Is there anyone whom you currently regard as a mentor- someone who gives advice and counsel on career issues and/or sponsors or advocates for you?

How many male and female mentors would you say you have?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Women Faculty Not of Color</th>
<th>Women Faculty of Color</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid N</td>
<td></td>
<td>303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male mentors</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female mentors</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total mentors</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:

1) Excluded one outlier for female mentors question. Zeroes and blanks within a category were not included in calculations.

2) No statistically significant differences (p<.05).
Please indicate the level of mentoring you currently receive in each area listed. My mentor(s)… mentoring currently received.

Notes:

1) Answer options were ‘Yes’, ‘No’, and ‘Infrequently’. ‘No’ and ‘Infrequently’ were combined for analysis purposes. In this chart, only ‘Yes’ percentage is shown for each item.

2) No statistically significant differences (p<.05).
Item Key (from left to right on chart):

- serves as a role model.
- promotes my career through networking.
- advises about preparation for advancement e.g., promotion, leadership positions...
- advises about getting my work published.
- advises about department politics.
- advises about obtaining the resources I need.
- advocates for me.
- advises about balancing work and family.
- is present at major academic events e.g., research conferences...
- publicly supports me at major academic events.
Please rate the climate of your unit(s)/department(s) on the following continuum. *(midpoint excluded in analysis)*

Notes:

1) 5-point scale with labels on endpoints. For this analysis, the two outermost scale options were combined on each side, the midpoint was excluded. In this chart, only the percentage of those who selected the two outermost scale options toward the non-parenthetical label is shown for each item.

2) Statistically significant differences (p<.05) denoted with a star above the comparison.

3) Significant p values: Friendly (p = ), Racially Sensitive (p = ), Respectful (p = ), Supportive (p = )
Please rate the climate of your unit(s)/department(s) on the following continuum. *(midpoint included in analysis)*

![Bar Chart](chart.png)

Notes:

1) 5-point scale with labels on endpoints. For this analysis, the two outermost scale options were combined on each side. In this chart, only the percentage of those who selected the two outermost scale options toward the non-parenthetical label is shown for each item.

2) Statistically significant differences (p<.05) denoted with a star above the comparison.

3) Significant p-values: Racially Sensitive (p < .000), Respectful (p = .027), Supportive (p = .024)
Please indicate your level of agreement with each of the following statements concerning conditions in your unit(s)/department(s), and your relationships with your unit/department colleagues. *(midpoint excluded in analysis)*

Notes:

1) 5-point scale from Strongly Disagree to Strongly Agree. For this analysis, the two outermost scale options were combined on each side, the midpoint and Not Applicable’ were excluded. In this chart, only the percentage of those who selected the two outermost scale options on the agree side is shown for each item.

2) Statistically significant differences (p<.05) denoted with a star in the chart above and the p-value can be found in the item key below.
3) **Item Key and Statistically Significant P-values** (from left to right on chart):

- My research interests are valued by my professional colleagues
- I feel pressured to change my research agenda in order to fit in.
- I feel/felt pressured to change my research agenda to make tenure/be promoted.
- I am comfortable asking questions about performance expectations.
- I am/was reluctant to bring up issues that concern me for fear that it will/would affect my promotion/tenure. (p = .030)
- My colleagues expect me to represent the point of view of my gender. (p = .033)
- My colleagues expect me to represent the point of view of my race/ethnicity. (p < .000)
- My colleagues solicit my opinions about their research ideas and problems. (p = .005)
- My colleagues have lower expectations of me than of other faculty. (p < .000)
- I constantly feel under scrutiny by my colleagues. (p = .001)
- I have/had to work harder than I believe my colleagues do, in order to be perceived as a legitimate scholar. (p = .002)
- There are many unwritten rules concerning how one is expected to interact with unit colleagues. (p = .001)
- Others seem to find it easier than I to fit in. (p < .000)
Please indicate your level of agreement with each of the following statements concerning conditions in your unit(s)/department(s), and your relationships with your unit/department colleagues. *(midpoint included in analysis)*

![Chart showing percentage agreement with various statements](image)

**Notes:**

1) 5-point scale from Strongly Disagree to Strongly Agree. For this analysis, the two outermost scale options were combined on each side, Not Applicable answers were excluded. In this chart, only the percentage of those who selected the two outermost scale options on the agree side is shown for each item.

2) Statistically significant differences (*p*<.05) denoted with a star in the chart above and the *p*-value can be found in the item key below.
3) **Item Key and Statistically Significant P-values** (from left to right on chart):

- My research interests are valued by my professional colleagues
- I feel pressured to change my research agenda in order to fit in.
- I feel/felt pressured to change my research agenda to make tenure/be promoted.
- I am comfortable asking questions about performance expectations.
- I am/was reluctant to bring up issues that concern me for fear that it will/would affect my promotion/tenure. (p = .046)
- My colleagues expect me to represent the point of view of my gender.
- My colleagues expect me to represent the point of view of my race/ethnicity. (p < .000)
- My colleagues solicit my opinions about their research ideas and problems. (p = .015)
- My colleagues have lower expectations of me than of other faculty. (p < .000)
- I constantly feel under scrutiny by my colleagues. (p = .001)
- I have/had to work harder than I believe my colleagues do, in order to be perceived as a legitimate scholar. (p = .008)
- There are many unwritten rules concerning how one is expected to interact with unit colleagues. (p = .005)
- Others seem to find it easier than I to fit in. (p < .000)
How would you rate your unit(s)/department(s)’s executive leader (chair or director) in each of the following areas? *(midpoint excluded in analysis)*

The chair/director of my unit/department...

Notes:

1) 5-point scale from Poor to Superior. For this analysis, the two outermost scale options were combined on each side, the midpoint were excluded. In this chart, only the percentage of those who selected the two outermost scale options on the ‘Above Average or Superior’ side is shown for each item.

2) Statistically significant differences (p<.05) denoted with a star above the comparison.

3) **Item Key and Statistically Significant P-values** (from left to right on chart):
   - maintains a high level of professionalism, e.g., communicates respectfully
   - maintains high academic standards

Note: Item Total Ns range from 198 to 248.
• is open to constructive criticism
• is an effective administrator
• shows interest in faculty
• encourages and empowers faculty
• treats faculty in an even-handed way
• helps me obtain resources I need
• gives me useful feedback about my performance
• articulates a clear vision
• articulates clear criteria for promotion/tenure
• honors agreements
• handles disputes/problems effectively
• communicates consistently with faculty
• creates a cooperative and supportive environment
• shows commitment to racial-ethnic diversity (p < .000)
• has a well-defined mission that is shared among colleagues
How would you rate your unit(s)/department(s)’s executive leader (chair or director) in each of the following areas? *(midpoint included in analysis)*

The chair/director of my unit/department...

Notes:

1) 5-point scale from Poor to Superior. For this analysis, the two outermost scale options were combined on each side. In this chart, the percentage of those who selected average or better is shown for each item.

2) Statistically significant differences (p<.05) denoted with a star above the comparison.
3) **Item Key and Statistically Significant P-values** (from left to right on chart):

- maintains a high level of professionalism, e.g., communicates respectfully
- maintains high academic standards
- is open to constructive criticism ($p = .028$)
- is an effective administrator
- shows interest in faculty
- encourages and empowers faculty
- treats faculty in an even-handed way
- helps me obtain resources I need
- gives me useful feedback about my performance
- articulates a clear vision
- articulates clear criteria for promotion/tenure
- honors agreements
- handles disputes/problems effectively
- communicates consistently with faculty
- creates a cooperative and supportive environment
- shows commitment to racial-ethnic diversity ($p < .000$)
- has a well-defined mission that is shared among colleagues
Please choose 3-5 of the committees you consider important, *whether or not you have served on them.*

- Department / Division Level Committees:

![Bar chart showing percentage of women faculty not of color and women faculty of color involved in various committees.](chart.png)

Notes: No statistically significant differences (p<.05).
- School / College Level Committees:

Notes: No statistically significant differences (p<.05).
### Years to Promotion from First Academic Appointment to Associate Professor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Women Faculty Not of Color</th>
<th>Women Faculty of Color</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Years to Associate Professor</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: No statistically significant differences (p<.05).

### Years to Promotion from First Academic Appointment to Full Professor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Women Faculty Not of Color</th>
<th>Women Faculty of Color</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Years to Full Professor Promotion</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>13.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: No statistically significant differences (p<.05).
For each item, please select the choice that best corresponds to how much influence you feel you have over the following matters in your unit/department.

Percentage Who Feel They Have No Influence Over a Matter

Notes:

1) Statistically significant differences (p<.05) denoted with a star above the comparison.

2) Significant p-values: unit curriculum decisions (p = .009), determining who is promoted (p = .011), affecting the overall unit climate/culture (p = .034)
Please indicate in the space provided the kinds of support/advice your mentors provide, according to their institutional affiliation category. *Excludes those who did not indicate that they have a male mentor.*

- Male mentors within UMN

![Bar chart showing support/advice categories for male mentors within UMN, divided by Women Faculty Not of Color and Women Faculty of Color.](chart)

Total N = 202

Notes: No statistically significant differences (p<.05).
Please indicate in the space provided the kinds of support/advice your mentors provide, according to their institutional affiliation category. *Excludes those who did not indicate that they have a male mentor.*

- Male mentors at other institution

![Bar chart showing support/advice provided by mentors. The chart shows the percentage of women faculty not of color and women faculty of color who receive various types of support/advice.](chart_image)

Notes: The statement "advises about obtaining resources I need" is significant at the .05 level (p = 008) but have expected counts of less than 5 for more than 20% of cells. This violates an assumption of chi-square significance testing.
Please indicate in the space provided the kinds of support/advice your mentors provide, according to their institutional affiliation category.

- Female mentors within UMN

![Bar chart showing support/advice provided by mentors]

Notes: No statistically significant differences (p<.05).
Please indicate in the space provided the kinds of support/advice your mentors provide, according to their institutional affiliation category.

- Female mentors at other institution

Notes: No statistically significant differences (p<.05).