



Vice Provost for Academic Personnel
900 University Avenue
Riverside CA 92521
951-827-3541

July 27, 2023

To: Robert Clare, Chair of Senate Committee on Faculty Welfare

From: Daniel Jeske
Vice Provost of Academic Personnel

Via: Cherysa Cortez, Executive Director of Riverside Division

RE: AY22-23 Senate Faculty Climate Survey

Dear Bob,

At my meeting with the Academic Senate Committee on Faculty Welfare (CFW) on June 13, 2023, I shared an initial APO analysis of the climate survey data. We discussed that the next step should be for me to draft a report around the analysis and send that to CFW for their dissemination within the Senate. Please find that report in the pages that follows.

I want to acknowledge the work of Teresa Mason, from APO, for her efforts in setting up the Qualtrics survey instrument, collecting the responses, and preparing the tables that comprise the Appendix to this report.

Thank you.

Dan

Copy to:

Sang-Hee Lee, Senate Division Chair

1. Introduction

Throughout AY18-19 the UCR Academic Senate Committee on Faculty Welfare (CFW) designed and distributed a Senate faculty campus climate survey. The survey was designed to assess the overall climate at UCR in seven dimensions: Research, Teaching, Advising/Mentoring, Service, Equity, Campus Climate, Leadership and Governance.

The results from the survey were analyzed by CFW throughout AY19-20 and shared with the campus in an April 2020 report [1]. A summary of the results was presented at the spring 2020 Academic Senate division meeting. In the fall of 2020 CFW requested a formal administrative response to the survey [2], which was provided by the administration in the winter of 2021 [3]. CFW issued an additional report in the spring of 2021 based upon a broader Senate review of the survey results that provided recommendations on how to resolve key issues revealed by the survey [4].

While the 2019 survey was developed, administered, and analyzed by the CFW, it was jointly decided by the Academic Senate and the Administration that an AY22-23 climate survey would be run out of the Academic Personnel Office (APO), with Senate consultation on the questions to be asked. This memo presents the AY22-23 survey, designed to again assess the overall climate of UCR in the same seven dimensions. The questions used in the AY22-23 survey are mostly the same as those used in the AY18-19 survey, which offers the opportunity to measure if and how much the perception of the campus climate has changed in the last 4 years.

2. The Survey

The survey was designed in the fall quarter of AY22-23 in a cooperative effort between APO, CFW, and the Senate Committee on Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion. It was administered to all active Senate faculty in the winter quarter of AY22-23 and was analyzed by APO in spring quarter of AY22-23. The Vice Provost of Academic Personnel met with CFW on June 13, 2023 to review the initial results of the survey. CFW requested this written report that they could share with the Senate in the fall of 2023.

When the survey was distributed to the faculty in winter quarter, it included a preface (at the suggestion of the Senate chair) that summarized efforts taken in response to the AY18-19 survey. The intended purpose of the preface was to encourage faculty that the time they invest in climate surveys does lead to actions taken. The preface made mention of the following actions:

Shared governance:

- A more transparent and collaborative search committee process for senior leaders reporting to the provost (in which the Senate directly appoints faculty to the search committee, and the search committee helps to develop the job description)
- A broader composition of members on the campus finance committee
- Incorporation of campus strategic plan goals into performance reviews for senior administrators
- Establishment of a new and more comprehensive governance structure in ITS (in process)

Communications:

- Annual meetings of the Provost with the academic departments
- Monthly Provost office hours for faculty, staff, and students
- Weekly VPAP office hours
- Increased communication with department chairs through monthly meetings with VPAP and an enhanced chairs' leadership workshop series
- Quarterly APO newsletter
- Delegation of faculty hiring to the deans, which allows for timelier and discipline-specific decision making

Diversity, equity, and inclusion:

- Diversification of senior leadership: the chancellor's 15-member cabinet as of 1/1/2023 consists of 9 women and 6 men, and includes 9 who identify as URM (5 Black, 4 Latinx)
- Numerous equity studies in APO, including salary equity and analyses of merit/promotion outcomes by gender and ethnicity
- Establishment of the faculty salary equity program
- Formation of the DEI Climate Council

Faculty misconduct:

- Establishment of an anti-bullying policy (by UCR in 2021 and systemwide in 2022)

Merits and promotions review processes:

- Multiple COVID accommodations
- A new life event outcome
- A new book project accommodation
- Recognition of grant activity
- Inclusion of individual mentoring statements and departmental research statements

3. Profiles of Respondents

The AY22-23 survey was distributed to 864 active Senate faculty members, of which 359 offered a full or partial response. The response rate was 41.2% which nearly matches the response rate reported for the AY18-19 survey. Tables 1-4 show the percentage of the total respondents by college, job title, gender, and ethnicity/racial identity.

College/School	AY18-19	AY22-23
CHASS	143 (39.4%)	125 (34.8%)
CNAS	120 (33.1%)	104 (29.0%)
BCOE	30 (8.3%)	33 (9.2%)
Business, SOE, SOM, SPP	39 (10.7%)	38 (10.6%)
Choose not to answer or skipped the question	31 (8.5%)	59 (16.4%)
Total	363	359

Table 1. Total and Percentage of Respondents by College/School

Job Title	AY18-19	AY22-23
Professor	46.1%	48.8%
Associate Professor	23.9%	27.0%
Assistant Professor	25.9%	18.8%
Assistant or Associate Professor of Teaching	4.0%	5.5%

Table 2. Percentage of Respondents by Job Title

Gender	AY18-19	AY22-23
Male	49.1%	43.2%
Female	33.9%	29.2%
Other	0.9%	1.3%
Do not wish to specify	16.1%	26.2%

Table 3. Percentage of Respondents by Gender

Ethnicity/Racial Identity	AY18-19	AY22-23
Black or African American	2.1%	2.0%
Asian	13.8%	14.6%
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	0	0
Native American or Alaskan	2.1%	1.0%
Hispanic or Latino	6.1%	5.3%
White	48.9%	39.1%
Other	0	5.6%
Do not wish to specify	26.9%	32.4%

Table 4. Percentage of Respondents by Ethnicity/Racial Identity

3. AY22-23 Survey Results

3.1 Quantitative Responses

The survey questions asked respondents to assess their level agreement with respect to 66 positively phrased assertions spread across nine major areas. Respondents answered on a Likert scale of 1-5 where 1 = strongly disagree, 2 = disagree, 3 = neutral, 4 = agree, and 5 = strongly agree. A detailed tabular summary of the responses to all of the survey questions is included in the appendix to this document. Table 5 below provides a high level summary that shows the number of questions within each of the major areas (n), the average of the responses to those questions, the percent of respondents that disagreed (or strongly disagreed) with the questions, and the percent of respondents that agreed (or strongly agreed) with the questions.

Area	n	Average Level of Agreement	Percent that Disagree or Strongly Disagree	Percent that Agree or Strongly Agree
1. Department/school supports my research agenda	8	3.23	33.1%	49.6%
2. Department/school distributes teaching assignments equitably	10	3.45	21.6%	56.7%
3. Department/school distributes advising and mentoring equitably	8	3.11	30.7%	40.0%
4. Department/school recognizes and supports service equitably	6	3.42	25.0%	58.7%
5. I have confidence in department-level academic leadership	5	3.57	23.2%	62.7%
6. I have confidence in college/school- level academic leadership	7	2.79	43.8%	34.4%
7. I have confidence in campus-level academic leadership	6	2.60	46.7%	23.4%
8. I have confidence in campus-level administrative leadership	12	2.57	46.0%	22.5%
9. My department/school works against discriminatory practices	4	3.47	25.0%	56.4%

Table 5. Respondent Agreement within Different Areas of the Survey

Keeping in mind the Likert scale range is 1-5, with the value 3 signaling a neutral response, it can be seen that the average measure of faculty satisfaction within each area is lukewarm. On the other hand, there are six major areas (highlighted in green) where there are significantly more faculty who agree (or strongly agree) than faculty who disagree (or strongly disagree), and only three major areas (highlighted in red) where the reverse is true.

Below are observations which are distilled from the drill-down tables provided in the appendix. The observations draw attention to aspects of the campus climate that faculty members are relatively less satisfied with (highlighted in red) and relatively more satisfied with (highlighted in green).

1. Department/school support for research

- Insufficient infrastructure and staff support for research; Inadequate balance of graduate students versus undergraduate students; Financial support packages that are not competitive with other UC campuses; Weak relationships/collaborations with granting institutions
- Adequate understanding of the heterogeneity within disciplines; Respect, encouragement, and support for different methodological approaches within disciplines

2. Department/school teaching assignments

- Inequity with respect to use of individual or small-seminar courses as substitutes for standard courses in teaching assignments
- Equity in teaching load, teaching schedules, range of courses, balance of new versus repeated courses, and course delivery options

3. Department/school advising and mentoring roles
 - Insufficient recognition of informal mentoring of graduate and undergraduate students in the m/p review process
 - Equity in distributing graduate student advising load; Recognition for advising graduate students in the m/p review process
4. Department/school recognition and support of service roles
 - Inadequate recognition for unofficial service
 - Equity in distributing committee service within the department, college/school, and campus; Support for professional service
5. Department-level academic leadership
 - Inadequate handling problematic behavior of colleagues
 - Consultation with faculty on department goals; Decisions on m/p reviews, hiring and retention
6. College/school- level academic leadership
 - Insufficient consultation with faculty on establishing department and college/school goals; Decisions on hiring, and retention; Inadequate handling problematic behavior of colleagues; Inadequate evaluation of teaching
 - Decisions on m/p reviews
7. Campus-level academic leadership
 - Insufficient consultation with faculty on campus goals; Decisions on hiring and retention; Inadequate handling problematic behavior of colleagues
 - Decisions on m/p reviews
8. Campus-level administrative leadership
 - Lack of confidence in decisions around UCPATH, retention of faculty, providing sufficient resources to help employees balance work-life needs, campus growth goals, and providing sufficient resources and facilities to enable growth goals
 - Confidence in decisions around efileplus, OATS, IMPACT23 implementation, STEM High School Initiative, necessary adjustments for the impact of the pandemic
9. Department/school efforts against discriminatory practices
 - None
 - Efforts to ensure fair promotion and tenure of URM groups; Efforts to create an inclusive and diverse community of faculty members; Equal wages for equal work; Fairness in teaching assignments given to faculty

3.2 Written Comments

Each area of the survey provided the opportunity for respondents to offer additional written comments. A total of 718 written comments were received by the respondents to the survey. The comments were read and categorized as addressing major areas, and then additionally categorized into secondary areas within each major area. A summary of that analysis appears below, showing nine major areas and then a varying number of secondary areas within each major area. Numbers in parentheses reflect the frequency of comments categorized as addressing the area. It is noted that only a handful of comments left by respondents can be described as positive.

1. M/P Process (157)

- a. Insufficient credit for service (37)
- b. Disproportionate allocation of service and/or mentoring (35)
- c. Mentoring efforts are not rewarded (30)
- d. Lack of consequence for low or poor teaching and/or service (21)
- e. Concerns with CAP decisions (16)
- f. Not all research areas are respected (11)
- g. efileplus (3)
- h. Overemphasis on funding (2)
- i. No credit for undergraduate research (1)
- j. Time involved (1)

2. Teaching (138)

- a. Equity in class assignments, schedule, new courses, graduate courses, large classes (33)
- b. Inadequate TA support (26)
- c. Use of student teaching evaluations (24)
- d. Lack of protection for faculty from student behaviors (20)
- e. Class size too large (11)
- f. Concerns about online teaching (9)
- g. Course relief opportunities (7)
- h. Concerns around curriculum (5)
- i. Scheduling of classes (2)
- j. Neglect of graduate education (1)

3. Climate (111)

- a. Bullying/Harassment/Intimidation (41)
- b. No consequences for problematic behavior (20)
- c. Inaction on part of administration (19)
- d. Vocal minority (13)
- e. Male dominance (9)
- f. Aggressive investigations (2)
- g. Confidentiality barriers (2)
- h. Senior faculty favoritism(2)
- i. Misogyny (1)
- j. Bylaw 55 (1)
- k. Student behavior (1)

4. Support at Department Level (100)

- a. Transparency and shared governance (35)
- b. Staff support (34)
- c. ITS systems (16)
- d. Program vision autonomy (6)
- e. Hiring autonomy (4)
- f. Campus funding level (3)
- g. Campus growth objectives (2)

- 5. Leadership (79)
 - a. Senior leaders (growth vision, engagement, competency) (59)
 - b. Department chairs (17)
 - c. Selection criteria (2)
 - d. Opportunities (1)
- 6. Benefits and Wellbeing (48)
 - a. Infrastructure (14)
 - b. Retentions (11)
 - c. Salary and salary equity (7)
 - d. Disability accommodations (4)
 - e. Childcare access (3)
 - f. Leaves access (3)
 - g. Mental health care (3)
 - h. Library resources (2)
 - i. Partner hires (1)
- 7. Graduate Program (38)
 - a. Support packages (19)
 - b. Student quality (9)
 - c. Insufficient priority (9)
 - d. Housing (1)
- 8. DEI Initiative (24)
 - a. Ineffective interventions (13)
 - b. Overemphasis (7)
 - c. Rigid connection to hiring (4)
- 9. Research Support (23)
 - a. Increasing cost to faculty (9)
 - b. Growing research program (5)
 - c. Grant writing support (4)
 - d. Need more GSRs (2)
 - e. Computing support (2)
 - f. Equipment investment (1)

Keeping in mind that 359 faculty responded to the survey, the frequency of comments that address the major areas, and secondary areas within the major areas, falls off rather quickly. To a large extent, the written comments echo what was seen in the responses to the quantitative questions. Namely, a significant number of faculty members have concerns around aspects of m/p reviews, teaching, climate, and academic/administrative leadership on the campus. The written comments may have been used by dissatisfied respondents as a way of emphasizing more specifically what they unhappy about.

4. Comparison of AY22-23 vs. AY18-19

With a significant overlap in the questions between the two surveys, AY18-19 and AY22-23, there is an opportunity to compare what change may have happened in the 4 years between the surveys. It is important to keep in mind that the pandemic occurred during the 4 year period between surveys. APO does not have access to the raw data from the AY18-19 survey, and therefore worked from the CFW summary report [1]. Consequently, it was not possible to make comparisons of all the survey questions. It was possible, however, to compare the questions shown in Table 6 below.

The first column in Table 6 shows the questions that were common to both surveys and for which the average Likert scale scores from the AY18-19 survey could be discerned. Columns 2 and 3 show the average Likert scores for the two survey years. The last column shows a p-value for testing a null hypothesis that the mean scores are the same for the two survey years. P-values less than a specified significance level, often .05 or .10, indicate the null hypothesis would be rejected. The yellow highlighted rows correspond to questions whose p-values are less than .10, and for which we would infer there is evidence in the survey data that suggests mean satisfaction levels differ for the two survey years. However, it can be seen from the differences in column 4 that the changes between the AY18-19 and AY22-23 survey responses are minimal even when they are statistically significant.

5. Summary

Responses to the AY22-23 climate survey that was distributed to the Senate faculty show lukewarm satisfaction in most of the areas surveyed. On the other hand, for a majority of the major areas covered by the survey, favorable faculty outnumber unfavorable faculty.

Comparison of the responses between the AY18-19 and AY22-23 surveys suggest not much change in the average level of satisfaction has transpired. Concerns remain around the level of faculty consultation (particularly around campus growth goals, hiring, and retention), how problematic behavior is handled, the level of financial support for graduate students, and how service and mentoring is recognized and rewarded in the m/p process. Collaboration between the faculty and the administration on identifying opportunities to improve the climate, and for overcoming challenges that hamper change, will be important in determining where campus efforts to improve the climate are able to go from here.

Question	Average Score AY18-19	Average Score AY19-23	Amount of Change	P-value
My department/school has:				
A good balance of graduate students versus undergraduate students	3.09	2.97	-0.12	.22
Graduate students who are prepared for advanced learning and research	3.26	3.23	-0.03	.78
Financial support packages for graduate students that are competitive with other UC campuses	2.59	2.65	0.06	.52
My department/school distributes advising and mentoring roles equitably with respect to:				
Advising graduate students	3.32	3.27	-0.05	.61
Advising undergraduate students	3.23	3.19	-0.04	.64
Informal mentoring of grad students	3.16	3.13	-0.03	.81
Informal mentoring of undergrad students	3.13	3.07	-0.06	.54
Evaluation of advising grad students in the m/p process	3.07	3.22	0.15	.15
Evaluation of advising undergrad students in the m/p process	2.91	3.08	0.17	.09
Evaluation of informally advising grad students in the m/p process	2.74	2.96	0.22	.03
Evaluation of informally advising undergrad students in the m/p process	2.77	2.93	0.16	.09
I have confidence in the academic leadership decision-making process of my department with respect to:				
Extent to which faculty are consulted regarding department goals	3.73	3.68	-0.05	.61
Hiring of faculty	3.84	3.79	-0.05	.61
Handling of problematic behaviors, practices, or personnel	3.23	3.04	-0.19	.10
I have confidence in the academic leadership decision-making process of my college/school with respect to:				
Extent to which faculty are consulted regarding college/school goals	2.53	2.50	-0.03	.81
Hiring of faculty	2.92	2.78	-0.14	.16
Handling of problematic behaviors, practices, or personnel	2.61	2.52	-0.09	.37
Evaluation of teaching in the m/p process	2.91	3.01	0.10	.30
I have confidence in the academic decision-making process at the campus level with respect to:				
Extent to which faculty are consulted regarding college/school goals	2.35	2.32	-0.03	.74
Hiring of faculty	2.46	2.48	0.02	.85
Handling of problematic behaviors, practices, or personnel	2.55	2.44	-0.11	.26
Evaluation of teaching in the m/p process	2.73	2.80	0.07	.49
I have confidence in the administrative leadership decision-making process at the campus level with respect to:				
Campus growth goals	2.10	2.24	0.14	.14
Providing adequate resources and facilities to enable growth goals	1.81	1.94	0.13	.12
Percent of respondents who report experiencing bullying, intimidation, physical violence, sexual harassment, sexual assault, or any other violation of the UCR Principles of Community	74%	57%	-17%	< .001

Table 6. Comparison of AY18-19 and AY22-23 Survey Results

REFERENCES

[1] Report on the Faculty Campus Climate Survey 2019. UCR Academic Senate Committee on Faculty Welfare. April 2020

[2] Memo to Chancellor Kim Wilcox from Academic Senate Chair Jason Stajich. November 20, 2020.

[3] Administration's Response to the 2020 Senate Committee on Faculty Welfare's Report on Campus Climate. January 15, 2021.

[4] Memo to Chancellor Kim Wilcox from Senate Committee on Faculty Welfare Chair Patricia Morton. April 27, 2021.

APPENDIX

Climate Survey 2023 – Summary Data

Department/school: *Indicate extent to which you agree to the following statements.*

Research and Creative Work: *My department / school and campus support my research agenda in the following ways:*

	2019	2023	2019	2023	2019	2023	2019	2023	2019	2023	2019	2023	2019	2023
Question	Strongly disagree (1)		Disagree (2)		Neutral (3)		Agree (4)		Strongly agree (5)		No opinion/Not applicable (6)		Averages	
My department/school has a variety of methodological approaches that reflect the heterogeneity of my field		4% [15]		10% [34]		10% [35]		34% [122]		40% [144]		3% [9]		3.99
My methodological approach is respected, encouraged, and supported		8% [28]		10% [35]		13% [47]		31% [111]		36% [130]		2% [7]		3.80
My methodological approach contributes to a plural departmental community where discussion, dissension, and collaborations are welcome		8% [27]		8% [29]		11% [40]		32% [116]		37% [131]		4% [15]		3.86
My department/school has sufficient infrastructural and staff support for my research		37% [132]		26% [94]		12% [42]		13% [48]		11% [38]		1% [3]		2.34
My department/school has a strong collaboration with granting institutions (such as Mellon Foundation, New Directions Fellowships, NIH, NSF, Sawyer Seminars, Simons Foundation, etc.)		11% [38]		26% [92]		22% [79]		20% [72]		14% [50]		8% [28]		3.01
My department/school has a good balance of graduate students versus undergraduates	12% [43]	15% [52]	19% [69]	20% [70]	18% [67]	24% [88]	27% [98]	27% [96]	12% [43]	10% [34]	12% [43]	4% [19]	3.09	2.97
Graduate students who enter my department/school are prepared to undertake advanced learning and research	7% [25]	10% [35]	18% [65]	18% [63]	21% [76]	22% [80]	35% [127]	33% [118]	10% [36]	13% [47]	9% [34]	4% [15]	3.26	3.23
My department/school has financial support packages for graduate students that are competitive with other UC campuses	23% [83]	25% [91]	25% [91]	20% [73]	16% [58]	18% [63]	23% [83]	20% [71]	5% [18]	10% [34]	10% [36]	7% [26]	2.59	2.65

Highlighted questions appear on 2023 Climate Survey Report and 2019 Climate Survey Report

**2019 Data: 363 responses were given.

**2023 Data: 359 responses were given.

Teaching: My department / school distributes teaching assignment equitably with respect to:

Question	Strongly disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neutral (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly agree (5)	No opinion/Not applicable (6)	Total Responses	Averages
Number of courses taught per year	7% [26]	9% [32]	10% [36]	41% [141]	31% [107]	2% [6]	348	3.79
Student enrollment in courses	12% [42]	13% [44]	21% [74]	35% [122]	15% [51]	4% [13]	346	3.29
Times of day/numbers of day per week courses are scheduled	9% [30]	11% [39]	17% [60]	38% [132]	21% [71]	4% [14]	346	3.53
Size of course (small seminar v. lecture format)	12% [41]	13% [44]	21% [71]	35% [120]	16% [54]	4% [14]	344	3.31
Range of courses (i.e. undergraduate v. graduate courses; content of courses)	5% [18]	10% [34]	18% [61]	43% [148]	19% [66]	5% [17]	344	3.64
Balance between new and repeated course assignments	4% [12]	7% [24]	21% [71]	43% [149]	20% [67]	6% [20]	343	3.73
Use of individual or small-seminar courses as substitutes for standard courses	11% [37]	17% [57]	24% [81]	22% [77]	11% [37]	16% [54]	343	3.07
Delivery method (face-to-face v. online/hybrid courses)	4% [13]	8% [28]	28% [96]	32% [111]	17% [58]	11% [38]	344	3.57
Access to course-release opportunities	13% [43]	13% [45]	24% [82]	24% [81]	14% [49]	13% [44]	344	3.16
TA and/or Reader support for courses	11% [36]	14% [48]	19% [65]	36% [123]	17% [59]	4% [12]	343	3.37

****There was no data in the summary of the 2019 Climate Survey Report to do a comparison**

****2023 Data: 343-348 responses were given.**

Advising/Mentoring: *My department / school distributes advising & mentoring responsibilities equitably with respect to:*

	2019	2023	2019	2023	2019	2023	2019	2023	2019	2023	2019	2023	2019	2023
Question	Strongly disagree (1)		Disagree (2)		Neutral (3)		Agree (4)		Strongly agree (5)		No opinion/Not applicable (6)		New Average	
Advising graduate students	7% [25]	7% [22]	15% [53]	19% [63]	19% [67]	20% [69]	31% [108]	34% [114]	13% [45]	11% [38]	15% [53]	9% [32]	3.32	3.27
Advising undergraduate students	6% [21]	5% [18]	10% [35]	17% [58]	29% [102]	25% [86]	26% [91]	27% [92]	7% [25]	9% [28]	22% [77]	17% [56]	3.23	3.19
Informal mentoring of graduate students	8% [28]	8% [27]	17% [60]	19% [63]	21% [74]	26% [89]	28% [98]	27% [92]	9% [32]	10% [33]	17% [59]	10% [34]	3.16	3.13
Informal mentoring of undergraduate students	6% [21]	7% [22]	16% [56]	20% [71]	26% [91]	28% [94]	26% [91]	23% [78]	6% [21]	9% [29]	20% [71]	13% [42]	3.13	3.07
The evaluation of advising graduate students in the personnel review process	10% [35]	10% [32]	18% [63]	15% [49]	15% [53]	23% [78]	23% [81]	32% [108]	10% [35]	10% [35]	24% [84]	10% [34]	3.07	3.22
The evaluation of advising undergraduate students in the personnel review process	7% [25]	8% [28]	18% [63]	18% [61]	22% [77]	26% [89]	16% [56]	24% [82]	5% [18]	9% [29]	32% [112]	15% [49]	2.91	3.08
The evaluation of informally mentoring graduate students in the personnel review process	12% [42]	10% [34]	19% [67]	21% [70]	21% [74]	27% [90]	14% [49]	21% [71]	5% [18]	8% [27]	29% [101]	13% [45]	2.74	2.96
The evaluation of informally mentoring undergraduate students in the personnel review process	10% [35]	9% [29]	18% [63]	22% [75]	23% [81]	29% [99]	12% [42]	18% [62]	5% [18]	8% [26]	32% [112]	14% [47]	2.77	2.93

****2023 Data:** 338 responses were given.

****2019 Data:** 351 responses were given.

Service at UCR: *My department / school recognizes and supports service responsibilities equitably with respect to:*

Question	Strongly disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neutral (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly agree (5)	No opinion/Not applicable (6)	Total Responses	Average
Service on standing or adhoc committees	8% [25]	15% [51]	16% [53]	43% [141]	18% [59]	0.3% [1]	330	3.48
Department/school service	9% [29]	16% [51]	13% [43]	44% [144]	19% [61]	0.3% [1]	329	3.48
Campus service (i.e. Academic Senate Committee Service, Campus Administration, Campus-wide Committees)	8% [26]	11% [37]	15% [49]	45% [148]	20% [65]	1% [4]	329	3.58
University-wide service	9% [28]	12% [41]	15% [50]	45% [148]	17% [57]	2% [5]	329	3.51
Professional service (e.g. journal editorships, conference organizing)	8% [27]	13% [43]	17% [55]	41% [134]	20% [64]	2% [5]	328	3.51
Officially recognized vs. unofficially recognized service (e.g. hosting visitors, attending events, observing lecturers or TAs, counseling students, participating in campus initiatives)	13% [43]	26% [85]	21% [69]	26% [85]	11% [36]	3% [11]	329	2.96

***There was no data in the summary of the 2019 Climate Survey Report to do a comparison*

Academic leadership: *I have confidence in the academic leadership decision-making processes of my department with respect to:*

	2019	2023	2019	2023	2019	2023	2019	2023	2019	2023	2019	2023	2019	2023
Question	Strongly disagree (1)		Disagree (2)		Neutral (3)		Agree (4)		Strongly agree (5)		No opinion/Not applicable (6)		New Average	
Extent to which faculty are consulted regarding department goals	10% [35]	13% [41]	9% [31]	8% [27]	10% [35]	11% [37]	33% [114]	32% [105]	33% [114]	34% [111]	5% [17]	2% [7]	3.73	3.68
Hiring of faculty	10% [35]	9% [31]	8% [28]	10% [32]	6% [21]	9% [29]	32% [111]	34% [110]	38% [131]	36% [119]	6% [21]	2% [7]	3.84	3.79
Retention of faculty		13% [42]		12% [40]		14% [47]		31% [103]		25% [80]		5% [16]		3.45
Tenure and promotion decisions		9% [30]		6% [18]		12% [39]		32% [105]		39% [129]		2% [7]		3.89
Handling of problematic behaviors, practices, or personnel	15% [52]	20% [65]	12% [42]	12% [40]	16% [55]	22% [71]	26% [90]	23% [74]	18% [62]	17% [54]	13% [45]	6% [23]	3.23	3.04

Highlighted questions appear on 2023 Climate Survey Report and 2019 Climate Survey Report

***2023 Data: Q1-Q4 (328) Q5 (327) responses were given.*

***2019 Data: 346 responses were given.*

I have confidence in the academic leadership decision-making processes of my college/school with respect to:

	2019	2023	2019	2023	2019	2023	2019	2023	2019	2023	2019	2023	2019	2023
Question	Strongly disagree		Disagree		Neutral		Agree		Strongly agree		No opinion/Not applicable		New Average	
Extent to which faculty are consulted regarding college/school goals	25% [86]	29% [94]	25% [86]	25% [81]	18% [62]	20% [67]	19% [65]	14% [46]	6% [21]	10% [32]	7% [24]	2% [7]	2.53	2.50
Extent to which faculty are consulted regarding department goals		24% [77]		23% [76]		17% [54]		20% [70]		14% [44]		2% [6]		2.78
Hiring of faculty	16% [55]	23% [75]	22% [76]	22% [73]	18% [62]	19% [62]	25% [86]	21% [69]	11% [38]	13% [41]	8% [27]	2% [6]	2.92	2.78
Retention of faculty		26% [84]		23% [76]		17% [54]		18% [60]		10% [32]		6% [21]		2.61
Tenure and promotion decisions		11% [40]		12% [38]		22% [71]		37% [119]		15% [49]		3% [9]		3.31
Handling of problematic behaviors, practices, or personnel	23% [79]	26% [88]	14% [48]	18% [58]	21% [72]	24% [79]	15% [52]	13% [41]	7% [24]	8% [26]	20% [69]	11% [36]	2.61	2.52
Evaluation of teaching in the merit and promotion process	15% [52]	16% [52]	20% [69]	15% [50]	21% [71]	28% [92]	24% [83]	25% [82]	9% [31]	12% [38]	11% [38]	4% [14]	2.91	3.01

Highlighted questions appear on 2023 Climate Survey Report and 2019 Climate Survey Report

**2023 Data: Q1, Q2, Q4 (327); Q3, Q5 (326); Q6 (323); Q7 (322) responses were given.

**2019 Data: 344 responses were given.

I have confidence in the academic leadership decision-making processes of my campus level with respect to:

	2019	2023	2019	2023	2019	2023	2019	2023	2019	2023	2019	2023	2019	2023
Question	Strongly disagree		Disagree		Neutral		Agree		Strongly agree		No opinion/Not applicable		New Average	
Extent to which faculty are consulted regarding campus goals	28% [95]	29% [95]	23% [78]	28% [92]	21% [72]	22% [72]	13% [44]	13% [41]	4% [14]	4% [14]	11% [38]	3% [9]	2.35	2.32
Hiring of faculty	23% [78]	22% [72]	24% [82]	26% [85]	23% [78]	27% [86]	16% [55]	13% [41]	3% [10]	5% [16]	11% [38]	7% [22]	2.46	2.48
Retention of faculty		22% [70]		25% [82]		28% [90]		10% [33]		5% [16]		10% [31]		2.46
Tenure and promotion decisions		15% [48]		12% [39]		29% [94]		29% [94]		10% [31]		5% [16]		3.06
Handling of problematic behaviors, practices, or personnel	23% [78]	24% [79]	13% [44]	20% [63]	24% [82]	30% [96]	15% [51]	10% [31]	4% [14]	5% [15]	21% [72]	12% [39]	2.55	2.44
Evaluation of teaching in the merit and promotion process	16% [55]	17% [55]	20% [68]	19% [60]	26% [89]	31% [100]	19% [65]	22% [72]	5% [17]	6% [18]	14% [47]	5% [17]	2.73	2.80

Highlighted questions appear on 2023 Climate Survey Report and 2019 Climate Survey Report

**2023 Data: Q1, Q5 (323); Q2, Q3, Q4, Q6 (322) responses were given.

**2019 Data: 341 responses were given.

Administration: UCR's Administrative Leadership (Chancellor, Vice Chancellors, Provost, Vice Provosts, Deans, Department Chairs)
I have confidence in the administrative leadership decision-making processes at the campus level with respect to:

	2019	2023	2019	2023	2019	2023	2019	2023	2019	2023	2019	2023	2019	2023
Question	Strongly disagree (1)		Disagree (2)		Neutral (3)		Agree (4)		Strongly agree (5)		No opinion/Not applicable (6)		Averages	
UCPath		23% [72]		16% [52]		30% [96]		13% [42]		4% [13]		13% [42]		2.99
eFilePlus		11% [34]		16% [49]		32% [100]		27% [85]		6% [20]		9% [28]		3.29
Oats		13% [40]		11% [33]		30% [94]		11% [36]		3% [10]		32% [101]		3.78
Concur Implementation		25% [77]		17% [53]		23% [73]		6% [18]		3% [8]		27% [83]		3.24
IMPACT23 Implementation		16% [49]		10% [32]		24% [76]		4% [13]		3% [10]		42% [133]		3.96
Retention of faculty		20% [62]		26% [81]		25% [80]		10% [33]		5% [16]		14% [43]		2.97
STEM High School Initiative		18% [57]		6% [20]		28% [88]		5% [17]		4% [13]		38% [118]		3.84
Providing sufficient resources to help employees balance work-life needs, such as childcare, elder care, and medical leave		21% [68]		21% [68]		25% [79]		15% [49]		5% [15]		12% [38]		2.97
Campus growth goals	32% [111]	30% [95]	25% [87]	29% [92]	21% [73]	18% [58]	7% [24]	11% [35]	2% [7]	4% [12]	12% [42]	8% [25]	2.10	2.24
Providing adequate resources and facilities to enable growth goals	45% [156]	41% [131]	27% [93]	30% [96]	12% [42]	12% [39]	5% [17]	8% [24]	2% [7]	3% [9]	10% [35]	6% [18]	1.81	1.94
Setting positive tone for online instruction at UCR		17% [53]		12% [38]		37% [118]		16% [49]		6% [20]		12% [37]		3.18
Making adjustments for the impact of the pandemic		13% [42]		10% [33]		25% [78]		35% [111]		13% [41]		3% [10]		3.34

Highlighted questions appear on 2023 Climate Survey Report and 2019 Climate Survey Report

**2023 Data: Q1, Q8, Q9, Q10 (317); Q2 (316); Q3 (314); Q4(312); Q5, Q7 (313); Q6, Q11, Q12 (315) responses were given.

**2019 Data: 346 responses were given.

Equity at UCR: *I have confidence that my department/school - works against discriminatory practices that would adversely affect:*

Question	Strongly disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Neutral (3)	Agree (4)	Strongly agree (5)	No opinion/Not applicable (6)	Total	Average
Promotion and tenure of under-represented groups	7% [21]	12% [38]	15% [48]	31% [97]	32% [102]	3% [10]	316	3.72
Efforts to create an inclusive and diverse community of faculty members	13% [41]	13% [42]	17% [53]	27% [85]	28% [89]	2% [5]	315	3.45
Equal wages for equal work	14% [45]	14% [45]	21% [66]	26% [82]	20% [63]	4% [14]	315	3.24
Fairness in teaching assignments given to faculty	11% [34]	13% [40]	19% [61]	31% [98]	24% [76]	2% [6]	315	3.46

***There was no data in the summary of the 2019 Climate Survey Report to do a comparison*

Campus climate: *Have you experienced any of the following issues?*

Question	2019	2023
Bullying or intimidation by administration, faculty, staff or students.	35% [119]	37% [129]
Physical violence by administration, faculty, staff or students.	2% [8]	0.28% [1]
Sexual harassment by administration, faculty, staff or students.	12% [41]	5% [17]
Sexual assault by administration, faculty, staff or students.	2% [7]	0.28% [1]
Any other violation of the UCR Principles of Community	23% [79]	15% [52]
None	26% [90]	43% [152]

***2023 Data: 352 responses were given.*

***2019 Data: Estimated 344 total responses were given.*