructional development.</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University services to support grants and contracts.</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequate time for research.</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of library facilities.</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of laboratory facilities.</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of computing facilities.</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of other facilities (parking, offices, classrooms...).</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table B-5: Satisfaction with local community life.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community Feature</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>No response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social opportunities in the local community.</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability of cultural events.</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of the local school system.</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreational opportunities.</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability of child care.</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health care.</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A diverse population.</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tolerance of ethnic and cultural diversity.</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spousal employment opportunities.</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### APPENDIX C: DISTRIBUTION OF RATINGS FOR IMPORTANCE

Table C-1: Importance of University and college practices.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>No response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities to participate in University governance.</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>36% 18% 4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities to participate in college governance.</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>18% 25% 21% 4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Validity of Penn State’s faculty performance evaluation methods.</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>18% 18% 57% 4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarity of performance review processes (for P&amp;T, salary).</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>7% 21% 61% 4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rewards for research at the University.</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>14% 18% 61% 4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rewards for teaching at the University.</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>21% 29% 43% 4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rewards for outreach at the University.</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>32% 18% 11% 4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The University's commitment to your field of study.</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>7% 25% 57% 4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal recognition (such as University and college awards).</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>32% 29% 18% 7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table C-2: Importance of departmental life.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>No response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities to participate in departmental governance.</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>11% 18% 46% 7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balanced overall workload assignments in the department.</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>7% 21% 54% 7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentoring of junior faculty.</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>7% 18% 46% 7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An academically strong department (re: disciplinary peers).</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0% 14% 71% 7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sufficient support for high quality graduate students.</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4% 11% 54% 14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequate performance feedback.</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities to communicate with department leadership.</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healthy social climate within the department.</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informal recognition by colleagues for good work.</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table C-3: Importance of individual considerations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>0%</th>
<th>4%</th>
<th>29%</th>
<th>57%</th>
<th>4%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Your course teaching assignments.</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your advising assignments.</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your internal service assignments.</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional autonomy (courses, research projects, service...).</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal money to initiate research activities.</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexibility to engage in consulting.</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salary increases that relate fairly to performance.</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of annual salary.</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee benefits.</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equity (ethnic, gender, age, disability, sexual orientation...)</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table C-4: Importance of individual considerations.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>No response</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional development support (such as funds for conferences)</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University services to support instructional development.</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University services to support grants and contracts.</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequate time for research.</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of library facilities.</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of laboratory facilities.</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of computing facilities.</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of other facilities (parking, offices, classrooms...).</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table C-5: Importance of local community life.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social opportunities in the local community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability of cultural events.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of the local school system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreational opportunities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability of child care.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health care.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A diverse population.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tolerance of ethnic and cultural diversity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spousal employment opportunities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12