Report on the Results of the 2022 MIT Quality of Life Survey
for the Department of Architecture

Prepared by the Strategy and Equity team, May 2023

I INTRODUCTION

The MIT Quality of Life Survey is an Institute-wide survey aimed at understanding the lives of MIT faculty, staff, postdoctoral scholars, and students. It is conducted every two years and has been running since 2012. In 2022, the [survey](#) was conducted from March 23, 2022 to April 11, 2022 and included two versions – one for faculty and staff and one for students – with similar or corresponding questions. Staff surveyed included administrative staff, research staff, instructional staff, postdocs, service staff, and support staff. Students included undergraduate and graduate students. The two versions of the survey consisted of eight main categories. This report summarizes some of the main results of questions pertaining to issues related directly or indirectly to the Department of Architecture, as opposed to the Institute more broadly.

113 responses to the survey were received from our department, with a 35% response rate. Compared to the 2012/13 survey, the response rate from our department has continuously dropped from 50% for that first survey, with a trend over the last decade of female members responding more than male members.[1] In the 2022 survey, the response rate from female members was 41% compared to a response rate of 29% from male members. The response rate for non-URM members was 37% compared to 30% for URM members. Responses within roles in our department varied. Administrative staff had a 78% response rate, and support staff had over a 67% response rate. Graduate students, the majority of the department's population, had a 34% response rate. Undergraduate students had a 22% response rate. Faculty had a 38% response rate. Instructional staff had the lowest response rate, at 16%. The summary of results presented here should be interpreted in light of these response rates. Also, both administrative staff and undergraduates are relatively small populations in our department, thus responses in these roles may be highly influenced by one or two respondents. The response rates or number of responses for instructional staff, postdocs, research staff, and service staff in our department were too low to be counted as valid responses and, in some cases, would compromise anonymity. Therefore, they are not included in this report, except in aggregate with all other department roles.

---

[1] Responses from nonbinary gendered department members were too low to be included in the reporting of responses and would compromise anonymity.

This report pulls out nine questions from both versions of the survey. Seven questions were taken from the Climate category, one from the Workload and Arrangements category, and one from the Health & Wellness category.[2] Eight of the questions are related to our department, and one question is related to DEIB and not specifically to the department:

1. My primary unit/major is a good fit for me.
2. My supervisor/department creates a collegial and supportive environment.
3. I feel excluded from an informal network in my unit/department.
4. My supervisor/advisor seems to care about me as a person.
5. My unit/major or program is a place where individuals/students may comfortably raise personal and/or family responsibilities (Faculty/Staff: when scheduling unit obligations).
6. My unit is diverse/The community in my major is a diverse community.
7. I have to work harder than some of my colleagues/peers to be taken seriously.
8. Overall, how would you rate your workload/academic and research workload?
9. During the past year, how often have you experienced acts of bigotry or disrespect based on your social identity (e.g. sex, race, national origin, sexual orientation, or values)?

Section **II Main Results** describes the main takeaways of the survey. Section **III Summaries of Responses** to Individual Questions gives more detailed summaries of responses to each of the questions. To better understand the responses, they are summarized in three ways. First, responses are summarized in aggregate for our department, which includes all roles. Second, responses are summarized separately for administrative staff, support staff, undergraduate students, graduate students, and faculty in our department. Last, responses from our department are compared to responses Institute-wide.

To provide further context for the survey, section **IV Demographics** gives demographics of our department for 2022 by role and in comparison with MIT as a whole.

II MAIN RESULTS

With a few exceptions, people in our department responded positively or somewhat positively (in other words, not negatively) about quality of life issues in our department. However, their responses were often less positive than responses in aggregate across the Institute as a whole. Among the different roles in our department, graduate students were more often less positive than people in other roles.

---

[2] The categories used in this report are taken from those used in the Institute Tableau reporting of the results of the survey, which differ in some places from the categories used in the separate Faculty/Staff and Student versions of the survey.

Respondents were mostly positive about the environment of the department (question number in parentheses):

- A large majority of respondents (80%) agreed[3] that **the department is a good fit** for them. (1)
- A majority of respondents (68%) agreed that their **supervisor/department creates a collegial and supportive environment.** (2)
- A majority of respondents (60%) agreed that their **supervisor/advisor cares about them as a person.** (4)
- A majority of respondents (69%) agreed that their **unit is diverse**, with just 17% disagreeing. (6)
- A very large majority (92%) respondents indicated that they **never or only occasionally experienced bigotry or disrespect based on social identity.** (9)

Respondents were equal or somewhat balanced on other questions:

- Equal numbers of respondents indicated that they **feel excluded from an informal network in their unit/major** as don't feel excluded. (3)
- Almost half of respondents (48%) agreed that they **feel comfortable raising personal and/or family issues in their unit or program**, but a substantial minority (30%) disagreed. (5)

Respondents were less positive responses about workload:

- A majority of respondents (62%) indicated that their **workload is too heavy or much too heavy.** (8)
- Almost half (49%) respondents indicated that they have to **work harder than some of their colleagues/peers to be taken seriously.** (7)

Negative responses about both the department environment and workload came mostly from graduate students:

- A large percentage (45%) reported that they **feel excluded from an informal network**. On average, grad responses from our department were the highest in feeling excluded, among all grad responses from units[4] reporting on this question. (3)
- On average, their responses were the lowest in their agreement that their **advisor cares about them as a person**, among all reporting units at the Institute. (4)
- On average, their responses were second lowest in their agreement that their **program is a place where students may comfortably bring up personal and/or family responsibilities**, among all reporting units. (5)
- A majority (55%) agreed that they have to **work harder than some of their peers to be taken seriously**. (7)

---

[3] Agreed includes both Strongly Agree or Somewhat Agree.
[4] A unit in the survey refers to a department, lab, or center (DLC).

Some of our most positive responses were from undergraduate students, and in sharp contrast to responses from grads:

- On average, their responses were the second highest, among all reporting units, in their agreement that their **advisor cares about them as a person**. (4)
- On average, their responses were the highest, among all reporting units, in their agreement that their **major is a place where students may comfortably bring up personal and/or family responsibilities**. (5)

However, undergraduate students were not positive about workload:

- 60% agreed that they have to **work harder than some of their peers to be taken seriously.** (7)
- 100% agreed that their **academic and research workload is too heavy.** On average, their responses were the highest, among all reporting units, in their agreement about a too heavy workload. (8)

Although the response rates to these survey questions are not representative of our entire student population, these results suggest that more work be undertaken around our advising and mentoring practices, classroom culture, and community building and wellness programs and activities for our graduate students.

III. SUMMARIES OF RESPONSES TO INDIVIDUAL QUESTIONS

Admin = Administration staff
Faculty = Faculty
Grad = Graduate student
Support = Support staff
UGrad = Undergraduate student

1.
Rate from 1 (Strongly Disagree) to 5 (Strongly Agree) the following statement:
My primary unit/major is a good fit for me. *(Climate: Staff & Faculty Survey/Student Survey)*

The average response department-wide was 4.3, with 80% of respondents agreeing (45% Strongly Agree, 35% Somewhat Agree) that their primary unit/major was a good fit for them, and just 6% disagreeing.

Within roles, the average responses varied from a low of 4.1 for Support to a high of 4.4 for UGrad.

Compared to responses Institute-wide, Admin, Faculty, Support, and Grad average responses from our department were all slightly lower than the Institute averages within those roles. The

UGrad average was somewhat higher than the Institute average. The Faculty average of 4.2 was the furthest from the Institute-wide Faculty average of 4.4.

2.
Rate from 1 (Strongly Disagree) to 5 (Strongly Agree) the following statement:
My supervisor/department creates a collegial and supportive environment*. (Climate: Staff & Faculty Survey/Student Survey)*

The average response department-wide was 3.8, with 68% of respondents agreeing (22% Strongly Agree, 46% Somewhat Agree) that their supervisor/department creates a collegial and supportive environment, and 12% disagreeing (10% Somewhat Disagree, 2% Strongly Disagree).

Within roles, the average responses varied from a low of 3.7 for Grad (16% Strongly Agree, 52% Somewhat Agree) to a high of 4.3 for Support (50% Strongly Agree, 24% Somewhat Agree). Of note, no UGrad and no Support or Admin disagreed that they had a collegial/supportive environment. They all strongly or somewhat agreed that they had a collegial/supportive environment.

Compared to responses Institute-wide, Admin, Faculty, and Grad responses from our department were below Institute averages within their roles. The differences between our department Faculty and Grad average responses and the Institute-wide averages were small. However, our department Admin average response of 3.9 was notably lower than the 4.3 Admin average response Institute-wide, particularly in the distribution of responses. The majority (57%) of our department Admin somewhat agreed that they had a collegial/supportive environment, whereas the majority (56%) of Institute-wide Admin strongly agreed that they had a collegial/supportive environment. Our department UGrad average response was slightly above the Institute average response. Our department and the Institute-wide average responses for Support were equal.

3.
Rate from 1 (Strongly disagree) to 5 (Strongly agree) the following statement:
I feel excluded from an informal network in my unit/department*. (Climate: Staff & Faculty Survey/Student Survey)*

The average response department-wide was 3.0, with almost equal numbers of respondents agreeing as disagreeing to feeling excluded from an informal network in their unit. 36% agreed (10% Strongly Agree, 26% Somewhat Agree) and 34% disagreed (20% Somewhat Disagree, 14% Strongly Disagree).

Within roles, the average responses varied from a low of 2.4 for Faculty, with just 8% agreeing to feeling excluded (8% Strongly Agree, 0% Somewhat Agree), to a high of 3.2 for Grad, with 45% agreeing to feeling excluded (13% Strongly Agree, 32 % Somewhat Agree).

Compared to responses Institute-wide, Faculty, UGrad, and Support average responses in our department were the same or about the same as Institute averages within their roles. The Admin average response of 2.7 from our department was notably higher than the Institute average of 2.2. It ranked in the highest quartile of all Admin averages responses to this question from all reporting units[5]. The Grad average response of 3.2 from our department was also notably higher than the Institute average of 2.7. The Grad average response from our department ranked the highest out of all of the average Grad responses to this question from all reporting units. In other words, despite a score close to the median of 3 for this question, our department had the highest percentage of graduate student respondents who indicated that they feel excluded.

4.
Rate from 1 (Strongly Disagree) to 5 (Strongly Agree) the following statement:
My supervisor/advisor seems to care about me as a person. *(Climate: Staff and Faculty Survey/ Student Survey)*

The average response department-wide was 3.6, with 60% of respondents agreeing (30% Strongly Agree, 30% Somewhat Agree) that their supervisor/advisor cares about them as a person, and 22% disagreeing (11% Somewhat Disagree, 11% Strongly Disagree).

Within roles, the average responses varied from a low of 3.3 for Grad to a high of 4.8 for UGrad. Of note, 80% of UGrad respondents strongly agreed to feeling cared about as a person, and the remaining 20% somewhat agreed. 72% of Faculty agreed (27% Strongly Agree, 45% Somewhat Agree) to feeling cared about. 72% of Admin also agreed (45% Strongly Agree, 29% Somewhat Agree) to feeling cared about. 63% of Support agreed (50% Strongly Agree, 13% Somewhat Agree) to feeling cared about. Of note, while half of Grad agreed (23% Strongly Agree, 28% Somewhat Agree) that their advisor cared about them as a person, a large minority of 30% disagreed (15% Strongly Disagree, 15% Somewhat Disagree).

Compared to responses Institute-wide, the largest disparities were in UGrad and Grad responses from our department. The UGrad average of 4.8 in our department was significantly higher than the Institute UGrad average of 3.6. Of note, the UGrad average response from our department ranked second highest out of all the average UGrad responses to this question from all reporting units. The Grad average of 3.3 from our department, on the other hand, was lower than the Institute Grad average of 3.9. The Grad average response from our department ranked the lowest out of all the average Grad responses to this question from all reporting units. Within all other roles, however, the averages in our department were only slightly lower than the Institute averages, and with somewhat smaller percentages in our department strongly agreeing to feeling cared about than Institute percentages.

---

[5] A reporting unit is a department or center with five or more responses to a question.

5.
Rate from 1 (Strongly disagree) to 5 (Strongly Agree) the following statement:
My unit/major or program is a place where individuals/students may comfortably raise personal and/or family responsibilities (Faculty/Staff: when scheduling unit obligations). *(Climate: Staff & Faculty Survey/ Student Survey)*

The average response department-wide was 3.2, with 48% of the respondents agreeing (17% Strongly Agree, 31% Somewhat Agree) that their unit/major is a place where they can comfortably raise personal/family responsibilities, and 30% disagreeing (18% Somewhat Disagree, 12% Strongly Disagree).

Within roles, the average responses varied from a low of 2.9 for Grad to a high of 4.3 for Support. Of note, 88% of Support agreed (38% Strongly Agree, 50% Somewhat Agree) and 0% disagreed that they can comfortably raise personal/family responsibilities. 86% of Admin agreed (29% Strongly Agree, 57% Somewhat Agree) that they can comfortably raise personal/family responsibilities and 0% disagreed. 80% of UGrad agreed (20% Strongly Agree, 60% Somewhat Agree) and 0% disagreed. Among Faculty, 85% agreed (31% Strongly Agree, 54% Somewhat Agree) and 16% disagreed (8% Strongly Disagree, 8% Somewhat Disagree). However, among Grad, just 31% agreed (12% Strongly Agree and 19% Somewhat Agree) that they can comfortably raise personal/family responsibilities, and 40% disagreed (15% Strongly Disagree, 25% Somewhat Disagree).

Compared to responses Institute-wide, the Support average response from our department was slightly higher than the Institute average, the Admin average response was slightly lower than the Institute average. The Grad and Faculty average responses from our department were lower than the Institute averages. Of note, the Grad average response from our department ranked second lowest out of all of the Grad average responses to this question from all reporting units. Conversely, the UGrad average response from our department, however, was notably higher than the Institute average. The UGrad average response from our department ranked the highest out of all of the UGrad average responses to this question from all reporting units.

6.
Rate from 1 (Strongly Disagree) to 5 (Strongly Agree) the following statement:
My unit is diverse/The community in my major is a diverse community. *(Climate: Staff & Faculty survey/ Student Survey)*

The average response department-wide was 3.7, with a strong majority of 69% agreeing (25% Strongly Agree, 44% Somewhat Agree) that their unit/major is diverse, and 17% disagreeing (12% Somewhat Disagree, 5% Strongly Disagree).

Within roles, the average responses varied from a low of 2.4 for Faculty to a high of 4.1 for Grad, indicating a wide variation of views about the diversity of the department. 61% of Faculty disagreed (38% Somewhat Disagree, 23% Strongly Disagree) that their unit is diverse. On the

other hand, 81% of Grad agreed (38% Strongly Agree, 43% Somewhat Agree), and 80% of UGrad agreed (20% Strongly Agree, 60% Somewhat Agree) that their unit/major is diverse. 57% of Admin and 50% of Support somewhat agreed that their unit is diverse.

Compared to responses Institute-wide, the Admin average response from our department was the same as the Institute average, and the Support average response from our department was almost the same as the Institute average. The Grad and UGrad average responses from our department were higher than the Institute averages, indicating stronger agreement about the diversity of the unit/major than respondents Institute-wide. The Faculty average from our department, however, was notably lower than the Institute average. The Faculty average response from our department ranked the lowest out of all of the Faculty average responses to this question from all reporting units.

Compared to the Quality of Life survey two years ago, the Grad average response increased from 3.8 to 4.1, indicating an increased perception of diversity. On the other hand, the Faculty average response dropped from 3.2 to 2.4, indicating a decreased perception of diversity.

7.
Rate from 1 (Strongly Disagree) to 5 (Strongly Agree) the following statement:
I have to work harder than some of my colleagues/peers to be taken seriously. (Climate: Staff & Faculty survey/ Student Survey)

The average response department-wide was 3.4, with 49% of the respondents agreeing (18% Strongly Agree, 31% Somewhat Agree) that they have to work harder than some of their colleagues/peers to be taken seriously, and 23% disagreeing (16% Somewhat Disagree, 7% Strongly Disagree).

Within roles, the average responses varied from a low of 2.6 for Support to a high of 3.6 for UGrad. About half (51%) of Support disagreed (39% Somewhat Disagree, 13% Strongly Disagree) that they have to work harder than some of their colleagues to be taken seriously, and just 13% agreed (Strongly Agreed). 57% of Admin agreed (14% Strongly Agree, 43% Somewhat Agree) that they have to work harder than some of their colleagues to be taken seriously. Faculty were almost evenly distributed between agreeing and disagreeing that they have to work harder than some of their colleagues to be taken seriously. 60% of UGrad agreed (20% Strongly Agree, 40% Somewhat Agree), and 55% of Grad agreed (19% Strongly Agree, 36% Somewhat Agree) that they have to work harder than some of their peers to be taken seriously.

Compared to responses Institute-wide, the UGrad, Grad, Faculty, and Support average responses from our department were somewhat higher than the Institute averages. The Admin average from our department was notably higher than the Institute average.

8.

Rate from 1 (Much Too Light) to 5 (Much Too Heavy) the following statement:
Overall, how would you rate your workload/academic and research workload? *(Workload & Arrangements: Staff & Faculty Survey/ Student Survey)*

The average response department-wide was 3.7, with 62% of respondents indicating a too heavy workload (50% Too Heavy, 12% Much Too Heavy). 37% of respondents considered their workload to be About Right, and 1% Too Light.

Within roles, the average responses varied from a low of 3.5 for Support to a high of 4.2 for UGrad and Admin. Of note, 100% of the UGrad respondents considered their workload to be too heavy (20% Much Too Heavy, 80% Too Heavy). Similarly, 83% of Admin considered their workload to be too heavy (33% Much Too Heavy, 50 % Too Heavy). 62% of Grad considered their workload to be too heavy (10% Much Too Heavy, 52% Too heavy). Faculty were almost evenly split in responses: 54% indicating a too heavy workload (8% Much Too Heavy, 46% Too Heavy) and 46% responding About Right (46%). A majority (63%) of Support rated their workload as About Right.

Compared to responses Institute-wide, Admin and UGrad average responses from our department were above Institute averages within their roles. Of note, our UGrad average response was the highest of all UGrad average responses from all reporting units at the Institute. Our Admin average response was also in the highest quartile of all the Admin average responses from all reporting units at the Institute.

9.
Rate from 1 (Never) to 4 (Very Often) the following statement:
During the past year, how often have you experienced acts of bigotry or disrespect based on your social identity (e.g. sex, race, national origin, sexual orientation, or values)? *(Health & Wellness)*

The average response department-wide was 1.5, with a majority of 59% indicating they Never experienced bigotry or disrespect based on social identity. 33% indicated Occasionally, 7% Often, and 1% Very Often.

Within roles, the average responses varied from a low of 1.1 for Support to a high of 1.6 for Faculty and Admin. Faculty had equal percentages (46%) of respondents who indicated they Occasionally experienced bigotry/disrespect as Never experienced bigotry/disrespect. Admin had the highest percentage (29%) of respondents who indicated they Often experienced bigotry/disrespect, but with a large percentage (71%) who indicated they Never experienced bigotry/disrespect. Among Grad, 39% indicated they Occasionally experienced bigotry/disrespect, and 54% Never. Both Undergrad and Support respondents had high percentages indicating they Never experienced bigotry/disrespect (80% and 86% respectively), with the remaining percentages indicating Occasionally.

Compared to responses Institute-wide, the Faculty, Grad, and Admin average responses were somewhat higher than the Institute-wide averages. The UGrad and Support averages were just slightly lower.

IV DEMOGRAPHICS

The data here are from 2022 and are self-reported by individuals through Atlas.

	Black or African-American		Hispanic or Latino		American Indian or Alaskan Native		Native Hawaiian or Other PI		Asian		2 or more races URM		2 or more races non-URM		2 or more races*	White		International		Unknown	
	Arch	MIT	Arch	MIT	Arch	MIT	Arch	MIT	Arch	MIT	Arch	MIT	Arch	MIT	MIT	Arch	MIT	Arch	MIT	Arch	MIT
UGrad	0%	7%	3%	15%	3%	.1%	0%	0%	31%	33%	10%	-	3%	-	8%	28%	24%	17%	10%	3%	2%
Grad	5%	3%	8%	6%	0%	0%	0%	0%	6%	12%	1%	-	1%	-	3%	21%	29%	55%	41%	3%	5%
Admin	0%	5%	0%	5%	1%	0%	0%	.2%	0%	7%	0%	-	0%	-	1.6%	67%	70%	0%	.6%	22%	9%
Support	8%	11%	25%	8%	0%	0%	0%	0%	0%	8%	0%	-	0%	-	2.4%	42%	59%	0%	3%	25%	9%
Faculty	6%	4%	3%	4%	0%	.1%	0%	0%	6%	12%	0%	-	3%	-	1.7%	54%	65%	0%	3%	29%	10%

*Data for MIT for 2 or more races combines both URM and non-URM

	Female		Male	
	Arch	MIT	Arch	MIT
UGrad	69%	48%	31%	52%
Grad	57%	38%	43%	62%
Admin	56%	60%	44%	40%
Support	58%	75%	42%	25%
Faculty	37%	25%	63%	75%