GT CLIMATE ASSESSMENT SURVEY REPORT 2013: OVERVIEW
Climate Assessment Task Force charged by Provost Bras in Spring 2013 to develop a survey to define, measure, and assess progress toward goals articulated in Institute’s strategic plan:

"We aspire to be an Institute that pursues excellence and embraces and leverages diversity in all of its forms. In the years ahead, we must continue to enhance a culture of collegiality, close collaboration, global perspective, intercultural sensitivity and respect, and thoughtful interaction among a community of scholars that includes all of our students, faculty, and staff..."

(Georgia Institute of Technology, 2010, p. 5)

- Task force composed of faculty, staff, and students and co-chaired by Archie Ervin (VPID) and Jonathan Gordon (OOA)
- Survey administered in February 2013
  - Separate surveys – with some common questions - for faculty, staff, students
Available to GT community at http://b.gatech.edu/17c2DzK
240 pages: Executive summary and sections devoted to faculty, staff, student responses; appendices with data, survey tool
48.1% response rate among faculty
- 913 tenured/tenure track faculty (TTF) invited
- 439 responded
- 191 CoE TTF responses or 43.8% of faculty survey responses (compared to 43.5% of faculty population)

Respondents representative based on sex & rank, but not ethnicity or college
Table 1.2. Survey response anchors based on a four-point Likert scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Agreement</th>
<th>Satisfaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4*</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>Very Satisfied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3*</td>
<td>Somewhat Agree</td>
<td>Somewhat Satisfied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Somewhat Disagree</td>
<td>Somewhat Dissatisfied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Very Dissatisfied</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Sufficient score for percentages rating an item as “agree” or “satisfied.”
Overall, responding faculty express general satisfaction with the support they receive from their colleagues.

Chart 1.1. Faculty satisfaction with colleagues (percent “very satisfied” or “somewhat satisfied”)

- Assistance with establishing professional contacts: 72.8%
- Offers to collaborate on research: 71.8%
- Advice on the promotion/tenure process: 71.7%
- Mentoring for teaching: 71.5%
- Guidance on publishing your research: 71.0%
- Acknowledging my contributions to the school/academic unit: 69.0%
- Advice on navigating department/institute politics: 67.2%
- Guidance on obtaining grants: 65.0%
- Informal invitations (e.g., lunch/coffee): 64.4%

CoE: 78.8%

Most CoE responses generally consistent with weighted GT means.
Responding faculty expressed relatively high levels of satisfaction with their chairs on several measures.

**Chart 1.2. Faculty satisfaction with support from chairs (percent “very satisfied” or “somewhat satisfied”)**

- Understanding that individuals have different family and personal responsibilities: 86.5%
- The degree to which agreements are honored by my supervisor: 83.3%
- Advice on the promotion/tenure process: 76.9%
- Acknowledging my contributions to the school/academic unit: 73.4%
- Advice on navigating department/institute politics: 69.0%
- Support for your research program: 68.1%
- Mentoring for teaching: 66.4%
- Assistance with establishing professional contacts: 65.7%
- Mentoring for leadership positions at GT or beyond: 58.5%
- Advice on obtaining grants: 56.9%

CoE: 79.9%

CoE: 63.2%

CoE: 61.3%
As asked about collaboration and the working climate in their schools, most faculty felt included and empowered.

**Chart 1.3. Faculty opinions on school/unit climate (percent “strongly” or “somewhat” agreed)**

- Collaboration in strategic planning for the school/unit is encouraged: 77.2%
- Faculty treat each other fairly: 75.4%
- I am provided with an opportunity to participate in important decision making: 72.2%
- My feedback is sought and respected: 72.1%
- Faculty are encouraged and empowered: 68.6%
- Faculty communicate regularly with one another: 67.6%
- Disputes and problems are resolved effectively: 66.8%

CoE: 63.1%

CoE: 63.2%
80% respondents agreed the climate was “comfortable & inclusive” (GT mean=3.16 out of 4)

75.8% were satisfied with their career progress (GT mean=3.06) and felt valued & respected (GT mean=3.02)

Note: Charted responses are “reverse coded”
Overall, respondents supported the Institute’s general diversity goals; expressed satisfaction with their School’s and the Institute’s commitments to diversity goals.

(SOME) RESULTS: DIVERSITY/INCLUSION

CoE responses generally consistent with weighted GT means
Female and URM* faculty were less likely to express that “faculty are encouraged and empowered” in their units
- Means for female=55.1% and for male=72.9% respondents
- Means for URM=54.1% and non-URM=70.3% respondents

Female faculty (mean=48.9%) were less likely than male faculty (mean=72.1%) to agree that disputes and problems in their unit are resolved effectively

Women (mean=71.7%) were less likely then men (mean=86.7%) to agree that GT is “a comfortable and inclusive environment for me” and were more likely (mean=56.1% vs 10.9% for men) to report instances of “marginalization” in the past 3 years

Only 37.1% URM faculty strongly or somewhat agreed that “there is clarity about the promotion and tenure process”, compared with 72.5% of non-URM faculty

* URM= American Indian, Black/African Americans, Hispanic (regardless of race)
Table 2.9: Staff selected responses by gender and URM status [continued]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I am satisfied with my unit’s efforts to retain staff from diverse backgrounds</th>
<th>Male Percent (n \approx 1,149)</th>
<th>Female Percent (n \approx 1,092)</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Eff. Size</th>
<th>Male Percent (n \approx 1,573)</th>
<th>Female Percent (n \approx 574)</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Eff. Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>84.7</td>
<td>75.1</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>85.2</td>
<td>67.9</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hiring practices in my unit are consistent with Georgia Tech’s commitment to diversity</td>
<td>89.4</td>
<td>81.4</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>90.8</td>
<td>71.8</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>0.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion practices in my unit are consistent with Georgia Tech’s commitment to diversity</td>
<td>80.3</td>
<td>62.8</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>80.5</td>
<td>49.7</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>0.31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: URM = Underrepresented Minorities.
Faculty encouraged to read report & provide feedback
- Additional findings (e.g., by rank) that were not shown today
- Complete results of survey shown in Appendix

Findings merit attention from Institute leadership and campus community
- Efforts led by Office of Institute Diversity
- Formulation of strategic actions to enhance campus climate
  - Analysis of qualitative survey data
  - Focus groups
  - Variety of actions to achieve goals

Measure progress toward Institute’s diversity goals through future use of survey