

Summary – Review of the overall results of the academic faculty climate survey in November 2016 indicates several important conclusions and concerns:

- Although faculty satisfaction has significantly improved since Spring 2014, the perceived retention rate has not improved significantly, with female and non-white faculty indicating a significant increase in perceived likelihood to leave Mines in the next 3 years.
- College structure continues to be a significant concern to faculty, in both the numeric results and the written comments (which showed little support for the current college/dean structure).
- There is a high level of faculty skepticism about the value and fairness of the proposed productivity metrics.
- About two-thirds of Mines faculty report that their workloads have increased significantly over the last two years.
- More than half of the faculty are dissatisfied with the faculty evaluation process, and how it impacts salaries and P&T.
- The faculty climate survey results indicate low faculty satisfaction with salary.
- Diversity issues are very important to many Mines faculty, and is a growing area of concern. The Faculty Senate strongly recommends that further analysis of the survey results be pursued regarding diversity issues.

1. Overview of Faculty Survey: The Fall 2016 version of the faculty climate survey was given Nov. 9 – Nov. 23, 2016 as an online poll. Faculty participation was very good: 268 responses in total, though some responders did not answer all the questions. Results are broken down by various groups:

- a) Position (Tenured, Tenure-track, Teaching and Research faculty)
- b) Years of service at Mines
- c) Gender
- d) Race
- e) College

2. **Historical comparison** – Fall 2016 vs. Spring 2014:

- a. Faculty satisfaction has increased across the board. Whereas in 2014 more than a third (35%) of faculty expressed dissatisfaction with their jobs at Mines, in 2016 it has declined to 24%. Much of this improvement may be due to the leadership change. Whereas written comments in the 2014 survey overwhelmingly expressed strongly felt concerns about leadership, faculty in 2016 were more likely to express sympathy or support, and to acknowledge the change in tone on campus. For example:
 - “I see a supportive administration that is trying to enhance and sustain Mines.”
 - “I am grateful for the positive and supportive leadership on this campus. I have found that the administrators at the highest levels are personable, caring, efficient, and are doing a good job balancing competing interests on campus based on the school’s available resources and strategic goals.”
- While faculty express concerns about some decisions, especially with respect to productivity model and the college structure (see below), on the whole attitudes have improved since 2014. Overall faculty dissatisfaction decreased significantly in all groups except Teaching Faculty and CECS, which remained relatively constant with low dissatisfaction rates. No group involved in the historical comparison had a significant increase in overall dissatisfaction.
- b. Higher overall dissatisfaction rates occurred among:
 - Tenured faculty (32% very or somewhat dissatisfied),
 - Faculty with 4-9 years service at Mines (29%), and
 - Faculty in CERSE (31%).
 - c. Of special note is the very high overall dissatisfaction (43% very or somewhat dissatisfied), among those 40 respondents chose not to reveal their gender.
 - d. Faculty retention: in spite of significantly lower overall dissatisfaction, the percentage of faculty very or somewhat likely to leave Mines in the next 3 years is quite high at 41% across campus, up somewhat from 38% in Spring 2014.
 - e. Diversity retention concern: female and underrepresented faculty showed the largest increases in likelihood to leave, rising to 45% and 37% (respectively, from 34% and 25% in Spring 2014).

3. College structure:

- a. The survey does not reveal strong confidence in the current college structure, with fewer faculty expressing satisfaction with the “current college structure” (at 30%) than dissatisfaction (at 38%) (Question #17).
- b. Moreover, just 12% of faculty agree (strongly/somewhat) that “The creation of colleges has made my professional life better” (Question 14a), a slight decline of 3% since 2014, when 15% agreed. On the flip side, the intensity of dissatisfaction appears to have declined. Whereas in 2014 half of all respondents disagreed that the colleges made their lives better, 38% disagreed in 2016.
- c. The written comments reflect these sentiments, and most express reservations about the current college/dean structure. The overwhelming sentiment in these comments is that the cost/benefit ratio is unfavorable. Noted were increased bureaucracy and costs for deans and their staff, with little benefit to fundraising and easing of burdens on faculty. One representative comment: “Constant ‘run-around’ from leadership – ever evolving discussion about some new thing, workload, productivity, etc. – come up with such alarming frequency it just makes me want to get the hell out of here.”
- d. Most dissatisfied with college structure: CERSE (54% very or somewhat dissatisfied), tenured faculty (63%), faculty with 10+ years at Mines (49%) and those not stating a gender (60%).
- e. Most satisfied with college structure: CECS (43% very or somewhat satisfied), tenure-track faculty (43%) and faculty with 1-3 years at Mines (45%).
- f. CERSE faculty were especially concerned about the annual faculty review process: 42% disagreed (very or somewhat) with the statement that “The annual review process is fair”), vs. 28% among all respondents.
- g. Faculty assessment of Mines-wide decision-making process (Question 16):
 - “Decision making is efficient”: 51% strongly or somewhat disagreed, and only 13% strongly or somewhat agreed.
 - “Decision making is collaborative and transparent”: 53% strongly or somewhat disagreed, and only 19% strongly or somewhat agreed.
 - “Decision making reflects sound priorities and relevant data”: 43% strongly or somewhat disagreed, and only 19% strongly or somewhat agreed.

- h. Of the 64 written comments on the college structure, just one is unequivocally positive: “I love my department and my college.” Others expressed reservations about cost/benefit, increased bureaucracy, and confusing structure:
- “I don’t really understand the benefits of how it is set up now. Why not college of eng and college of a&s [arts and sciences]?”
 - “The colleges are an extra layer of needless bureaucracy wasting more than a million dollars per year.”
 - “Colleges have removed some of the effectiveness of the departments. I don’t see benefit at this point of the college structure compared to the cost.”
 - “expensive and serves little purpose”
 - “only adds bureaucracy, no efficiency in decision making!”
 - “The deans do not seem to represent value added.”
 - “The business case for colleges has not been presented to the Faculty and is being widely questions. The faculty were told that a key role of the deans was to bring in more money. Given the enormous bureaucratic overhead associated with setting up the colleges, do we know whether this most fundamental metric of success has been achieved[?] If not, when do we declare failure and fix the problem?”
 - “The breakdown of departments within each college is very confusing, also the names are all so similar it’s hard to remember them.”
 - “Our colleges have always been an artificial construct.”
 - “[Colleges] didn’t make our lives on campus easier or our work more efficient.”
 - “Somehow, it seems to have added to the administrative workload rather than reduced it.”

4. Workloads and Productivity Metrics:

- a. Workload -- Among all faculty respondents campus-wide, 65% report a significant workload increase over the last two years, but only 2% report their workload has decreased. More than 75% of the respondents identified the following as contributing factors: change in position/appointment, teaching demands, research demands, service/administration expectations, paperwork and reporting requirements, and personnel/staffing shortages.

- b. Productivity metrics: In Fall 2016 there was high level of faculty skepticism about the value and fairness of the proposed productivity metrics:
- Among all faculty respondents campus-wide, 45% disagreed (somewhat/strongly) with the statement “The development of workload and productivity metrics will improve quality and productivity of teaching and scholarship” whereas only 26% agreed (somewhat/strongly).
 - Among all faculty respondents campus-wide, 38% disagreed (somewhat/strongly) with the statement “The development of workload and productivity metrics will improve equity on campus” whereas 36% agreed (somewhat/strongly).
 - Written comments expressed strong concerns about productivity metrics. Although respondents were not prompted specifically to comment on the productivity model, many faculty chose to raise concerns about the workload model when asked the generic “do you have any additional comments to make about workload?” Of the 95 written comments, just 2 expressed support for the productivity model, and only one of those unequivocally. Most comments expressed the view that faculty were already maxed out, or expressed frustration at workload formula. While some of this can be interpreted as poor understanding of the metric (in part from timing: this survey was administered before the final model was rolled out), much of the criticism appears applicable. For example:
 - “The new workload formula has introduced incredible stress and uncertainty into the mix, aside from the folly of having performance standards unrelated to educational outcomes.”
 - “You can use whatever spreadsheet you want to assess faculty workload and performance metrics but every department knows exactly who the underperforming people are.”
 - “Teaching Faculty concern about emphasis placed on quantity of credit hours rather than quality of teaching. We should be learning initiatives on innovative teaching and active learning, but how is this approach even possible if we are expected to deliver 720 credit hours each year?”
 - “Most of us work quite hard and I believe are quite productive ... As such it is frustrating to be constantly told by the administration – even if this isn’t the intent

- that we are not working hard enough and need to indeed work harder due to budgetary or regulatory reasons which seem to be the primary drivers for additional straws on our backs.”
- “The workload model (credit hours x #students) does not take into account the teaching style and resulting contact hours with students. Studio classes double the contact time relative to a lecture time. ... Since my departmental teaching load is based on the expectation of teaching 3 courses, the difference in teaching environments leads to a large inequity for teaching load. ... The benefits of active learning in a studio environment have [been] well documented ... [but] the current method of determining workload encourages large lecture classes.”
- “On this campus there is a high price for being competent in service work. The same 20-30 faculty are on almost every committee of significance.”
- “Find another job or get away. Love the students, research, teaching – but not this madness.”
- “I feel that the current administration, at all levels, allocates no credit for hours that the faculty may devote to external service, traditional high-impact publications (as opposed to sponsored research), teaching of essential low-enrollment courses, or advising sub-par high maintenance students. The incentives apparently work against these activities. This results in a misalignment between CSM’s evaluation of faculty performance and the faculty’s professional goals and peer evaluations. I think this is a recipe for disaster.”
- “The expected workload on faculty across campus is much too high. Considering that many faculty earn nearly half of the salary they would earn at an analogous position within the private sector, they should not be expected to work twice as much as they would in a private sector position. The faculty workload expectations at Mines have been increasing annually in recent years, and it's time for them to decrease, as faculty unrest is growing at an alarming rate.”
- “Here's a recurring feature of workload stress at Mines: Administration starts asking us to cook up all kinds of metrics related to what we do, or administration creates some kind of new "policy" discussion that takes up all kinds of time. The latest this year: the proposed "productivity models" and "workload policies." The

pattern looks like this: a poorly thought-out idea is either leaked or shared, the proposal triggers all kinds of stress and anxiety because of all the unintended (but foreseeable) consequences, we have to then spend all kinds of time showing why the idea needs modification or to be scrapped, we have to educate administration about what goes on in our little corner of the world and how its not that simple... and in the end of the day, we've moved forward not an inch, but we have sucked up a ton of time doing nothing. These kind of recurring events are colossal dents in our productivity. We spend so much time debating how to be productive we have no time to actually be productive! Here's a thought: why doesn't admin rethink how it approaches this. Rather than focus the conversation on what we faculty aren't doing right -- or, worse, what a few bad apples among us aren't doing right -- and put more thought into: how can we help faculty do things better?"

Other comments expressed a related concern about the push to increasing class sizes, a perceived by-product of the productivity matrix:

- “One of the major assets CSM used to have was the feeling of a small college. Part of that was class sizes of <40 and extensive student-faculty interactions. I’m afraid we’re losing that culture and I couldn’t honestly tell a parent why their son/daughter shouldn’t go to CU-Boulder or ASU.”
- “Mines students are fantastic, and it’s a pleasure to work with them. I am so busy, however, it’s almost impossible for me to develop new courses or even large adjustments in the courses I currently teach. I am deeply concerned about increasing courses sizes; not every class is suited to large numbers of students, especially if there is no TA/grading help. I am worried about the future.”

5. Faculty Evaluation, Salaries, and P&T:

- a. Data from the climate survey reveals the following about the annual faculty review process:
 - ~37% of the faculty somewhat or strongly agrees the process is transparent;
 - ~37% somewhat or strongly agrees the process is fair;
 - ~32% somewhat or strongly agrees the criteria reflect university priorities and

strategic goals;

- ~24% somewhat or strongly agrees the process incentivizes excellence;
- ~21% somewhat or strongly agrees salary increases are allocated according to performance.

These rather low satisfaction numbers, along with anecdotal comments, are a source of concern, especially when one considers that faculty evaluations play a key role in determining salary as well as promotion & tenure. (In addition, comments about workload, summarized above, indicate a general sentiment that high workloads or productivity do not correspond to more positive faculty evaluations or other incentives.) Accordingly, Senate sent a memo to AA titled “Faculty Evaluation Concerns” dated January 14, 2017 and received a detailed and thoughtful response from Provost Boyd on February 13, 2017. These memos are available at <http://facultysenate.mines.edu/FAS-Faculty-Documents>. Continued dialogue between the Faculty Senate and Academic Affairs is needed to resolve this issue.

b. Data from the recent faculty climate survey suggest a rather low level of faculty satisfaction with salary. For example:

- ~15 % of the faculty is somewhat or very satisfied with salary raises;
- ~11 % is somewhat or very satisfied with cost of living adjustments;
- ~32 % is somewhat or very satisfied with current salary;
- ~23% of the faculty somewhat or strongly agrees that their salaries are comparable with those of peers at other institutions.
- In contrast, ~78% are somewhat or very satisfied with benefits.

Approximately 64% of the faculty indicates that to some or great extent, it has considered leaving to increase salary. These concerns led to the Senate sending AA a memo titled “Faculty Salary Concerns” on Dec 19, 2016 to which we received a detailed response from Provost Boyd on Jan 11, 2017. These memos are available at <http://facultysenate.mines.edu/FAS-Faculty-Documents>. In addition, the Mines administration has engaged a consultant to perform a total compensation assessment for academic and administrative faculty.

c. Faculty comments:

- “I appreciated my raise this year, I really did. But 1.25% didn’t even cover the increase in my rent; an increase that didn’t occur because I moved to a bigger, better, nicer place but increased due to the current Denver metro housing/rental market. Additionally, I don’t know that I’ve ever received such a low percentage raise, to be honest. ... I think about it every day.”
- “The raise distribution this year ... made it very clear that there is exactly zero reward for going above and beyond to increase research productivity. The primary reward for research productivity that I can see today is to keep myself competitive to apply for other jobs.”

6. Diversity:

- a. Data from faculty survey indicates that
 - ~61% of female faculty are somewhat or very satisfied (70% for male faculty) while ~23% are somewhat or very dissatisfied (21% for male faculty). On first glance, these numbers do not suggest a problem.
 - However, 40 faculty chose a “prefer not to say” response under Gender in the survey. Because written responses to Question #37 reveal that most faculty who selected “I prefer not to say” with respect to gender or ethnicity did so because it would be “too identifying,” we can infer that many of those faculty who did not indicate their gender were female. Of these, 43% indicated they are somewhat or very dissatisfied while 40% indicated they are somewhat or very satisfied at Mines. These numbers are concerning.
- b. In addition, a more in-depth analysis of the numbers (see appendix) shows some areas where females perceptions vary substantially from males. Within their departments:
 - 38% of females somewhat or strongly agree with “I fear retaliation for what I say or do” (17% of males);
 - 53% somewhat or strongly agree that “department creates a collegial and supportive environment (66% for males);
 - 45% somewhat/strongly agree that “diversity of opinion is respected and valued” (67% for males).

When these questions are repeated in the context *of the Mines campus* the raw percentages are not necessarily better, but the female-male gaps in the responses are reduced. Senate recommends that the Mines Office of Diversity and Inclusion looks at these issues more carefully.

- c. Comments from women faculty note “potential gender bias” or that “women faculty [may be] at a disadvantage in terms of campus service versus years to promotion.”

There is insufficient data on underrepresented faculty (since many did not identify themselves) to make clear conclusions for minority faculty. But some anecdotal evidence indicates that faculty of color may not feel fully welcome or included on campus, including comments made to senators personally. Respondents noted in anonymous comments:

- “There is no class ceiling at Mines; it is concrete. Underrepresented groups feel the pressure and know that they will be limited as they advance.”
- “Not much noticeable or effective focus on status and climate of/for people of color.”
- “Dissatisfied that so little leadership is present to change the woeful working environment for faculty/staff of color.”

7. Conclusion – Survey results and breakdowns by groups (position, gender, college, term of service at Mines, etc.) are available online at <http://facultysenate.mines.edu/FAS-Faculty-Survey>. Some survey results and comparisons between faculty groups are tabulated in the Appendix to this report. Further survey data, including additional group breakdowns, are available upon request. In summary, several conclusions and concerns seem especially significant:

- Although faculty satisfaction has significantly improved since Spring 2014, the perceived retention rate has not improved significantly, with female and non-white faculty indicating a significant increase in perceived likelihood to leave Mines in the next 3 years.
- College structure continues to be a significant concern to faculty, in both the numeric results and the written comments (which showed little support for the current college/dean structure).

- There is a high level of faculty skepticism about the value and fairness of the proposed productivity metrics.
- About two-thirds of Mines faculty report that their workloads have increased significantly over the last two years.
- More than half of the faculty are dissatisfied with the faculty evaluation process, and how it impacts salaries and P&T.
- The faculty climate survey results indicate low faculty satisfaction with salary.
- Diversity issues are very important to many Mines faculty, and is a growing area of concern. The Faculty Senate strongly recommends that further analysis of the survey results be pursued regarding diversity issues.

Overall Satisfaction – Historical comparison:

Recent survey (Fall 2016): in bold Previous survey (Spring 2014): in italics

	Number of responses	Very or somewhat <u>dissatisfied</u> at Mines (%); Question 18	Very or somewhat <u>satisfied</u> at Mines (%); Question 18	Very or somewhat likely to leave Mines in next 3 years (%); Question 27
All responses	268	24 35	64 56	41 38
Tenured faculty	88	32 47	57 47*	45 41
Tenure-track faculty	40	25 37	65 47*	35 29
Teaching faculty	56	18 19	71 72	34 38
Research faculty	15	0 50	93 50	27 50
1 – 3 years at Mines	73	16 29	79	33 35
4 – 9 years at Mines	68	29 35	51	46 34
10+ years at Mines	83	22 42	64	42 40
Male	141	21 31	70 60	38 37
Female	64	23 44	61 46	45 34
prefer not to say	40	43	40	43
White	169	20 32	67	39 37
Black, Hispanic, American Indian, Asian and other	19	21 42	68 58	37 25
CASE	66	18 31	70 62	37 37
CECS	68	28 26	60 65	32 30
CERSE	67	31 43	66 50	43 41

*Tenured and tenure-track faculty were not distinguished in the 2014 survey.

Workload and productivity metrics, by groups

Question #14b: “The development of workload and productivity metrics will improve quality and productivity of teaching and scholarship.”

	% Disagreed (somewhat/strongly)	% Agreed (somewhat/strongly)
Campus	45	26
CASE	58	21
CECS	57	27
CERSE	46	28
Tenured faculty	58	24
Tenure-track faculty	50	30
Teaching faculty	53	22
Research faculty	40	33
1 – 3 years at Mines	32	31
4 – 9 years at Mines	57	16
10+ years at Mines	45	34
Male	46	29
Female	38	24
No gender stated	63	15

Question #14c: “The development of workload and productivity metrics will improve equity on campus.”

	% Disagreed (somewhat/strongly)	% Agreed (somewhat/strongly)
Campus	38	36
CASE	43	30
CECS	43	40
CERSE	43	30
Tenured faculty	44	35
Tenure-track faculty	40	35
Teaching faculty	45	31
Research faculty	26	33
1 – 3 years at Mines	23	48
4 – 9 years at Mines	43	25
10+ years at Mines	41	37
Male	34	38
Female	35	39
No gender stated	60	20

College structure by groups

Question #17: “How satisfied are you with the current college structure?”

	% Dissatisfied (somewhat/very)	% Satisfied (somewhat/very)
Campus	38	30
CASE	44	21
CECS	30	43
CERSE	54	22

Tenured faculty	63	19
Tenure-track faculty	25	43
Teaching faculty	35	31
Research faculty	7	33
1 – 3 years at Mines	21	45
4 – 9 years at Mines	40	22
10+ years at Mines	49	23
Male	40	35
Female	22	27
No gender stated	60	15

Question #4: “Has your total workload changed over the last two years, if at all?”

	% with workload increase	% with workload decrease	Reasonableness of workload (% too heavy or much too heavy; Q #6)	Most significant factor in workload increase (Question #5)	2 nd most significant factor in workload increase (Question #5)
Campus	65	2	58	Change in position/appointment	Teaching demands
CASE	65	3	62	Change in position/appointment	Teaching demands
CECS	56	2	56	Research demands (tie)	Teaching demands (tie)
CERSE	68	3	66	Teaching demands	Research demands
Tenured faculty	70	0	76	Change in position/appointment	Research demands
Tenure-track faculty	68	0	65	Research demands	Change in position/appointment
Teaching faculty	54	7	50	Teaching demands	Service/administration
Research faculty	47	0	27	Change in position/appointment	Staffing shortage
Male	65	1	58	Teaching demands	Research demands
Female	62	3	54	Service/administration	Teaching demands
No gender stated	63	5	78	Teaching demands & research demands (tie)	Service/administration

Survey Results by Position (Selected Questions)

Number of respondents:

Research faculty: 15

Teaching faculty: 56

Tenure-Track faculty: 40

Tenured faculty: 88

Q3: Please indicate the extent to which each of the following has been a source of STRESS for you over the past twelve months.

Top two extensive sources of stress in each position

	Highest	Next Highest
Research	Scholarly productivity 27 %	Securing funding & paperwork/bureaucracy (tie: each 20 %)
Teaching	Teaching responsibilities 36 %	Departmental politics 34 %
Tenure-Track	Securing funding 73 %	Scholarly productivity 45 %
Tenured	Securing funding 54 %	Managing research finances 43 %

Q17. Overall, how satisfied are you with the current college structure?

	% Dissatisfied (somewhat/very)	% Satisfied (somewhat/very)
Campus	38	30
Research	7	33
Teaching	35	31
Tenure-Track	25	33
Tenured	63	19

Q18. Overall, how satisfied are you being a faculty member at Mines?

	% Dissatisfied (somewhat/very)	% Satisfied (somewhat or very)
Campus	24	64
Research	0	93
Teaching	18	71
Tenure-Track	25	65
Tenured	32	57

Q19: With respect to the annual faculty review,

Process is fair.

	% Disagree (somewhat/strongly)	% Agree (somewhat/strongly)
Campus	28	37
Research	7	33
Teaching	25	32
Tenure-Track	18	53
Tenured	41	44

Process is transparent

	% Disagree (somewhat/strongly)	Agree (somewhat/strongly)
Campus	38	37
Research	13	40
Teaching	32	32
Tenure-Track	33	46
Tenured	48	41

Q24 Have you applied for a job at another university recently?

	% Yes, in past year
Campus	20
Research	13
Teaching	16
Tenure-Track	13
Tenured	25

Q25 Have you applied for a job outside academia recently?

	% Yes, in past year
Campus	11
Research	7
Teaching	5
Tenure-Track	5
Tenured	10

Q27 In the next three years, how likely are you to leave (or try to leave) Mines?

	% Unlikely (somewhat/very)	% Likely (somewhat/very)
Campus	42	41
Research	40	27
Teaching	46	34
Tenure-Track	53	35
Tenured	40	45

Survey Results by Time of Service (Selected Questions)

Q3: Please indicate the extent to which each of the following has been a source of STRESS for you over the past twelve months.

Top two extensive sources of stress in each demographic

	Highest (somewhat/extensive)	Next Highest (somewhat/extensive)
1-3 years	Securing funding (23%/27%)	Scholarly productivity (44%/19%)
4-9 years	Paperwork/bureaucracy (54%/39%)	Departmental politics (46%/35%)
10+ years	Departmental politics (33%/39%)	Securing funding (26%/38%)

Q6 Overall, how would you rate the reasonableness of your workload?

	Too Heavy	Much Too Heavy
1-3 years	32%	4%
4-9 years	53%	25%
10+ years	49%	12%

Q8 Specify the degree to which you are satisfied with each of the following, related to compensation

Current salary:

	Very/somewhat dissatisfied	Very/somewhat satisfied
1-3 years	38%	44%
4-9 years	58%	25%
10+ years	56%	27%

Cost of Living adjustments:

	Very/somewhat dissatisfied	Very/somewhat satisfied
1-3 years	29%	22%
4-9 years	68%	4%
10+ years	53%	10%

Q17 How satisfied are you with the current college structure?

	Very/somewhat dissatisfied	Very/somewhat satisfied
1-3 years	21%	45%
4-9 years	40%	22%
10+ years	49%	23%

Q17 How satisfied are you being a faculty members at Mines?

	Very/somewhat dissatisfied	Very/somewhat satisfied
1-3 years	16%	79%
4-9 years	29%	51%

10+ years	22%	64%
-----------	-----	-----

Q17 In the next three years, how likely are you to leave (or try to leave) Mines?

	Very/somewhat unlikely	Very/somewhat likely
1-3 years	52%	33%
4-9 years	32%	46%
10+ years	42%	42%

Survey Results by College (Selected Questions)

Q17. Overall, how satisfied are you with the current college structure

	Dissatisfied (somewhat/very)	Satisfied (somewhat/very)
Campus	38%	30%
CASE	44%	21%
CECS	30%	43%
CERSE	54%	22%

Q18. Overall, how satisfied are you being a faculty member at Mines

	Dissatisfied (somewhat/very)	Satisfied (somewhat or very)
Campus	24%	64%
CASE	18%	70%
CECS	28%	60%
CERSE	31%	60%

Q19: With respect to the annual faculty review,

Process is fair.

	Disagree (somewhat/strongly)	Agree (somewhat/strongly)
Campus	28%	37%
CASE	21%	50%
CECS	24%	37%
CERSE	42%	37%

Process is transparent

	Disagree (somewhat/strongly)	Agree (somewhat/strongly)
Campus	38%	37%
CASE	35%	45%
CECS	37%	36%
CERSE	40%	37%

Q24 Have you applied for a job at another university recently?

	Yes, in past year
Campus	20%
CASE	18%
CECS	19%
CERSE	22%

Q25 Have you applied for a job outside academia recently?

	Yes, in the past year
Campus	11%
CASE	11%
CECS	9%
CERSE	7%

Q27 In the next three years, how likely are you to leave (or try to leave) Mines?

	Unlikely(somewhat/very)	Likely(somewhat/very)
Campus	42%	41%
CASE	48%	37%
CECS	54%	32%
CERSE	31%	43%