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Introduction

In fall 2016, UMass Amherst conducted an extensive Campus Climate Survey to help the university better understand the challenges of creating a respectful and inclusive campus environment. The Campus Climate Survey Abridged Report, released in May 2017, describes the conceptual framework that guided development of the survey and communicates a portion of the results for the university’s four main populations – undergraduates, graduate students, staff, and faculty. The Abridged Report focuses primarily on compositional diversity and the psychological dimension of campus climate (link to Abridged Report).

Part One of this report focuses on survey results for faculty that were not included in the Abridged Report, including results of questions specific to the faculty version of the climate survey. Although most of Part One focuses on these faculty-specific questions, it also covers additional findings related to “common core” survey questions that were asked of all four campus populations. Part One communicates results related to compositional diversity, as well as the psychological and behavioral dimensions of campus climate.

Part Two of this report focuses on the results of a qualitative study of faculty responses to open-ended questions about faculty experiences with unfair treatment and specific suggestions for change.

The Abridged Report details survey methods, efforts undertaken to maximize the response rate, response rates achieved, and how closely survey participants match target populations on key demographics. Given this report’s focus on faculty, it is important here to review the response rate and the demographic representativeness of faculty survey participants. The overall participation rate for the Campus Climate Survey was a robust 41 percent, but the rate for faculty was considerably higher – 61 percent (n=1,054). Faculty survey participants closely match the overall faculty population with regard to gender and college/school, but full professors are slightly overrepresented among participants (33 percent versus 28 percent) and White faculty are slightly underrepresented (69 percent versus 75 percent). Survey participation rates for faculty by college/school are included in the Campus Climate Unit Reports (link to Unit Reports).
Part One: Quantitative Analyses

Considering Context

Given this report’s focus on faculty, it is important first to consider some relevant distinctive aspects of this campus population. Faculty constitute the smallest of the four main population groups, comprising only about 5 percent (N=1,638) of the total campus community.

The gendered nature of academic fields of study and their clustering within the university’s nine discipline-based colleges/schools is an important aspect of the campus context for faculty. The distributions of women and men within the colleges/schools — which are similar to national distributions within disciplinary clusters — are quite disproportionate for seven of the nine colleges/schools (the College of Social and Behavioral Sciences and the College of Humanities and Fine Arts are fairly proportionate). Overall, 45 percent of UMass Amherst faculty are women, but within the colleges/schools, this percentage ranges from 14 percent in the College of Engineering to 96 percent in the College of Nursing.

Another important context consideration is that the faculties of each of the colleges/schools are predominately White, ranging from 72 percent in the College of Social and Behavioral Sciences to 92 percent in the College of Nursing. The underrepresentation of Black/African American, Latino/a, and Native American faculty members is a prominent aspect of the campus context for diversity and inclusion.

The designation of positions as either tenure system (64 percent) or non-tenure system (36 percent) is a distinctive aspect of the campus context for faculty. Faculty members in tenure-system roles are eligible to pursue tenure (and the job security it offers), whereas faculty not on the tenure track are not eligible for tenure. The extent to which this dichotomy undergirds hierarchies and impacts faculty work environments can vary among academic departments/programs.

Compared to other types of university employees, faculty exercise substantial control over their work environments. Most faculty members have a private, campus-based office and many (perhaps most) have discretion with regard to when and where they do much of their work. Consequently, most faculty have greater control over their own interfacing with the campus environment—including the amount of time they spend on campus—than do other categories of employees, particularly those whose work confines them to specific, physical locations and set work schedules.

For the undergraduate and graduate students with whom they interact through their teaching, research, advising, and mentoring, faculty members are principal representatives of both their academic departments/programs and the larger university. The institutional prominence of the faculty role, and the longevity of this group of campus employees, position faculty members to be influential cultivators of an inclusive campus climate. Tenured faculty, given the relative fixedness of their connection to the organization, are particularly well positioned to influence and shape the campus environment.
Who We Are: Additional Aspects of Compositional Diversity

The Campus Climate Survey Abridged Report includes data illustrating the compositional diversity of faculty survey participants with regard to race/ethnicity, gender identity, sexual orientation, religious identity, age, and political view. The climate survey gathered additional data pertaining to the demographic characteristics of faculty, including length of employment at UMass Amherst, commuting distance, college/school, and rank. These data – including some intersections of these particular characteristics – are included here (note: the numbers of trans or genderqueer faculty, and faculty of another gender identity, are too small to include for intersections).

About one-half of faculty survey participants indicated that they have worked at UMass Amherst for 11 years or more, whereas 20 percent are relatively new to the university (see Figure 1, inner ring). The distribution of women and men within duration-of-employment categories is least balanced among faculty who have worked at the university for more than 20 years (see Figure 1, outer ring).

Figure 2 illustrates the distribution of faculty survey participants by rank and gender (self-reported). As shown in the outer ring, men full professors constitute the largest discrete category, followed by women non-tenure-track faculty. The distribution of men and women within rank categories is least balanced for full professors and most balanced for associate professors.
As illustrated in Figure 3, nearly one-half of faculty members indicated that they live in very close proximity to campus (within 5 miles) and nearly three-quarters live within 10 miles.

**Figure 3: Distance of commute to campus**

![Distance of commute to campus chart](chart)

Figure 4 shows the distribution of faculty survey participants across the university’s nine discipline-based colleges/schools. This distribution mirrors the actual population distribution, with the College of Natural Sciences (CNS), the College of Humanities and Fine Arts (HFA), and the College of Social and Behavioral Sciences (SBS) accounting for approximately two-thirds of all faculty. Eleven percent (n=119) of faculty survey participants indicated an affiliation with Commonwealth Honors College (CHC). Overall, one-tenth of faculty reported that they work part time, and 7 percent of faculty indicated that they hold a joint appointment.

Figure 5 illustrates the intersection of college/school and gender identity for women and men faculty who participated in the survey. As shown in the outer ring, men and women are represented relatively equally on the faculties of SBS and HFA. Men outnumber women substantially in CNS, the College of Engineering (ENG), Isenberg School of Management (ISOM), and the College of Information and Computer Science (CICS), whereas women outnumber men substantially in the School of Public Health and Health Sciences (PHHS), the College of Education (EDUC), and the School of Nursing (NUR). Overall, men CNS faculty constitute the largest of the faculty subgroups depicted here, followed by women HFA faculty, and women CNS faculty.
As illustrated in Figure 6, the faculties of the university’s nine colleges/schools vary considerably with regard to rank.
Perceptions of Immediate Work Environment

The faculty version of the Campus Climate Survey included a set of eight Likert-type items (agree/disagree) aimed at gauging their perceptions of their immediate work environment.

One of the agree/disagree statements pertaining to work environment focused on availability of necessary resources. Overall, 17 percent of faculty agreed strongly that they have the resources they need to do well. Figure 7 illustrates the substantial variation in faculty responses to this item by college/school. Faculty in CICS and ISOM were more likely than faculty in the other colleges/schools to agree strongly that they have the resources to do well (41 percent and 36 percent, respectively). In contrast, PHHS and EDUC faculty were more likely than faculty in the other colleges and schools to disagree (either somewhat or strongly, 56 percent and 49 percent, respectively).

Figure 7: “I have the resources I need to do well”

Figure 8 shows that the vast majority of faculty have clarity about their role and responsibilities in their immediate work environment.

Figure 8: “I am clear on my role and responsibilities”
Responses to six of the Likert-type items were combined as a composite measure of work environment quality (see Table 1).

**Table 1: Survey items comprising quality of work environment measure**

- I feel appreciated.
- There is a spirit of cooperation.
- People seem to care about me.
- I have opportunities to do what I do best.
- I am encouraged to grow in my position.
- Differences among people are valued.

*(Response scale: Strongly Agree, Agree, Disagree, Strongly Disagree)*

Figure 9 illustrates mean scores on the quality of work environment measure by college/school, rank, gender, and race/ethnicity. Across most colleges/schools the means are quite similar. However, the mean for EDUC faculty is nearly one standard deviation below that of faculty overall, and the mean for HFA faculty is approximately one-half a standard deviation below. There are very slight differences in means by race/ethnicity, gender and rank.

**Figure 9: Quality of work environment by college/school, race/ethnicity, gender, and rank**

*Note: composite measure ranges from 1 (low quality) to 4 (high quality)*
Perceptions of Graduate Advising Load

Figure 10 shows how faculty perceive their own level of graduate student advising relative to most other faculty members in their department (or program). Responses are broken down by college/school, rank, gender, and race/ethnicity. Overall, 33 percent of faculty perceive that they do “a bit more” or “much more” advising than do others, whereas 39 percent perceive that they do less.

The most striking difference among groups is between non-tenure faculty and faculty of other ranks. This difference is understandable, given common differences in faculty responsibilities by tenure status. There is considerable variation in responses by colleges/school. For example, the percentage of faculty who perceive that they do “much less” ranges substantially, from 8 percent in ENG to 40 percent in NUR. Likewise, the percentage of faculty who perceive that they do “much more” ranges from 34 percent in EDUC to 11 percent in PHHS. Compositional differences in the faculties of the different colleges/schools likely underlie these differences to some extent.

Figure 10: From your perspective, how much graduate student advising do you do relative to most other faculty in your department (or program)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>I do much less</th>
<th>I do a bit less</th>
<th>I do about the same amount</th>
<th>I do a bit more</th>
<th>I do much more</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CICS</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNS</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUC</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENG</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HFA</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISOM</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NUR</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHHS</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBS</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Tenure</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asst. Prof.</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assoc. Prof.</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Prof.</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Man</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woman</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Another Gender</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino/a</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiracial</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Likelihood of Recommending UMass Amherst to Others

Overall, the vast majority of faculty indicated that they are somewhat likely (35 percent) or very likely (53 percent) to recommend UMass Amherst as a good place to work as a faculty member. A breakdown of faculty responses by college/school revealed some variation, however (see Figure 11). Most notably, EDUC faculty and PHHS faculty were more likely than faculty in the other schools and colleges to indicate that they would be somewhat or very unlikely to recommend UMass Amherst to others as a good place to work (39 percent and 23 percent, respectively).

Figure 11 shows that across faculty rank, gender, and race/ethnicity, the vast majority are likely to recommend the university. A few modest differences among groups are worthy of note, however. The proportion of faculty indicating they would be “very likely” to recommend UMass Amherst was lowest among Black faculty (35 percent), multiracial faculty (38 percent), and faculty of another gender (38 percent). Also, women (17 percent) were almost twice as likely as men (9 percent) to report that they are somewhat or very unlikely to recommend UMass Amherst as a good place to work.

Figure 11: How likely or unlikely are you to recommend UMass Amherst to others as a good place to work as a faculty member?
The *Abridged Report* revealed that for faculty, sense of belonging at UMass Amherst varies by social identity (see page 13). Figure 12 illustrates that the likelihood of recommending UMass Amherst varies substantially by sense of belonging. Faculty with a high sense of belonging (“to a great extent”) were much more likely to say they would be “very likely” to recommend the university than those who feel like they belong only “to some extent.” Not surprisingly, the vast majority of faculty who do not feel like they belong indicated that they would be unlikely to recommend UMass Amherst.

**Figure 12: Likelihood of recommending UMass Amherst by sense of belonging**

![Bar chart showing likelihood of recommending UMass Amherst by sense of belonging](chart.png)
Perceptions of Leadership Opportunities

Overall, 39 percent of faculty indicated that they are asked to assume leadership roles “often” or “very often.” Among racial/ethnic groups, Asian faculty members were least likely to report that they are offered leadership roles “often” or “very often,” whereas Latino/a faculty members were most likely to indicate that they are offered leadership roles “rarely” or “never” (see Figure 13).

**Figure 13: How often are you asked to take on a leadership role in important departmental (or program) committees or initiatives?**

Overall
- Never: 12%
- Rarely: 18%
- Sometimes: 30%
- Often: 22%
- Very Often: 18%

By School:
- CICS: 16% Never, 19% Rarely, 32% Sometimes, 23% Often, 10% Very Often
- CNS: 11% Never, 20% Rarely, 30% Sometimes, 22% Often, 18% Very Often
- EDUC: 9% Never, 21% Rarely, 25% Sometimes, 30% Often, 15% Very Often
- ENG: 10% Never, 17% Rarely, 33% Sometimes, 26% Often, 14% Very Often
- HFA: 10% Never, 15% Rarely, 31% Sometimes, 25% Often, 20% Very Often
- ISOM: 10% Never, 25% Rarely, 24% Sometimes, 19% Often, 22% Very Often
- NUR: 21% Never, 14% Rarely, 38% Sometimes, 17% Often, 10% Very Often
- PHHS: 11% Never, 17% Rarely, 28% Sometimes, 23% Often, 20% Very Often
- SBS: 14% Never, 20% Rarely, 30% Sometimes, 14% Often, 23% Very Often

By Race:
- Asian: 13% Never, 26% Rarely, 36% Sometimes, 16% Often, 8% Very Often
- Black: 5% Never, 33% Rarely, 28% Sometimes, 15% Often, 20% Very Often
- Latino/a: 15% Never, 30% Rarely, 24% Sometimes, 13% Often, 17% Very Often
- White: 11% Never, 16% Rarely, 29% Sometimes, 24% Often, 20% Very Often
- Multiracial: 11% Never, 29% Rarely, 26% Sometimes, 17% Often, 17% Very Often
As might be expected given differences in faculty work responsibilities commonly associated with position, faculty responses varied substantially by rank (see Figure 14). Faculty not on the tenure track were much more likely than tenure track faculty of all ranks to report that they are “never” asked to assume a leadership role. Full professors were most likely to report being asked to take on a leadership role “very often,” followed by associate professors. Within rank, the responses of women faculty nearly mirrored those of men.

Figure 14: Perceived frequency of leadership opportunities, by rank and gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Very Often</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-Tenure Man</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Tenure Woman</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asst. Prof. Man</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asst. Prof. Woman</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assoc. Prof. Man</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assoc. Prof. Woman</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Prof. Man</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Prof. Woman</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Work/Life Balance

Overall, a substantial proportion of faculty indicated a level of dissatisfaction with their ability to balance work and personal life priorities. Figure 15 illustrates that satisfaction levels vary somewhat by rank, gender identity, and race/ethnicity. Among racial/ethnic groups, dissatisfaction is highest among Latino/a faculty (50 percent) and multiracial faculty (52 percent). It is notable that Latino/a faculty were more than five times more likely than Asian faculty to report being “very dissatisfied” (22 percent versus 4 percent).

With regard to gender, men faculty were nearly twice as likely as women faculty to report being “very satisfied” (29 percent versus 15 percent) with their ability to balance work and personal life priorities. Both faculty of another gender and women faculty were more likely than men faculty to express a level of dissatisfaction (46 percent and 44 percent versus 28 percent).

The vast majority of full professors and non-tenure faculty expressed satisfaction with their work/life balance. However, nearly one-fifth of associate professors indicated being “very dissatisfied.”

Figure 15: How satisfied or dissatisfied are you with your ability to balance your work priorities and personal life priorities?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Somewhat Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Somewhat Satisfied</th>
<th>Very Satisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-tenure</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asst. Prof.</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assoc. Prof.</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Prof.</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Man</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woman</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Another Gender</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latino/a</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiracial</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Use of University Resources to Address Unfair Treatment

The *Campus Climate Survey Abridged Report* includes survey results regarding experiences with unfair treatment on the basis of nine different aspects of social identity. All faculty were asked a related question about their personal use of each of five university resources to address unfair treatment in the workplace. Figure 16 shows that union processes and the Ombuds Office are the resources most likely to be used by faculty, followed by the Office of Equal Opportunity and Diversity.

**Figure 16: Have you used any of these university resources to address an issue of unfair treatment in your workplace in the last five years?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resource</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Union processes</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ombuds Office</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of Equal Opportunity &amp; Diversity</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty &amp; Staff Assistance Program</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workplace Bullying Grievance Procedure</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Used other resource</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall, 24 percent of faculty indicated that they had used at least one university resource in the past five years to report unfair treatment. Figure 17 shows that the percentage is similar across most race/ethnicity, gender, and rank categories, with a few exceptions: 1) faculty who identified as multiracial were much more likely than those of other identities to report having used a university resource, 2) women faculty were more likely than men or those of another gender to report having used a resource, and 3) assistant professors were slightly less likely than those of other ranks to report having used a resource.

The *Abridged Report* revealed that slightly more than one-half of Black faculty indicated having experienced unfair treatment on the basis of race/ethnicity in fall 2016. Slightly less than one-quarter of these faculty members reported that they used a university resource to report unfair treatment in the last five years, suggesting that only a fraction of the Black faculty who experienced unfair treatment sought recourse. The percentage of women faculty who experienced unfair treatment on the basis of gender (in fall 2016) and also reported having used a university resource is much higher than it is for Black faculty – 43 percent. And the percentage of non-tenure faculty who experienced unfair treatment on the basis of rank (in fall 2016) and also reported having used a university resource is identical.
Faculty survey participants who indicated that they used a university resource to report unfair treatment were asked a follow-up question about effectiveness of response. Figure 18 shows that 40 percent of those who used a university resource to report unfair treatment perceived the response to their problem to be “not too effective” or “not at all effective.”
Faculty who responded to the question about effectiveness were invited to elucidate their response to the closed-response item via a follow-up, open-ended response. Among faculty members who rated the response to their problem as “not too effective” or “not at all effective,” the most common theme was that “nothing happened” in response to their seeking recourse – either due to lack of follow-through or because they were informed that nothing could be done in response to, or to alleviate, the problem at hand. For example, one faculty member explained, “I didn’t feel I received any support beyond the one meeting. There was no follow-up, and the person that I felt bullied me remains in the position of power.” Another faculty member commented, “I was advised to document incidents but to basically just ‘deal with it and keep quiet.’” Yet another explained, “There was basically no response whatsoever from anyone, but I wasted a lot of time trying and got a lot of pats on the back. Nothing has changed.”

The comments of faculty who perceived the response to their problem to be somewhat or very effective revealed no common themes, although in almost half the cases, ambivalence was evident. For example, some faculty noted helpfulness on the part of the campus resource they used, but also acknowledged that little or nothing could be done to resolve their problem.
Teaching Environment

The faculty version of the Campus Climate Survey included a set of eight Likert-type (agree/disagree) items designed to gauge the teaching environment for subject matter/topics related to social identity and diversity.

The set of questions about teaching was posed to all faculty members, across all of the colleges/schools, and the response set for each item included a “No basis for judgment” option. Very large percentages of faculty in ENG, CNS, and CICS marked “no basis for judgment” for nearly all of these items (the item pertaining to derogatory comments was an exception). Figure 19 shows rates of “no basis for judgment” responses across the colleges/schools for one of the items pertaining to teaching.

Figure 19: Percent of faculty indicating “No Basis for Judgment” in response to the statement “I have difficulty managing diversity-related topics/conversations in my classes”
Figure 20 depicts faculty responses to one of these items (related to students’ responses during class discussions), broken down by race/ethnicity (and excluding those who indicated “no basis for judgment”). Across all groups, roughly two-thirds of faculty reported that students do not make derogatory comments during class discussions. However, there is variation by race/ethnicity in responses to this question. White, Latino/a, and Asian faculty were more likely to disagree strongly with this statement than were multiracial and Black faculty. Conversely, multiracial and Black faculty were more likely to agree either strongly or somewhat with this statement.

**Figure 20:** “In class discussions, students make derogatory comments about individuals based on social identity” (responses by race/ethnicity)

The set of figures on the following page show faculty members’ responses to six of the survey items pertaining to teaching environment – excluding “no basis for judgment” responses. Figure 21 shows that a vast majority perceive that students in their courses have enthusiasm for learning about diverse perspectives. Figure 22 illustrates that a very small percentage of faculty experience student objections when they include diverse perspectives in class, and Figure 23 shows that a slightly larger percentage experience students questioning the scholarly foundation of diversity-related content in their courses.

Figure 24 shows that a vast majority of faculty members perceive that their academic field is supportive of enhancing course content by including diversity-related topics and/or perspectives. Figure 25 illustrates that most faculty do not perceive that student resistance limits the free expression of ideas in their classes, and Figure 26 shows that a vast majority of faculty don’t have difficulty managing diversity-related conversations in their classes.
Figure 21: Students in my courses have enthusiasm for learning about diverse perspectives

- Strongly Agree: 13%
- Agree: 62%
- Disagree: 23%

Figure 22: Students object when I include diverse perspectives in class

- Strongly Agree: 47%
- Agree: 44%
- Disagree: 8%

Figure 23: Students question the scholarly foundation of diversity-related content in my courses

- Strongly Agree: 34%
- Agree: 48%
- Disagree: 14%

Figure 24: My academic field is supportive of instructor efforts to enhance course content by including diversity-related topics and/or perspectives

- Strongly Agree: 15%
- Agree: 44%
- Disagree: 41%

Figure 25: Student resistance limits the free expression of ideas in my classes

- Strongly Agree: 43%
- Agree: 43%
- Disagree: 10%

Figure 26: I have difficulty managing diversity-related topics/conversations in my classes

- Strongly Agree: 38%
- Agree: 44%
- Disagree: 15%
Experiences with Negative Interpersonal Behaviors

Faculty were asked about their fall 2016 experiences with a set of six specific negative interpersonal behaviors perpetrated by other faculty, administrators or other staff, undergraduates, and graduate students. The specific behaviors that faculty were questioned about are as follows: being treated with disrespect, having their scholarly expertise challenged, having their competence as an instructor challenged, being accused of treating others unfairly on the basis of social identity, being targeted or singled out unfairly based on gender identity, and being targeted or singled out unfairly based on race/ethnicity. Disrespectful treatment was the only one of these behaviors that 10 percent or more of faculty reported experiencing.

Figure 27 shows that overall, faculty are most likely to have experienced disrespect from other faculty members and least likely to have experienced disrespect from graduate students.

Experiences with disrespect by other faculty vary somewhat by social identity. More than one-third of multiracial faculty, and slightly more than one-quarter of Black and Latino/a faculty, reported being treated with disrespect by other faculty during fall 2016. Women faculty and faculty of another gender were twice as likely as men faculty to report being treated disrespectfully by other faculty members. Slightly more than one-fifth of both assistant and associate professors reported being treated respectfully by other faculty members.

Overall, faculty were slightly less likely to report disrespect from administrators or other staff than from other faculty. The overall pattern of differences by social identity was somewhat similar to that previously described for disrespect by other faculty members.

Black faculty were much more likely than faculty of other races/ethnicities to report being disrespected by undergraduate students: more than one-quarter of Black faculty members reported being treated disrespectfully by undergraduates.

Women faculty were twice as likely as men faculty to report being disrespected by undergraduates, and full professors were less likely than faculty of other ranks to report having been disrespected by undergraduate students.

Overall, faculty were less likely to report disrespect from graduate students than from other faculty, staff, or undergraduate students. The overall pattern of differences by social identity was very similar to that previously described for disrespect by undergraduates.
Treated with disrespect by other faculty (overall=19%)

- Non-tenure: 16%
- Asst. Prof.: 23%
- Assoc. Prof.: 22%
- Full Prof.: 17%

- Man: 13%
- Woman: 26%
- Another Gender: 26%

- Asian: 12%
- Black: 28%
- Latino/a: 26%
- White: 19%
- Multiracial: 35%

Treated with disrespect by staff (overall=14%)

- Non-tenure: 14%
- Asst. Prof.: 12%
- Assoc. Prof.: 15%
- Full Prof.: 15%

- Man: 12%
- Woman: 18%
- Another Gender: 9%

- Asian: 8%
- Black: 23%
- Latino/a: 17%
- White: 15%
- Multiracial: 14%

Treated with disrespect by undergraduates (overall=11%)

- Non-tenure: 14%
- Asst. Prof.: 19%
- Assoc. Prof.: 11%
- Full Prof.: 0%

- Man: 8%
- Woman: 16%
- Another Gender: 8%

- Asian: 10%
- Black: 28%
- Latino/a: 9%
- White: 11%
- Multiracial: 16%

Treated with disrespect by graduate students (overall=6%)

- Non-tenure: 7%
- Asst. Prof.: 9%
- Assoc. Prof.: 6%
- Full Prof.: 0%

- Man: 9%
- Woman: 9%

- Asian: 13%
- Black: 9%
- Latino/a: 6%
- White: 6%
- Multiracial: 11%
Experiences with Unfair Treatment: Additional Insights

Up to this point, the report has focused mainly on Campus Climate Survey questions particular to faculty. The last four sections of Part One of this report highlight faculty responses to questions that were part of the survey’s “common core” items directed to all four main campus populations.

The climate survey queried faculty about their experiences with unfair treatment during the fall 2016 semester based on 12 specific aspects of social identity (see Abridged Report, p. 44). Figure 28 shows that, overall, slightly more than one-half of faculty did not report experiencing any type of social-identity-based unfair treatment during fall 2016, whereas 17 percent experienced four or more different types. Figure 29 shows that mean campus climate ratings are highest for those who did not experience social-identity-based unfair treatment and lowest for those who experienced four or more different types.

The Abridged Report revealed that the most prevalent types of unfair treatment reported by faculty were unfair treatment on the basis of gender and unfair treatment on the basis of rank. Here, we focus on these two specific types of unfair treatment and the intersection of rank and gender.

Figure 30 shows percentages of faculty who reported experiencing unfair treatment on the basis of rank during the fall 2016 semester, broken down by rank and gender (women and men only). Overall, women reported experiencing rank-based unfair treatment at twice the rate of men. As illustrated,
women faculty across all ranks were more likely than their men counterparts to indicate that they experienced unfair treatment on the basis of rank.

**Figure 30: Experienced unfair treatment on the basis of rank, by rank and gender**

Figure 31 shows percentages of faculty who reported experiencing unfair treatment on the basis of gender during the fall 2016 semester, broken down by rank and gender (women and men only). Overall, women across all ranks reported experiencing gender-based unfair treatment at substantially higher rates than their men counterparts.

**Figure 31: Experienced unfair treatment on the basis of gender, by rank and gender**
Negative Remarks Related to Social Identity

The climate survey asked participants to indicate how often they hear (or see) negative remarks or comments related to social identity in a variety of settings. Figure 32 shows that negligible percentages of faculty reported that they hear negative remarks “often.” However, more than one-quarter of faculty indicated that they hear negative remarks (either sometimes or often) in public spaces outdoors on campus. Nearly one-quarter said they hear negative remarks in class, lecture, or lab, and nearly one-quarter said they hear negative remarks in their immediate work environment.

Figure 32: How often faculty members hear or see negative remarks or comments related to social identities in particular locations

- Public spaces outdoors on campus: 29% (sometimes), 4% (often)
- In class, lecture, or lab: 24% (sometimes), 4% (often)
- In your immediate work environment: 24% (sometimes), 4% (often)
- Social media related to people at UMass: 15% (sometimes), 4% (often)
- Administrative offices: 11% (sometimes), 4% (often)
- Sports venues: 9% (sometimes), 4% (often)
- On the bus: 9% (sometimes), 4% (often)
- Online campus communications: 8% (sometimes), 4% (often)
- Dining Commons or retail dining: 6% (sometimes), 4% (often)
- Libraries: 4% (sometimes)
- Residence halls: 4% (sometimes)
- Other campus locations: 4% (sometimes)
- Off-campus housing/apartments: 4% (sometimes)
- Downtown Amherst: 29% (sometimes), 4% (often)
Faculty were asked a follow-up question about the aspects of social identity that are the targets of the negative remarks that they hear (or see). Figure 33 shows that the two most common targets are racial/ethnic identity and political view.

**Figure 33: Social identity aspects that are targets of the negative remarks faculty hear (or see)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social Identity Aspect</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Race/ethnicity identity</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political view</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender identity</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National origin</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socioeconomic class background</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual orientation</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion or spiritual beliefs</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veteran status</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Faculty were asked how often they hear particular categories of people making negative remarks or comments related to social identity. Figure 34 shows that faculty are most likely to hear remarks from individuals not perceived to have a university affiliation. However, more than one-quarter of all faculty reported that they hear non-employee students making negative remarks either sometimes or often.

**Figure 34: How often faculty members hear (or see) particular categories of people making negative remarks or comments**

- Non-employee students: 26% (Sometimes)
- Course instructors or faculty: 21% (Sometimes)
- University staff members or administrators: 19% (Sometimes)
- Undergraduate employees: 14% (Sometimes)
- Graduate employees: 12% (Sometimes)
- Other people: 28% (Sometimes)
Perceived Impact of Campus Interactions across Social Identity Differences

One set of items asked survey participants to reflect on the interactions they have had at UMass Amherst with people whose social identities are different from their own – and to report their perceptions of how much these interactions impacted them in particular ways. In this section, we include faculty responses to three of the items in this set, broken down by college/school. Each of the figures in this section is comprised of a main chart and a supplementary chart that shows the varying, and sometimes considerable, percentages of faculty who indicated “no basis for judgment.” It is important to keep in mind that differences in college/school compositional diversity and disciplinary focus likely underlie some of the variation in faculty responses.

Figure 35 shows that a vast majority of faculty members perceive that their campus interactions across difference have increased their ability to work effectively with other people either “quite a bit” or “some.” Faculty members in CICS and in ENG were more likely than faculty members in other colleges/schools to respond to this survey question by indicating that they had “no basis for judgment.” Faculty in EDUC, SBS, and HFA were more likely than faculty in other colleges/schools to report that their interactions across difference have increased their ability to work effectively with others “quite a bit.”

**Figure 35: How much interactions across difference increased faculty members’ ability to work effectively with others**
A vast majority of faculty perceive that their campus interactions across difference have helped them be more thoughtful about their use of language pertaining to social identity either “some” or “quite a bit” (see Figure 36). Faculty members in ENG, ISOM, and CICS were less likely than faculty in other colleges/schools to indicate that interactions across difference have helped them be more thoughtful about their use of language. EDUC faculty and SBS faculty were most likely to indicate that their interactions across difference helped them be more thoughtful about language use “quite a bit.”

Figure 36: How much interactions helped faculty members be more thoughtful about their use of language
Figure 37 shows that the vast majority of faculty reported that their campus interactions across difference have helped them recognize biases that affect their own thinking “some” or “quite a bit.” CICS and ENG faculty were least likely to say “quite a bit,” whereas EDUC faculty were most likely to say “quite a bit.” Approximately one-quarter of ENG and NUR faculty, and one-fifth of CICS faculty, responded to this question by indicating that they had “no basis for judgment.”

Figure 37: How much interactions helped faculty members recognize biases that affect their own thinking
Perceptions of Institutional Commitment to Inclusion

Faculty were asked to report their perceptions of institutional commitment to inclusion – both at the level of their own college/school (Figure 38) and at the broader institutional level (Figure 39).

A vast majority of faculty members across race/ethnicity and gender identities and college/school affiliations perceive that administrators in their college/school are either very or somewhat committed to inclusion (see Figure 38). Nevertheless, substantial percentages of some groups perceived a lack of commitment, including 30 percent of Black faculty, 29 percent of Latino/a faculty, 34 percent of PHHS faculty, and 26 percent of EDUC faculty.

EDUC faculty and faculty in PHHS and HFA were less likely than faculty in other colleges/schools to perceive their administrators to be “very committed.” Also, Black faculty were much less likely than White or Asian faculty to perceive their administrators to be “very committed.”

Figure 38: How committed or uncommitted to inclusion are administrators in your college/school?
Figure 39 shows that a vast majority of faculty members across race/ethnicity and gender identities and college/school affiliations perceive that UMass Amherst is either very or somewhat committed to inclusion. That said, some substantial differences exist among groups. The percentages of Asian and White faculty who perceived that the institution is “very committed” to inclusion are more than twice that of Black faculty. Only 21 percent of EDUC faculty perceived that UMass Amherst is “very committed” to inclusion — a much lower percentage than in any other college/school. Lastly, nearly one-quarter of Latino/a faculty perceived a lack of commitment to inclusion, compared to 9 percent of Asian faculty and 11 percent of White faculty.

**Figure 39: How committed or uncommitted to inclusion is UMass Amherst as an institution?**
Part Two: Qualitative Analyses

Background and Methods

This section presents results of a qualitative analysis of faculty survey participants’ responses to the climate survey’s open-ended questions. Analysis of these rich and extensive comments (972 in total) provides a nuanced description and understanding of the experiences of faculty at the university and reveals common themes in their suggestions for how to make UMass Amherst more welcoming and inclusive.

The qualitative data analysis team was comprised of three researchers who each assumed primary responsibility for coding the data of a specific population or populations (undergraduates, graduate students, staff, and faculty). The team used NVivo software to code and analyze the four sets of open-ended data. Initially, each team member read through their entire set(s) of comments and identified key themes, question-by-question. The team worked together as a group to develop an initial set of codes/themes. For example, feeling disrespected and being isolated surfaced in survey participants’ descriptions of unfair treatment, and each of these themes was designated as a code.

Next, each researcher coded all of the comments in their assigned data set(s). The data coding and analysis process was both iterative and comprehensive. The team revised the initial data coding scheme, adding specificity to or combining similar themes. Ultimately, all comments across the four data sets were coded completely. In addition, data pertaining to survey participants’ social identity characteristics (e.g. gender, rank, race/ethnicity) were linked to the comments and used to run “matrix coding” to explore and identify patterns within and among subgroups. Once all of the data were coded, each team member crafted a set of question-specific memos that summarized the themes present in the set(s) of comments they analyzed. The research team discussed each of these memos, and one team member initially crafted four separate narratives that each communicated the findings for a specific campus population. Thereafter, the report was reviewed by another research team, who revisited the original data and coding memos, iteratively editing the report, to ensure clarity for a broader audience.

The faculty version of the climate survey included two open-ended questions that were part of the survey’s “common core” of items, two questions that were asked of faculty and staff only, and one question that was asked of faculty and graduate students only.

The first of these questions is a follow-up posed to survey participants who reported experiencing unfair treatment on the basis of social identity during fall 2016. The wording is as follows: You indicated that you have personally experienced unfair treatment based on social identity. Please describe your experience(s) with unfair treatment – for example, the context(s) and impact on you. Note: your anonymous comments may appear in public reports exactly as worded. Of the 497 faculty members who received this follow-up question, 239 (48 percent) provided a comment (22 percent of all faculty survey participants).

The second open-ended question, which was asked of all survey participants, solicited suggestions for change. The wording of this question is as follows: From your perspective, what specific things need to
change to make UMass Amherst a more welcoming and inclusive place for all? This question yielded 468 comments from faculty members (44 percent of all faculty survey participants).

In addition, two open-ended questions were asked of specific subgroups. Faculty who noted that they had used University resources to address an issue of unfair treatment (n=650) were asked: From your perspective, how effective was the response to your problem? Please provide any additional information that will help us to understand your response. Of the 650 participants who received this follow-up question, 75 (12 percent) provided a comment (7 percent of all faculty survey participants). Faculty who reported that they felt excluded or marginalized on campus (n=471) were asked: You indicated you are personally excluded or marginalized here at UMass on the basis of social identity. Please use the space below to describe your experiences. Of the 471 faculty survey participants who received this follow-up question, 190 (40 percent) provided a comment (18 percent of all faculty survey participants).

**A note on intersectional identity.** Intersections of identity were emphasized by faculty. For example, gender was a primary social identity by which unfair treatment was illustrated, with an emphasis on women being treated with less respect and feeling devalued. Women of color, older women, younger women, and women associate professors, in particular, expressed feelings of disrespect or isolation. Although the quantitative data presented unfair treatment by social identity singularly (e.g., race, gender, disability, etc.), in the open-ended comments, faculty described layered experiences of unfair treatment. All faculty possess multiple social identities, across intersections of race, class background, sexuality, English language, rank, and religion. However, faculty who possessed multiple marginalized identities described experiences of unfair treatment of a stronger degree or intensity because their experiences represented an accumulation of unfair treatment stemming, for instance, from race, gender, and rank.

**Illustrating the Nature of Unfair Treatment**

The primary themes that illustrate the nature of unfair treatment experienced by faculty include: 1) disrespect, 2) insensitivity and hostility, and 3) isolation and marginalization. In some cases, the same faculty member experienced disrespect, hostility, and isolation, whereas in other cases, only one type of unfair treatment was described.

**Disrespect.** The primary way that faculty described unfair treatment was in terms of disrespect. Faculty experienced disrespect from their colleagues, administrators, and students. Disrespect included instances of being interrupted or ignored, or where someone did not attribute credit to the faculty member, or failed to treat them as knowledgeable or credible. Although disrespect was noted in relation to every social identity, gender-based disrespect was particularly pervasive. Being devalued was a particular type of disrespect faculty experienced when they did not see their contributions as being treated with importance, worth, or recognition, whether in comparison to others in a similar situation or as expected for the nature of the achievement. Being devalued also referred to faculty time, in particular with regard to expectations for service and when looking at compensation or other faculty resources. In some cases, when faculty described the situation as disrespectful, they also shared they felt devalued for their contributions. Thus, although disrespect is the overarching theme, faculty often interlinked their descriptions of disrespect with being devalued.
Faculty members described being disrespected when they were interrupted or ignored in meetings, whether by colleagues or leaders, as well as when students undermined them in the classroom:

- **I am often the only woman in a meeting or on a committee, and sometimes there are meetings in which my opinion is ignored, I am interrupted by men, or my thoughts/ideas are attributed to male members of the group. I have also met in a group with female leaders who direct all of the conversation to the males in the group and overlook (or perhaps ignore) my presence in the room.**

- **I think there are certain class markers in my speech and delivery that gets picked up by students. I believe this also combines negatively with my racial minority woman status and rank. I think this emboldens some students in their effort to undermine my knowledge, expertise, and authority in the classroom. I also see this undermining through the way they address me in person or in emails.**

- **Gaining respect from my undergraduate students – e.g., to be considered knowledgeable in my subject matter – takes me at least half a semester . . . probably due to an interactional effect between my accent, gender, and ethnicity.**

- **My comments in meetings are dismissed, and I believe this is a function of race, class, and gender—intersectionality.**

Faculty linked being devalued to a lack of recognition and credit, saying they felt devalued by colleagues and administrators when their expertise and effort went unrecognized and therefore their contributions were deemed unimportant.

- **Accomplishments of female colleagues are not mentioned, nor is there any validation of the work that female colleagues do, whereas male colleagues are routinely praised and recognized in various meeting contexts.**

- **These micro-interactions build up to larger issues of credit for work – my contributions to developing ideas goes unnoticed while male colleagues are rewarded for work to which I have contributed more hours, ideas, and efforts.**

Responses differed at the intersection of age and gender. Older women described being discounted or disrespected for their knowledge, whereas younger women emphasized needing to prove themselves and having their successes overlooked.

- **I have felt marginalized because of my age . . . in that colleagues in my program seem to meet frequently and I am not included. I get the impression that they think their ideas are more current than mine (which I believe is not the case).**

- **There is a pervasive unfair treatment of women faculty that is always in operation – especially young-looking women faculty, and especially with respect to assumptions that we do not have as serious a research agenda, that our administrative accomplishments are not as worthy of respect, or that we do not have the “gravitas” of our male colleagues.**
As a younger female faculty member, I often find myself being treated differently – unfairly – with respect to my mostly male peers. This is evident in the expectations that people have of me and my work, as well as their willingness to give me access to information and positions of power.

Another thread present within being devalued were comments pertaining to gaining of resources, whether pay, career opportunities, or networking. When faculty did not have access to similar types of resources, the perception of being discriminated against was evident. For example, pay discrepancy and being overlooked for leadership opportunities were a sign of being devalued in addition to lack of resources:

My compensation is lower than white faculty members with fewer years of experience (and lower research productivity) than me. White faculty members are often tapped for leadership as well.

I earn less than my male counterparts. Male colleagues get course releases and/or pay for “extra” work that I was never compensated for. When I assert my opinions in meetings I am considered difficult and un-collegial – as opposed to men who are just considered assertive or “being guys.”

Women are consistently treated with less respect and underpaid relative to male faculty in my department. As an assistant professor, I was bullied and treated disrespectfully by senior male colleagues. When I objected, I was told by my chair that it was my job to please them.

I have (unfairly) benefitted from my social identity as a straight, white, middle-aged man who speaks English as my first language. I benefit from the presumption that I have certain skills and abilities simply because I have those traits.

Being overlooked for leadership opportunities was especially prominent for women and at the intersection of gender and race:

When I pointed out that no female faculty are being trained to take leadership positions, whereas several male faculty are being encouraged and trained for leadership . . . I was met with intense defensiveness on the part of several colleagues.

I believe I was not considered for a leadership appointment due to my race and gender, even though I had strong support from a number of members of the search committee. The candidates they brought in had weaker credentials and experience. I believe that had I been a white man, the search committee would have treated me more fairly.

It is difficult for women of color to get into leadership positions. Often this is because they are not groomed for these positions from an early stage.

An additional dimension of disrespect and being devalued pertained to time devoted to institutional service, including who is permitted to say no to service requests and how excessive service demands can derail faculty productivity. These discrepancies were viewed as unfair by faculty across social identities, especially for women, faculty of particular ranks, and women of color:
Women of color carry a heavier service load than our white, male, counterparts. We also do a disproportionate amount of mentoring of our students – particularly our undergraduate and graduate students of color.

There seem to be inequities in service and advising for women, and even more so with service for people of color (I am white). Because everyone is looking for diverse and balanced committees, if you are the only woman/person of color in a certain situation, you get asked more frequently to serve. I like doing this work – I think it’s important – but I see my white, male, full professor colleagues doing MUCH LESS, and that seems to be fine with everyone.

Female professors, especially associate-level females, do about four times as much service as their male colleagues. Stunting their progression toward full. And then they are blamed for not having said no to the service in the first place.

I am a woman of color faculty member on a majority white campus. This means that I am often pressed into service on committees or in administrative positions so that the institution can demonstrate its commitment to diversity.

Rather than feeling like this work reflects the respect their colleagues have for them, many faculty members suggest that some colleagues escape from the communal, less prestigious work of running the institution because they refuse or do not do a good job.

It’s actually associate profs who get slammed the most. . . . white women get asked to do a lot of the daily grind work of the faculty (committees, advising, coordinating programs, etc.) . . . the system does not reward good citizens, and in fact rewards those who say “no” to requests by no longer asking! . . . The more you do, the more you get asked to do. We need university-wide requirements/systems in place to hold Full Professors accountable for their contributions.

Although these things may be unconscious or unintentional, there is a pervasive sense in my academic unit that women faculty are expected to do more departmental service, more emotional labor, and more taxing teaching assignments; that we are passed over for visible or high-status leadership positions, treated with less respect, and subjected to micro-aggressions from SOME (not all) of our male colleagues. Women in my unit are less successful at negotiating for “goodies” for ourselves, such as course releases, easier teaching assignments, smaller class sizes, and more TA support. Since our unit lacks clearly transparent policies and procedures for this type of thing, a system of favoritism and cronynism exists, and this seems to favor men even though my intellectual field is dominated by women.

Early-career faculty and women tend to be expected to carry a larger burden of service in my work environment and tend to get subtle negative comments and “hits” throughout their personnel reviews. Male faculty tend to be allowed more leeway when they skip meetings or decline service-oriented work that has to be completed.

Expectations and treatment of faculty women of color across campus and in my department is markedly worse, with many given increased advising loads, service work, and no support when it comes time for evaluation and or tenure.
I see more women relied on for advising and mentoring students and for college and campus-level service commitments. I see male colleagues having more time for research and grant writing and being requested to participate in/nominated for more “public” university-wide service commitments.

Faculty status, whether they were in a tenure-stream or non-tenure-stream position also was a basis for disrespect and being devalued.

I am a lecturer. Some, a small minority, tenure/tenure track faculty treat us like second-class citizens . . . it is bad enough that the difference is reflected in our pay and promotion procedures, but the odd insinuation that I am not as “good a PhD” as they are is insulting.

As a lecturer-advisor, I am sometimes treated as less capable, less competent, and/or less able to take on certain tasks, while expected to take on a significant amount of the less “glamorous” tasks.

I have been present when tenured and tenure-track faculty members have made disparaging remarks about the importance of lecturers in different departments. For example, a tenured professor said, “I can’t believe that a lecturer had the gall to tell a department chair that s/he would not do X, Y, & Z.”

Gross disrespect, negligence and lack of good faith for part-time faculty. Part-time faculty are overused, overworked, undercompensated, and disposed of with alacrity. Fear of speaking out for the impact it would have on the job.

Disability was highlighted by faculty as an area of acute disrespect.

Faculty disabilities are rarely acknowledged and not respected, nor are they recognized as a criteria for creating an inclusive environment. The disability is treated as the faculty member’s weakness and problem, whether or not that results in exclusion from student and/or department activities and the loss of the ability to engage with colleagues.

Having a disability is a struggle at the best of times, but dealing with the blatant disrespect of your colleagues takes a toll on your teaching and research.

To summarize, the open-ended responses included a strong theme pertaining to being disrespected and devalued, whether by colleagues, department chairs, administrators, or students. While faculty from all social identities mentioned some form of disrespect or devalue in their responses, the threads of gender, rank, and race are particularly notable. The behaviors associated with this form of unfair treatment includes being ignored, being interrupted, not recognizing accomplishments or giving credit, not being able to say no to service requests, lower compensation, not connecting to various resources, having complaints ignored, and being undermined.

Insensitivity and hostility. A second prominent theme within the open-ended comments pertained to insensitivity and hostility. Insensitivity referred to instances when faculty encountered negative assumptions or stereotypes by others that left them feeling degraded or misunderstood. Hostility referred to more overt instances of bias or negative treatment. In experiences of insensitivity
and hostility, the faculty member saw their social identity as the basis of the negative treatment by others. This form of unfair treatment was also associated with seeing the campus as less inclusive.

I have had a senior faculty member sometime mimic my accent in front of others and at other times make me repeat myself in department meetings, as if my accent is incomprehensible, until another colleague steps in and repeats my words.

UMass is a wonderful institution, which prides itself in being inclusive and tolerant. However, that tolerance seems to end when folks display any hint of conservative political or religious affiliation.

I don’t believe that some heterosexual faculty treat me the same way they treat other heterosexual colleagues due to my sexual orientation.

There is a general lack of knowledge regarding the dates of the Jewish high holidays – Rosh Hashanah and Yom Kippur. Major campus meetings are often scheduled on these days. While my department has been willing to shift meetings from these days to alternative days, essential college and university events have been scheduled on these days.

In my department, some faculty members make ageist comments regularly, despite my pointing out that these actions are illegal, unprofessional, and unethical.

I sometimes perceive a condescending attitude by faculty colleagues with respect to having served [in the military].

For faculty members who do not come from socioeconomic privileged backgrounds, class status assumptions were a particular dimension of insensitivity.

I come from a working-class background, although that is something that I do not share, but I often feel disconnected when my colleagues who come from privilege make assumptions about those who do not come from privilege.

I’m surprised how often in conversation some colleagues express the belief that those from the working class are not prepared for or don’t belong in a university – as students or as faculty.

It is widely assumed that I must come from at least a middle-class background. This is conveyed to me on almost a daily basis in my interactions with other faculty. I grew up in poverty, and of my immediate family (parents and siblings), I’m the only person with an income above the poverty line. While other faculty often mean well, they simply don’t realize that comments or actions actually make me feel bad.

In some cases, the treatment went beyond being insensitive into hostility because the intensity, bias, or anger within the exchange. Although cases of hostile treatment were less common than cases of insensitive treatment, they are important to acknowledge. Hostility was present across social identities, but more apt to feature race, language, religion, and political views.

The blatant and repeated homophobia, heterosexism, racism, sexism, and classism that I have experienced in the context of UMass, at the levels of my department, college, and university interferes with my ability to work.
I think department chairs and personnel committees need some kind of training that would help faculty be more aware when using terms like “angry” when referring to faculty of color.

The staff in the HR office are not always polite. I had several issues there in relation to my immigration status and immigration documents. I am a faculty, I am white, but I am an immigrant and English is not my first language. More than once, different women working in HR have yelled at me, accusing me of not understanding immigration protocols/documents and implying that I did not understand English well. Absolutely mortifying.

My students often make anti-Semitic comments.

I teach materials related to race, class, gender, [nation], and power. This has put me – and my teaching assistants – in the firing line for hostility from students who are made uncomfortable by the subject material.

My colleagues have a very naive understanding of race and racism, and also of sexism. Any criticism of lack of inclusiveness toward minorities or of double standards for women is received defensively. The response is “how dare you imply that we are racist or misogynistic.” There is no appreciation for the more nuanced ways in which structures of race, gender, and power interact to create norms that disadvantage minorities and women. The implicit assumption is that if you don’t fit in, it must be your fault.

I have had sexual harassment from a graduate student that my Chair and colleagues refused to take seriously or act upon.

Family status was also an important dimension on which faculty felt a lack of sensitivity and occasionally hostility. Women were the most likely to note that their gender intersects with family status in shaping their experiences.

As a junior faculty member (and working mother), I am asked to show up to events and mentor students more so than more senior members. There has been no systematic policy or set of informal guidelines to curb this. This lowers my research productivity and work-life balance.

When I brought up how junior male colleagues were paid more than I was, and asked why this was, I was told this was because I had taken maternity leaves.

Men who have children are perceived to be successful, while having a family is considered to be something that will add a burden to a woman.

When I told my department chair that I was [pregnant], his immediate reactions were 1) (angry tone) “Who do you think is going to teach your classes when you’re on parental leave?!” 2) (incredulous tone) “You spent years getting a PhD; why do you want to throw all that away?”

There is an inclination to accommodate the needs for heterosexual families with children in the timing of meetings and in workload—as if they have more legitimate needs than people who are single.
Taken together, this sampling of comments illustrates the range of insensitivity and hostility experienced by faculty across social identity groups. Through comments made by peers, students, or administrators, and in interactions with various offices across campus, colleagues, or within department spaces, faculty perceived differential treatment because of their identity.

**Isolation and Marginalization.** A third theme from the open-ended comments pertained to isolation and marginalization. Isolation referred to when faculty members did not feel a sense of belongingness or community, or when they felt removed from campus facilities or the campus network of information. Marginalization was a sentiment of existing in the margins, or being of less importance. In some cases, faculty linked discussion of isolation and marginalization, and so these sentiments are discussed together in this section. While isolation was described by faculty across social identities, particularly faculty of color, for LGB faculty and faculty with disabilities, the experience of marginalization was especially prevalent with regard to faculty rank and faculty who were not in the tenure stream.

Isolation referred to a sense of invisibility, whether in conversation or omitted from departmental information:

*As an African American, I have felt often that my opinion is discarded in conversations. There is a club in which I will never be part of. This is something that I have dealt with my entire life. I survive because I never feel like I have to prove anything to anyone. Because of this, I am reluctant to give my opinion frequently. Like the “invisible man.”*

*The invisible woman effect: research ignored or undervalued; fewer professional opportunities extended; exclusion from professional discussion; unseen when positions of leadership must be filled.*

*My disability makes social interactions more difficult, so I reserve my energy for meetings and classes. In my department, a lot of decisions seem to be formed in informal settings (hallway chit-chat) in which I don’t participate. This leads to my feelings of marginalization as I’m not contributing to decision making and feel that my views are not valued.*

*At times, I have also felt marginalized because of age – younger faculty in my program meet regularly without me, and I get the impression that they think my ideas are not as cutting-edge or valuable as theirs.*

*Colleagues have kept information about scholarships and fellowships away from me, but my faculty of color colleagues inform me of the availability of these opportunities for advancement.*

*The number of times white faculty go into each other’s offices exceeds by fourfold the number of times that they enter the office of a faculty of color.*

*I think that effort is made by all of the administrators from department heads to deans to recognize the work done by non-tenure-track faculty, but there are many subtle differences in treatment that can lead to a sense of exclusion. For instance, failure to update directories to include individual information about all faculty members can make those omitted faculty feel invisible.*
Disabled students, staff, and faculty are without the most basic resources and support that might make this campus livable and, moreover, might make the educational process truly accessible . . . This sends a message to our campus community that disabled people are not valuable, “too expensive,” that it is their own responsibility to navigate a hostile environment or—worse yet—that they don’t exist here at all.

Because I teach online with no physical space on campus, I have no sense of community or support as an educator.

There are some rather challenging ways of speaking about international students and immigrants. As a second-generation immigrant, I find myself disturbed by these homogenizing comments.

Many of my minority colleagues choose to live in Springfield, Holyoke, Boston, Providence, or NYC as a way to minimize their sense of alienation.

Thus, isolation took the form of disconnection, remote physical space, and invisibility, across a range of social identities.

In contrast, faculty felt marginalized when they heard their group disparaged and/or were in a group where alternative views could not be expressed openly. This occurred most often in relation to political identity, with the majority voicing concern about the lack of ideological breadth on campus.

It seems to be it is okay to express an opinion, as long as it is the deemed the right opinion. For example, I would like to wear a Donald Trump t-shirt around campus, yet I do not because I am afraid of physical and or verbal abuse . . . I hear people chatting and screaming about how awful our president-elect and his supports are, and it scares me. Just because I don’t have the same point of view as some at our university, it does not mean I shouldn’t be heard. There is a lot of talk about acceptance, so long as that acceptance is in line with a particular political party or agenda. If you don’t agree with that point of view, people try to shame you into silence.

I am a moderate conservative who reads widely, seeks out diverse sources of information, and holds several liberal views. Nonetheless, I would never share my politics within my department or school because to do so would be scandalous.

My political beliefs are not in line with those of my colleagues. I am not “excluded” because I intentionally do not share my political views on campus. But I do feel “marginalized” in that my immediate work environment is populated with those of the extreme left. There is the presumption that we all share the same political views, and comments are made frequently to this end, creating a meme of intolerance.

People who disagree with the left/ultraliberal majority are not safe sharing their views publicly, unless they want to face social and professional ostracism. Many fields in the humanities and social sciences are “no-go” zones for anyone with political views that outside of universities are considered “moderate” (not to speak of those with “conservative” views).

However, some faculty felt that moderate/conservative ideology predominates.
The scope of available political perspectives mirrors the status quo in American society, ranging from center-left to conservative, with little broadly visible platform given to left perspectives. This is a climate where faculty and other employees are pressured to avoid offending conservative students, even when those students express ideas that are void of intellectual merit and are hostile to people from marginalized groups. I feel as though my continued employment is conditioned on tolerating students’ expressions that are in conflict with our mission of diversity and inclusion and my own values, even when those expressions are counter-factual and otherwise have no academic merit. If there is any “political correctness” and “safe space” at UMass, it is to the advantage of conservative and white students.

In rare cases, faculty described feeling marginalized on the basis or being white and/or male.

If you are American and white from a working-class family, you are marginalized because UMass focuses a lot on the traditional marginalized groups of race and national origin.

There are multiple support groups for women at each level of career that exclude men participation. The same groups do not exist for men.

Beyond political identity, faculty members described feeling marginalized around their religious identity.

Departmental activities (faculty meetings, social events) are scheduled on significant religious holidays which I observe.

The open houses are on Sunday mornings, which does not work with my religious/spiritual practice.

I am an atheist, but this is something I feel I cannot say aloud. When discussion of religion comes up in discussions, I don’t feel I can participate, as the assumption is that I am religious.

In summary, faculty described feeling isolated when faculty did not perceive others would understand their experience, or felt excluded by other faculty in conversation and from important networks of information. Isolation also referred to physical isolation when faculty with disabilities could not access the campus or when online faculty lacked a connection to the campus. Marginalization was experienced most often in denigrating comments made by peers, resulting from the perceived lack of ideological diversity on campus and a silencing of those whose opinions do not conform. Faculty members also described marginalization resulting from their religious identity.

Recommendations for Change

Faculty members shared suggestions for how to make changes that would make UMass more welcoming and inclusive. The recommendations were wide-ranging and concentrated within these four areas: 1) supporting diversity and inclusion on campus, 2), improving administrative leadership with a focus on transparency and accountability, 3) greater investment in open dialogue across difference, and 4) investments in learning and professional development opportunities. Each of these recommendations are explained in greater detail and illustrated in the following section.
Support Diversity and Inclusion on Campus. A strong sentiment among faculty members who shared recommendations was the importance of supporting diversity and inclusion on campus. This included increasing the demographic diversity of UMass administrators, faculty, staff, and students and supporting existing diverse populations on campus. Faculty also discuss how resources should be mobilized, primarily with an aim to retaining diverse faculty, staff, and students. It is important to note that very few people suggest focusing less on diversity.

Faculty members underscored the importance of recruiting and retaining diverse faculty, staff, and students. For example, in some cases, the recommendation was clear and straightforward: “Recruit more underrepresented minorities among faculty, staff, and students.” Others provided more nuanced recommendations (e.g., engaging in programs in local communities, engaging in cluster hires of senior faculty members of color, providing free tuition to successful graduates of Massachusetts community colleges).

More diversity programs across campus. I’m disappointed by the homogeneity of certain programs and departments and would like to see more pointed efforts to hire and enroll persons from a variety of backgrounds and identities.

Some departments on this campus still don’t have one single faculty of color, but don’t hire token people, especially those who are pre-tenure. Instead, do cluster hires that include senior positions.

If our community were more diverse in terms of race, socioeconomic status, and nationality, I expect that members of marginalized communities would feel safer and more included.

Faculty members emphasize that retention requires providing resources to include programs aimed at providing support and services for first-generation college students, staff, and faculty; more resources for social and intellectual engagement for underrepresented groups on campus; more resources for disability services; and more training of colleagues of the specific challenges faced by faculty from underrepresented groups. Faculty recognize that diversifying the institution without providing the appropriate level of resources would only be partially successful. They recommended collecting more specific data that could inform future interventions.

Way more resources for students of lower socio-economic origins. More outreach, more transition to college help, more financial aid, more resources . . . once they are here.

Do more for first-generation-to-go-to-college students, regardless of race. Make them feel welcome, too.

A much better system for helping students with learning disabilities (or perhaps restructure or invest in a more efficient way to interface with Disability Services).

Faculty need to acknowledge the various ways in which we all contribute to a climate that is at times not inclusive. We also need to address diversity head-on in our classes and help and support our students understand the ways that their understanding of the world is enhanced through diversity. Much more support for faculty of color: understanding how racism impacts student evaluations and thus changing their role in reviews, more hiring and support for
retention, education for chairs and personnel committees about the impact of racism on faculty (teaching, evals, workload, etc.).

Overall, faculty members in their open-ended responses voice very strong support for finding ways to recruit, retain, and support more diverse populations at UMass. Within these comments was a recognition that this is a large-scale issue, one that requires focusing resources to ensure success.

**Leadership Changes: Accountability and Transparency.** Another major theme among the recommendations pertained to changes from the university leadership, with an emphasis on improving accountability and transparency. One sentiment is that leaders have the potential to make the climate more welcoming and inclusive, while others were more critical of the possibility for change. One suggestion was that resources should be linked to those who have been accountable in the areas of diversity and inclusion.

*I am proud to work at UMass, particularly under the current administration. I hope the chancellor stays for many more years.*

*I’m not sure there’s a whole lot the administration can do to improve campus climate (without changing who is on the campus).*

**Diversity and inclusion appears to be a token effort by the vast majority of white administrators; almost as if they will bear with it until the next chancellor comes to town. How seriously do we take diversity and inclusion? It has not saturated the fabric of UMass since I was an undergraduate in this area more than 20 years ago.**

**Resources in the form of budgets and lines need to be provided to the places on campus (the colleges, majors, programs) that promote and have been successful at equity and inclusion on this campus. The programs, departments, and colleges that do not prioritize diversity and inclusion should be put on notice that their resources may not increase until their successful integration by gender and race at the faculty as well as student level increases.**

**Leadership has to be challenged to examine their own systemic biases and perceptions and to make meaningful changes with a validated accountability process. This is not a call for giving “passes” to nonqualified faculty, but a recognition and valuing of bright, qualified faculty with diversity social identity who “make it to UMASS.”**

Recommendations also focused on encouraging the administration to be more consultative with faculty, and addressing problems swiftly. Another sentiment was to invest in campus safety, antibullying, and resolution of complaints:

*Safety is paramount. Students can’t educate themselves if they don’t feel safe on campus. Fighting against sexual assault will also help this cause.*

*Administration to take specific action in a timely manner for raised issues and then communicate that action clearly and in a timely fashion.*
It seems talking to lower-level administration about concerns is like talking to a wall – it goes nowhere to no one and is never acted upon or taken seriously. Concerns are effectively blocked by those in the chain of command and campus leadership who are willing bystanders to bullying.

There is a climate here that tries to sweep all issues of mistreatment, ill treatment, racism, sexism, and bullying under the rug.

I think UMass needs to do much better in its treatment of reportees of sexual assault/harassment.

UMass suffers from a top-heavy approach in which administrators often gather flawed data and make sweeping decisions based on incomplete and erroneous information using poor judgement with little or no input from the faculty. When the faculty are consulted, it’s usually done only for show to enhance or justify whatever poor decisions are being made.

Another suggestion was for administrators and chairs to treat faculty with greater respect by welcoming and listening to faculty, staff, and student perspectives. Faculty members desired a process of bringing issues forward that was more open and respectful:

The tone from the top is negative; there is a clear sense that faculty are not welcome to approach the dean’s level; we are reprimanded if we do . . . Changes at the college level are needed to be more approachable, supportive, less punitive, respectful.

More transparent processes for handling incidents of harassment, assault, racist behavior.

I have dealt with students who have been harassed and bullied, with written evidence, with the wrongdoer walking away without a consequence and the harmed feeling as though they were wrong to challenge faculty or administrators. I believe this campus really needs to adopt a restorative practices program. Not a pretense, but a long-term, sustained effort.

I met with EEOD to alert them about [a sexual harassment claim against a faculty member]. They were supposed to speak to the students concerned, investigate the matter, which presumably leads to a solution. I found the process totally opaque. I have no idea if anything has changed—has the faculty member been reprimanded? Do the students who spoke to EEOD know if any steps have been taken? There needs to be much more transparency in the EEOD process so the person/people making the complaint KNOW what (if anything) has been done. Absent transparency, they [the complainants] feel that nothing has changed. That doesn’t make them feel confident that the system works.

Others specified ways that within colleges and schools, faculty searches could be carried out differently, including the process by which departments identify and consider candidates who might diversify their department.

Another sentiment was to more fully recognize service in addition to research and teaching. Some faculty suggest that valuing and respecting all of the work that faculty do would lead to a more inclusive campus climate.
Broader definition of, and appreciation for, all of the contributions made by faculty. Many women and minorities are called on to serve on committees of all kinds, but are then penalized when they don’t produce in the “most important” aspects of their jobs (e.g. research). Their service is simply not recognized as important after they have been used to fill a quota.

Much of the criteria for both tenure and promotion is individual-focused so there is little incentive to work collectively on things. Creating a form of assessment that considers how well (and how much effort) people spend on collective tasks that have little personal benefit may address this problem.

Overall, faculty recognize the importance of leadership in making UMass welcoming and inclusive, but suggest that there are important approaches that leaders could take that would improve transparency and accountability, and improve the experiences of faculty.

**Dialogue across Difference.** A third prominent theme in terms of recommendations for change included greater opportunity for dialogue. One suggestion was to create opportunities for diverse students, staff, and faculty to discuss the issues they face, and feel supported. Such an opportunity would help foster community-building, if taken up in smaller groups at one’s department level in addition to broader engagement. Faculty members explained the need to move away from shaming or labeling to working together in an open-minded fashion:

*I get the impression that UMass’s strategy for making UMass Amherst a more welcoming and inclusive place for all is to shame the person who is not inclusive enough. Sometimes that works, especially in a workplace environment, but I believe a more tolerant approach to unconscious racism, sexism, etc. in which the offending person is asked questions, would work better. I have had this impression talking to colleagues, who are, in my opinion, often as closed-minded as those they seek to change.*

*Allow and indeed encourage a climate where different political beliefs and perspectives can be discussed openly without the ad hominem attacks and labeling that currently takes place . . . promote the idea that people of good will can disagree.*

Another suggestion focused on creating opportunities for those with varied political identities to discuss political issues in respectful and open ways. This was also a shared sentiment in conversations across race. Such open dialogues could benefit not only those who have faced challenges, but also can serve students as they observe faculty modeling respectful engagement across groups. Such opportunities can also help the university at large engage in respectful debate and promote understanding.

*By inclusive, we should also mean including (and protecting) students with different political/social views from the prevailing progressive norm. I had a Trump supporter in class who was clearly afraid and browbeaten. I did not contribute to this problem, but I didn’t need to. Students can be ruthlessly efficient in enforcing perceived social norms.*

*There are many ways to accomplish the objectives of a fair and just society, and we have to make sure that we hear all perspectives as we work toward those goals. The free and open expression of ideas is fundamentally important to institutions of higher learning, and we need to
reinforce our commitment to First Amendment protections, even as we work toward promoting diversity and inclusion.

We need more opportunities for our students to air their concerns about issues of race. These need to be unmitigated, public forms, in which university administration allows students to talk at length. There is a significant pain among students of color on this campus, and the administration needs to air their concerns on the students’ terms.

Finding ways to bridge the divide within groups of people (e.g., undergraduates with different political beliefs – how should they engage in dialogue? . . . faculty members of different racial identities – how can we talk about race [in] a way that’s not politically charged?)

Another recommendation was to improve access to spaces where faculty members can air grievances; ideally such opportunities would include diverse speakers. Overall, faculty members emphasize the importance of civil discourse and events and opportunities for dialogue that leads to improved relations and understanding.

**Education and Professional Development.** A fourth theme focused on ways education and professional development could improve campus climate. Faculty members pointed to the importance of ensuring the curriculum helps students learn to think about diversity and inclusion. Suggestions in this vein included new required courses for first-year students, general education courses, or implicit bias training for graduate students in science and engineering fields.

Another related suggestion included support for faculty to improve their expertise to teach materials regarding diversity effectively and sensitively.

*It is imperative that diversity courses be widened and engaged at the general education level to allow students for further conversations (and exposure) to people different than they are.*

*Our general undergraduate population reflects the social fabric of the country: there is a significant fraction of students who discriminate against fellow student and faculty/staff members based on race, gender, etc. It is important that these students are educated about the policies of respect and inclusiveness of the university.*

*My LGBTQ+ students have thanked me for including LGBTQ+ relevant materials in one of my courses, telling me they seldom see readings or units included in course curricula that reflect their experiences. I’m trying to do better about making sure their experiences and those of other social identity groups are better reflected in my course materials.*

Another strong sentiment related to the need for training on issues of diversity and inclusivity. Faculty thought it would benefit the entire campus, but stressed it was needed for chairs, department heads, and personnel committees:

*Training so that faculty are more aware of pitfalls, so that search committees, personnel committees, and heads are aware of bias.*
All administrators and faculty, from the dean of [college] on down, need to be brought to understand that their actions and attitudes about women are discriminatory and sexist, no matter what their conscious good intent.

The university must have an effective program for faculty and administrator workplace bullying that recognizes the insidious effects that bullying has on a person’s career. If the university is serious about stopping bullying at all levels of faculty and administrative ranks, it will set aside resources and programs for those bullied to enter programs that give them a chance to rehabilitate their careers and move forward effectively. At this point, the workplace bullying office has a list of programs you can apply for, but all of them are awarded based on your administrator’s recommendation. That does no good if the administrator is part of, or the entire problem.

One specific suggestion is that department-level trainings may be more effective than one-size-fits-all training, and that the training invested in needs to be of high quality. In addition, one critique of existing training was that the current workshops tend to focus on particularly egregious examples, when faculty need more subtle examples in order to develop the tools to create positive and inclusive environments.

Faculty members elaborated what would help:

*Implicit bias trainings done by a diverse team of individuals with expertise in this area. I think the team approach is critical because some people can “say” things that other people cannot “say” (and have it be heard and processed). I’m white and privileged and work hard to acknowledge and challenge my assumptions but still screw up. I would benefit from working with others who have different backgrounds/identities—we need to continue to diversify our workforce and student body.*

*I would have much preferred my two-hour workshop tackle the more relevant issue of our hidden, internal biases. I believe that the vast majority of us would be keen to be awakened to this self-awareness and would be keen to learn strategies for achieving this self-awareness.*

*I think it would have been much more effective if the premise [of the workshop] had been a positive one – how to create a positive and inclusive work environment.*

*I think also that individual departments need to receive diversity training specific to their disciplines – especially on how to provide equity and work optimally with diverse populations of students.*

In summary, faculty members make many different recommendations for how to change the university. Yet, the major themes coalesce around supporting diversity and directing resources to support inclusion, having leaders recognize and address these goals, and develop more transparent and accountable processes. Some faculty members call for the need for dialogue where they can effectively address political viewpoints and engage across difference. Faculty also call for creating more opportunities for education and training to include implicit bias, search procedures, and inclusive teaching.