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SURVEY CONTEXT

MAKING WAVES INTERVENTION PROGRAM

GOAL 1
Disrupt Microaggressions
- Awareness Campaign Re: Microaggressions
- Feedback Cycles on Climate Data
- Bystander Training for Faculty

GOAL 2
Provide Mentoring
- IDEA Communities & Group Mentoring
- Networking Opportunities & 50/50 Lectures

GOAL 3
Promote Equity & Accountability
- Foggy Climate Initiative
  - Personnel Protocols
  - Service Equity
- Accountability Initiative
  - Departmental Goal Setting
  - Recognize Best Practices

Interpersonal
Individual
Structural
THE SURVEY & WAVES

- 2015, 2017, 2019
- Often awareness leads to increased reporting
- Survey has changed over the years due to several factors

WHAT THE SURVEY MEASURED

22 DEPENDENT VARIABLES

- Women’s Gender Bias
- Men’s Gender Bias
- Women’s Resources & Relationships
- Men’s Resources & Relationships
- Own Resources & Relationships
- Women’s Institutional Support
- Men’s Institutional Support
- Devalued Social Identities
- Problem Settings
- Job Satisfaction
- Teaching
- Mentoring
- Team Orientation
- Collective Efficacy Toward Equity
- Tolerance for Individual Differences
- Perceived Departmental Fairness
- Perceived Department Belonging
- Perceived Influence
- Likelihood of Colleague Intervention
- Work-Life Balance
- Sexual Harassment
- Trust in the UML Process
WHAT THE SURVEY MEASURED

**Independent Variables**
- Gender
- Race
- College
- Faculty Rank

**Open response questions**
- Valuing experience
- Devaluing experiences
- Department’s fairness
- Faculty’s influence in department
- Faculty experienced microaggression

RESPONDENTS

- Administered in summer 2019
- 327 faculty respondents (57% of total faculty, N=576)
  - Sample was representative of faculty rank
  - Not representative of gender, race, and college

- Demographic reporting
  - 4 (1.2%) did not report any demographics
  - 130 (39.8%) reported only some demographics
  - 193 (59%) reported all demographics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>UML Faculty</th>
<th>Survey Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>55.7%</td>
<td>45.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>44.3%</td>
<td>54.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>20.3%</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>67.0%</td>
<td>74.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty of Color</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
<td>17.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAHSS</td>
<td>29.3%</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Sciences</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>13.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>22.7%</td>
<td>19.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>19.4%</td>
<td>13.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
QUANTITATIVE HIGHLIGHTS

• Overall, significant main effects of
  – Faculty Rank $(F(100, 402.9) = 13.975, p<.001, \eta^2 = .773)$.  
  – Gender $(F(50, 202) = 39.652, p<.001, \eta^2 = .908)$.  

• No main effects of college or race  

• Significant interactions between  
  – Faculty rank & Race $(F(175,694.9) = 1.273, p<.05, \eta^2 = .236)$.  
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QUANTITATIVE HIGHLIGHTS

• Female faculty members:  
  – Reported more gender bias & sexual harassment on campus than males  
  – Reported fewer women’s resources and relationships & institutional support than males  
  – Reported feeling devalued more often in university settings than males  
  – Reported feeling less perceived department belonging & department fairness than males

• Faculty members in Science & Business:  
  – Reported feeling more fairness in their department than faculty in Education and Health Sciences

• Faculty of color (not Asian):  
  – Reported more social identities for which they felt they had been devalued than White and Asian faculty  
  – Reported feeling devalued more often in university settings than White and Asian faculty
**WOMEN’S GENDER BIAS**

(Scale: 1 = Fair to 6 = Significant Gender Bias)

- Women's gender bias $M = 3.41$, $SE = .094$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender** &amp; Race**</th>
<th>Female $M = 4.05$</th>
<th>Male $M = 2.70$</th>
<th>Other/Did not answer $M = 3.22$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>3.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>4.37</td>
<td>4.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty of Color, Non-Asian</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>4.37</td>
<td>4.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did not answer</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>4.37</td>
<td>4.30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- No college effect
- * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$

**WOMEN’S RESOURCES & RELATIONSHIPS**

(Scale: 1 = Lack to 6 = Enough)

- Women faculty’s resources and relationships $M = 4.27$, $SE = .079$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty Rank**</th>
<th>Assis/Assoc. Prof Tenure Track $M = 4.39$</th>
<th>Assoc. Prof. Tenured $M = 3.86$</th>
<th>Full Prof. $M = 4.37$</th>
<th>Teaching Prof. $M = 4.30$</th>
<th>Other/Did not answer $M = 4.39$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

- No race nor college effects.
- * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$
2017 AND 2019 RESULTS COMPARISON
62 SURVEY PARTICIPANTS WERE MATCHED

1. Women’s Gender Bias

- No gender, faculty rank, race, nor college interactions.
- *p<.05

2. Women’s Research and Relationship

- No year differences
- No gender, faculty rank, race, nor college interactions.

WOMEN’S INSTITUTIONAL SUPPORT

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

- Women faculty’s Institutional support
  Overall M=4.47, SE = .065
- No race, faculty rank, nor college effects
MEN’S GENDER BIAS, RESOURCES & RELATIONSHIPS, & INSTITUTIONAL SUPPORT

(Scale: 1 = Fair to 6 = Significant Gender Bias, 1 = Lack to 6 = Enough)

- Men’s gender bias $M = 2.69$, $SE = .055$ (1 = fair to 6 = significant gender bias)
- Men faculty’s resources and relationships $M = 4.73$, $SE = .067$ (1 = Lack to 6 = Enough)
- Men faculty’s institutional support $M = 4.38$, $SE = .063$
  
  (I = highly not supportive to 6 = highly supportive)

- No gender, faculty rank, college, nor race effects for either variable

OWN RESOURCES & RELATIONSHIPS

(Scale: 1 = Lack to 6 = Enough)

- Own resources and relationships
  
  Overall $M = 3.97$, $SE = .078$

- No faculty rank, race nor college effects.
- * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$
2017 AND 2019 RESULTS COMPARISON
62 SURVEY PARTICIPANTS WERE MATCHED

3. Own Research and Relationship

Gender by Year*

- No year differences
- No faculty rank, race, nor college interactions.

* p < .05

4. Women’s Institutional Support

Women’s Institutional Support

- No gender, faculty rank, race, nor college interactions.

TEACHING RESOURCES

(SCALE: 1=LACK TO 6=ENOUGH)

- Teaching Overall M= 3.99, SE = .072

- No race nor college effects.
- * p < .05, ** p < .01
MENTORING
(Scale: 1=Lack to 6=Enough)

- Mentoring Overall M= 3.776, SE = .087
- No race, faculty rank, nor college effects.
- * p < .05, ** p < .01

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>3.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>4.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other/Did not answer</td>
<td>3.36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DEVALUED SOCIAL IDENTITIES

- Faculty of color Non Asian had significantly more identities for which they felt devalued than Asian and white professors
- Business and Science faculty had significantly less identities for which they felt devalued than Education faculty
**PROBLEM SETTINGS**

(Scale: 1 = Never, 2 = Rarely, 3 = Sometimes, 4 = Often, 5 = Always)

- Regular meetings with faculty: 2.29
- Special decision making meetings: 2.21
- Projects that involve collaboration with other faculty: 2.02
- Informal encounters: 2.01
- Big public events: 1.96
- Interactions with students: 1.85

---

**TEAM ORIENTATION**

(Scale: 1 = Strongly Disagree to 5 = Strongly Agree)

- Team Orientation Overall M = 3.49, SE = 0.060

- College by Faculty Rank*
  - Science - Assist/Assoc. Prof: 3.24
  - Tenure Track: 3.28
  - FAHSS - Full Prof: 3.79
  - Health Sciences - full prof: 2.88
  - Science - Other/Did not answer: 2.43

- Gender* & Race*
  - Female: 3.45
  - Male: 3.64
  - Other/Did not answer: 2.97

- Asian: 3.97
- White: 3.50
- Faculty of Color, Non-Asian: 3.24
- Did not answer: 3.28

Results shown are top 2 and bottom 2 groups

- No faculty rank, nor college effects.
- * p < .05, ** p < .01
**TOLERANCE FOR INDIVIDUAL DIFFERENCES**

(Scale: 1=STRONGLY DISAGREE to 5=STRONGLY AGREE)

- Tolerance for Individual Differences
  - Overall M= 3.32, SE = .057

- No race, faculty rank, nor college effects.
- * p < .05, ** p < .01

**PERCEIVED DEPARTMENTAL FAIRNESS**

(Scale: 1=UNFAIR to 5=FAIR)

- Perceived Departmental Fairness
  - Overall M= 3.58, SE = .064

- No faculty rank, nor race effects.
- * p < .05, ** p < .01
Learning with Purpose

PERCEIVED DEPARTMENT BELONGING
(Scale: 1=Less Belonging to 5=Very Belonging)

- Perceived Department Belonging
  Overall M= 3.79, SE = .060
  • No race, faculty rank, nor college effects.
  • * p < .05, ** p < .01

PERCEIVED INFLUENCE
(Scale: 1=Less Influential to 5=Very Influential)

- Perceived Influence Overall M= 2.84, SE = .062
  • No college effects.
  • * p < .05, ** p < .01
Learning with Purpose

JOB SATISFACTION

Overall, more than 67.6% of respondents were moderately or extremely satisfied with their jobs.

Male: 4% Extremely dissatisfied, 11% Slightly dissatisfied, 2% Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied, 10% Slightly satisfied, 41% Moderately satisfied, 32% Extremely satisfied.

Female: 4% Extremely dissatisfied, 10% Slightly dissatisfied, 3% Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied, 10% Slightly satisfied, 42% Moderately satisfied, 24% Extremely satisfied.

Other/Did not answer: 3% Extremely dissatisfied, 9% Slightly dissatisfied, 12% Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied, 4% Slightly satisfied, 43% Moderately satisfied, 22% Extremely satisfied.

JOB SATISFACTION

- Asian: 6% Extremely dissatisfied, 6% Slightly dissatisfied, 12% Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied, 59% Slightly satisfied, 18% Moderately satisfied.
- White: 2% Extremely dissatisfied, 11% Slightly dissatisfied, 7% Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied, 11% Slightly satisfied, 38% Moderately satisfied.
- Faculty of Color, Non-Asian: 13% Extremely dissatisfied, 10% Slightly dissatisfied, 13% Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied, 5% Slightly satisfied, 40% Moderately satisfied.
- Other/Did not answer: 1% Extremely dissatisfied, 9% Slightly dissatisfied, 9% Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied, 5% Slightly satisfied, 47% Moderately satisfied.

Learning with Purpose

JOB SATISFACTION

- Asian: 6% Extremely dissatisfied, 6% Slightly dissatisfied, 12% Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied, 59% Slightly satisfied, 18% Moderately satisfied.
- White: 2% Extremely dissatisfied, 11% Slightly dissatisfied, 7% Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied, 11% Slightly satisfied, 38% Moderately satisfied.
- Faculty of Color, Non-Asian: 13% Extremely dissatisfied, 10% Slightly dissatisfied, 13% Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied, 5% Slightly satisfied, 40% Moderately satisfied.
- Other/Did not answer: 1% Extremely dissatisfied, 9% Slightly dissatisfied, 9% Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied, 5% Slightly satisfied, 47% Moderately satisfied.
DEPARTMENTS’ FAIRNESS

FACULTY’S INFLUENCE IN DEPARTMENT
**LIKELIHOOD OF COLLEAGUE INTERVENTION**

(Scale: 1=Very unlikely to 5=Very likely)

- Likelihood of Colleague Intervention Overall M=3.59, SE = .066

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender x Race x Faculty Rank*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female Faculty of Color (Non-Asian) Assist./Assoc. Prof. Tenure Track</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male White Teaching Prof.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female White Assoc. Prof. Tenured</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female White Assist/Assoc. Prof. Tenure Track</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- No gender, race, faculty rank, nor college effects.
- * p < .05, ** p < .01
- Results shown are top 2 and bottom 2 groups

---

**WORK-LIFE BALANCE**

(Scale: 1=Unbalance to 5=Balance)

- Work-life balance Overall M= 3.65, SE = .057

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College &amp; Faculty Rank*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Science - Assist/Assoc. Prof. Tenure Track</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science - Assoc. Prof. Tenured</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Sciences - Assist/Assoc. Prof. Tenure...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science - Other/Did not answer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other/Did not answer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- No race nor faculty rank effects.
- * p < .05, ** p < .01
SEXIST BEHAVIOR
(Scale: 1=NEVER to 5=VERY OFTEN)

- Sexual Behavior Overall M= 1.36, SE = .039
- No race nor college effects.
- * p < .05, ** p < .01

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Other/Did not answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Behavior</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty of Color, Non-Asian</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did not answer</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

OFFENSIVE BEHAVIOR
(Scale: 1=NEVER to 5=VERY OFTEN)

- Offensive Behavior Overall M= 1.06, SE = .022
- No race nor college effects.
- * p < .05, ** p < .01

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty Rank*</th>
<th>Assist/Assoc. Prof Tenure Track</th>
<th>Assoc. Prof. Tenured</th>
<th>Full Prof.</th>
<th>Teaching Prof.</th>
<th>Other/Did not answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>1.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other/Did not answer</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
UNWANTED SEXUAL ATTENTION

(Scale: 1=NEVER to 5=VERY OFTEN)

- Unwanted Sexual Attention Overall M= 1.04, SE = .020

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty Rank*</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Other/Did not answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assist/Assoc. Prof Tenure Track</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>1.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assoc. Prof. Tenured</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Prof.</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Prof.</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other/Did not answer</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Gender**

- No race nor college effects.
- * p < .05, ** p < .01

SEXUAL COERCION

(Scale: 1=NEVER to 5=VERY OFTEN)

- Sexual Coercion Overall M= 1.02, SE = .018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender** &amp; Rank **</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Other/Did not answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tenure Track</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assoc. Prof. Tenured</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Prof.</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Prof.</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other/Did not answer</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

College*

- * p < .05, ** p < .01
**EXPERIENCES OF BEING VALUED**

**WHAT ‘SMALL THINGS’ MAKE YOU FEEL VALUED?** [138] [SGBI 2017 (132)]

Most comments fell into eight main themes:

1. **Respect and support from colleagues** [50] [SGBI 2017 (35)]
   - “When a publication, scholarly accomplishment, or other initiative I’m involved with is announced by our Chair or Dean, I frequently receive “congratulations” or “great job” or “thanks”, “I'm interested” emails from other faculty.

2. **Recognition and support from administrators** [41] [SGBI 2017 (16)]
   - “Strong Dept. Chair consistently and publicly recognizes all accomplishments -- even small ones -- of the faculty. Makes me feel valued.”
EXPERIENCES OF BEING VALUED

3. Recognition and acknowledgment (23) [SGBI 2017 (50)]
   — “Words of encouragement of how my teaching and service efforts make a real positive difference for our students and the College.”

4. Respect and appreciation from students (22) [SGBI 2017 (10)]
   — “Students sincerely thanking me for a good semester and caring about them outside of the classroom.”

5. Obtaining research intensive, positive comments and interest on my research and publication (16)
   — “Colleagues are very supportive of all research progress - submissions to journals, R&Rs, publications, etc. and are good at celebrating small victories.”

6. Opportunities for responsibility and leadership (15) [SGBI 2017 (12)]
   — “Students sincerely thanking me for a good semester and caring about them outside of the classroom.”

7. Promotions and Awards (11)
   — “I was given a departmental teaching award.”

8. Other comments (24)
   — “My male direct supervisor came to me for input and to brainstorm new projects; he supported me being placed on a committee outside of our department.”
EXPERIENCES OF BEING DEVALUED

WHAT ‘SMALL THINGS’ MAKE YOU FEEL DEVALUED? (137) [SGBI 2017 (124)]

– Wider range of themes than ‘valued’ comments
– Six frequently cited themes:

1. **Lack of recognition, acknowledgment and support** (36) [SGBI 2017 (7)]
   – “I have been talked down by a male colleague who is also in IT support, in an email chain including my PhD students and another colleague.”

2. **Negative experiences related to faculty rank or status** (30) [SGBI 2017 (9)]
   – “I was not allowed to attend an NIH grantwriting workshop put on by the college of Health Sciences, because I was not considered "faculty".”
   – Hearing that teaching faculty aren’t valued as much as research faculty.

3. **Negative experiences experiencing disrespect and non-support from department staff** (24) [SGBI 2017 (3)]
   – “My chairperson has generally has treated me very poorly, even though I am one of the senior members of the department.”

4. **Negative experiences related to work or service loads** (23) [SGBI 2017 (10)]
   – “Also workloads are more generous for tenure track faculty and they can have a sabbatical. I can never have a sabbatical.”


EXPERIENCES OF BEING DEVALUED

5. Negative experiences of disrespect and non-support from administrators (21) [SGBI 2017 (11)]
   – “Being scolded by administration for asking basic questions about resources such as sufficient coverage for courses and administrative functions.”

6. Other comments (38)
   – “Faculty member in an associate chair position exclaiming that a fellow faculty was an embarrassment for wearing her nursing cap to a nursing student pinning event, and exclaiming this negative and devaluing opinion in an aggressive tone at a full faculty meeting.”

EXPERIENCES OF BEING DEVALUED

RELATED TO YOUR INTERSECTIONAL IDENTITY(IES) (48)

– Most comments fell into four main themes:

1. Gender and race, ethnicity, or sexual orientation (23)
   – “I've always felt devalued as a female faculty of color. Not by all colleagues; but by a few. Notwithstanding, it is equally painful. Let me add that "micro-aggression" can't be "cured" overnight. These are learned behaviors that have been inculcated over a long period of time. It is naive to think that a few changes in personnel will change underlying cultures and practices in an environment; however, it is good to know that the university has the will to keep working at improving campus climate.”
EXPERIENCES OF BEING DEVALUED
RELATED TO YOUR INTERSECTIONAL IDENTITY(IES) (48)

2. Gender and age (9)
   – “I'm a white woman in her late twenties with no children and a terminal degree. Colleagues assume I must have no problems and float through work because I do not have children and I have finished school. They have no idea of my own history, struggles, extra jobs I work, or responsibilities for elders at home.”

3. Gender and position (6)
   – “My experience is often ignored and junior faculty (white women) are given priority over my requests.”

4. Gender and other comments (5)
   – “The men in my department are congratulated as good dads for leaving work early for childcare. I am viewed as less serious about my work.”

DEPARTMENTS’ FAIRNESS (58)

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

– Most additional comments fell into six main themes:

1. Office and research space (24)
   – “Department is respectful of faculty wishes when it comes to resource allocations and work allocation, which can lead to unfair distribution of tasks (the more easy-going members are assigned more work, especially for advising).”

2. Experiencing disrespect and non-support (15)
   – “I see this as more of an issue with administration than with faculty.”

3. Related to gender (15)
   – “Gender inequity in service assignments. Women are clearly expected to do more.”
DEPARTMENTS' FAIRNESS (58)

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

4. Promotion, Evaluation, job security, contract, salary issues (7)
   – “University hired teaching faculty at significantly lower salaries than tenure track faculty regardless of whether the teaching faculty has equivalent qualifications.”

5. Related to rank and status (6)
   – “NTT faculty are considered second-class citizens by many TT faculty and within our administrative leadership.”

6. Other comments (13)
   – “There are no rules in our department. All assignments for research or teaching is done secretly. Whole department is run like a family business. Too much politics and too much behind the closed door decisions. The department is run with unorganized chaotic matter where the only justification is "traditionally we have done it this way" and change is not welcome. People do not come to meetings, do not respond to emails or request. It was shocking to see how bad it is.”
FACULTY’S INFLUENCE IN DEPARTMENT (58)

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

– Most additional comments fell into six main themes:

1. **Influence on democracy and decision making process** (14)
   – “Faculty department governance has been squashed as all decisions are made at the Dean level who dictates most, if not all, faculty actions. The election of the chair process and search committee processes are interfered with at all levels from above.”

2. **Influences by others (Chair, Admin, Leaderships)** (10)
   – “these decisions over the past six years have been done by our chair, with the dean, with little communication or discussion. Faculty have had little ability to influence decisions.”

3. **Influence on schedules, syllabus, workload & service distribution** (8)
   – “Advising load versus committee work may be better balanced. Advising could be handled more efficiently. I feel less authority to change aspects of my course syllabus than I would like in response to student feedback.”

4. **Influence on research, publication, grants, resources and office space** (7)
   – “When decisions regarding space allocation are made, we are not included in these conversations until after major decisions have been made.”
FACULTY’S INFLUENCE IN DEPARTMENT (58)

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

5. Influence by rank and status (6)
   – “Faculty autonomy has been eroded and the department is very hierarchical; the whole question of academic freedom in choosing courses to teach, teaching scheduled is not dictated by the chairperson. Even the department administrative assistant is not equally available for help.”

6. Other comments (7)
   – “I think I am fairly well-respected by all of my colleagues in my department; however, there have been times where some people have demonstrated cultural insensitivity based upon my race.”

FACULTY EXPERIENCED MICROAGGRESSION

ANYTHING YOU DID IN RESPONSE TO THE MICROAGGRESSION (76)

– Most additional comments fell into seven main themes:

1. Ignored it (22)
   – “interrupted multiple times by a senior male colleague (I'm junior and female) during a seminar talk; spoke back forcefully until he was discouraged. was afterwards told (encouragingly) by multiple departmental members that he is well-known as a thorn in the side and should be ignored; he has little power within the department.”
2. Discussed with colleagues (21)
   – “An email I sent to my department reporting on recent student activities was then mocked in an email sent to the department by another faculty member. My chair refused to take action and I addressed it with an email back to the original sender which I copied the rest of the department on. Individual members of the department spoke privately to me about their concerns about the email but did not take public action.”

3. Reported to chair and dean (9)
   – “I did step in when it happened to a colleague. I have also been subject to overt aggression and reported to my chair and dean- their response was along the lines of ”that's too bad.”

4. Did nothing (8)
   – “Nothing - it involved having making a comment in a public setting to the main speaker who was in a leadership position and having that person present a dissembled answer that implicitly suggested the comment was ill-informed.”

5. Confronted the micro-aggressor (6)
   – “Tried to confront the microaggressor.”

6. Distanced myself from micro aggressor (5)
   – “Walked away and cried alone in my office.”

7. Other comments (37)
   – “I have complained about last minute meeting invitations to the organizers. Aside from an apology, nothing has changed, with this behavior continuing..”
5. Devalued Social Identities

- No year differences
- No gender, faculty rank, race, nor college interactions.

6. Problem Settings

- No year differences
- No gender, faculty rank, race, nor college interactions.

7. Job Satisfaction

- No year differences
- No gender, faculty rank, race, nor college interactions.