The results of the second Value Survey aligned with results of the first. There was an overall increase in scores, an encouraging sign. However, the overall increase did not appear to be statistically significant.

1. One main driver of survey opinions was Work. In the Work arena, the major drivers were and "Clear understanding what is expected of you."

Plans: I will continue with implementation of my Resource Allocation plan to address concerns about "Able to do stimulating work."

(a) We will update or purchase new departmental equipment, prioritized to reflect the number of users and their impact on the departmental research mission. We have thus far in 2017-2018 provided most or all funds for modern air shakers on MI2 and MI6, a new Tecan plate reader, a Mass Spec ionization apparatus for proteomics work, and a bath sonicator for chromatin fragmentation. This plan is being augmented through my work with EHS to modernize and reduce mold contamination in the MI 273 coldroom. EHS is currently collecting estimates for the renovation.

(b) We will ensure that our PhD student admissions aligns with our research programs and labs in need of students. In 2018 we increased the number of admitted students and implemented an innovation of Sandy's to increase out Neuroscience applicant pool. We will continue to enroll larger PhD student classes provided that departmental grant support is strong enough to absorb costs for students who enter a laboratory, and provided that our applicant pool remains strong. Also, I have formalized the process whereby a PhD student can enter a lab outside of our department: https://www.cmu.edu/bio/graduate/phd_program/requirements.html#advisor Most importantly, our department will not cover costs for students in outside labs. This step will preserve financial support for students in our own labs.

2. A second driver of survey opinions was Remuneration. In the Remuneration arena, the major driver was "Salary competitive with comparable institutions."

Plans: I have worked with the Dean's office to remedy inequities among our own faculty's salaries. I had requested salary comparison data for peer institutions from the Provost's office, and found out that they do not carry out such studies. I regret that I cannot justify using departmental funds to do such a study ourselves.