Overview and Results of the 2017 Cluster Hiring and Recently Hired Faculty Surveys

Dear Colleagues:

The UCR Division of the Academic Senate implemented a pair of confidential surveys during the Spring 2017 Quarter: the Cluster Hiring Survey (2016-2017) and the Survey of Recently Hired Faculty (for colleagues hired during and since 2013-2014). The first survey was a follow-up to a similar Senate survey issued in 2015-2016, and offered an opportunity for respondents to (re-)evaluate the processes, outcomes, and future of the Cluster Hiring program after completion of its first cycle, and during the middle-to-latter phases of its second cycle. The second survey provided an opportunity to build a more rigorous and concrete understanding of the campus conditions and climate affecting newer UCR faculty members (across ranks), paying particular attention to matters of recruitment, research and teaching capacity, quality/availability of facilities, and implications for short-to-long term retention.

I am pleased to announce that 282 Senate members responded to the Cluster Hiring Survey (2016-2017), and 56 Senate colleagues participated in the Survey of Recently Hired Faculty. An illustrative bar graph summary of respondents’ feedback to the surveys’ multiple-choice questions follows this cover letter. This visual summary includes a differentiation of responses received from Senate members identifying themselves as part of the three UCR colleges (CHASS, CNAS, and BCOE) and combined data reflecting responses from those who are members of the four schools (SPP, GSOE, SOM, SoBA).

I have worked with Prof. John Cioffi (Political Science), the Senate Vice Chair, to provide this concise narrative account of the surveys, focusing on major themes that recur in the qualitative comments offered by our responding colleagues. I intend for this narrative summary to reflect the breadth, tenor, and thoughtfulness of our collective reflections on the impact of the recently implemented cluster hiring initiative on UCR as a growing public research university.

Major/Recurring Themes in Survey Comments

While there are numerous areas of concern indicated in both qualitative and multiple-choice responses, a close reading of respondents’ survey comments raises the following issues as the most consistently and urgently raised across the colleges and schools:

- concern over fundamental lack of coordination/symbiosis between cluster hiring initiatives and departmental hiring/research/teaching plans;
- concern over the role of departments in reviewing and selecting faculty members hired through clusters;
- concern about the conceptual design, coordination, and short-to-long-term implementation of the program;
- concern over possible links between cluster hiring initiative, diminishing research/teaching capacity, and retention of faculty members, including those hired through clusters;
- expression of need for more robust engagement with faculty and departments prior to, during, and after the recruitment process to ensure that prospective faculty members will be well-supported by their home departments/colleges/schools;
- concern over inconsistency in relative success and failure of cluster searches;
- expression of need for infrastructural support for newly hired faculty members (including those not hired through clusters);
• expression of need for more consistent and substantive processes to integrate new faculty members into campus research and teaching infrastructure/protocols (e.g. office and lab set-up, renovations to office and research spaces, more staff support for facilitating needs of newly arrived faculty);
• expression of desire for more effective use of faculty/staff labor and time in the cluster recruitment and hiring process;
• concern over implications of the cluster hiring program for UCR’s national and global reputation as a research university;
• expression of need for administrative follow-up beyond the hiring process that builds support infrastructure for ongoing, sustainable research clusters that include “cluster-hired” faculty members as well as other faculty members in relevant research areas;
• concern over lack of transparency in the cluster proposal review process; and
• concern that cluster hiring puts extreme stress on the resources and capacity required to fulfill the university’s research and teaching mission.

Summary of Evaluations and Collegial Consensus

The results of the Cluster Hiring Survey indicate a strong-to-overwhelming collegial consensus in the overall evaluation of the cluster hiring initiative. This consensus is reflected in both comments and quantitative responses, and clearly articulates the notion that cluster hiring should constitute a much smaller percentage of UCR faculty recruitments. Yet, our colleagues generally do not categorically reject the concept of cluster hiring. Rather, a clear majority of respondents articulate some degree of appreciation for cluster hiring’s potential as a complement to department-focused faculty hiring. Such a restructuring of the cluster hiring approach would need to be consistent with the programmatic needs and plans of departments and colleges at both the undergraduate and graduate levels, and informed by more sustained and substantive interaction with departments and their faculty throughout the hiring process.

A strong plurality of the responding faculty would support (i) a far more narrowly targeted cluster hiring program that (ii) acknowledges and builds on existing campus/departmental research strengths and/or carefully defined research areas likely to yield high-value research over a long-term research trajectory, in which (iii) departments take the lead role in conducting the cluster searches themselves.

Respondents’ written comments reinforce the quantitative results and provide additional nuance and depth to our understanding of faculty sentiments towards cluster hiring, recruitment, and related issues. The comments were overwhelmingly negative in their appraisal of the cluster hiring program as conceived and implemented in academic years 2015-2016 and 2016-2017. Indeed, the number of strongly positive evaluations of the program was relegated to the single digits.

The dominant theme in the survey comments concerns the need for a far more rigorous articulation between cluster hiring and the departments in which cluster faculty are placed. Further, there is an overwhelming consensus that the selection of cluster hire themes and recruitment of prospective faculty members often do not account for the programmatic and pedagogical needs of departments, which are the primary locus for UCR’s fulfillment of the academic mission.

The survey responses include notable instances in which this incompatibility has adversely affected the research and teaching capacities of colleagues hired through the cluster process. Dozens of comments aver that cluster committees and the cluster search process have not been adequately equipped to evaluate candidates within the highly specific contexts of the disciplines and fields into which they are being recruited, since cluster committee members are often not trained in or deeply familiar with those areas.
Echoing these themes, numerous respondents voice urgent concern at the reallocation of campus resources to the cluster hiring initiative, and are especially alarmed at the prospect of sustaining the initiative over the long term. Such comments frequently criticize the administration’s development and execution of the cluster hiring program as an encroachment of the faculty’s authority over academic matters under the UC system’s structure of Shared Governance.

The separate Survey of Recently Hired Faculty illuminates the conditions experienced by our newest UCR colleagues, though the smaller number of responses limits the probative power of the survey results. While there is a range of responses to several survey questions, a majority of recently hired colleagues share the concerns of the broader respondent group regarding research infrastructure, offices, and other facilities. Fortunately, the well-documented flaws and shortcomings of the cluster hiring process do not appear—so far—to have induced negative attitudes towards the campus by these responding colleagues. However, the responses do indicate disappointment with excessively large class sizes, inadequate campus research funding, and poor teaching and graduate student support.

The Senate offers this document as a critically constructive contribution to the ongoing conversations and debates about the future of faculty recruitment, funding, collaboration, and collegial support during a crucial moment of UCR’s institutional growth. These surveys were conceived and conducted in the spirit of Shared Governance, guided by a deep belief in the principal role of faculty wisdom, expertise, and leadership in fulfilling UCR’s mission as a public research university in the service of its students and multiple communities.

We are grateful to the faculty respondents for their high response rate as well as the serious, thoughtful, and balanced character of their comments. Our colleagues’ responses remind us that the distinguishing feature of a research institution like ours is the vital necessity of symbiosis among scholarly innovation and world-class research, high quality and internationally renowned education of first generation undergraduate and graduate students, and sustainable institutional growth and planning.

Peace.

Dylan Rodríguez
Professor of Media and Cultural Studies
Chair of the UCR Division of the Academic Senate
Cluster Hiring Survey, 2016-2017

Question 1:
What role, if any, did you have in conducting a cluster search during the 2015-16 academic year? (check all that apply)

1. I was hired as part of a cluster
2. I was part of a cluster hire search committee
3. I attended job talks and/or meetings with cluster hire candidates
4. I was a member of a department proposed as a departmental home for a cluster hire candidate
5. I was not involved in a cluster hire search
6. My department was not involved in a cluster hire search

Question 2:
How many faculty searches in your department (not including cluster hiring) have you participated in, over the last five years?

1. None
2. 1-2
3. 3-5
4. More than 5
Question 3:

Please check the box that best describes the success of faculty searches in your department during the last five years prior to the cluster hiring strategy (choose one):

1. My department filled all open positions
2. My department filled over 50% of open positions but fewer than all
3. My department filled between 25% to 50% of open positions
4. My department filled less than 25% of open positions
5. My department did not fill any available positions
6. My department had no positions to fill
7. Don’t know

Question 4:

Does your department have a strategic plan for hiring faculty members, separate from any plan that is part of cluster hiring?

1. Yes
2. No
3. Don’t Know
Question 5:

If yes to Question 4, please describe your role in formulating your department's most recent strategic hiring plan:

1. I led the planning process
2. I served on a committee the formulated the plan
3. The entire faculty of the department developed the plan
4. I did not participate in formulating the plan

Question 6:

What role, if any, did you have in preparing a proposal in response to the cluster hiring strategy during the 2014-15 academic year?

1. I was part of a cluster hiring proposal that was funded in 14-15
2. I was part of a cluster hiring proposal that was not funded in 14-15
3. I was not part of a cluster hiring proposal in 14-15

Other:
Cluster Hiring Survey, 2016-2017

Question 7:
What is your faculty rank?

Question 8:
Please indicate the college or school at UCR where you hold your primary appointment:
Question 9a:
The time and resources to conduct a cluster search were adequate.
1. Strongly Agree
2. Agree
3. Neutral
4. Disagree
5. Strongly Disagree
6. Don't Know

Question 9b:
The cluster hiring process made efficient use of faculty time.
1. Strongly Agree
2. Agree
3. Neutral
4. Disagree
5. Strongly Disagree
6. Don't Know
Cluster Hiring Survey, 2016-2017

Question 9c:
The cluster search committee understood and agreed upon the criteria for selecting cluster hire candidates.

1. Strongly Agree
2. Agree
3. Neutral
4. Disagree
5. Strongly Disagree
6. Don't Know

Question 9d:
The members of the cluster search committee had appropriate knowledge and relevant expertise to make cluster hire candidate selections.

1. Strongly Agree
2. Agree
3. Neutral
4. Disagree
5. Strongly Disagree
6. Don't Know
Question 9:
The cluster search process provided for adequate input from faculty who were not participants in the cluster proposal or cluster hiring committee.

1. Strongly Agree
2. Agree
3. Neutral
4. Disagree
5. Strongly Disagree
6. Don’t Know

Question 10a:
The proposed “home” department(s) played a clearly defined and appropriate role in the cluster search process that was made clear to departmental faculty (e.g., criteria for candidate evaluation, selection, and ranking).

1. Strongly Agree
2. Agree
3. Neutral
4. Disagree
5. Strongly Disagree
6. Don’t Know
Cluster Hiring Survey, 2016-2017

Question 10b:
The role of the proposed "home" department(s) in the cluster hiring process was made clear to departmental chairs and faculty (e.g., negotiation of and departmental contribution to salary, benefits, research funds, office space, etc.).

1. Strongly Agree
2. Agree
3. Neutral
4. Disagree
5. Strongly Disagree
6. Don't Know

Question 10c:
The role and involvement of the proposed "home" department(s) for the cluster candidate(s) were sufficient to ensure quality control over hiring.

1. Strongly Agree
2. Agree
3. Neutral
4. Disagree
5. Strongly Disagree
6. Don't Know
Question 11a:

The cluster hiring process was consistent with the undergraduate teaching mission of the designated "home" department(s) of recently hired cluster faculty.

1. Strongly Agree
2. Agree
3. Neutral
4. Disagree
5. Strongly Disagree
6. Don't Know

Question 11b:

The cluster hiring process was consistent with the graduate teaching/training mission of the designated "home" department(s) of recently hired cluster faculty.

1. Strongly Agree
2. Agree
3. Neutral
4. Disagree
5. Strongly Disagree
6. Don't Know
Cluster Hiring Survey, 2016-2017

Question 11c:

The cluster hiring process is consistent with my department's growth and/or strategic development plan(s) with respect to teaching priorities (i.e., reflects current and anticipated teaching needs as determined by department faculty).

1. Strongly Agree
2. Agree
3. Neutral
4. Disagree
5. Strongly Disagree
6. Don't Know

Question 11d:

The cluster hiring process is consistent with my department's growth and/or strategic development plan(s) with respect to research priorities (i.e., reflects current and anticipated research needs as determined by department faculty).

1. Strongly Agree
2. Agree
3. Neutral
4. Disagree
5. Strongly Disagree
6. Don't Know
Question 12a:
The allocation of cluster hiring faculty lines corresponded to departmental undergraduate enrollments so that low-enrollment departments did not receive a disproportionate share of cluster hires.

1. Strongly Agree
2. Agree
3. Neutral
4. Disagree
5. Strongly Disagree
6. Don't Know

Question 12b:
The allocation of cluster hiring faculty lines corresponded to departmental graduate enrollments so that low-enrollment departments did not receive a disproportionate share of cluster hires.

1. Strongly Agree
2. Agree
3. Neutral
4. Disagree
5. Strongly Disagree
6. Don't Know
Cluster Hiring Survey, 2016-2017

Question 12c:
The allocation of cluster hiring faculty lines corresponded to existing departmental and/or campus research strengths.

1. Strongly Agree
2. Agree
3. Neutral
4. Disagree
5. Strongly Disagree
6. Don't Know

Question 12d:
The home department provided adequate office space for the cluster hire(s).

1. Strongly Agree
2. Agree
3. Neutral
4. Disagree
5. Strongly Disagree
6. Don't Know
Cluster Hiring Survey, 2016-2017

Question 12e:
The campus or department provided adequate lab space and/or other necessary research facilities to support the cluster hire(s).

1. Strongly Agree
2. Agree
3. Neutral
4. Disagree
5. Strongly Disagree
6. Don't Know

Question 12f:
The campus or department provided adequate administrative staff to support the cluster hire(s) individually and (if applicable) collectively.

1. Strongly Agree
2. Agree
3. Neutral
4. Disagree
5. Strongly Disagree
6. Don't Know
Cluster Hiring Survey, 2016-2017

Question 12g:

The campus or department provided adequate equipment, or sufficient funding for its purchase, to support the cluster hire(s).

1. Strongly Agree
2. Agree
3. Neutral
4. Disagree
5. Strongly Disagree
6. Don't Know

Question 12h:

The resources committed to the cluster hire(s) did not compromise the research resources available for existing faculty members.

1. Strongly Agree
2. Agree
3. Neutral
4. Disagree
5. Strongly Disagree
6. Don't Know
Question 13a:
The cluster hiring process as implemented to date is superior to and an effective replacement for department-centered hiring processes.

1. Strongly Agree
2. Agree
3. Neutral
4. Disagree
5. Strongly Disagree
6. Don’t Know

Question 13b:
Cluster hiring has the potential to be superior to and an effective replacement for the department-centered hiring processes if the policy and process is appropriately designed.

1. Strongly Agree
2. Agree
3. Neutral
4. Disagree
5. Strongly Disagree
6. Don’t Know
Question 13c:

Cluster hiring has the potential to be an effective complement to the department-centered hiring processes if the process is appropriately designed.

1. Strongly Agree
2. Agree
3. Neutral
4. Disagree
5. Strongly Disagree
6. Don't Know
Question 13d:

Except in carefully-researched specific research areas, cluster hiring is neither an effective substitute for nor an effective complement to department-centered hiring processes.

1. Strongly Agree
2. Agree
3. Neutral
4. Disagree
5. Strongly Disagree
6. Don't Know

Question 13e:

Cluster hiring is neither an effective substitute for nor an effective complement to department-centered hiring processes.

1. Strongly Agree
2. Agree
3. Neutral
4. Disagree
5. Strongly Disagree
6. Don't Know
Cluster Hiring Survey, 2016-2017

Question 14a:
The cluster hiring strategy has high potential for improving the quality and reputation of UCR as a research campus.

1. Strongly Agree
2. Agree
3. Neutral
4. Disagree
5. Strongly Disagree
6. Don’t Know

Question 14b:
The cluster hiring strategy has moderate potential for improving the quality and reputation of UCR as a research campus.

1. Strongly Agree
2. Agree
3. Neutral
4. Disagree
5. Strongly Disagree
6. Don’t Know
Question 14c:
The cluster hiring strategy has **little or no potential** for improving the quality and reputation of UCR as a research campus.

1. Strongly Agree
2. Agree
3. Neutral
4. Disagree
5. Strongly Disagree
6. Don’t Know

---

Question 14d:
The cluster hiring strategy poses a **high risk** of degrading the quality and reputation of UCR as a research campus.

1. Strongly Agree
2. Agree
3. Neutral
4. Disagree
5. Strongly Disagree
6. Don’t Know
Cluster Hiring Survey, 2016-2017

Question 14e:

The cluster hiring strategy poses a moderate risk of degrading the quality and reputation of UCR as a research campus.

1. Strongly Agree
2. Agree
3. Neutral
4. Disagree
5. Strongly Disagree
6. Don't Know

Question 14f:

The cluster hiring strategy poses little or no risk of degrading the quality and reputation of UCR as a research campus.

1. Strongly Agree
2. Agree
3. Neutral
4. Disagree
5. Strongly Disagree
6. Don't Know
Question 15:
What percentage of new faculty members planned for the campus should be hired as part of a cluster (pick one):

1. 100% of new Faculty
2. More than 75% but fewer than 100% of new faculty
3. Between 50-75% of new Faculty
4. Between 25-50% of new faculty
5. Between 10-25% of new faculty
6. Fewer than 10% of new faculty but more than none
7. No faculty should be hired as part of a cluster

Question 16:
What is your overall assessment of the design of the cluster hiring program?

1. Excellent
2. Very Good
3. Good
4. Fair
5. Poor
6. Very Poor
7. Don’t Know
Question 17:
What is your overall assessment of the internal procedures you have observed within the cluster hiring process?

1. Excellent
2. Very Good
3. Good
4. Fair
5. Poor
6. Very Poor
7. Don't Know
Survey of 2013 – 2016 UCR Faculty Hires

Question 1:
In what academic year were you hired (i.e., the year in which the search was conducted, regardless of when negotiation over terms concluded and/or when your faculty appointment formally began)??

1. 2013-2014
2. 2014-2015
3. 2015-2016

Question 2:
Is this your first full-time, tenure track faculty position?

1. Yes
2. No
Question 3:

If your tenure-track academic position did not start at UCR, how many years did you spend at previous institutions?

1. 1
2. 2
3. 3
4. 4
5. 5
6. N/A

Question 4:

Please indicate the college or school at UCR where you hold your primary appointment.
Question 5a:
At what rank and step were you hired? (Select one choice for each column below) Rank

1. Acting Assistant Professor
2. Assistant Professor
3. Associate Professor
4. Professor(Full)

Question 5b:
At what rank and step were you hired? (Select one choice for each column below) Step

1. I
2. II
3. III
4. IV
5. V
6. VI
Question 6:
At the time your offer of employment from UCR, how many other competing offers (if any) did you have?

1. None
2. 1
3. 2
4. More than 2

Question 7:
Did the UCR search coincide with the hiring "season" or annual timeline traditional in your discipline?

1. Yes
2. No
3. Not applicable
4. Don't know
Question 8:

If the answer to question 7 was "no", tell us whether the search was:

1. Earlier than typical for your discipline
2. Later than typical for your discipline
3. N/A

Question 9a:

Start-up research funds

1. Exceeded Expectations
2. Met Expectations
3. Below Expectations
Question 9b:

Availability of campus, college, and/or departmental funding for research, conferences, and/or colloquia

1. Exceeded Expectations
2. Met Expectations
3. Below Expectations

Question 9c:

Availability of UC system-wide funding for research, conferences, and/or colloquia

1. Exceeded Expectations
2. Met Expectations
3. Below Expectations
Question 9d:

Institutional infrastructure and support for faculty research (e.g., research centers, institutes, organized research units)

1. Exceeded Expectations
2. Met Expectations
3. Below Expectations

Question 9e:

Physical facilities/infrastructure for faculty research (lab and office space, core research facilities, computational support)

1. Exceeded Expectations
2. Met Expectations
3. Below Expectations
Question 9f:
Departmental/College level graduate student financial support and/or RA funding

1. Exceeded Expectations
2. Met Expectations
3. Below Expectations

Question 9g:
Tenure expectation relative to scholarship and research productivity (and funding, if applicable)

1. Exceeded Expectations
2. Met Expectations
3. Below Expectations
Question 10a:
Class size(s) appropriate to educational mission (exceeded expectations = class size too large, etc.)

1. Exceeded Expectations
2. Met Expectations
3. Below Expectations

Question 10b:
Diversity of student body

1. Exceeded Expectations
2. Met Expectations
3. Below Expectations
Question 10c:
TA availability (vs. no TA) for courses expected to teach

1. Exceeded Expectations
2. Met Expectations
3. Below Expectations

Question 10d:
Class scheduling flexibility (times and days of the week)

1. Exceeded Expectations
2. Met Expectations
3. Below Expectations
Question 10e:
Distribution of teaching load across quarters/academic year

1. Exceeded Expectations
2. Met Expectations
3. Below Expectations

Question 10f:
Balance of undergraduate “service” courses vs. non-service courses (upper division electives, seminars, etc.)

1. Exceeded Expectations
2. Met Expectations
3. Below Expectations
Question 10g:
Alignment of your scholarly expertise with teaching obligations

1. Exceeded Expectations
2. Met Expectations
3. Below Expectations

Question 10h:
Balance of graduate vs. undergraduate teaching

1. Exceeded Expectations
2. Met Expectations
3. Below Expectations
Question 10i:
Balance of graduate "service" courses vs. more specialized non-service courses

1. Exceeded Expectations
2. Met Expectations
3. Below Expectations

Question 10j:
Campus-wide teaching support

1. Exceeded Expectations
2. Met Expectations
3. Below Expectations
Question 11a:
Salary

1. Exceeded Expectations
2. Met Expectations
3. Below Expectations

Question 11b:
Benefits (pension, health care, etc.)

1. Exceeded Expectations
2. Met Expectations
3. Below Expectations
Question 11c:
Housing assistance program
1. Exceeded Expectations
2. Met Expectations
3. Below Expectations

Question 11d:
Campus-wide infrastructure and amenities for enhancing faculty welfare (e.g., parking, temporary housing, dining services)
1. Exceeded Expectations
2. Met Expectations
3. Below Expectations
Question 11e:
Family-friendly policies (e.g., Child Development Center, maternal and paternal leave/modified duties)

1. Exceeded Expectations
2. Met Expectations
3. Below Expectations

Question 11f:
Cost of living in area

1. Exceeded Expectations
2. Met Expectations
3. Below Expectations
Question 11g:
Opportunity for spousal hire

1. Exceeded Expectations
2. Met Expectations
3. Below Expectations

Question 11h:
Institutional culture of (primary) hiring department

1. Exceeded Expectations
2. Met Expectations
3. Below Expectations
Question 11c:
Institutional culture of the campus

1. Exceeded Expectations
2. Met Expectations
3. Below Expectations

Question 11d:
Regional recreation opportunities, school districts, etc.

1. Exceeded Expectations
2. Met Expectations
3. Below Expectations
Question 12:

Were you hired as part of a "cluster" search (as opposed to a departmental search)?
(Note: cluster searches applicable only to hiring during the 2015-2016 academic year)

1. Yes
2. No

Question 13:

If you were hired through a cluster search, did the fact that you were part of a cluster positively impact your decision to join UCR?

1. Yes
2. No
Question 14a:

If you were hired through a cluster search, rank the following factors that influenced your decision in the choice of home department(s):

1. Field in which you earned your Ph.D. or in which you had a prior faculty appointment/post-doctoral fellowship
2. Important
3. Neutral
4. Least Important
5. Not Important
6. Don't Know

Question 14b:

If you were hired through a cluster search, rank the following factors that influenced your decision in the choice of home department(s):

1. Subject matter of the research cluster
2. Most Important
3. Important
4. Neutral
5. Least Important
6. Not Important
7. Don't Know
Question 14c:

If you were hired through a cluster search, rank the following factors that influenced your decision in the choice of home department(s)

Research resources available to the cluster
1. Most Important
2. Important
3. Neutral
4. Least Important
5. Not Important
6. Don't Know

Question 14d:

If you were hired through a cluster search, rank the following factors that influenced your decision in the choice of home department(s)

Number of planned faculty lines within the cluster
1. Most Important
2. Important
3. Neutral
4. Least Important
5. Not Important
6. Don't Know
Question 14e:
If you were hired through a cluster search, rank the following factors that influenced your decision in the choice of home department(s):

Pre-existing interdisciplinary campus strength in the cluster research area:
1. Most Important
2. Important
3. Neutral
4. Least Important
5. Not Important
6. Don't Know

Question 14f:
If you were hired through a cluster search, rank the following factors that influenced your decision in the choice of home department(s):

Pre-existing departmental strength in the cluster research area:
1. Most Important
2. Important
3. Neutral
4. Least Important
5. Not Important
6. Don't Know
Question 14g:
If you were hired through a cluster search, rank the following factors that influenced your decision in the choice of home department(s):

Enthusiasm of and time spent with faculty involved in the cluster
1. Most Important
2. Important
3. Neutral
4. Least Important
5. Not Important
6. Don't Know

Question 14h:
If you were hired through a cluster search, rank the following factors that influenced your decision in the choice of home department(s):

Enthusiasm of and time spent with faculty within your home department(s)
1. Most Important
2. Important
3. Neutral
4. Least Important
5. Not Important
6. Don't Know
Question 14:
If you were hired through a cluster search, rank the following factors that influenced your decision in the choice of home department(s):

Different pay scales among colleges/disciplines
1. Most Important
2. Important
3. Neutral
4. Least Important
5. Not Important
6. Don't Know

Question 15a:
The cluster interview process was well organized and efficient.

1. Strongly Agree
2. Agree
3. Neutral
4. Disagree
5. Strongly Disagree
6. Don't Know
Question 15b:

The cluster hiring process (e.g. negotiations over selection of home department(s), salary, research funding and support, etc.) was well organized and efficient.

1. Strongly Agree
2. Agree
3. Neutral
4. Disagree
5. Strongly Disagree
6. Don’t Know

Question 15c:

The definition(s) of the research cluster, job description, and/or search criteria were clear to you when you applied for the position.

1. Strongly Agree
2. Agree
3. Neutral
4. Disagree
5. Strongly Disagree
6. Don’t Know
Question 15d:

The definition(s) of the research cluster, job description, and/or search criteria were clear to you by the time you visited campus for your on campus interview(s) and job talk.

1. Strongly Agree
2. Agree
3. Neutral
4. Disagree
5. Strongly Disagree
6. Don't Know

Question 15e:

The definition(s) of the research cluster, job description, and/or search criteria were never clear to you.

1. Strongly Agree
2. Agree
3. Neutral
4. Disagree
5. Strongly Disagree
6. Don't Know
Question 15f:
The department and college/school responsible for funding your salary and research support, including start up funding and lab/office space were clearly identified during your negotiations over the terms of employment.

1. Strongly Agree
2. Agree
3. Neutral
4. Disagree
5. Strongly Disagree
6. Don't Know

Question 15g:
The faculty with whom you met in interviews had appropriate knowledge and relevant expertise to assess your research and candidacy.

1. Strongly Agree
2. Agree
3. Neutral
4. Disagree
5. Strongly Disagree
6. Don't Know
Question 15h:
The proposed home department(s) played a clearly defined and appropriate role in the interview process.

1. Strongly Agree
2. Agree
3. Neutral
4. Disagree
5. Strongly Disagree
6. Don't Know

Question 16a:
The home department provided you with adequate office space and related equipment (e.g., furniture, computer).

1. Strongly Agree
2. Agree
3. Neutral
4. Disagree
5. Strongly Disagree
6. Don't Know
Question 16b:
The campus or department provided adequate lab space and/or other necessary facilities to support your research and (if applicable) that of the cluster as a whole.

1. Strongly Agree
2. Agree
3. Neutral
4. Disagree
5. Strongly Disagree
6. Don’t Know

Question 16c:
The campus or department provided adequate administrative staff to support you individually and (if applicable) the cluster as a whole.

1. Strongly Agree
2. Agree
3. Neutral
4. Disagree
5. Strongly Disagree
6. Don’t Know
Question 16d:

The campus or department provided adequate equipment, or sufficient funding for its purchase, to support you individually and (if applicable) the cluster as a whole.

1. Strongly Agree
2. Agree
3. Neutral
4. Disagree
5. Strongly Disagree
6. Don't Know

Question 18a:

Have you been granted a delay in tenure or additional time to tenure because of a lack of lab space or other essential research support? (If, so please elaborate.)

1. Yes
2. No
Question 19a:

The cluster hiring strategy has high potential for improving the quality and reputation of UCR as a research campus.

1. Strongly Agree
2. Agree
3. Neutral
4. Disagree
5. Strongly Disagree
6. Don't Know

Question 19b:

The cluster hiring strategy has moderate potential for improving the quality and reputation of UCR as a research campus.

1. Strongly Agree
2. Agree
3. Neutral
4. Disagree
5. Strongly Disagree
6. Don't Know
Question 19c:

The cluster hiring strategy has little or no potential for improving the quality and reputation of UCR as a research campus.

1. Strongly Agree
2. Agree
3. Neutral
4. Disagree
5. Strongly Disagree
6. Don't Know

Question 19d:

The cluster hiring strategy poses a high risk of degrading the quality and reputation of UCR as a research campus.

1. Strongly Agree
2. Agree
3. Neutral
4. Disagree
5. Strongly Disagree
6. Don't Know
Question 19e:
The cluster hiring strategy poses a moderate risk of degrading the quality and reputation of UCR as a research campus.

1. Strongly Agree
2. Agree
3. Neutral
4. Disagree
5. Strongly Disagree
6. Don’t Know

Question 19f:
The cluster hiring strategy poses little or no risk of degrading the quality and reputation of UCR as a research campus.

1. Strongly Agree
2. Agree
3. Neutral
4. Disagree
5. Strongly Disagree
6. Don’t Know
Question 20:
What percentage of new faculty members planned for the campus should be hired as part of a cluster (pick one):

1. Excellent
2. Very Good
3. Good
4. Fair
5. Poor
6. Very Poor
7. Don't Know

Question 21:
Which of the following best fits your overall assessment of the design of the cluster hiring program?

1. Excellent
2. Very Good
3. Good
4. Fair
5. Poor
6. Very Poor
7. Don't Know
Question 22:

Which of the following best fits your overall assessment of the implementation of the cluster hiring program?

1. Excellent
2. Very Good
3. Good
4. Fair
5. Poor
6. Very Poor
7. Don’t Know