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INTRODUCTION

This report marks the fifth study of campus climate for faculty conducted at the University of Michigan (U-M) by the ADVANCE Program since 2001. This study provided an opportunity for us to learn how the climate at the university was experienced by different groups of faculty. These studies were an important corollary to ADVANCE’s focus on the success of a diverse and excellent faculty. Since its beginning as an NSF Institutional Transformation Grant, faculty and staff associated with the ADVANCE Program worked to engage discussion, stimulate new efforts, and develop optimal practices throughout the campus. The ADVANCE team engages with U-M faculty and academic leaders to help us realize the vision that unites us all: the development of a just and equitable university environment where everyone can thrive and do their best work.

In 2001 and 2006 ADVANCE administered faculty climate surveys to assess the climate for STEM (science, technology, engineering, mathematics) faculty as part of the program’s initial funding which focused on tenure-track women in STEM fields. These studies documented a comparatively more negative work environment (e.g., more disparaging comments about women made by faculty, more reports of gender discrimination) for women and minority scientists and engineers than for white men. The 2006 study suggested little change in the climate for science and engineering faculty as well as a consistent pattern of a more negative climate for women faculty and BIPOC+ (especially BIPOC+ women). There were, however, indications that some things were improving (e.g., white women reported significantly fewer instances of unwanted sexual attention). In addition, for all faculty except women of color, experiences of scholarly isolation were lower.

The overall findings from the 2012 survey were consistent with the previous two surveys and indicated that the general climate was relatively positive for white men in all disciplinary groups, but less so for white women and faculty of color. For instance, consistent with the previous studies, more women reported gender discrimination. There were also some areas of improvement for science and engineering faculty at that time (e.g., fewer disparaging comments about women by faculty, fewer disparaging comments about racial-ethnic minorities by faculty, fewer instances of unwanted sexual attention). Despite the positive changes noted, the data also suggested that there continued to be clear and consistent gender/race-ethnicity differences concerning some aspects of the climate at both the University and the department levels, indicating a more negative climate for women and faculty of color.

In the most recent climate assessment, 2017, the experiences of tenure-track faculty within broad disciplinary groups were considered over time (i.e., 2017 as compared to 2012), including an emphasis on the work environment for women and faculty of color. The findings suggested that some aspects of the broader University climate continued to be less welcoming for women and faculty of color (e.g.,
disparaging comments about women by faculty, unwanted sexual attention, gender discrimination). Rates of racial-ethnic discrimination across groups were generally low and consistent over time, except for some women of color. Although disparaging comments about racial-ethnic minorities and/or religious groups by faculty were generally low, we observed an increase in such reports between 2012 and 2017. Department climate ratings and diversity scale scores in 2017 were fairly positive and consistent with 2012 mean scores. Nevertheless, other ratings for faculty of color were trending downward over time, and white men generally reported a more positive climate for diversity in 2017.

2023 STUDY

Our goal for the current climate study was to observe how faculty and lecturers experience their working environments at U-M. This report evaluated the general campus climate experiences of tenure-track faculty on the Ann Arbor campus, including Michigan Medicine. Planned subsequent reports will focus on tenure-track faculty experiences in their department/unit as well as the general campus climate and department/unit experiences of particular subgroups of faculty (e.g., URM\(^1\), associate professors, LGBTQIA+\(^2\), clinical-track) over time.

The unique historical context for the present report merits attention. Since the last climate assessment in 2017, we have collectively experienced a worldwide pandemic. In response to the COVID-19 pandemic, the U-M eliminated nearly all on-campus activity in March 2020. Starting in May 2021, on-campus activities gradually increased through the summer. By Winter 2022, most classes were offered in-person; spending, hiring, and merit pay restrictions had also been lifted. Although university activity has mostly returned to pre-pandemic levels, the overall impact of the pandemic on faculty and the resulting U-M campus shutdown is not yet fully understood. This faculty climate assessment was administered three years after the start of the COVID-19 pandemic, and a few months into Winter 2023. At the time of this survey, few mitigation strategies (e.g., social distancing, room capacity limitations) remained in place. Across multiple climate studies in recent years, some faculty reported ongoing personal challenges with mental health, physical health and social interactions. Numerous reports have highlighted differential experiences of the COVID-19 pandemic in the academy, with women, parenting, and racialized faculty feeling especially overwhelmed and unsupported in their professional pursuits during the early months of the pandemic due to higher burdens of care for children, family, and community members. The lack of social interactions was also exacerbated by the shift to online teaching and research interruptions due to close of in-person facilities/sites. Departments indicated a continued struggle with building community, an on-campus presence, and networking.

---

1 Historically Underrepresented Minorities (URM) includes individuals who self-identify as African American/Black, Hispanic/Latino/a/x, Native American/Alaskan Native, and Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander. For individuals who self-identified with two or more races, where further detail was available, URM also includes those individuals who self-identified with at least one of the categories considered URM.

2 LGBTQIA+ includes individuals who self-identify as lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, queer or questioning, intersex, asexual, and more.
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1 Historically Underrepresented Minorities (URM) includes individuals who self-identify as African American/Black, Hispanic/Latino/a/x, Native American/Alaskan Native, and Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander. For individuals who self-identified with two or more races, where further detail was available, URM also includes those individuals who self-identified with at least one of the categories considered URM.

2 LGBTQIA+ includes individuals who self-identify as lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, queer or questioning, intersex, asexual, and more.
The underlying assumption of this report was that aggregated data about difficulties faced by all or some faculty at the U-M informs targeted intervention efforts to improve their circumstances and assess how well these efforts worked overall. We believe that our findings can be helpful in this way, however, we also offer a caution: aggregate data can only provide a picture of an overall group—that picture may, in fact, not reflect the lived experiences of a given individual or unit. It does not fill in the crucial nuance that only individual units and faculty can discern. What this study can do—and we hope it does—is provide a picture, in broad strokes, of our faculty across many different units and individuals.

It is important to keep this in mind, both in the case where an obstacle identified may seem not to apply, and in the case where an individual may feel they face an obstacle, but it does not appear in the aggregate data. It is worthwhile for institutional decision-makers to think about the problem, even if there were individual cases that seem to be presently unaffected by it. In fact, it would be wise for decision-makers to examine those individual cases carefully, not because they conflict with the aggregate data, but so we can learn how to ensure more women and URM faculty experience their departments as positively as white men faculty moving forward.

**Changes Made in 2023**

The 2023 campus-wide survey included the following contemporaneous updates that differed from previous survey waves:

- Demographic questions included both gender identity and race-ethnicity options for respondents beyond the federally designated categories as well as options to share details of their ancestral lineage.
- The 2023 analysis used self-reported gender identity and race-ethnicity instead of the federally designated categories.
- Most of the previous items that included open-ended “Other” response options were reviewed and updated with additional response choices added to the 2023 survey.
- New questions and response options (e.g., clinical hours per week, amount of creative/studio/performance space) provided a better understanding of a broader range of activities across faculty tracks. 2023 was also the first time that lecturers were invited to participate in the survey.
- New questions in faculty workload, perceived workload equity, mentoring received from other faculty, and codeswitching were added.
- The 2023 analysis used five variables (i.e., age group, sex, school/college, race-ethnicity, rank) in the survey weight calculations.

In an effort to maintain a reasonably acceptable survey length, the following items from previous survey assessments were excluded: infant care, childcare, parenting responsibilities, elder care, experiences of spouse/partner, and the impact of specific life experiences on the faculty member’s professional life.

---

3 Codeswitching refers to the practice of adjusting one’s self presentation by mirroring the norms, behaviors, and attributes of the dominant group (i.e., White people) in specific contexts.
**WHO WAS INVITED TO PARTICIPATE?**

In winter 2023, all tenure-track faculty, research-track faculty, clinical-track faculty, and lecturers with paid appointments on the Ann Arbor campus, including Michigan Medicine, were invited to participate in a climate survey administered by the ADVANCE Program \((N = 7,164)\) and 37% responded \((N = 2,623)\).

U-M institutional data captured the federal categories for sex and race-ethnicity as well as each faculty appointment. The faculty invited to participate had the following characteristics:4

- **Sex** = 46% Female, 54% Male
- **Race-Ethnicity** = 9% URM, 19% A/AA5, 69% White, 2% Multi-racial, and 2% Not Indicated
- **School/College** = 10% Engineering, 20% LSA, 46% Medicine, and 25% Remaining Schools/Colleges6
- **Track** = 33% Clinical Faculty, 15% Lecturers, 8% Research Faculty, and 44% Tenure-track Faculty.

**PARTICIPANT DEMOGRAPHICS: TENURE-TRACK FACULTY ONLY**

This report focuses on the institutional experiences of the subsample of tenure-track faculty. Out of the 3,149 tenure-track faculty who were invited to participate, 41% responded \((N = 1,289)\) respondents.

The **tenure-track faculty** who completed the survey self-reported the following demographic characteristics:

- **Gender Identity** = 51% Men, 42% Women, and 2% TGD7
- **Race-Ethnicity** = 2% AMENA8, 11% URM, 13% A/AA, 1% Multi-racial, and 66% White
- **School/College** = 12% Engineering, 33% LSA, 23% Medicine, and 31% Remaining Schools/Colleges
- **Broad Field** = 30% STEM, 22% Social/Behavioral Sciences, 19% Arts & Humanities, 28% Health Sciences, and 1% Interdisciplinary

All survey demographics from the tenure-track faculty subsample were presented as an infographic (see Appendix A).

In this report, both gender identity and race-ethnicity were obtained from the respondents’ self-reported survey responses, which includes additional categories that were not included in the current federal definitions. Self-reported survey responses about identity characteristics differed from those available via institutional data sources. Importantly, for the purposes of this report, new race-ethnicity and gender

---

4 Percent totals that do not equal 100% were due to rounding.
5 Asian/Asian-American (A/AA)
7 Transgender and gender-diverse (TGD) people have a gender identity that differs from the sex they were assigned at birth.
8 Arab/Middle Eastern/North African (AMENA)
identity groups were created: BIPOC+ and TGD. Hereafter, we refer to the following analytic groups of tenure-track faculty:

- BIPOC+ women ($N = 158$)
- BIPOC+ men ($N = 172$)
- BIPOC+ TGD ($N = 6$)$^{10}$
- White women ($N = 368$)
- White men ($N = 455$)
- White TGD ($N = 17$)$^{16}$

**Missing Data.** Of the faculty who provided at least one of the demographic questions, 113 did not respond to any other items and were therefore not included in the subsequent analyses. Of these 113 faculty, 30 were assistant professors, 23 were associate professors, and 60 were professors.

**UNIVERSITY CLIMATE**

This report analyzed survey items that focused on the university climate in the following areas:

- **Experiences in U-M Environment**
  - disparaging comments about women made by faculty
  - disparaging comments about racial-ethnic minorities made by faculty
  - experiences of gender discrimination
  - experiences of racial-ethnic minority discrimination
  - unwanted and uninvited sexual attention
  - codeswitching
  - campus climate/environment and safety
- **Satisfaction**
  - overall career satisfaction at U-M
  - work satisfaction
  - satisfaction with teaching load
- **Professional Experiences**
  - mentoring
  - service and leadership
  - workload equity
- **Faculty Retention**
  - intention to stay at U-M
  - outside offers and counteroffers

---

$^9$ Black, Indigenous, People of Color (BIPOC) were faculty who identify as URM and A/AA. The “+” signifies the addition of Arab/Middle Eastern/North African (AMENA) to this group.

$^{10}$ The TGD group was excluded from group comparisons in this report for statistical reasons due to the small number; however, we wish to fully affirm the presence of TGD individuals at U-M.
**DATA ANALYSIS STRATEGY**

**COMPARISON GROUPS: GENDER, RACE/ETHNICITY, RANK**

Intersectional research approaches, which are rooted in Black feminism, highlight the “experience and meaning of simultaneously belonging to multiple intertwined social categories” (Else-Quest & Hyde, 2016, p. 157), assume some dimension of inequality or power, and assume that the importance of different social categories may be more or less relevant depending on social context (Cole, 2009; Else-Quest & Hyde, 2016).

Scholars have used intersectional approaches to examine workplace climate (Berdahl & Moore, 2006; Fattoracci, Revels-Macalinao, & Huynh, 2020), centering the experiences of women of color who experience workplace harassment at higher levels than white women, men of color, and white men (Berdahl & Moore, 2006). In addition, scholars use intersectional approaches to examine workload equity for faculty (Berge et al., 2023; Misra et al., 2021; O’Meara et al., 2019). While previous research found that women and URM faculty often spend more time on mentoring, service, and teaching (O’Meara et al., 2017; O’Meara et al., 2019; Wood, Hilton, & Nevarez, 2015), more recent work has found differences in how white women and women of color perceive workload equity and recognition (Misra et al., 2021). Taken together, this work underscores the importance of exploring differences between intersectional groups on topics such as campus climate and workload equity as opposed to examining the main effects of gender and race/ethnicity. In order to examine the experiences of faculty in different intersectional groups (i.e., BIPOC+ women, BIPOC+ men, white women, white men), we used one-way ANOVA tests, with post-hoc analyses to compare all of the intersectional groups to each other to determine if, and if so, where, there are statistically significant differences between groups.

We assessed differences in tenure-track faculty experiences across faculty ranks (i.e., assistant professor, associate professor, professor). Preliminary analyses were conducted to compare URM and A/AA faculty. These analyses revealed few significant differences among the URM and A/AA groups. Although the number of AMENA faculty was too small for statistical analyses, descriptive statistics suggested that their experiences were similar to URM and A/AA faculty. Given that previous work indicated that AMENA faculty climate experiences parallel those of other racially minoritized groups (Awad et al., 2019), we combined URM faculty, A/AA faculty and AMENA faculty in these analyses to create the BIPOC+ faculty group.

---

When we use a factorial approach, we see outcomes that support the conclusions made about the pattern of means, i.e., on 66% of tests in which significant effects emerged ($p < 0.06$), either two main effects or an interaction between gender and race were evident, supporting the interpretation of an additive effect of gender and race.
Weights\textsuperscript{12}

The distribution of respondents was not fully representative of the faculty invited to participate in the survey in terms of age, sex, school/college, race-ethnicity, and rank. To address this, all analyses were conducted using weights. Weighted data analyses adjust the raw survey data to enable statistical inference to the population from which the sample was drawn. These data were weighted on the basis of HR-reported age groups (i.e., <=40, 41-50, 51-60, 60+), sex, school/college (i.e., Engineering, LSA, Medicine, 15 remaining schools/colleges), race-ethnicity (i.e., BIPOC, white, unknown), and rank (i.e., assistant professor, associate professor, professor) among the tenure-track faculty invited to participate in the survey.

The approach for weighing data in 2023 differed from previous reports in that it considered all seven variables used previously in weight calculations (i.e., sex, school/college, race-ethnicity) or as control variables (i.e., age group, rank, years since highest degree, years in service). The weights were created using a calibration adjustment called “raking” (Awad, et al., 2019). During the raking process, years since the highest degree and years in service at U-M were also considered as possible auxiliary variables to compute the weights. Neither years since the highest degree or years in service were associated with the likelihood of responding to the survey or the key variables of interest; these variables were therefore not used to compute the 2023 weights.

Statistical Tests

Analyses were completed using analysis of variance\textsuperscript{13} (ANOVAs) on scales and items from the survey to assess differences by gender/race-ethnicity groups, comparing the mean scores of the four groups. The analyses for the rank groups used the same analytical approach. In some cases, an ANOVA may indicate no overall significant difference when in fact a difference exists between a specific subset of groups (Vasey & Thayer, 1987). For this reason, we examined post-hoc group comparisons of all groups for each ANOVA conducted (Chen, et al., 2018).

In the results discussed below, all references to significant differences or group differences indicated differences found to be statistically significant ($p < .05$) after adjusting for multiple comparisons.

Data tables follow the report. Two sets of tables were produced for each topic (e.g., discrimination, satisfaction, mentoring, workload equity) by gender/race-ethnicity as well as by rank. Tables described the group means or frequencies, and were followed by differences between group means or frequencies. Although TGD faculty and faculty who did not select a gender identity and/or race-ethnicity were not included in the group comparison analyses due to small sample sizes, their descriptives were included in the gender/race-ethnicity tables, when possible (Refer to Tables 1 - 4).

\textsuperscript{12} Weights also adjusted for the variance in key variables of interest explained by the main effects of age group, sex, school/college, race-ethnicity, and rank, in addition to some of their interactions.

\textsuperscript{13} This is a statistical procedure that apportions variation in scores on a variable to different group membership factors.
FINDINGS

The results reported below describe findings for each of the outcome variables considered. As noted above, we describe overall differences by gender/race-ethnicity intersectional groups (i.e., BIPOC+ women, BIPOC+ men, white women, white men) as well as rank (i.e., assistant professor, associate professor, professor). We examined differences between these groups within this 2023 wave. Brackets were added to figures to indicate the subgroups that were significantly different.

This report focused on the findings concerning the general university climate for the tenure-track faculty. It began with a discussion of variables that address climate issues more broadly, and then those variables in which both race-ethnicity and gender issues are directly implicated. It described multiple types of satisfaction, again looking at gender/race-ethnicity differences. Faculty who differed by professional experiences as well as their intent to leave U-M were presented.

EXPERIENCES IN U-M ENVIRONMENT (Tables 1A - 1D)

DISPARAGING COMMENTS ABOUT HISTORICALLY MARGINALIZED GROUPS

All faculty were asked how often they had overheard insensitive or disparaging comments from faculty about people from historically marginalized groups (i.e., women, racial-ethnic minorities, religious groups, people who were LGBTQIA+, people with disabilities, people from other countries) within the past 12 months. Responses ranged from 1 (never) to 5 (weekly). All mean scores were relatively close to “never” and ranged from 1.2 (for disparaging comments about people who were LGBTQIA+) to 1.5 (for disparaging comments about women).

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN GENDER/RACE-ETHNICITY GROUPS. Women (both BIPOC+ and white women) reported overhearing disparaging comments about women more frequently than men (both BIPOC+ and white men) (see Figures 1 and 2). BIPOC+ women overheard the greatest amount of disparaging comments about racial-ethnic minorities, more than BIPOC+ men, white women, and white men. BIPOC+ men and white women were the second highest in hearing disparaging comments about racial-ethnic minorities, hearing them more frequently than white men. White men reported overhearing the lowest amount of disparaging comments about racial-ethnic minorities.

BIPOC+ women reported overhearing disparaging comments about people who were LGBTQIA+ more frequently than white men. Furthermore, white women reported overhearing disparaging comments about people with disabilities more frequently than both BIPOC+ men and white men. White men reported overhearing the least amount of disparaging comments about people from other countries. No gender/race-ethnicity groups differed in their reported frequency of overhearing disparaging comments about religious groups.

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN RANK GROUPS. Associate professors reported overhearing the highest amount of disparaging comments about women. Professors reported overhearing the lowest amount of disparaging comments about racial-ethnic minorities. Associate professors reported overhearing disparaging...
comments about people from other countries more frequently than professors. Assistant professors, associate professors, and professors did not differ in their reported frequency of overhearing disparaging comments about religious groups, people who were LGBTQIA+, or people with disabilities.

Figure 1: Frequency with which faculty heard insensitive or disparaging comments made by faculty regarding women and racial-ethnic minorities by gender/race-ethnicity.

Figure 2: Frequency with which faculty heard insensitive or disparaging comments made by faculty regarding people who were LGBTQIA+, have disabilities, and people from other countries by gender/race-ethnicity.
DISCRIMINATION EXPERIENCES

Faculty were asked if they had experienced discrimination at U-M in the last 12 months; responses were coded “yes,” “maybe/I don’t know,” or “no.” Fifty-five percent of faculty reported having no such experiences of discrimination, whereas about 14% of faculty reported experiencing discrimination. An additional 22% of faculty were unsure if they had experienced discrimination.

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN GENDER/RACE-ETHNICITY GROUPS. White men were the least likely to report experiencing discrimination with certainty (i.e. a “yes” response) or uncertainty (i.e., a “maybe/I don’t know” response), when compared to not experiencing discrimination at all. In addition, BIPOC+ women were more likely than white women to report experiencing discrimination with certainty, when compared to not experiencing discrimination (see Figure 3).

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN RANK GROUPS. Associate professors were more likely than professors to experience discrimination with certainty, than to not experience discrimination at all. Professors were the least likely to report experiencing discrimination with uncertainty when compared to experiencing no discrimination.

UNWANTED AND UNINVITED SEXUAL ATTENTION

Faculty were asked if they had experienced any unwanted and uninvited sexual attention within the past five years; responses were coded “yes,” “maybe/I don’t know,” or “no.” A large majority (83%) of faculty reported no exposure to unwanted and uninvited sexual attention in the past five years. About 5% reported experiencing unwanted and uninvited sexual attention, and an additional 3% of faculty were unsure.

Figure 3: Percent of faculty who experienced discrimination in the last 12 months by gender/race-ethnicity. The percent of “No” is not displayed.
DIFFERENCES BETWEEN GENDER/RACE-ETHNICITY GROUPS. Women (both BIPOC+ and white) were more likely than men (both BIPOC+ and white) to experience unwanted and uninvited sexual attention with certainty (i.e. a “yes” response), than to not experience these behaviors. BIPOC+ men and white women were more likely than white men to experience unwanted and uninvited sexual attention with uncertainty (i.e., a “maybe/I don’t know” response), than to not experience the sexual attention (see Figure 4).

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN RANK GROUPS. Assistant professors were more likely than professors to experience unwanted and uninvited sexual attention with certainty, than to not experience sexual attention. There was not a difference between the faculty ranks in their experiences of unwanted and uninvited sexual attention with uncertainty, when compared to not experiencing these behaviors.

Figure 4: Percent of faculty who experienced unwanted and uninvited sexual attention in the last 5 years by gender/race-ethnicity. The percent of “No” is not displayed.

CODESWITCHING

We also asked faculty respondents how often they change nine specific behaviors or attributes (e.g., style of speech, demeanor/mannerisms, preferred name, style of clothing) to fit in at work (i.e., codeswitching). Responses were coded on a five-point scale from 1 (never) to 5 (very often). On average, faculty reported that they seldom ($M = 2.0$) engaged in codeswitching.

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN GENDER/RACE-ETHNICITY GROUPS. White men reported the least amount of codeswitching, whereas BIPOC+ women reported the greatest amount of codeswitching (see Figure 5).

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN RANK GROUPS. Professors codeswitched the least when compared to both assistant and associate professors (see Figure 6).
DISCUSSION

**Disparaging Comments and Discrimination.** Our survey findings are consistent with literature and prior reports on faculty’s experiences within university environments. Firstly, hearing disparaging comments from a colleague, particularly about women, racial/ethnic minorities, and/or other countries, remains a common and impactful experience for faculty. On average, U-M faculty reported never hearing a disparaging comment to hearing a comment 1-2 times a week. This parallels climate experiences at the University of New Hampshire, where 33% of their faculty surveyed heard their colleagues make insensitive
or disparaging comments about someone because of their gender, disability status, sexual orientation, or gender/race-ethnicity. Among their faculty, 22% indicated hearing a colleague imply that faculty from underrepresented groups were not as strong in their field (Jones et al., 2016). U-M faculty similarly witnessed biased language, specifically targeted at women. When compared to both BIPOC+ and white men, U-M women faculty (both BIPOC+ and white) heard more faculty make disparaging comments about women. Women faculty’s heightened exposure to discriminatory language has been and continues to remain a salient climate issue, both at U-M and on other college campuses. Our previous study of faculty in science and engineering departments showed that women experienced significantly more informal gender derogation (e.g., exposure to insults about their own sex) than men (Settles et al., 2013).

Findings from our 2023 climate survey indicated that BIPOC+ women also overheard the greatest amount of disparaging comments about racial-ethnic minorities. This aligns with findings from a campus climate survey at Virginia Tech, where 67% of Black, 50% of Hispanic, and 32% of Asian tenured and tenure-track faculty surveyed had read, heard, and/or seen insensitive or disparaging comments in the workplace that were offensive to them (Saddler & Creamer, 2007). We know that BIPOC+ women’s various intersecting, marginalized racial and gender identities creates compounded experiences of oppression, and thus, places them at greater risk of discriminatory language and incidents of bias (Crenshaw, 1991). One future direction may be examining differences between schools and colleges, particularly Michigan Medicine vs others, in the various measures relating to experiences of discrimination. The majority of faculty who responded to our survey were from Michigan Medicine (46%). Tenure-track faculty in Michigan Medicine have clinical responsibilities that are not typically a part of other tenure-track faculty’s responsibilities on campus. Questions of whether the rate of discrimination changes between Michigan Medicine and other schools and colleges are worth exploring. More research is needed to gain insight on when the disparaging comments are heard, the demographics of the perpetrators (e.g., faculty rank, discipline, gender, age), and the implications of these comments for departmental climate, institutional climate, job satisfaction, and faculty retention.

We found that white men were the least likely to report experiencing discrimination (with and without certainty), whereas BIPOC+ women were more likely than white women to report experiencing discrimination with certainty. Our survey findings underscore the all too frequent discrimination BIPOC+ women faculty are experiencing on their campuses. For example, quantitative findings from one mixed-method study at a predominantly white institution found that underrepresented (URM) female faculty were more likely than URM men to report both racial/ethnic and gender discrimination (Zambrana et al., 2017). Qualitative data from that same study revealed that this gender, racial/ethnic, and/or class discrimination included outright and subtle racism, devaluation of scholarly contributions, merit and skillset by colleagues and administrators, as well as being burdened with representing their minoritized group or inequitable service load (Zambrana et al., 2017). Similarly, in a prior study, we found that female faculty in science and engineering departments experienced significantly more gender based mistreatment, including gender discrimination (e.g., discrimination in pay, promotion, and resources) (Settles et al., 2013). Female faculty who reported more gender discrimination also reported greater scholarly alienation and negative climate, and in turn, worsened job satisfaction (Settles et al., 2013). Among a separate sample of academic medical faculty, women were more likely to report perceiving
gender-specific bias in their academic environment and were more likely to report personally experiencing gender bias in professional advancement when compared to men (Jagsi et al., 2016).

With regard to rank, associate professors overheard the highest amount of disparaging comments about women and were more likely than professors to experience discrimination with certainty. Departmental context, the nature of associate professor’s service roles, and their demographics may explain this finding. Upon securing tenure, associate professors may feel accepted by their department and more comfortable self-advocating and voicing their opinions about departmental and institutional inequities. Moreover, associate professors are often burdened by inequitable amounts of visible and invisible service, much of which has a diversity, equity, and inclusion focus (Gordon et al., 2022). Associate professors who speak up about injustices and undertake service roles like mentoring underrepresented students, conducting community outreach, or leading DEI committees within their unit, may possibly encounter situations and discussions that enable discrimination. Demographics may also play a role; more women get “stuck” at the associate professor rank for some time, and it has been well-documented that women faculty experience more discrimination when compared to men (Buch et al., 2011; Settles et al., 2013).

**Unwanted and Uninvited Sexual Attention.** Unwanted and uninvited sexual attention remains an urgent climate matter at U-M. Data revealed that women faculty (both BIPOC+ and white) were more likely than men (both BIPOC+ and white) to experience unwanted and uninvited sexual attention with certainty. Sexual harassment has been and remains a persistent plague for women faculty, both at U-M and at other institutions. In a study of academic medical faculty, women were more likely to personally experience sexual harassment than men. Of those women faculty who reported harassment, 40% described more severe forms of harassment, 59% perceived a negative effect on confidence in themselves as professionals, and 47% reported that this harassment had negative impacts on their careers (Jagsi et al., 2016).

Assistant professors were also more likely than professors to experience unwanted and uninvited sexual attention with certainty. It is possible power dynamics are at play; due to their more junior status, colleagues may perceive assistant professors as an “easy target” for unwanted and uninvited sexual attention. It is also important to note that our survey question did not inquire about the perpetrator and only asked if they had experienced unwanted and uninvited sexual attention in the past 5 years. Thus, faculty, staff, or students may have also been transgressors. Assistant professors are typically younger in age when compared to associate and full professors, and closer in age to students. In turn, students may also perceive them as more of a peer and thus, an easy target. Assistant professors may not understand the process, feel comfortable calling attention to the matter, feel comfortable reporting the incident, or addressing the transgressor as they may be new to the department and institution. They may also fear the consequences of addressing a transgression prior to their review for tenure and promotion. One future direction is for researchers to explore what is being done to address sexual harassment at other institutions where sexual harassment is less prevalent. For instance, an [ADVANCE 2022 climate report from the University of Washington (UW)](http://example.com) revealed that nearly 95% of faculty had never experienced sexual harassment on the UW campus. Work being spearheaded by the U-M Prevention, Education, Assistance,
and Resources (PEAR) team in the Equity, Civil Rights and Title IX (ECRT) can ensure university discrimination or harassment policies and procedures have been followed.

**Code Switching.** With regard to code switching, white men reported the least amount of code switching, whereas BIPOC+ women reported the greatest amount of code switching. Full professors' code switched the least when compared to both assistant and associate professors. When examining code switching, it is important to first ask: what about the culture of academia both presses BIPOC+ women faculty to code switch and encourages white and full professors to not code switch? A separate study found that BIPOC women faculty report feeling they must transform themselves to be welcomed in the workplace (Azhar & DeLoach, 2021). When interviewed about their experiences in academic medicine at U-M, URM faculty described the difficulty of cultivating and maintaining cross-cultural relationships with white colleagues within their medical schools (Pololi, et al., 2010). Although these URM faculty attributed these challenges to their different professional and social “frames of reference”, the culture of academia ultimately privileges whiteness and patriarchy and, inherently, marginalizes identities that stray from that norm (Bagilhole and Goode, 2001; Blaisdell et al., 2022). Indeed, BIPOC+ faculty at other institutions have described code switching as “a response to racist, classist, and sexist expectations that keep BIPOC from being taken seriously by their colleagues” and a means of “maintaining the confidence of their safety by their white colleagues” (Jones et al., 2016; Vue, 2021). These faculty may have intended to change their behaviors to garner greater acceptance and more positive treatment. Whereas there is ample research on how faculty of marginalized ethnic-racial identities code switch within the academy, future studies should a) investigate the nature of the code switching across ranks and b) explore ways to increase awareness and gain buy-in to effectively decenter whiteness and patriarchal norms within the academy.

**SATISFACTION (TABLES 2A - 2D)**

**SATISFACTION WITH CURRENT POSITION**

Overall satisfaction was assessed with one item: All things considered, how satisfied were you with your current position at U-M? Responses were rated on a five-point scale from 1 (very dissatisfied) to 5 (very satisfied). The mean score for faculty was 3.7 (closest to satisfied).

**BETWEEN GENDER/RACE-ETHNICITY GROUPS:** BIPOC+ women reported lower overall satisfaction with their current position at U-M than white men (see Figure 7).

**BETWEEN RANK GROUPS:** Overall, associate professors were the least satisfied with their current position at U-M when compared to assistant professors and professors (see Figure 8).
Figure 7: Frequency with which faculty were satisfied with their current position at U-M, opportunities for scholarly engagement, and perceived value of their teaching and mentoring by gender/race-ethnicity.

Figure 8: Frequency with which faculty were satisfied with their current position at U-M, the campus climate/environment, and their teaching load by rank.
**SATISFACTION WITH TEACHING LOAD**

Satisfaction with teaching was assessed with one item (i.e., “How satisfied were you with your teaching load?”). Responses were rated on a five-point scale from 1 (very dissatisfied) to 5 (very satisfied). On average, faculty indicated that they were satisfied ($M = 3.7$) with their teaching load.

**DIFFERENCES BETWEEN GENDER/RACE-ETHNICITY GROUPS.** There were no differences in satisfaction with teaching load between the gender/race-ethnicity groups.

**DIFFERENCES BETWEEN RANK GROUPS.** Associate professors reported the least amount of satisfaction with their teaching load when compared to assistant professors and professors.

---

**CAMPUS CLIMATE/ENVIRONMENT AND SAFETY**

Satisfaction with the campus climate and perceptions of environmental safety over the past 12 months were assessed with four questions.

First, faculty were asked how satisfied or dissatisfied they were with the overall campus climate/environment that they experienced at U-M on a five-point response scale ranging from 1 (very dissatisfied) to 5 (very satisfied). The mean for 2023 was $3.4$ (closest to neither dissatisfied nor satisfied).

In addition, faculty were asked how often they were concerned about their physical health due to contagions as well as how often they had been concerned about their physical safety around the U-M workplace, excluding contagions. Both items were on a five-point scale with the following labels: 1 = never, 2 = seldom (1-2 times per year), 3 = sometimes (couple times per semester), 4 = often (more than once a month), 5 = very often (weekly). On average, faculty indicated that they were concerned for their physical health sometimes (couple times per semester, $M = 2.8$) and faculty were seldom (1-2 times per year, $M = 1.6$) concerned about their physical safety around campus.

**DIFFERENCES BETWEEN GENDER/RACE-ETHNICITY GROUPS.** Faculty did not differ in their reported satisfaction with the overall campus climate/environment. However, BIPOC+ women reported being more concerned for their physical health than both BIPOC+ and white men. White women reported greater concern for their physical health than white men. Further, BIPOC+ women reported the greatest concern for their physical safety, whereas white men reported the least amount of concern (see Figure 9).

**DIFFERENCES BETWEEN RANK GROUPS.** Associate professors reported the least amount of satisfaction with the overall campus climate/environment (see Figure 8). Associate professors also reported more concern for both their physical health and their physical safety around campus than professors.
WORK SATISFACTION

Work satisfaction was assessed with 13 items, which asked faculty how satisfied they were with work in their primary department in three areas: feeling valued in their department, opportunities for scholarly engagement, and feeling valued for their teaching and mentorship. Work satisfaction related to perceptions of being valued by members of the department was assessed with 5 items (e.g., current salary in comparison to salaries of U-M colleagues). Work satisfaction related to scholarly engagement was assessed with 5 items (e.g., opportunity to collaborate with other faculty). Work satisfaction related to their perceptions of being valued for their teaching and mentorship was assessed with three items (e.g., sense of being valued as a teacher by students). Responses ranged from 1 (very dissatisfied) to 5 (very satisfied). On average, faculty were neither satisfied nor dissatisfied with their perceptions of being valued by members of the department ($M = 3.4$), somewhat satisfied with their scholarly engagement ($M = 3.5$), and satisfied with their perceived value as a teacher and mentor ($M = 4.1$).

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN GENDER/RACE-ETHNICITY GROUPS. Faculty did not differ in their reported satisfaction with their perceptions of being valued by members of their department. BIPOC+ women were less satisfied with their opportunities for scholarly engagement than white men. Both BIPOC+ women and BIPOC+ men were less satisfied with the perceived value of their teaching and mentoring contributions than white men (see Figure 7).

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN RANK GROUPS. Associate professors reported the least amount of satisfaction with their perceptions of being valued by members of their department and opportunities for scholarly engagement. In addition, professors indicated feeling the most valued for their teaching and mentorship. (see Figure 10).
DISCUSSION

**Satisfaction with Current Position & Concern for Physical Health and Safety.** Our satisfaction findings illustrate the overall lack of satisfaction experienced by BIPOC+ women faculty and associate professors at U-M. When compared to white men, BIPOC+ women reported: lower overall satisfaction with their current position, greater concern for their physical health and physical safety, less satisfaction with their opportunities for scholarly engagement, and less satisfaction with their perceived value of their teaching and mentoring contributions. Across faculty ranks, associate professors were the least satisfied with their current position, their teaching load, the overall campus/climate environment, their opportunities for scholarly engagement, and felt the least valued within their department. When compared to full professors, associate professors also reported greater concern for both their physical health and safety around campus.

A host of factors may be detrimental to BIPOC+ women’s faculty’s satisfaction with their current position, including discrimination experiences, continuous threats to their safety both on and off campus, as well as being overburdened by visible and invisible service (Azhar & McCutcheon, 2021; Neal-Jackson, 2020; Trejo, 2020; Watson et al., 2015). It has been well-documented that BIPOC+ women faculty experience more discrimination when compared to their white colleagues (Mohamed & Beagan, 2019). BIPOC+ women faculty may also be hypervigilant of their physical safety and the health consequences that follow the acts of violence and racist rhetoric they are faced with (Chae et al., 2021). This heightened vigilance has only been exacerbated by the increase in discrimination amidst and following COVID-19. Findings from a study conducted in 2020 showed that Asian American and Black Americans who self-reported more vicarious racism also experienced more depression and anxiety (Chae et al., 2021). Moreover,
hypervigilance related to racism, harassment, and violence was also associated with depression and anxiety symptoms among Asian American and Black Americans (Chae et al., 2021). More research is needed to identify patterns of hypervigilance around faculty’s physical health and safety on campus, particularly during times of sociopolitical turmoil and harrowing current events.

With regard to rank differences, associate professors were least satisfied with their current position, their teaching load, and the current campus climate. The challenges that come with the associate rank and its implications for associate professors’ career satisfaction have been well-documented (Baldwin et al., 2005; Nandan & Krishna, 2013). Mid-career faculty have higher levels of dissatisfaction with their jobs than faculty at other career stages (Baldwin et al., 2005; Mamiseishvili et al., 2016; Welch et al., 2019). Upon receiving tenure, associate professors must navigate a lack of clarity around professional goals that can result in energy decreases, periods of confusion regarding one’s career, and concerns about remaining competitive and relevant within one’s discipline (Baldwin et al., 2008). Departmental leadership often prioritize supporting early career or more senior “star” faculty members, leaving mid-career faculty to feel either neglected or taken for granted (Baldwin et al., 2008). Moreover, the longer associate professors stay in the rank, the more dissatisfied they are with their role, the level of recognition they receive, and their relationships with colleagues and departmental leadership (Mathews, 2014). This parallels research done at Cornell University with tenured and tenure-track faculty who were surveyed on their academic work life in 2016 and in 2022. In 2022, among women faculty, there was a more pronounced decline in work satisfaction among associate professors (Hecht, 2022). Although associate professors are expected to work towards the full professor rank, a lack of departmental culture and clarity around promotion expectations and timeline could make it challenging for them to be promoted to Professor (Mathews, 2014). Associate professors may also be unsatisfied with their teaching load due to the lack of recognition they receive from teaching or the nature of the courses assigned to them. Qualitative research can shed light on what aspects of their teaching load are particularly challenging for associate professors. Our findings also showed that associate professors felt the greatest amount of concern for both their physical health and safety. This rank difference may also be tapping into the gender makeup of associate professors. The majority of associate professors in our study were BIPOC+ women and we know that BIPOC+ women are at greater risk of physical harm (Crenshaw, 2013). Future research should investigate what mentorship, support, and departmental culture is needed to facilitate more positive experiences at the associate professor rank.

Satisfaction with Opportunities for Scholarly Engagement. Our findings regarding BIPOC+ women’s lack of satisfaction with opportunities for scholarly engagement are comparable to other institutions’ climates. Indeed, findings from a 2019 Harvard climate survey showed that only 33% of URM tenured or tenure-track faculty were satisfied or very satisfied with their time available for scholarly work (Harvard Office of Institutional Research, 2020). BIPOC+ women may have fewer or less enticing opportunities for scholarly engagement due to colleagues’ biases, expectations set on their service contributions, their limited bandwidth/time to dedicate to scholarly pursuits, and their areas of scholarship. BIPOC+ women faculty have to navigate biases centered around both their marginalized ethnic-racial identity and their sex that creates a “double jeopardy” of both race and sex (Kulis et al., 1988; Moore, 2017). Racial and gender stereotypes may interfere with their scholarly engagement, including possible invitations to collaborate.
with other faculty, how much they interact with members of their department/unit, their ability to attract graduate students to work with them, and whether they have opportunities to contribute to their discipline overall (Bavishi et al., 2010; Llorens et al., 2021). Barriers to scholarly engagement hinder BIPOC+ women faculty’s daily lives within their department, their perceptions of climate on campus, and ultimately, impedes their career advancement.

**Perceived Value of Teaching and Mentoring.** Service expectations and perceptions of different types of labor and research may also contribute to BIPOC+ women’s discontent with how valued their teaching and mentoring are. Firstly, women engage in more service than men, much of which is invisible and underappreciated when compared to research contributions (Gardner, 2013). When compared to male faculty, women are asked to teach and serve more which may be linked to their hindered levels of satisfaction. Colleagues and departmental leadership may also take this service for granted, while simultaneously undervaluing it when it comes to review for promotion. BIPOC+ women are also tasked with a disproportionate amount of teaching and service that is identity and DEI focused. In the context of the classroom, faculty of color are often perceived as less qualified to teach and often receive more negative teaching evaluations when compared to white colleagues (Ford, 2011). Moreover, they often conduct research centered around race, class, or gender disparities which are often undervalued, discredited, or deemed “not rigorous” (Garrison-Wade et al., 2012). Associate professors are also expected to engage in increased number of and responsibility in service initiatives upon receiving tenure, and may similarly feel their contributions are rarely acknowledged or appreciated (Baldwin et al., 2008).

Within the context of research institutions, teaching and mentoring remain undervalued as compared to scholarship (Geschwind & Brostrom, 2015). Teaching and mentoring are often considered secondary priorities for faculty, particularly at R1 universities like U-M. This may amplify women, both BIPOC+ and white, faculty’s feelings of being undervalued for these contributions. One future direction for scholars is to elucidate how this undervaluing of teaching and mentoring manifests for both BIPOC+ women and associate professors.

**PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCES AT U-M (TABLES 3A - 3D)**

**MENTORING**

Faculty were asked about their formal and informal mentors both at U-M and outside of U-M. Approximately equal percentages of faculty indicated they have an informal mentor at U-M (45%) and outside U-M (45%). A smaller percentage (25%) indicated they have a formal mentor at U-M, and a small percentage (9%) have a formal mentor outside U-M.

Faculty respondents also indicated how frequently mentors provided 10 different forms of advice or support (e.g., serves as a role model for me, promotes my career through networking). Responses were coded on a five-point scale from 1 (never) to 5 (weekly). We also asked how frequently faculty obtain mentorship; on average, faculty reported receiving mentorship 1 - 2 times per year ($M = 2.0$).
DIFFERENCES BETWEEN GENDER/RACE-ETHNICITY GROUPS. White men were the least likely to have a formal mentor at U-M, an informal mentor at U-M, or informal mentor outside of U-M. BIPOC+ women were more likely to have a formal mentor at U-M than white women. Both BIPOC+ women and BIPOC+ men were more likely to have a formal mentor outside of U-M than white men. Faculty did not differ significantly in their reported frequency of mentorship received.

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN RANK GROUPS. Assistant professors were the most likely to have mentors; this was true across four mentoring types (i.e., formal and informal mentors internal and external to U-M). Associate professors were significantly more likely than professors to have formal internal mentors, informal internal mentors, and informal external mentors. Assistant professors indicated that they received the most mentoring.

SERVICE AND LEADERSHIP

Faculty were asked about committee service, in terms of both the number of committees they served on and the number of committees chaired in a year. Nearly 90% of the tenure-track faculty reported serving on at least one committee, and about 23% reported serving on five or more committees. Although a sizable proportion (43%) had not chaired a committee within the last year, 27% and 18% reported chairing one or two or more committees, respectively. Faculty reported on how willing they were to take on time-consuming service tasks using a five-point scale ranging from 1 (not at all willing) to 5 (very willing). The mean score was 3.3 (closest to moderately willing). Faculty were also asked how important having a department, unit, or college leadership position was to them, on a scale from 1 (not at all important) to 5 (very important). The mean score was 2.6 (closest to moderately important).

Access to department leadership was also assessed with four questions. First, faculty were asked if they had been asked to serve as a department chair, department section/area/program chair, or center/institute/program director or administrator, with “yes” or “no” as responses; 48% reported being asked to serve. Next, faculty were asked if they had served as a department chair, department section/area/program chair, or center/institute/program director or administrator, with “yes” or “no” responses; 41% indicated that they had served in such a role. In addition, faculty were asked about feeling excluded from serving on important decision-making department-level or college-level committees, with “yes” or “no” as responses; 24% reported they felt excluded. Lastly, faculty indicated whether they had been excluded from leadership opportunities, with responses coded “yes” or “no” as responses; 23% of faculty indicated they felt excluded from leadership opportunities.

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN GENDER/RACE-ETHNICITY GROUPS. BIPOC+ women reported serving on fewer committees than white women. BIPOC+ women were also less likely to chair committees than both white women and white men. On average, BIPOC+ women were less willing to take on time-consuming service tasks than either white women or white men.

Although faculty did not differ in their beliefs regarding the importance of having a leadership position, both BIPOC+ women and BIPOC+ men were less likely to be asked to serve in a leadership role (e.g., department chair or center director) than white men. In addition, BIPOC+ women were less likely to be asked to serve than white women (see Figure 11). Among faculty who were asked to serve, BIPOC+ women
and white women were less likely to have served in a unit leadership role than white men (see Figure 12). Faculty did not differ in their perception of being excluded from important leadership opportunities.

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN RANK GROUPS. Assistant professors served on the least amount of committees and were the least likely to chair a committee. Associate professors served on fewer committees and were less likely to chair a committee when compared to professors.

Having a leadership position was less important to assistant professors than professors. Assistant professors were the least likely to take on time-consuming service tasks. Associate professors were less willing to take on time-consuming service tasks than professors. Assistant professors were the least likely to feel excluded from either serving on important decision-making committees or from having leadership opportunities.

Figure 11: Percent of faculty who were asked to serve as the department chair, department section/area/program chair, or center/institute/program director or administrator by gender/ race-ethnicity.
Figure 12: Of those who were asked to serve, percent of faculty who served as the department chair, department section/area/program chair, or center/institute/program director or administrator by gender/race-ethnicity.

WORKLOAD EQUITY

To assess workload equity, faculty were asked to document how they spent their time in their last typical work week. Respondents indicated how many hours out of the 168 hours in a week they spent on 4 areas: professional activities, visible service, invisible service, and outside activities. The three items for professional activities are: scholarship or creative activities (e.g., researching, writing, securing funding, performing); teaching or teaching-related activities; and clinical work (e.g., patient care-related activities, supervising internships or practicums). Visible service includes three items: mentoring assigned students and postdocs (e.g., serving on committees, reading and commenting on papers); service to the university or their department/program (e.g., attending meetings, holding leadership positions); and service to their professional discipline and community (e.g., reviewer for professional journal, press, or foundation/agency). Invisible service\textsuperscript{14} includes three items: special requests (e.g., unofficial mentoring); care work to improve the institution (e.g., providing emotional support to students and/or colleagues); and identity-based activities (e.g., helping students and/or colleagues navigate experiences of marginalization). The three items for “outside activities” are: personal or family time, sleep, and non-U-M related employment or compensated activities (e.g., consulting).

Of the time spent on professional activities, faculty spent the most time engaging in scholarship and creative activities ($M = 25.4$ hours per week). Among the visible service items, faculty spent the most time

\textsuperscript{14} Required work to support an academic unit or its members that is not recognized or credited during tenure and promotion reviews.
on service to the university or their department/program ($M = 10.7$ hours per week). Among the invisible service items, faculty spent the most time on special requests ($M = 3.3$ hours per week).

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN GENDER/RACE-ETHNICITY GROUPS.

Professional Activities. BIPOC+ men reported spending significantly more time on scholarship or creative activities (e.g., researching, reading, writing, meeting with research assistants or collaborators, securing funding, presenting at conferences, practicing, performing, directing, composing) than white women and white men. Faculty gender/race-ethnicity groups did not differ in their reported time spent on teaching or teaching-related activities or clinical work (see Figure 13).

Visible Service. Faculty gender/race-ethnicity groups did not differ in their reported time spent mentoring assigned students and postdocs, service to the university or department, or service to their professional discipline or community.

Invisible Service. BIPOC+ women reported spending the greatest amount of time on identity-based activities (e.g., helping students and/or colleagues navigate experiences of marginalization; expectation to represent identity group or DEI-related affairs; managing experiences of exclusion for self and others) BIPOC+ men reported spending significantly more time on identity-based activities than white men. White women reported spending significantly more time on care work to improve the institution/department/unit than white men. Faculty gender/race-ethnicity groups did not differ in their reported time spent on special requests (see Figure 14).

Outside Activities: BIPOC+ women and BIPOC+ men reported engaging in significantly less personal or family time than white men. BIPOC+ women reported significantly less sleep time than white women. Faculty gender/race-ethnicity groups did not differ in their time spent on non-U-M related employment or compensated activities (see Figure 13).

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN RANK GROUPS.

Professional Activities. Assistant professors reported the greatest amount of time on scholarship or creative activities. There were no differences between the ranks in their time spent on teaching or teaching-related activities or in clinical work (see Figure 15).

Visible Service. Assistant professors reported spending the least amount of time on service to the university or their department. Associate professors reported spending less time on university or department service than professors. The same pattern exists with service to professional or community organizations. Specifically, assistant professors spent the least amount of time on professional service, and associate professors spent less time on this activity than professors. Rank did not differ in time spent mentoring assigned students and postdocs (see Figure 15).

Invisible Service. Assistant professors reported spending the least amount of time on care work to improve the institution/department/unit. Associate professors spent more time on care work as compared to professors. There was no significant difference between ranks in time spent on either special requests or identity-based activities (see Figure 15).
Outside Activities: Assistant professors reported spending more time on personal or family time than professors. There were no significant differences in the time spent sleeping or on non-U-M related employment.

Figure 13: Average number of hours per week that faculty spent on professional activities (i.e., scholarship or creative activities) and outside activities (i.e., personal/family time) by gender/race-ethnicity.

Figure 14: Average number of hours per week that faculty spent on invisible service (i.e., identity-based activities, care work) by gender/race-ethnicity group.
DISCUSSION

**Mentoring.** White men were least likely to have a formal mentor at U-M, an informal mentor at U-M, or informal mentor outside of U-M. BIPOC+ women were more likely to have a formal mentor at U-M than white women. Both BIPOC+ women and BIPOC+ men were more likely to have a formal mentor outside of U-M than white men. No differences were found across gender/race-ethnicity for frequency of mentoring. This is in contrast to research that shows that people of color often receive less mentoring, are more likely to experience negative mentorship, and are less satisfied with the mentoring they received post-tenure (Davis et al., 2022). White faculty may need less mentoring due to the cultural congruence between whiteness and academia. Conversely, BIPOC+ faculty experience a greater cultural discrepancy within the academy and may be more intentional and strategic when it comes to finding a mentor within U-M. Faculty of color may also find that receiving mentorship is a necessity when it comes to navigating institutional bureaucracy, teaching, service, and scholarship as well as the hidden curriculum involved in the tenure process. Per Davis and colleagues (2022), mentoring may serve as an “intervention that can offset marginalizing experiences for faculty of color” and may be a top priority for BIPOC+ faculty seeking to thrive in systems not necessarily designed for them or with them in mind.

When we examined rank differences in mentorship received, assistant professors were most likely to have mentors and this was true across four mentoring types (e.g., formal and informal mentors internal and external to U-M). Assistant professors also received the most mentoring. Given assistant professors’ junior status and the department’s commitment to retaining and promoting assistant professors, it is likely that a senior faculty mentor will be assigned a junior faculty to mentor upon their hiring. There is also evidence...
that junior faculty who receive mentorship are more satisfied, more familiar with the tenure process, and more likely to stay in academia and receive tenure (Blau et al., 2010; Etzkorn & Braddock, 2020).

Associate professors were significantly more likely than full professors to have formal internal mentors, informal internal mentors, and informal external mentors. Full professors may not necessitate as much mentoring as associate professors due their seniority. Upon reaching the associate rank, professors must navigate a pivot in their career and may seek out guidance and mentorship from more senior colleagues, or they may maintain relationships with mentors from their assistant professor stage. A lack of institutional and departmental attention and career opportunities, transparency regarding promotion, and disproportionate service demands are only a few of the challenges associate professors grapple with (Blau et al., 2010). It is also possible that full professors, given their experience and seniority, may not be willing to admit they either have or necessarily need a mentor. Attending to the needs of mid-career faculty is crucial, and there is evidence that mentoring and coaching programs for associate professors prove beneficial in associate professors’ experiences and retention (Baldwin et al., 2008; Buch et al., 2011). Scholars should examine what deters faculty across gender/race-ethnicity intersectional groups and rank from receiving or seeking out mentorship both in and out of their institution.

**Leadership.** With regard to leadership, BIPOC+ women reported serving on fewer committees than white women, and they were less likely to chair committees when compared to white women and white men. Colleagues’ implicit gendered and racial biases may be at play, such that women are often granted fewer opportunities for leadership opportunities that will advance their career, particularly in male-dominated spaces (Dominici et al., 2009). Indeed, we found that both BIPOC+ women and white women were less likely to have served in a unit leadership role when compared to white men. There is also evidence, both at U-M and various other institutions, that women perform more service than men in academia, and are less satisfied with their work (Ezell Sheets et al., 2018). This gender discrepancy is often exacerbated if a man is head of the department (Guarino & Borden, 2017). One future direction is to explore whether BIPOC+ women are less likely to chair committees due to bias amidst departmental leadership or due to a lack of time available to engage in these roles.

Rank differences also emerged for leadership. Assistant professors served on the least amount of committees, were least likely to chair a committee, and were least likely to feel excluded from either serving on important decision-making committees or from having leadership opportunities. Given their junior status, assistant professors are encouraged and expected to minimize their service endeavors in pursuit of scholarly recognition, and ultimately tenure. We also found that associate professors served on fewer committees and were less likely to chair a committee when compared to professors. This aligns with full professors’ involvement in more senior, administrative leadership roles.

**Workload Equity.** With regard to workload equity, BIPOC+ women reported spending the greatest amount of time on invisible service, such as identity-based activities. Identity-based activities include helping students and/or colleagues navigate experiences of marginalization, representing identity groups or DEI-related affairs, and managing experiences of exclusion for self and others. Whereas these activities are more formal, there are also informal favors such as the interaction deemed the “hallway ask”, where
women are asked for service favors in an informal way and in an informal setting (Ezell Sheets et al., 2018; O’Meara, 2018). This pattern among faculty from historically minoritized racial groups and women has been well-documented and research at other institutions similarly reflects these workload inequities (O’Meara et al., 2021). BIPOC+ faculty and women faculty are also rarely being recognized for all of their service contributions. Findings from one 2019 study at Indiana University, Bloomington found that perceptions of service equity (e.g., perceptions of committee assignment distribution, responsibilities, and equitability of compensation for additional service work) were lowest among women and URM faculty. URM faculty at Indiana also consistently reported lower recognition for their teaching, research, service, and advising contributions. This lack of recognition was from colleagues, department chair/unit head, as well as dean/division head. This overburden of service may also hinder BIPOC+ faculty’s well-being and lives outside of work. Our findings showed that BIPOC+ women and men reported engaging in significantly less personal or family time than white men and had significantly less sleep than white women. We also found gender disparities amongst white faculty, such that white women reported spending significantly more time on care work to improve the institution when compared to white men. These findings parallel research that shows “hidden administrative duties” such as informal mentorship of students of marginalized identities, advising identity-based groups, and working in communities is often performed more by women and faculty of color (Davis et al., 2022). One daily diary study found that women faculty spend more time on campus service, student advising, and teaching-related activities in comparison to men who spent more time on their scholarship (O’Meara et al., 2017). Not only did the frequency of work requests differ with women receiving more than 3 times the number of requests men did, the nature of the requests differed across genders. O’Meara and colleagues (2017) found that female faculty received more work activity requests for teaching, student advising, and faculty advising. Furthermore, this overburden of duties and service has implications for female and BIPOC+ faculty. Female and BIPOC+ faculty at Harvard University reported higher levels of stress across various domains of invisible service, specifically teaching and service-related issues. We found evidence that BIPOC+ women had reached their bandwidth with regard to visible and invisible service; on average, BIPOC+ women were less willing to take on time-consuming service tasks than either white women or white men.

In terms of rank, assistant professors reported the greatest amount of time on scholarship or creative activities, spent the least amount of time on service to university or their department, and spent the least amount of time on professional service. This finding aligns with scholarship expectations of assistant professors, in that assistant professors’ research carries the most weight in their tenure portfolio and thus, is prioritized by tenure-track junior faculty. Associate professors reported spending less time on university or department service, service to professional or community organizations, and more time on care work, when compared to professors. It is possible that professors, due to their senior status, are engaging in more service at the university level via administrative roles, as well as participation in professional societies and funding agencies. Furthermore, associate professors may be tasked with curating the departmental culture and making the department a “better place” via invisible and unofficial service (e.g., mentoring students, providing emotional support to junior colleagues). Indeed, interviews conducted with senior faculty members about advice they give junior faculty emphasized the importance of both national level service, for the visibility it brings associate professors, and service related to the governance
of the department (Miller & Noland, 2003). More research is needed to untangle the distinct types of service and what may propel tenure-track faculty of various ranks to engage in one versus the other.

**FACULTY RETENTION (TABLES 4A - 4D)**

**INTENTION TO STAY AT U-M**

We asked respondents about their intention to stay at U-M for next two years (i.e., “How likely is it that you will stay at U-M for the next two years?”) on a five-point scale ranging from 1 (very unlikely) to 5 (very likely). On average, faculty indicated that they were likely \( M = 4.1 \) to stay at U-M.

**DIFFERENCES BETWEEN GENDER/RACE-ETHNICITY GROUPS.** Faculty gender/race-ethnicity groups did not significantly differ in their expressed intentions to stay at U-M.

**DIFFERENCES BETWEEN RANK GROUPS.** Associate professors reported being the least likely to stay at U-M for the next two years (see Figure 16).

![Figure 16: Likelihood of faculty intending to stay at the University for the next two years by rank.](image-url)
Outside Offers and Counteroffers

Faculty were asked two questions about outside offers and counteroffers. The first asked if they had received an outside offer while at U-M in the last two years; responses were “yes” or “no.” Of the faculty respondents, 28% reported they had received an outside offer. A follow-up question asked if this offer resulted in a change in their situation at U-M, with “yes” or “no” as the response options; 18% said yes.

Differences Between Gender/Race-Ethnicity Groups. Faculty gender/race-ethnicity groups did not differ in their likelihood of receiving an outside offer. However, white women were more likely than white men to report having an outside offer that resulted in a change in their situation at U-M.

Differences Between Rank Groups. Assistant professors reported receiving the least amount of outside offers. There was no significant difference between ranks in whether an outside offer resulted in a change in the faculty’s situation at U-M.

Discussion

Intention to Stay at U-M, Outside Offers, and Counteroffers. When we examined faculty retention, we found no gender/race-ethnicity group differences in expressed intentions to stay at U-M or in likelihood of receiving an outside offer. We did find that, when compared to white men, white women were more likely to have an outside offer that resulted in a change in their situation at U-M. Per the challenges women faculty are expected to navigate on college campuses and within their departments (see above), it is plausible that women may more actively be looking for jobs at other institutions in an effort to improve their experiences at work. As previously mentioned, we also found that white women were engaging in more care work to improve their institution/department/unit when compared to white men. Their frustration with this gender discrepancy, in conjunction with other gendered experiences within the academy, may propel them to continuously seek employment elsewhere.

Regarding rank, we found that associate professors were the least likely to stay at U-M for the next two years, whereas assistant professors received the least amount of outside offers. We found no rank differences in whether an outside offer resulted in a change in faculty’s situation at U-M. As previously mentioned, associate professors often find themselves deflated post-tenure and are often neglected and underappreciated in their department (Baldwin et al., 2008; Blau et al., 2010; Buch et al., 2011). Associate professors are also expected to complete an inequitable amount of service, navigate ambiguous promotion guidelines, and maintain momentum to seek promotion a second time, all with minimal department programming, mentoring, and support (Blau et al., 2010). Moreover, some professors get “stuck” at the associate rank level for some time due to these reasons, and a lack of promotion salary may only exacerbate the duration of this plateau. To fully comprehend why associate professors are least likely to stay at their institution, more research is needed to identify what needs are being neglected and how to best address this neglect.
DATA-BASED RECOMMENDATIONS AND RESOURCES

EXPERIENCES IN U-M ENVIRONMENT

- **Recognize, validate, and respond to junior faculty and women’s, particularly BIPOC+ women’s, heightened discriminatory experiences.** Leaders can do so by:
  - Shedding light on women faculty’s lived experiences (without singling out individuals) by initiating difficult conversations within their unit. Leadership can cultivate an anti-racist workplace by scheduling workshops during department faculty meetings that strengthen facilitation skills for anti-racist discussions. Examples of these workshops include those facilitated by the U-M-Antiracism Oversight Committee (AROC) at Michigan Medicine.
  - Offering faculty professional development resources that promote bystander intervention skills such as the Change It Up! Sessions held by Organizational Learning.
  - Implementing Universal Design into new and existing policies. This is the idea that creating a design to benefit the most marginalized populations ultimately benefits everyone.
  - Educating faculty on the differences between academic freedom, freedom of speech, and disparaging comments.
  - Recognizing and addressing disparaging comments and microaggressions via approaches highlighted in climate case studies offered by U-M ADVANCE RISE Committee.
  - According to the National Academies recommendations on Sexual Harassment of Women, we must do more than training sessions and have written policies & procedures to change the culture. They recommend (video):
    - Integrate values into the system
    - Change the power dynamics
    - Support targets of sexual harassment
    - Improve transparency and accountability
  - **Take active efforts to combat harassment based on sex and gender.** Leadership can implement strong anti-harassment programs that include:
    - Clearly written anti-harassment policies
    - Accessible and flexible complaint procedures
    - Investigative procedures by the department and by Equity, Civil Rights and Title IX (ECRT) Office
    - Actions leaders can take to hold faculty accountable
  - **Seek out innovative actions that other organizations and institutions have taken to address sexual harassment.** The National Academies of Science, Engineering, and Medicine has a repository containing self-reported information to help higher education organizations address and prevent all forms of sexual harassment on campus.
  - **Offer mandatory training, workshops, and other resources that provide sexual and gender-based misconduct prevention.** Leadership should also understand and distribute resources that clarify who is obligated to report sexual misconduct or discrimination within their department or academic unit.
Leadership can encourage attendance at workshops held by the U-M Prevention Education, Assistance and Resources (PEAR) team in the Equity, Civil Rights and Title IX (ECRT) Office.

Center for Research on Learning and Teaching (CRLT) annually offers a series Moving the Needle on Sexual Harassment workshop series, as well as Creating Climates Resistant to Sexual Harassment: Defining the Problem workshops for academic leadership teams.

Expect respect from all members of the academic community. Take actions to ensure that your department promotes and maintains a climate of respect to discourage sexual harassment.

Hold faculty accountable; communicate meaningful consequences. The National Academies’ convened the “Action Collaborative on Preventing Sexual Harassment in Higher Education” resulting in multiple resources such as Exploring Sanctions and Early Interventions for Faculty Sexual Harassment in Higher Education. Rather than allowing excuses and granting exceptions or excuses to a subset of faculty or to more senior or “star” faculty, leaders of academic units should uniformly interpret and communicate the existing policies and guidelines with respect to diversity, equity, and inclusion. If our core values, including DEI, really matter, academic leaders must ensure that consequences are meaningful and must be willing to make the right but sometimes difficult or unpopular decision. This ensures that all faculty share common expectations and are treated equitably. Per the National Academies of Science, Engineering, and Medicine, potential accountability actions can include:

- A sanction letter or warning
- Temporary salary reduction
- Forced administrative leave
- Separation from the college or university
- Monetary restitution to targets
- Reporting to current funding agency about the violation of sexual harassment policy
- Restrictions on conditions of teaching and/or mentoring
- Denial of tenure or emeritus status
- Public disclosure of actions taken

Take a more exploratory approach to implement accountability. Department leaders can take a more exploratory approach to solutions, such as piloting various approaches to holding faculty accountable such as establishing community norms within their departments.

Create clear and concise language across the University. Leaders should establish cultural norms and clear, concise language that emphasizes individual responsibility and accountability for actions or inactions across the entire faculty community. Additionally, they should have resources they can point to as a reference for faculty members who question climate practices.

Share updated language and policies at department meetings. Department chairs, with the support of the Associate deans, should provide any updates and reminders when it comes to DEI practices and policies.

Educate faculty and leadership about code-switching and discuss how minority faculty may feel pressured to assimilate to their white peers to increase their chances of being legitimized in the academic community.
- **Acknowledge that professionalism, particularly within academia, is rooted in white, patriarchal norms, behaviors, and values.** Understanding and acknowledging the white, patriarchal norms and values that academic culture is rooted in is essential (McCluney et al., 2021). Leadership should recognize that BIPOC+ and more junior faculty may feel pressured to code switch, and reflect on whether their units allow for expressions of professionalism that stray from white, patriarchal notions of professionalism.

- **Reflect on and address implicit biases in the workplace.** Units should reflect on and address implicit biases that may impact how they perceive and interact with colleagues within their unit. To facilitate discussions on bias, leadership can look to implement workshops such as those offered by the STRIDE committee or U-M College of Literature, Science and the Arts.

- **Welcome and center underrepresented voices and experiences.** Leadership should not only welcome but *center* underrepresented voices and experiences to promote inclusivity and psychological safety within their units. Third-party climate consulting or having the university hire in-house climate consultants should be considered by leadership to shed light on whose voices and experiences are being represented, and may bolster DEI efforts on campus. DEI leads within schools, colleges, and campus units should have the authority to recommend changes to senior leadership in the unit while serving as a first line of support regarding DEI matters. For guidance, leadership can look to the Office of Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion (ODEI).

- **Identify and quantify faculty engagement with DEI-centered programming and training.** Leadership can incorporate a standalone DEI category (separate from research, teaching and service) on Faculty Activity Reports that indicates whether faculty attended DEI programs or training, or whether they engage in DEI-related service. This category would not only provide visibility to faculty’s DEI efforts; it could also be used to evaluate faculty for tenure or promotion.

**SATISFACTION**

- **Identify sources of negative climate.** Leadership should be strategic about identifying where and/or who (e.g., specific unit, person) inequity and dissatisfaction is stemming from before creating change via policy and interventions. Resources should be used to determine where neglectful behavior may be occurring within units. Identifying pockets of positive climates within the university (e.g., specific units or colleges where climate is warm, diverse, and inclusive) can also provide insight for climate-related initiatives. Departmental Climate Assessments conducted by ADVANCE can be leveraged as an intervention tool to identify what climate issues are present within a specific unit and provide their leadership with a starting point in addressing climate concerns.

- **Acknowledge and address associate professors’ unmet needs and inequitable workloads.** Over the past 12 years, associate professors represented 25% of the voluntary faculty departures at U-M. In the most recent seven years, the percentage of associate professors who voluntarily terminate from the university has been **gradually increasing to 31% in AY 2022-23.** It is critical that we find ways to improve the experiences of our associate professors, since they have the institutional knowledge and experiences that are lost when they voluntarily leave the university. Leadership should be wary of overburdening associate professors with service loads, particularly amidst what can be a disorienting phase of associate professors’ careers. Department leadership should be
intentional about attending to associate professors by identifying and addressing their climate and scholarly engagement needs. Per an LSA report, this can be done by holding annual information sessions, providing events and programming for associate professors early in rank, and/or by adding questions to faculty annual report templates that ask about mentoring needs, understanding of promotion guidelines, or the opportunity to indicate other needs not currently being met. Leadership should also consider exploring how much support a cohort structure provides, particularly for associate professors who are often lacking in support at the departmental-level.

- **Create/ensure mechanisms for faculty recognition that do not rely exclusively on their scholarship.** Departmental leaders can ensure faculty are nominated and recognized for their commitments to and innovations in teaching, service, and DEI, in addition to their scholarship.

- **Ensure faculty have opportunities and time to do meaningful work.** Scholarly engagement may be evidenced in publications, but often involves time that cannot be quantified and documented on annual reviews, or in tenure/promotion portfolios. Leadership should recognize that time spent collaborating, presenting on panels, brainstorming, and engaging in intellectually stimulating conversations with colleagues, community engagement, and/or public outreach is time well spent, and essential to some faculty’s satisfaction and scholarly success.

- **Recognize that faculty who hold marginalized identities or do work with marginalized communities are more at risk of experiencing harassment, threats, and attacks.** Leadership should recognize that U-M is not a microcosm, and that national social issues as well as current events occurring off-campus have repercussions for faculty well-being, safety, and climate experiences on-campus. Moreover, the divisive sociopolitical context and ongoing racist rhetoric leaves these scholars more susceptible to harm and targeted attacks. The safety of faculty who conduct research and implement curriculum centered around anti-racism, systemic inequities, and DEI is also at risk and should be of concern to leadership. Resources about institutional responses to scholar safety like those provided below [U-M National Center for Institutional Diversity](#) should be leveraged by administrative leadership:
  - Envisioning Institutional Responses to Scholar Safety panel
  - Environment, Health, and Safety (EHS) offers resources related to workplace safety, work-related incident reporting, and workplace hazard assessments
  - Sexual and Gender-Based Misconduct Reporting & Resources offers reporting tools as well as sexual assault awareness and prevention education.
  - Center for Research on Learning and Teaching (CRLT) offers services related to teaching and mentoring including consultations, orientations, funding and climate-related theater-based learning experiences.
  - Council for Disability Concerns provides connection opportunities, resources, and programs related to disability, honoring individual needs, and accessibility.
  - Faculty and Staff Counseling and Consultation Office (FASCCO) provides resources specific for caregivers, pre-tenure support, grief/loss, and return to work.

- **Be intentional about shifting the climate towards respect and inclusion.** Leadership can refer to the [ADVANCE Respect in Striving for Excellence (RISE) Committee’s framework](#) for ways to intentionally cultivate respect and inclusion at the unit level.
Facilitate faculty’s search for resources within the university’s decentralized campus. Given the decentralized nature of the university, it is difficult to be aware of resources on campus. All resources should be readily accessible and straightforward to access. Navigating the various offices, programs, and committees on campus can be challenging and overwhelming for faculty who are already facing challenges on campus. Creating a central location both online and in-person (e.g., on-campus consultant center) where all resources and initiatives across campus are stored can facilitate cross-unit communication and collaboration.

PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCES AT U-M

Demystify the criteria for promotion to full professor. There are structural policies and guidelines at the university, school/college and/or department level to set norms and expectations for tenure, but not for promotion to full professor. Articulate the criteria for promotion to full and communicate these expectations using transparent guidelines.

Be an ally of equitable faculty workloads. Follow KerryAnn O’Meara’s advice:

- Encourage transparency. Provide faculty with accessible, basic data about workload and promote policies that allow all faculty to know how to obtain certain service positions.
- Be a vigilant bystander in your department. Intervene if you see someone trying to shift less desirable work to others.
- Encourage accountability. If it is clear someone in the department is not doing their share of department work, ask them to do so.
- Acknowledge differences in contexts and promote flexibility. It is important to recognize that faculty members have different responsibilities and therefore create flexibility approaches and policies.
- Ask. Ask colleagues, especially women and underrepresented minority faculty members, how their work is going and if they are challenged in particular areas.

Be mindful of the mid-career challenges experienced by associate professors. Leadership should be mindful of the challenges faced by associate professors, and the implications these challenges have for associate professors’ resources, time, and energy. Associate professors are less protected timewise when compared to assistant professors and they have more service tasks, while simultaneously having more external demands as their prominence is increasing in the field. Leadership should seek out training on how to mentor associate professors through the mid-career stage.

Revisit faculty activities that are credited during tenure and promotion reviews. There are core activities that faculty are needed to maintain the university’s excellence but often are outside of their official responsibilities (e.g., meeting with a prospective faculty member, recruiting while giving a talk at another institution). Advising a graduate student is no longer exclusively about their scholarship, but often includes providing emotional support and more mentoring than ever before. These contributions need to be acknowledged, appreciated, and recognized as official faculty work that contributes to tenure and promotion.
Create multiple pathways to promotion. Valuing and crediting all aspects of the promotion portfolio would increase promotion rates and underscore that a successful unit is not only composed of faculty’s research and scholarship.

Recognize service as a valid path towards promotion. Often, the primary focus of tenure and promotion is academic research, with little to no credit provided to teaching and service. Since this work is required for an academic department’s success, it should all be recognized.

Work toward eliminating the cultural tax placed on BIPOC+ faculty. Leadership should acknowledge the disproportionate burden placed on BIPOC+ faculty of resolving DEI issues within their institutions. Recognizing that a) these service tasks are in addition to their current workload; b) BIPOC+ faculty may feel pressured and obliged to say yes; and c) their service must be visible and rewarded are all steps towards eliminating this cultural tax.

Provide greater recognition, formal and informal, of faculty’s teaching, scholarship, service and DEI contributions. University leaders should acknowledge the various types of visible and invisible activities that faculty engage in, as well as the inequitable workloads that BIPOC+, women, and early/mid-career faculty are often burdened with, and how this hinders their work satisfaction. Address the disproportionate responsibility placed on URM faculty for diversity work and mentoring, as well as women faculty for teaching and service (O’Meara, et al., 2021). Some specialized initiatives that support the university (e.g., recruiting diverse faculty, mentoring URM students) require faculty with the same identity as members of a community to maximize the impact of the university’s efforts. These interactions are vital to the functioning of the university, yet this service is often invisible and unrewarded. Leadership can:

- Create value statements for teaching, service contributions, and participation in DEI activities to increase the importance of these activities in the faculty review process.
- Recast “service” as “leadership” or “governance” at the local level as well as in tenure and promotion documents and materials.
- Differentiate service loads created by both invisible and visible service. Recognize and compensate service through but not limited to: summer salary, course releases, and administrative differentials.

Address underrepresentation in department leadership. The demographic makeup of faculty administrators should be periodically examined within units. Identifying which voices and identities are underrepresented amongst leadership is necessary to ensure those who are historically underrepresented also have a seat at the table.

Empower faculty who have expressed interest in leadership roles. Faculty who hold minoritized identities (e.g., BIPOC, women) have less access to leadership opportunities and when granted access, have reduced support in navigating leadership roles. Campus leaders should encourage underrepresented faculty to seek positions of leadership. To ensure administrators have the resources and support to thrive in these roles, campus leaders should support faculty in positions of leadership.

Be intentional about avoiding faculty burnout due to high workloads. University leaders should remain cognizant of the visible and invisible work faculty of color are often tasked with, and how this takes a toll on their lives outside of work. To remedy these workload inequities, leadership can implement strategies highlighted in equity reports, such as:
Reducing service loads.
Recognizing both visible and invisible service, redistribute workloads accordingly.
Increasing teaching support.
Providing supportive funding opportunities.
Addressing salary inequities.

Show a commitment to faculty well-being by modeling work-life balance. Unit leaders can set an example of work-life balance by setting work boundaries, prioritizing self-care, and encouraging faculty to follow suit. One effective example includes LSA’s policy about not sending email after business hours or on the weekends. Other resources that can help promote faculty well-being include:

- **MHealthy** also offers resources that focus on nutrition, physical activity, mental and emotional well-being, financial well-being, and chronic health conditions.
- **Faculty and Staff Counseling and Consultation Services (FASSCO)** helps university faculty and staff resolve personal and work-related issues via: professional counseling, coaching, training, and consultation services. FASSCO also provides support groups for new moms returning to work, faculty who are experiencing grief, sexual harassment, are parenting teens, dealing with a break-up or divorce, and managing their anger issues.
- **Child and Family Care** provides resources to support a balance between personal and professional life, including child care resources, elder care resources, a family helpers posting board, and resources for adults and children with disabilities.
- **The Well-being Collective** at the University of Michigan is a collaborative effort focused on making U-M a better place to live, work and learn for our students, faculty and staff by implementing a system-wide approach to supporting well-being across our campus. In addition, Human Resources offers a curated collection of programs and resources for faculty and staff that cater to physical, mental, environmental, financial, occupational, social, intellectual, and spiritual well-being.
- Consider expanding Faculty Leadership Development programs so that faculty interested in a future administrative role can attend. Create a clear path for faculty who are interested in potential administration to network with university leaders.
- Share resources that promote professional development and faculty success, such as those offered by the National Center for Faculty Development and Diversity (NCFDD).

Seek out and share climate-related resources that cater to faculty’s identities and needs. Since BIPOC+ women are the most disenfranchised, addressing their needs will help all faculty. Taking an intersectional approach is not simply about “multiple identities”, but it could help to address power and interlocking structural inequality experienced by BIPOC+ women faculty (Bowleg, 2021). Leadership should make efforts to cultivate a positive climate by periodically sharing resources with faculty within their unit, such as:

- **Respect in Striving for Excellence (RISE) ADVANCE** committee offers resources such as Climate Case Studies, programming, and community-building opportunities that focus on building respect and inclusion in academic workplace climates.
- **ADVANCE’s Networks for faculty** offer opportunities for women+ scientists and engineers, faculty of color, single faculty, and LGBT+ faculty to find community.
Center for Education of Women (CEW+) offers career counseling, funding opportunities, support communities, events, and advocacy initiatives that cater to women as well as underrepresented and underserved communities. This includes:

- **Women of Color in Academy Project (WOCAP)** is a campus-wide faculty network that supports women of color in the academy via scholarship, community, and advocacy work.
- **Women of Color Task Force (WCTF)** provides professional development, networking, and training opportunities that cater to women of color staff and faculty.

**FACULTY RETENTION**

- *Prioritize recruiting and retaining faculty.* Leadership should be intentional, systematic, and strategic when it comes to recruiting and retaining faculty. The **ADVANCE Program** focuses on recruitment, retention, climate, and leadership development and has various committees and resources committed to supporting faculty at different stages of their careers, including:
  
  - Research highlighted by the **Committee on Strategies and Tactics for Recruiting to Improve Diversity and Excellence (STRIDE)** shows that often leadership has intent, but lacks the tools to recruit and retain these faculty. STRIDE resources include:
    - **STRIDE Committee** provides information and advice about practices that promote the recruitment, retention, and promotion of diverse, well-qualified candidates for faculty positions. Recent data shows that recruitment for faculty who identify as women has increased from 33% in 2015 to 37% in 2022.
    - A **handbook for faculty searches and hiring** as well as **applicant and interview evaluation tools** contain best practices and are designed for faculty and administrators involved in hiring and retention processes.
    - Search committees for department chairs, deans, provost, and president should be required to participate in full STRIDE training sessions.
  
  - **LAUNCH Committees** provide resources for new tenure-track assistant professors, offering support and guidance throughout their first year. Committees include the department chair as well as senior faculty members. Topics include teaching and working with students, research and publication plans, resources for scholarship and funding, starting collaborations, as well as integration into the university.
  
  - The **Respect in Striving for Excellence (RISE)** committee works to support climates of respect and inclusion within academic units. Rather than waiting until a faculty member secures an external job offer, leadership should proactively support a positive climate every day.
  
  - **Post-Promotion Academic Career Exploration (PACE)** is a pilot coaching program designed to support faculty who have been newly promoted to associate professor with tenure, and do not already have coaching resources in their home academic units.
Critically examine departure factors and retention strategies. A recent ADVANCE report revealed that associate and assistant professors left U-M from 2019-2022 due to concerns about: departmental climate and culture, department leadership styles and skills, unequal treatment compared to peers, as well as the level of recognition/appreciation received. Data-informed recommendations for practice include:

- regularly measuring department climate and culture
- performing salary equity analyses
- cultivating local community-building
- amplifying faculty recognition efforts
- encouraging faculty to use available career resources

Do not promote the practice of current faculty needing to secure an outside job offer as a means to increase their salary at the University of Michigan. Rather than requiring faculty to secure an outside job offer and receive a counter-offer, departments could explore different approaches to faculty retention (e.g., systematic review and identification of salary inequities; providing opportunities for faculty to initiate review of their salary). This approach could also create equity for faculty who do not seek outside offers, because they do not intend to leave the University of Michigan.

Acknowledge epistemic exclusion as a challenge during recruitment and retention. Epistemic exclusion refers to the ways in which disciplinary traditions as well as individual faculty biases result in faculty of color’s scholarship being devalued and deemed illegitimate (Settles, 2001). Acknowledging epistemic exclusion is a necessary first step for effective recruitment and retention of faculty of color.

Implement strategies to retain faculty of color. Strategies unit leadership can implement include:

- Making efforts to understand the type of challenges that may lead to BIPOC faculty leaving Michigan such as the BIPOC faculty retention report.
- Considering preemptive retention, or making retention efforts that begin at the start of faculty’s employment.
- Appreciating the full range of scholarly work by embracing all scholarship including: interdisciplinary, public engagement, and community-based work.
- Broadening assessments of teaching quality and being aware of potential bias in student evaluations that can differentially impact faculty of color.
- Increasing service equity.
- Working to change the narrative that excellence can only be produced by scholars who hold certain identities, or that considering diversity in one’s work undermines scholarly rigor.

Communicate clear and transparent timetables and guidelines for promotion to full professor. Per a 2018 LSA report, departmental guidelines should be revised to emphasize the criteria of achievement for various domains (e.g., research, teaching, engaged scholarship, both visible and invisible service, leadership/governance and notable/outstanding achievement) resulting in multiple paths to promotion. Providing annual information sessions, FAQ resources about the promotion to professor, and mentoring programs for associate professors can help provide clarity around timeline and guidelines for promotion.
Create systematic and uniform ways of discussing tenure and promotion guidelines across units. The conversations about the requirements for tenure and multiple pathways to promotion that are discussed at the university level should be mirrored within schools and colleges. Moreover, expectations at the school/college level should be replicated within their departments and programs. This would enable clear communication about the institution’s priorities amongst leadership and creates an opportunity for holding leadership at all levels accountable.

Revise reward structure for promotion. Per an LSA report, making a portion of the promotion salary increase available after a certain period of time in rank (e.g., 5 years), provided faculty responsibilities have been met could: a) decrease the number of professors stuck in associate rank; b) provide needed recognition of associates’ efforts; and c) improve morale and incentivize associate professors to work towards receiving the final portion of salary upon promotion to full.

Recognize service contributions as noteworthy achievements. To address inequitable service expectations and lack of departmental recognition, department leadership can create awards with compensation focused on service, governance, and leadership for newly promoted associate professors.

Create more flexible pathways to retirement. Easing senior faculty into retirement may help faculty members “view retirement as an opportunity, not a threat” as described in the special issue of The Chronicle of Higher Education. Supporting faculty members as they plan out the end of their employment can also make personnel planning easier for the university. Ways to ease the transition to retirement could include:

- A program to incentivize retirement can eliminate a faculty bottleneck, and speed up the diversification of faculty as new faculty are hired.
- Intentional succession planning (e.g., junior faculty shadow senior faculty) can be a more flexible pathway to retirement and can also leave more availability and flexibility to hire assistant professors within the unit.
- Phased retirement enables faculty to gradually decrease their responsibilities over time by working less to reduce the shock of leaving academia. In some cases, faculty may receive the same or reduced pay.
- Hiring faculty-retirement-liaisons to serve as advocates for senior faculty members by helping them navigate the challenges of retirement and transitioning their identity from being an active faculty member to emeritus faculty or a retiree.
- Post-retirement programming that arranges things like book clubs, lectures, and short courses for retirees in an effort to keep retired scholars intellectually engaged on campus and in the community such as the Osher Lifelong Learning Institute (OLLI).

Review time in the associate professor rank, and dialogue with any departments that are not promoting faculty at a comparable rate. A comprehensive and regular analysis across the schools, colleges and departments, such as the Associate Professor Time in Rank report, is necessary to pinpoint academic units with higher time in the rank or lower rates of promotion of associates to full professors. Once these units are identified, actionable strategies to support leadership should be adopted to address any problems and provide more opportunities for faculty promotion.
HOW CAN WE BREAK THIS PERSISTENT CLIMATE CYCLE?

After twenty-two years, it is time to consider new approaches to address these long-standing faculty climate experiences. Using a multifaceted approach that builds on the current initiatives, the university could create norms, expectations, assessments and ultimately, accountability for creating and supporting a more positive climate for all faculty. Given how pervasive and constant these faculty climate inequities remain, we must consider different actions in an effort to create a different reality for faculty climate.

Most recently, the Culture Journey identified the University of Michigan’s core values as: integrity, respect, inclusion, equity, diversity, and innovation. These values should inform shared expectations about the university community, including faculty climate, and faculty accountability. In an effort to address systemic climate challenges, the University boldly implemented DEI 1.0 (AY 2017 through AY 2021), although the project’s momentum was interrupted by the world-wide pandemic, COVID-19. It is important to note that the DEI initiative is the first university-wide, multi-level effort to address university climate and culture. Due to the decentralized nature of the university, prior efforts were implemented in an inconsistent and unsystematic way by some academic units at different times. It is only recently that we have been able to capture systematic efforts to change climate and their implications. Moreover, these systematic issues take time to address and resolve in a cohesive sustainable way. The university is beginning to do the work to do so, and we hope this report can serve as a call to action for university leadership.
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### Table 1A: Experiences in the University Environment - Gender by Race-Ethnicity (Means)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>BIPOC+ Women</th>
<th>BIPOC+ Men</th>
<th>White Women</th>
<th>White Men</th>
<th>BIPOC+ TGD</th>
<th>White TGD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disparaging comments about women</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>2.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disparaging comments about racial/ethnic minorities</td>
<td>1.81</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>1.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disparaging comments about religious groups</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>1.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disparaging comments about people who are LGBTQIA+</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>1.76</td>
<td>1.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disparaging comments about people with disabilities</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>2.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disparaging comments about people from other countries</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>2.04</td>
<td>1.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Codeswitching</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>2.02</td>
<td>2.05</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>3.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction with overall campus climate/environment</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>2.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concern for physical health</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>4.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concern for physical safety</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>1.62</td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>2.54</td>
<td>2.21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>%</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Experienced discrimination - Yes</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experienced discrimination - Maybe / I don't know</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experienced unwanted sexual attention - Yes</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experienced unwanted sexual attention - Maybe/Don't Know</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 1B: Experiences in the University Environment - Gender by Race-Ethnicity (Group Differences)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Differences between BIPOC+ Women and BIPOC+ Men (BIPOC+ Women - BIPOC+ Men)</th>
<th>Differences between BIPOC+ Women and White Women (BIPOC+ Women - White Women)</th>
<th>Differences between BIPOC+ Men and White Women (BIPOC+ Men - White Women)</th>
<th>Differences between BIPOC+ TGD and White TGD (BIPOC+ TGD - White TGD)</th>
<th>Differences between BIPOC+ Women and BIPOC+ Men (BIPOC+ Women - BIPOC+ Men)</th>
<th>Differences between BIPOC+ Women and White Women (BIPOC+ Women - White Women)</th>
<th>Differences between BIPOC+ Men and White Women (BIPOC+ Men - White Women)</th>
<th>Differences between BIPOC+ TGD and White TGD (BIPOC+ TGD - White TGD)</th>
<th>% difference</th>
<th>% difference</th>
<th>% difference</th>
<th>% difference</th>
<th>% difference</th>
<th>% difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disparaging comments about women</td>
<td>0.30*</td>
<td>-0.13</td>
<td>0.31*</td>
<td>-0.42*</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.44*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disparaging comments about racial/ethnic minorities</td>
<td>0.27*</td>
<td>0.32*</td>
<td>0.57*</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.29*</td>
<td>0.25*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disparaging comments about religious groups</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disparaging comments about people who are LGBTQIA+</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.20*</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disparaging comments about people with disabilities</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>-0.18*</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>0.16*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disparaging comments about people from other countries</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.37*</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.28*</td>
<td>0.17*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Codeswitching</td>
<td>0.31*</td>
<td>0.28*</td>
<td>0.51*</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>0.20*</td>
<td>0.24*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction with overall campus climate/environment</td>
<td>-0.19</td>
<td>-0.17</td>
<td>-0.25</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concern for physical health</td>
<td>0.47*</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.52*</td>
<td>-0.27</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.31*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concern for physical safety</td>
<td>0.44*</td>
<td>0.28*</td>
<td>0.65*</td>
<td>-0.16</td>
<td>0.21*</td>
<td>0.37*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>% difference</th>
<th>% difference</th>
<th>% difference</th>
<th>% difference</th>
<th>% difference</th>
<th>% difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Experienced discrimination - Yes</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>11%*</td>
<td>17%*</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>9%*</td>
<td>6%*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experienced discrimination - Maybe / I don't know</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>22%*</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>17%*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experienced unwanted sexual attention - Yes</td>
<td>8%*</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>9%*</td>
<td>-8%*</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>9%*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experienced unwanted sexual attention - Maybe/Don't Know</td>
<td>-1%</td>
<td>-1%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>4%*</td>
<td>4%*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Asst Professor</td>
<td>Assoc Professor</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>Differences between Asst Professor and Assoc Professor</td>
<td>Differences between Asst Professor and Professor</td>
<td>Differences between Assoc Professor and Professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disparaging comments about women</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>-0.25*</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>0.19*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disparaging comments about racial/ethnic minorities</td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>0.15*</td>
<td>0.18*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disparaging comments about religious groups</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disparaging comments about people who are LGBTQIA+</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disparaging comments about people with disabilities</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disparaging comments about people from other countries</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>-0.15</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.15*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Codeswitching</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.25*</td>
<td>0.21*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction with overall campus climate/environment</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>0.32*</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>-0.28*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concern for physical health</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td>-0.18</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.24*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concern for physical safety</td>
<td>1.72</td>
<td>1.76</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.21*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% experienced discrimination - Yes</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>-6%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>8%*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% experienced discrimination - Maybe / I don’t know</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>10%*</td>
<td>5%*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% experienced unwanted sexual attention - Yes</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>4%*</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% experienced unwanted sexual attention - Maybe/Don’t Know</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1C: Experiences in the University Environment - by Rank (Means)
Table 2A: Satisfaction - Gender by Race-Ethnicity (Means)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>BIPOC+ Women</th>
<th>BIPOC+ Men</th>
<th>White Women</th>
<th>White Men</th>
<th>BIPOC+ TGD</th>
<th>White TGD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>mean</td>
<td>mean</td>
<td>mean</td>
<td>mean</td>
<td>mean</td>
<td>mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current position</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>2.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarly engagement</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>2.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceptions of departmental value</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>2.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceptions of being valued for teaching &amp; mentorship</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>4.24</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>4.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching load</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>3.03</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2B: Satisfaction - Gender by Race-Ethnicity (Differences)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Differences between BIPOC+ Women and BIPOC+ Men</th>
<th>Differences between BIPOC+ Women and White Women</th>
<th>Differences between BIPOC+ Men and White Women</th>
<th>Differences between BIPOC+ Men and White Men</th>
<th>Differences between White Women and White Men</th>
<th>Differences between White Women and White Men</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>mean difference</td>
<td>mean difference</td>
<td>mean difference</td>
<td>mean difference</td>
<td>mean difference</td>
<td>mean difference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current position</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>-0.19</td>
<td>-0.27*</td>
<td>-0.14</td>
<td>-0.22</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarly engagement</td>
<td>-0.18</td>
<td>-0.20</td>
<td>-0.29*</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>-0.12</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceptions of departmental value</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>-0.20</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>-0.20</td>
<td>-0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceptions of being valued for teaching &amp; mentorship</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>-0.16</td>
<td>-0.30*</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>-0.23*</td>
<td>-0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching load</td>
<td>-0.14</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>-0.25</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>-0.12</td>
<td>-0.17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 2C: Satisfaction - by Rank (Means)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Asst Professor</th>
<th>Assoc Professor</th>
<th>Professor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>mean</td>
<td>mean</td>
<td>mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current position</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>3.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarly engagement</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>3.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceptions of departmental value</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>3.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceptions of being valued for teaching &amp; mentorship</td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>4.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching load</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>3.81</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 2D: Satisfaction - by Rank (Differences)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Differences between Asst Professor and Assoc Professor (Asst Professor - Assoc Professor) mean difference</th>
<th>Differences between Asst Professor and Professor (Asst Professor - Professor) mean difference</th>
<th>Differences between Assoc Professor and Professor (Assoc Professor - Professor) mean difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Current position</td>
<td>0.41*</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
<td>-0.51*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarly engagement</td>
<td>0.27*</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>-0.35*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceptions of departmental value</td>
<td>0.41*</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
<td>-0.51*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceptions of being valued for teaching &amp; mentorship</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>-0.19*</td>
<td>-0.28*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching load</td>
<td>0.26*</td>
<td>-0.20</td>
<td>-0.45*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 3A: Professional Experiences at U-M - Gender by Race-Ethnicity (Means)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>BIPOC+ Women</th>
<th>BIPOC+ Men</th>
<th>White Women</th>
<th>White Men</th>
<th>BIPOC+ TGD</th>
<th>White TGD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frequency of mentorship received</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of committees served on in a typical year</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Importance of leadership position</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willingness to take on time-consuming service tasks</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekly hours: Scholarship or creative activities</td>
<td>25.69</td>
<td>30.49</td>
<td>22.79</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>14.63</td>
<td>12.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekly hours: Teaching</td>
<td>15.06</td>
<td>12.86</td>
<td>13.63</td>
<td>12.66</td>
<td>23.76</td>
<td>18.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekly hours: Clinical work</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>1.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekly hours: Mentoring</td>
<td>9.20</td>
<td>7.96</td>
<td>8.19</td>
<td>7.59</td>
<td>2.41</td>
<td>6.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekly hours: Service to U-M</td>
<td>11.37</td>
<td>10.27</td>
<td>11.98</td>
<td>9.76</td>
<td>6.98</td>
<td>9.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekly hours: Service to discipline &amp; community</td>
<td>5.67</td>
<td>5.18</td>
<td>5.39</td>
<td>5.37</td>
<td>7.38</td>
<td>4.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekly hours: Special requests</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td>4.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekly hours: Care work to improve U-M</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td>5.12</td>
<td>4.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekly hours: Identity-based activities</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>5.27</td>
<td>4.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekly hours: Personal/Family time</td>
<td>39.01</td>
<td>38.92</td>
<td>43.43</td>
<td>46.92</td>
<td>47.46</td>
<td>47.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekly hours: Sleep</td>
<td>47.91</td>
<td>49.46</td>
<td>51.29</td>
<td>50.25</td>
<td>47.92</td>
<td>55.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekly hours: Non-UM employment</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>2.02</td>
<td>1.09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 3B: Professional Experiences at U-M - Gender by Race-Ethnicity (Differences)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frequency of mentorship received</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of committees served on in a typical year</td>
<td>-0.35</td>
<td>-0.59*</td>
<td>-0.44</td>
<td>-0.23</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Importance of leadership position</td>
<td>-0.22</td>
<td>-0.19</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willingness to take on time-consuming service tasks</td>
<td>-0.30</td>
<td>-0.48*</td>
<td>-0.42*</td>
<td>-0.18</td>
<td>-0.12</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekly hours: Scholarship or creative activities</td>
<td>-4.80</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>7.70*</td>
<td>5.50*</td>
<td>-2.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekly hours: Teaching</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>2.39</td>
<td>-0.77</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekly hours: Clinical work</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>-1.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekly hours: Mentoring</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>1.61</td>
<td>-0.22</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekly hours: Service to U-M</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>-0.61</td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td>-1.70</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>2.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekly hours: Service to discipline &amp; community</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>-0.20</td>
<td>-0.19</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekly hours: Special requests</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>-0.21</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekly hours: Care work to improve U-M</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>-0.38</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>-0.79</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>1.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekly hours: Identity-based activities</td>
<td>1.07*</td>
<td>1.54*</td>
<td>1.97*</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>0.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekly hours: Personal/Family time</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>-4.42</td>
<td>-7.91*</td>
<td>-4.51</td>
<td>-8.01*</td>
<td>-3.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekly hours: Sleep</td>
<td>-1.55</td>
<td>-3.38*</td>
<td>-2.34</td>
<td>-1.84</td>
<td>-0.79</td>
<td>1.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekly hours: Non-UM employment</td>
<td>-0.60</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>-0.17</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>-0.23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** Differences and % difference are calculated using the mean values for each category.
Table 3C: Professional Experiences at U-M - by Rank (Means)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Asst Professor</th>
<th>Assoc Professor</th>
<th>Professor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frequency of mentorship received</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>1.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of committees served on in a typical year</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>3.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Importance of leadership position</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>2.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willingness to take on time-consuming service tasks</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>3.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekly hours: Scholarship or creative activities</td>
<td>29.65</td>
<td>24.13</td>
<td>24.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekly hours: Teaching</td>
<td>14.71</td>
<td>14.48</td>
<td>12.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekly hours: Clinical work</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>4.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekly hours: Mentoring</td>
<td>8.55</td>
<td>8.74</td>
<td>7.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekly hours: Service to U-M</td>
<td>5.08</td>
<td>10.39</td>
<td>13.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekly hours: Service to discipline &amp; community</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>5.31</td>
<td>6.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekly hours: Special requests</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>3.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekly hours: Care work to improve U-M</td>
<td>1.74</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>2.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekly hours: Identity-based activities</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>1.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekly hours: Personal/Family time</td>
<td>46.62</td>
<td>43.91</td>
<td>41.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekly hours: Sleep</td>
<td>50.18</td>
<td>49.81</td>
<td>50.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekly hours: Non-UM employment</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>1.83</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3D: Professional Experiences at U-M - by Rank (Differences)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Differences between Asst Professor and Assoc Professor</th>
<th>Differences between Asst Professor and Professor</th>
<th>Differences between Assoc Professor and Professor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Asst Professor - Assoc Professor)</td>
<td>(Asst Professor - Professor)</td>
<td>(Assoc Professor - Professor)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>mean difference</td>
<td>mean difference</td>
<td>mean difference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency of mentorship received</td>
<td>0.40*</td>
<td>0.53*</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of committees served on in a typical year</td>
<td>-1.24*</td>
<td>-1.55*</td>
<td>-0.30*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Importance of leadership position</td>
<td>-0.27</td>
<td>-0.48*</td>
<td>-0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willingness to take on time-consuming service tasks</td>
<td>-0.61*</td>
<td>0.83*</td>
<td>-0.22*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekly hours: Scholarship or creative activities</td>
<td>5.53*</td>
<td>5.39*</td>
<td>-0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekly hours: Teaching</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>1.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekly hours: Clinical work</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>-1.34</td>
<td>-2.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekly hours: Mentoring</td>
<td>-0.19</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>1.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekly hours: Service to U-M</td>
<td>-5.31*</td>
<td>-8.09*</td>
<td>-2.79*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekly hours: Service to discipline &amp; community</td>
<td>-1.38*</td>
<td>-2.41*</td>
<td>-1.03*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekly hours: Special requests</td>
<td>-0.54</td>
<td>-0.62</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekly hours: Care work to improve U-M</td>
<td>-1.46*</td>
<td>-0.74*</td>
<td>0.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekly hours: Identity-based activities</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>-0.12</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekly hours: Personal/Family time</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>5.33*</td>
<td>2.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekly hours: Sleep</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>-0.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekly hours: Non-UM employment</td>
<td>-0.52</td>
<td>-0.97</td>
<td>-0.45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>% difference</th>
<th>% difference</th>
<th>% difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Formal mentor/career advisor at UM</td>
<td>57%*</td>
<td>74%*</td>
<td>17%*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informal mentor/career advisor at UM</td>
<td>21%*</td>
<td>44%*</td>
<td>23%*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal mentor/career advisor outside UM</td>
<td>11%*</td>
<td>13%*</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informal mentor/career advisor outside UM</td>
<td>23%*</td>
<td>36%*</td>
<td>13%*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chair one or more committees in a typical year</td>
<td>-34%*</td>
<td>-47%*</td>
<td>-13%*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excluded from decision-making committees</td>
<td>-13%*</td>
<td>-13%*</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excluded from leadership opportunities</td>
<td>-13%*</td>
<td>-17%*</td>
<td>-4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 4A: Faculty Retention at U-M - Gender by Race-Ethnicity (Means)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>BIPOC+ Women mean</th>
<th>BIPOC+ Men mean</th>
<th>White Women mean</th>
<th>White Men mean</th>
<th>BIPOC+ TGD mean</th>
<th>White TGD mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intention to stay at U-M</td>
<td>4.02</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>4.22</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>3.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Received an outside offer</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside offer resulted in change</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 4B: Faculty Retention at U-M - Gender by Race-Ethnicity (Differences)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Differences between BIPOC+ Women and BIPOC+ Men (BIPOC+ Women - BIPOC+ Men) mean difference</th>
<th>Differences between BIPOC+ Women and White Women (BIPOC+ Women - White Women) mean difference</th>
<th>Differences between BIPOC+ Men and White Women (BIPOC+ Men - White Women) mean difference</th>
<th>Differences between BIPOC+ Men and White Men (BIPOC+ Men - White Men) mean difference</th>
<th>Differences between White Women and White Men (White Women - White Men) mean difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intention to stay at U-M</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>-0.15</td>
<td>-0.19</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Received an outside offer</td>
<td>% difference</td>
<td>% difference</td>
<td>% difference</td>
<td>% difference</td>
<td>% difference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside offer resulted in change</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*24%*
Table 4C: Faculty Retention - by Rank (Means)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Asst Professor</th>
<th>Assoc Professor</th>
<th>Professor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>mean</td>
<td>mean</td>
<td>mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intention to stay at U-M</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>4.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Received an outside offer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside offer resulted in change</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. The transgender and gender-diverse (TGD) group was excluded from group comparisons in this report for statistical reasons due to the small number; however, we wish to fully affirm the presence of TGD faculty at U-M.

2. Black, Indigenous, People of Color (BIPOC) were faculty who identified as URM or A/AA. The “+” signifies the addition of Arab/Middle Eastern/North African (AMENA) to this group.

3. LGBTQIA+ includes individuals who self-identify as lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, queer or questioning, intersex, asexual, and more.