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WHAT THE SURVEY MEASURED

Seven Dependent Variables
  - Gender Bias
  - Women’s Resources & Relationships
  - Institutional Support
  - Own Resources & Relationships
  - Devalued Social Identities
  - Problem Settings
  - Job Satisfaction

Independent Variables
  - Gender
  - Race
  - College
  - Rank
  - Years at UMass Lowell

Open response questions
  - Valuing experience
  - Devaluing experiences

EXAMPLE QUESTIONS

- Gender Bias (6 questions)
  - Example: At my institution, women are evaluated more harshly for tenure and promotion compared to men.

- Women’s Resources & Relationships (4 questions)
  - Example: Colleagues in my workplace advocate for the research and scholarship needs of female faculty.

- Institutional Support (5 questions)
  - Example: My institution supports policies that ensure everyone is treated fairly regardless of race, gender, and sexual orientation.
EXAMPLE QUESTIONS

• Own Resources & Relationships (5 questions)
  Example: Colleagues in my workplace advocate for my research and scholarship needs.

• Devalued Social Identities (9 questions)
  If you have felt devalued at work, do you think it has been related to any of the following social identities you have? Variable is the total number of different social identities indicated.
  • Age, ethnicity, faculty status, gender, parental status, national origin, race, religion, sexual orientation, other

EXAMPLE QUESTIONS

• Problem Settings (6 questions)
  Please indicate how often you have felt devalued in the past 12 months in each of the following settings?
  • Regular meetings with faculty
  • Special decision making meetings
  • Projects that involve collaboration with other faculty
  • Informal encounters
  • Big public events
  • Interactions with students

• Job Satisfaction (1 question)
  Taking everything into consideration, how do you feel about your job as a whole?
  (Extremely Dissatisfied, to Extremely Satisfied)

RESPONDENTS

• Administered in summer 2017
• 370 faculty respondents (65% of total faculty, N=571; 47.4% women)
  • Sample was representative of gender, employment length and college
  • Not representative of faculty race and rank
    • Asian faculty were underrepresented
    • Non-Asian faculty of color were overrepresented
    • Tenured faculty were underrepresented
    • Tenure track (not tenured) and Lecturers were overrepresented
    • Some racial and rank categories too small to analyze separately

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>UML Faculty</th>
<th>Survey Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>24.7%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>68.3%</td>
<td>68.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Asian Faculty of Care</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td>15.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure Track</td>
<td>27.0%</td>
<td>31.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>36.4%</td>
<td>32.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Professor</td>
<td>37.8%</td>
<td>23.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecturer</td>
<td>16.1%</td>
<td>31.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

QUANTITATIVE HIGHLIGHTS

• Demographic reporting
  • 88 (24%) did not report any demographics
  • 49 (13%) reported only some demographics
  • 233 (63%) reported all demographics
  • This variable was only significant when looking at satisfaction question (F(2, 242)=4.740, p<.01) and the Own R & R (F(2, 242)=4.352, p<.01), with those not reporting demographics indicating lower satisfaction and fewer personal resources and relationships.
QUANTITATIVE HIGHLIGHTS

- Overall, significant main effects of
  - Gender (F(14, 374) = 4.985, p<.001, $\eta^2 =.157$).
  - College (F(28, 676) = 1.624, p<.05, $\eta^2 =.057$).
  - Race (F(21, 670)=3.694, p<.001, $\eta^2 =.100$).
- No differences based on faculty rank.
- Significant interactions between
  - Gender & College (F(49,954) = 2.015, p<.001, $\eta^2 =.069$).
  - Faculty rank & College (F(98,1192) = 1.493, p<.005, $\eta^2 =.099$).

Female faculty members:
- Reported more gender bias on campus than males
- Reported fewer women’s resources & relationships on campus than males
- Reported feeling devalued related to more social identities than males
- Reported feeling devalued more often in university settings than males

White faculty members:
- Reported more gender bias than other races

Non-Asian faculty of color:
- Reported more social identities for which they felt they had been devalued
- Reported fewer own resources & resources than White or Asian faculty did

GENDER BIAS

(SCALE: 1-FAIR TO 6-SIGNIFICANT GENDER BIAS)

- Gender bias $M=2.56$, $SE=.080$
- Females believe there is significantly more gender bias than male professors (F(2,242)=11.589, p<.001).
- White professors believe there is significantly more gender bias than Asian and faculty of color (F(3, 242)=6.998, p<.005).
- No faculty rank or college effects.

WOMEN’S RESOURCES & RELATIONSHIPS

(SCALE: 1-LACK TO 6=ENOUGH)

- Women faculty’s resources and relationships $M=4.27$, $SE=.065$
- Male professors believe there are more resources and relationships for women than females do (F(2,242)=6.552, p<.001).
- No race, faculty rank, or college effects.
**INSTITUTIONAL SUPPORT**

(SCALE: 1=HIGHLY NOT SUPPORTIVE TO 6=HIGHLY SUPPORTIVE)

- Institutional support Overall M=4.70, SE = .055
- No gender, race, faculty rank, or college effects
- Gender by college significant effect on faculty perceptions about institutional support
  \((F(7,242)=2.109, p<.05, \eta^2 = .071)\)
- Results shown are top 2 and bottom 2 groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender by College</th>
<th>Institutional Support (M)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male faculty in the College of Business</td>
<td>5.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male faculty in the College of Health Sciences</td>
<td>5.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female faculty in the College of FAHSS &amp; Education</td>
<td>4.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female faculty in the Colleges of Science &amp; Engineering</td>
<td>4.18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**OWN RESOURCES & RELATIONSHIPS**

- Race & Demographic Info Provided

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race &amp; Demographic</th>
<th>Info Provided</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>4.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>3.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Asian Faculty of Color</td>
<td>3.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Same demographic</td>
<td>3.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All demographic</td>
<td>3.30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Gender by College

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender by College</th>
<th>Own Resources &amp; Relationships (M)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male faculty in the College of Business</td>
<td>5.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male faculty in the Colleges of FAHSS &amp; Education</td>
<td>4.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female faculty in the College of FAHSS &amp; Education</td>
<td>4.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female faculty in the Colleges of Science &amp; Engineering</td>
<td>4.81</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**DEVALUED SOCIAL IDENTITIES**

- Female faculty felt devalued related to more social identities than did male faculty
- Faculty of color Non-Asian had significantly more identities for which they felt devalued than Asian and white professors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Identity</th>
<th>Female Faculty</th>
<th>Male Faculty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>19.5%</td>
<td>18.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability</td>
<td>32.5%</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Origin</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>18.0%</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Orientation</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PROBLEM SETTINGS**

(SCALE: 1=NEVER, 2=RARELY, 3=SOMETIMES, 4=OFTEN, 5=ALWAYS)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Setting</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regular meetings with faculty</td>
<td>2.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special decision making meetings</td>
<td>2.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projects that involve collaboration with other faculty</td>
<td>1.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informal encounters</td>
<td>2.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Big public events</td>
<td>1.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interactions with students</td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Learning with Purpose

QUALITATIVE RESULTS

EXPERIENCES OF BEING VALUED

• What ‘small things’ make you feel valued? (132 comments)
  – Most comments fell into five main themes:
    1. Recognition and acknowledgment (50)
       – “Receiving an award of excellence in teaching made me feel valued”
    2. Respect and support from colleagues (35)
       – “When a colleague asks me my professional opinion about an aspect of their research or teaching.”
    3. Support from leaders (e.g., dean, chair, administrators) (16)
       – “I was told by my dean that she actually wants to help with getting my research funded, rather than letting it languish.”
    4. Opportunities for responsibility and leadership (12)
       – “Being allowed to assume a leadership role when I asked if I could”
    5. Respect and appreciation from students (10)
       – “Students provide appreciation in the form of letters, emails and visits to my office, sometimes years after graduation.”

EXPERIENCES OF BEING DEVALUED

• What ‘small things’ make you feel devalued? (124 comments)
  – Wider range of themes than ‘valued’ comments
  – Five frequently cited themes:
    1. Being ignored (22)
       – “Made a suggestion in the faculty meeting that was ignored. Minutes later a male colleague said made the same suggestion and everyone was interested to hear why and then agreed.”
    2. Disrespect from leaders (e.g., chair, dean, administrators) (11)
       – “Being yelled at by the Associate Dean of College”
    3. Negative experiences related to work or service loads (10)
       – “Asked to add significant item to my service load with no compensating decrease in other service activities.”
    4. Demeaning or dismissive interactions (10)
       – “Having the word ‘just’ used in front of my title/work”
    5. Negative experiences related to faculty rank or status (9)
       – “Negative comments about being NTT, or patronizing comments about how being NTT is not bad (in a context where an advantage of being TT is very obvious).”
JOB SATISFACTION
(Scale: 1=EXTREMELY DISSATISFIED, 7 = EXTREMELY SATISFIED)

- Overall, more than 70% of respondents were moderately or extremely satisfied with their jobs.
- Only 54.8% of non-Asian faculty of color were moderately or extremely satisfied with their jobs.
- Only 56.9% of Associate professors with tenure were moderately or extremely satisfied with their jobs.
- * p < .05, ** p < .01

ONGOING QUESTIONS

- Why are there differential perceptions of the work environment? (women vs. men; white faculty vs. faculty of color)
  - Do some faculty not see the subtle biases? Not see them as a problem?
- Why do so many people report no (or limited) demographics?
  - Fear of being identified, distrust around retaliation, survey fatigue, other?
- Why is faculty status endorsed by many as a “devalued” identity?
  - NTT vs. TT? Are junior TT faculty being intimidated/bullied/devalued?
- Why are there few changes from 2015 to 2017?
  - Change takes time (Stewart)? Other reasons?

IMPLICATIONS

ATTEND TO SPECIFIC BIAS EXPERIENCED BY SUBGROUPS

- Women – perceive more bias against women (i.e., gender biases and lack of resources for women), multiple identities devalued, devalued across settings
- Faculty of color, not Asian – fewer own resources; multiple identities devalued
- Women in S & E – perceive less institutional support for women, fewer own resources

FOCUS ON WHERE DEVALUING HAPPENS MOST

- Department meetings
- Special decision making meetings (personnel, hiring, etc.)

PROVOST’S SPEAKERS SERIES
- Awareness campaigns
- Mentoring initiatives
- Survey feedback sessions
- College-based initiatives
- What more?
IMPLICATIONS
ENHANCE SENSE OF BEING VALUED FOR ALL FACULTY

• Support from leadership (& reduce incidents of disrespect)
• Support from colleagues (& reduce dismissive interactions)
• Opportunities for leadership
• Respect from students

*****
• Provost office recognition & awards – mentoring and more
• Highlighting best practices – April 18th event
• Also builds on other work, e.g., bystander training
• What more?

QUESTIONS? NEXT STEPS?