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The bulk of the results reported here are based on responses from 20,771 full-time undergraduate teaching faculty members at 143 four-year colleges and universities. Data for full-time faculty are weighted to provide a normative national profile of full-time faculty at four-year colleges and universities. This year’s survey included four optional modules for campuses to append to the core survey. Similar to the 2013–2014 administration, institutions could choose to add modules focusing on campus climate, spirituality, or STEM. Several changes to the core and modules for 2016–2017 included moving the sexual orientation and gender identity questions from a separate module to the core instrument. Further, items from the advising module were added to the core and a new module focused on faculty mentoring undergraduates, graduate students, and other faculty was added. We highlight findings from the mentoring module in this monograph.

DISCRIMINATION A SOURCE OF STRESS FOR FEMALE FACULTY OF COLOR AND FEMALE STEM FACULTY

Figure 1 shows that White male faculty are least likely to consider discrimination a source of stress (13.9%), roughly 17 percentage points lower than White female faculty. Though sex differences within race/ethnicity groups persist, men of all other race/ethnicity groups other than Asian/Pacific Islander report a higher percentage of discrimination as a source of stress than White women. For example, more than one-third of male Native American (33.8%), other (35.5%), multiracial (35.2%), Black (40.5%), and Latino (44.1%) faculty report discrimination as at least somewhat a source of stress. Greater differences emerge for women faculty. The percentages for women faculty of color range from 44.8% (Asian/Pacific Islander) to 60.2% (other race), multiracial (59.0%), Black, and Latina (60.1% each) faculty. In other words, more than half of female faculty of color consider discrimination at least somewhat a source of stress.

Of all institution types, women in STEM fields were most likely to consider discrimination at least somewhat of a source of stress at public universities. It is important to note, however, that women at public universities in non-STEM fields felt similar levels of stress from discrimination (43.0% and 43.3%, respectively). By contrast, 13.1% of men in STEM fields and 22.7% of men in non-STEM fields at public universities consider discrimination at least somewhat a source of stress.
LEGITIMACY IN SCHOLARSHIP: FACULTY OF COLOR AND WOMEN PERCEIVE AN UNEVEN PLAYING FIELD

Although half of all full-time faculty (51.0%) felt they needed to work harder than their colleagues to perceive as a legitimate scholar, agreement with this statement varied considerably by intersections of race/ethnicity and gender. Almost without exception, rates of agreement among faculty of color, regardless of race, exceed the proportion of White male and female faculty who felt they needed to work harder than their colleagues to gain legitimacy. As shown in Figure 2, White men feel the least vulnerable among all race/gender pairings with 39.0% believing they need to work harder than their colleagues to be perceived as a legitimate scholar. Similarly, among women, White faculty felt the least vulnerable, as just over half (57.3%) agreed with the statement.

By contrast, substantially higher proportions of men and women faculty of color perceived a need to work harder than their colleagues to be thought of as legitimate scholars. Without exception, within each racial/ethnic group the proportion of women expressing this belief exceeded that of men. The largest gender gap emerged among Native American faculty, as 97.7% of women agreed with this sentiment compared to 54.5% of men. Multiracial (39.2%), Latino/a (39.8%), Black (46.7%), and Asian/Pacific Islander (47.1%) are all less satisfied with the relative equity of salary and job benefits than their White peers (50.1%).

Faculty were asked how many hours during the typical week they spend doing a variety of activities. In general, as shown in Figure 3, the level of satisfaction increased as the mean hours per week spent on teaching and preparing for teaching decreased. For example, faculty who were not satisfied had a mean of 2.56 on the hours per week scheduled teaching item (2 represents 1–4 hours per week and 3 represents 5–8 hours per week), while those who were very satisfied had a mean of 1.98. By contrast, as time spent doing research and scholarly writing increased, so did the level of satisfaction, though the differences weren’t as large. Faculty who were not satisfied with equity salary and benefits had an average of 2.13, while those who were very satisfied had an average of 2.26. It is interesting to note that those who were satisfied spent even more time on research and scholarly writing, with a mean of 2.45.
NEWER AND NON-STEM FACULTY MORE LIKELY TO RECOGNIZE/ACKNOWLEDGE THEIR ROLE IN STUDENT DEVELOPMENT

Faculty were asked about their role in helping undergraduates achieve various goals. As shown in Figure 4, almost three-quarters (73.0%) of faculty strongly agree that it is their responsibility to promote students’ ability to write effectively, but only about a quarter (26.8%) strongly believe they should provide for students’ emotional development. Faculty are also more likely to strongly agree that they should prepare students for employment after college (69.2%) and for graduate or advanced education (61.4%) than to encourage students to become agents of social change (37.2%), or develop students’ personal values (37.0%) and moral character (40.0%). When it comes to diversity, 57.6% of faculty strongly agree that it is their role to teach students tolerance and respect for different beliefs, and fewer, 44.3%, strongly agree that they should enhance students’ knowledge of and appreciation for other racial/ethnic groups.

Faculty in non-STEM fields are more likely to strongly agree that they play a role in most of these goals for undergraduate education. The two exceptions are in preparing students for employment (76.3% STEM vs. 66.4% non-STEM) and preparing students for graduate or advanced education (71.8% STEM vs. 57.1% non-STEM). Figure 5 also highlights significant gaps between STEM and non-STEM faculty on several of these goals. The largest gaps (each of which non-STEM faculty were more likely) can be seen when it comes to teaching students tolerance and respect for different beliefs (24.7 percentage point difference), enhancing students’ knowledge of and appreciation for other racial/ethnic groups (23.7 percentage point difference), and in encouraging students to become agents of social change (19.7 percentage point difference); highlighting STEM faculty as much less likely to feel responsible for playing a role in diversity goals for undergraduates. The smallest gaps, or where non-STEM and STEM faculty were most
likely to agree with each other, were when it comes developing students’ moral character and providing for students’ emotional development. It should be noted though, as mentioned earlier, fewer faculty in general feel strongly responsible for these last two goals.
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