

Results from the 2016-2017 HERI Faculty Survey for Full-time Undergraduate Faculty

Contents

Results from the 2016-2017 HERI Faculty Survey for Full-time Undergraduate Faculty 1

Executive Summary..... 2

 General Observations 2

 Key Findings by Themes..... 2

 Goals & Action Items..... 3

 Goal 1 3

 Goal 2 3

 Goal 3 4

 Goal 4 4

 Theme A: Professional Practice - Teaching..... 5

 Theme B: Professional Practice – Scholarship 7

 Theme C: Professional Practice - Service 7

 Theme D: Institutional Support and Resources 8

 Theme E: Goals for Undergraduate Education 9

 Theme F: Diversity 10

 Theme G: Satisfaction 12

 Theme H: Institutional Priorities..... 12

 Theme I: Interaction with Students 14

 Theme J: Habits of Mind 14

 Theme K: Health and Wellness 15

 Theme L: Relationship with Administration..... 16

 WU Added Questions..... 17

 Campus Climate Module..... 17

 Cooperative Institutional Research Program Construct: Diversity Climate..... 18

Executive Summary

The HERI Faculty Survey, developed by the Higher Education Research Institute (HERI) at UCLA and the Cooperative Institutional Research Program in 1989, provides institutions with a comprehensive, research-based picture of key aspects of the faculty experience.

The web-based survey was sent to 389 faculty and instructional staff at Washburn University and the Washburn Institute of Technology (WU) during the spring of 2017; 256 responded for a response rate of 65.8%. These results are organized by full-time undergraduate faculty who responded to the HERI Faculty Survey themes. Each of these questions displayed comparison summary data between WU and the two higher education comparison group institutions. Comparison group 1 was from a group of public 4-year colleges with low/medium selectivity and Comparison group 2 was from a group of public 4-year colleges. The responses to each question were further broken down by “men” and “women” with respective data provided for the two comparison group institutions. It should be noted these results were from full-time undergraduate faculty at WU, $n = 202$, Comparison group 1, $n = 1,157$ and Comparison group 2, $n = 3,034$.

General Observations

Comparison group 1 was comprised of five other institutions that vary in geographical location, type/background of students, diversity, athletic ranking, graduate and undergraduate academic programs, and size of student body. WU’s inclusion in this grouping was based on only two variables: low/medium admission requirements and whether the institution identifies as a public college.

Within the first several questions in the survey instrument, faculty were asked to self-identify their “sex” with provided response categories of “male” and “female.” HERI used these groupings to classify responses into “men” or “women” faculty for comparison purposes. In this reporting of the results, the distinction of “male” and “female” are used to refer to these response groupings.

For many of the HERI theme areas, where a difference occurs between “men” and “women” faculty, the difference is great enough to significantly affect the overall mean comparison data with the comparison group institutions. In many of these cases, the differences suggested that female faculty performed or incorporated student-centered teaching elements into their courses more than did male faculty. Female faculty also appeared to incorporate elements more in line with the values and mission of the university on certain topics being assessed.

Key Findings by Themes

Themes A-C: A high percentage of faculty rated the professional practices of Teaching, Scholarship (research) and Service *all* to be essential/very important (99.5%, 69.3% and 80.3%, respectively).

Theme D: For Institutional Support and Resources, the results indicated that WU supports faculty development adequately and at higher levels than the comparison group institutions.

Theme E: WU faculty hold beliefs that it is essential/very important to prepare students for employment after college as stated in the Goals for Undergraduate Education theme.

Theme F: For the theme Diversity, WU faculty agreed strongly/agreed somewhat (96.0%) that a racially/ethnically diverse student body enhances the educational experience of all students.

Theme G: In regard to Satisfaction, when asked if they were to begin their career again, would they still want to come to this institution, 84.5% of WU faculty responded definitely yes/probably yes, and this was significantly higher than the comparison group institutions.

Theme H: For Institutional Priorities, faculty report it is the highest priority/high priority of the university to facilitate student involvement in community service. Similarly, WU faculty report it is a priority to provide resources for faculty to engage in community-based teaching or research.

Theme I: WU faculty more frequently advise student groups involved in service or volunteer work than the comparison group institutions (64.4% vs. 57.2% and 58.0%, respectively for the theme Interaction with Students).

Theme J: For Habits of Mind, a large percentages of WU faculty report encouraging the use of asking questions in class (98.3%), analyzing multiple source of information before coming to a conclusion (94.0%), and evaluating the quality or reliability of information they receive (96.7%).

Theme K: Faculty at WU, both men and women, tend either to be equal or slightly better than the comparison group institutions related to reported overall Health and Wellness.

Theme L: For Relationship with Administration WU faculty were slightly higher in agreement than the comparison group institutions in regard to administrators consider faculty concerns when making policy.

Goals & Action Items

Goal 1: Increase the number of faculty members, and minimize the disparity between men and women, who report using student-centered pedagogy and seeking professional development opportunities.

Goal 1 Action Items:

- Based on distinctive, self-reported differences between male and female survey respondents, facilitate focus groups to further investigate why male faculty members report relying less on student-centered pedagogy and are less likely to be involved in professional development.
- Explore further additional factors besides gender identity, such as age, that could contribute to these differences in respondents' reporting of utilizing student-centered pedagogy.
- Investigate more on-line modules for professional development and whether these would be popular with faculty who do not currently participate in C-TEL professional development.
- Examine how to include professional development in the faculty evaluation process, including tenure and promotion and annual reviews.
- Consider additional ways of rewarding and incentivizing faculty members for incorporating additional best practices into their teaching and for pursuing professional development.

Goal 2: Enhance WU's efforts to cultivate a diverse and inclusive campus community and support individual faculty members' demonstrated commitment to diversity and inclusion.

Goal 2 Action Items:

- Develop and implement strategic recruitment and hiring practices aimed to diversify the University workforce and leadership.
- Develop and implement trainings for search committees to successfully incorporate strategic recruitment and hiring practices into search processes.

- Promote WU's commitment to diversity and inclusion, for example, through the University's website and marketing materials.
- Develop and implement recruitment strategies to yield more diversity in the student body; share this plan with faculty and staff.
- Work with the Foundation to create scholarship opportunities for students from marginalized communities.
- Provide additional professional development opportunities for faculty members with regards to inclusive pedagogies and the importance of developing cross-cultural fluency among undergraduates.
- Encourage academic departments to incorporate successful demonstration of a commitment to diversity, inclusion, and student success into the faculty evaluation process, including tenure and promotion and annual reviews.

Goal 3: Build on WU's strengths, especially regarding a) community engagement and b) satisfaction with the workplace

Action Items for Goal 3a:

- Provide additional outreach and programming in High Impact Community Engaged Practices (HICEPs) and its benefits to faculty members.
- Continue to build and strengthen relationships with the local community through broad faculty participation in HICEP courses and faculty members' service in the community and region.
- Promote and celebrate WU's commitment to community-engaged learning.

Action Items for Goal 3b:

- Promote and celebrate the findings that WU is an institution with a culture of collaboration and respect among faculty, staff, and administration.
- Maintain and enhance this culture of collaboration and respect in our campus community.
- Continue to enhance and strengthen transparency of administrative decisions and commitment to faculty governance.

Goal 4: Improve the administration of the HERI survey to focus on continuous improvement.

Goal 4 Action Items:

- Add qualitative and quantitative questions in areas where more information would be useful.
- Review and revise WU-added HERI questions to ensure they are appropriate to assess WU's goals and priorities.
- Conduct HERI survey every three years.
- Establish a focus group to examine and compare the results of each survey; review whether goals from previous survey have been met and set new goals to work towards.

Theme A: Professional Practice - Teaching

The items in this section relate to use of pedagogical practices and evaluation methods as well as the prevalence of specific types of teaching assignments.

Almost all WU faculty (99.5%) responded that teaching was essential or very important to them, which was slightly higher than the comparison group institutions at 98.7% and 98.8%, respectively. WU faculty reported more engagement in teaching honors courses (18.2%) than both comparison group institutions (13.6% and 14.9%, respectively). Male WU faculty reported a higher percentage (27.6% vs. 16.8% and 17.3%, respectively) than male faculty at both comparison group institutions with WU female faculty reporting percentages similar to the comparison group institutions (10.5% vs. 10.0% and 12.1%, respectively).

WU female faculty were more likely than WU male faculty to report engaging in teaching a/an:

- interdisciplinary course (40.0% vs. 34.5%),
- area studies course (e.g., women's studies, ethnic studies, LGBTQ studies) (15.1% vs. 7.1%),
- service learning course (18.7% vs. 15.3%), and
- course exclusively online (53.8% vs. 40.0%).

WU female faculty were also more likely than WU male faculty to report participating in organized activities around enhancing pedagogy and student learning (78.5% vs. 67.4%), and in the development of curriculum (enhancing an existing course or creating a new course) (91.6% vs. 84.9%). Whereas, WU male faculty were more likely than WU female faculty to report teaching a seminar for first-year students (24.1% vs. 19.8%).

WU faculty tend to teach more courses than the comparison group institutions (*Medians* = 5.0 vs 4.0 and 4.0, respectively). There were no noticeable differences between the type of courses WU faculty are teaching (e.g., general education courses, courses required for an undergraduate major), and where they are being taught at (this institution vs. at another institution).

There were no statistically significant differences between groups for how often in the past year faculty encouraged students to recognize the biases that affect their thinking. Similarly, there were no statistically significant differences between groups in the courses faculty taught that at least one assignment required students to write in the specific style or format of their discipline. Although not statistically significant, WU female faculty more frequently gave at least one assignment that required students to describe how different perspectives would affect the interpretation of a question or issue in their discipline (87.0%) than WU male faculty (80.2%). There were no statistically significant differences between groups in the frequency by which ethical or moral implications of a course of action were taught, nor how frequently students applied mathematical concepts and computational thinking.

In reference to how many of the courses faculty teach that utilize certain pedagogical practices, there were statistically significant differences between WU faculty and the comparison group institutions on performances/demonstrations, group projects, multiple drafts of written work, community service as part of coursework, and student presentations. These differences are detailed, below.

WU faculty indicated that they use more performances/demonstrations practices than both of the comparison group institutions, statistically significant at the < .05 level. In addition, WU male faculty were more likely to use performances/demonstrations than male faculty at the second comparison

group institution, however, there was a small effect size (0.23). WU faculty reported using less group projects in all or most courses they teach than the comparison group institutions. These results were statistically significant for all faculty and female faculty at the second comparison group institution, at the $< .05$ level with a small effect size. WU faculty were less likely than faculty at the second comparison group institutions to report that they use multiple drafts of written work in all or most of their courses, statistically significant at the $< .05$ level, small effect size (-0.16). WU faculty were more likely than faculty at the first comparison group institutions to use community service as part of coursework, statistically significant at the $< .05$ level, small effect size (0.17).

WU faculty were less likely to use student presentations in all or most of their courses, as compared to the comparison group institutions. In addition, female faculty at WU were less likely than female faculty at the second comparison group institutions to use student presentation in all or most of their courses. These findings were statistically significant at the $< .05$ level, small effect sizes. While the use of student presentations is important, WU faculty are likely experimenting with alternative pedagogical practices as a function of C-TEL and the exploration of alternative methods of teaching students. It should also be noted that this does not reflect general education outcomes since the data is not restricted to just general education courses.

Although the following findings were not statistically significant, it is interesting to explore them. WU faculty indicated more use of small group/cooperative learning than the comparison group institutions. WU faculty reported using less extensive lecturing than the comparison group institutions, but this difference was accounted for by female faculty (44.5%) rather than male faculty (54.8%). Male faculty at WU were less likely to use electronic quizzes with immediate feedback, while female faculty reported more use with respect to both comparison group institutions. While somewhat comparable overall percentages related to readings on women and gender issues, WU male faculty were less than both comparison group institutions with female WU faculty reporting slightly higher percentages. This same pattern where WU female faculty reported higher percentages than both comparison group institutions and male faculty reporting lower percentages than both comparison group institutions was noted in use of "supplemental instruction that is outside of class and office hours." Faculty at WU reported that they were less likely to grade on a curve in relation to the comparison group institutions.

In reference to incorporating more forms of technology into courses, male faculty at WU were less likely to use online discussion boards frequently or occasionally in courses than male faculty at both of the comparison group institutions, statistically significant at the $< .05$ level, small to medium effect sizes. There were no statistically significant differences among groups with other forms of technology in courses, such as videos or podcasts, simulations/animations and online homework or virtual labs.

Faculty at WU reported much higher hours per week related to teaching, statistically significant at the $< .001$ level with a small to medium effect size for the first comparison group institution on nine or more hours of scheduled teaching, $< .01$ for the second comparison group institution. For gender, significant differences were consistent and at the $< .05$ level, small effect sizes. The differences between WU faculty and the comparison group institutions is considerable (60.7% vs. 49.5% and 53.4%), and while higher for male WU faculty (56.0%), it is very high for women WU faculty (64.7%) and the comparison group institutions (48.8% and 52.9%).

Theme B: Professional Practice – Scholarship

These items related to faculty's involvement and opinions about activities associated with scholarship.

Research was viewed not as essential/very important by WU faculty (69.3%) when asked "Personally, how important to you is:" compared to both comparison group institutions (78.6% and 77.2%, respectively).

The focus of research was considerably different where WU female faculty compared to male faculty were much more likely to be engaged in research on topics related to the racial or ethnic minorities (32.7% vs. 17.4%), women and gender (30.1% vs. 13.8%) and lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, queer (LGBTQ) issues (16.5% vs. 7.0%). WU male faculty were more likely than female faculty to engage in research that spans multiple disciplines (65.1% vs. 55.8%) and to receive funding from their work from state or federal government (28.4% vs. 18.4%) and business or industry (15.3% vs. 6.9%). WU faculty were considerably less likely to indicate a very large/large extent of involvement in publishing with undergraduates (2.1%) than the comparison group institutions (5.6% and 6.0%, respectively).

Fewer faculty at WU reported publication of five or more articles in academic or professional journals, and one or more chapters in edited volumes than the comparison group institutions and these differences were statistically significant at the $< .001$ level with small to medium effect sizes. These findings were consistent across the genders as well in that male and female faculty published significantly less than the comparison group institutions.

Similarly, WU faculty were less likely to publish one or more books, manuals, or monographs than the first comparison group institutions at the $< .05$ level and with the second comparison group institutions at the $< .001$ level. Male faculty were also significantly less likely to publish one or more books, manuals, or monographs than both comparison group institutions at the $< .05$ level with small effect sizes.

WU faculty were also less likely in the past three years to have had three or more professional writings published or accepted for publication, statistically significant at the $< .001$ level, small to medium effect sizes. This trend held across the genders compared to the comparison group institutions, although for female faculty this difference was at the $< .001$ level for the first comparison group institutions and at the $< .05$ level for the second comparison group institutions.

It should be noted that the number of graduate students may significantly influence scholarship and the types of postgraduate degrees taught at the comparison group institutions.

Theme C: Professional Practice - Service

The items for this theme relate to faculty's involvement and opinions about activities associated with the service component of faculty work.

More WU faculty rate the importance of service as essential/very important (80.3%) than compared to faculty at the comparison group institutions (67.6% and 66.9%, respectively). Moreover, male and female faculty at WU shared the sentiment equally that service was essential/very important at 80.5% and 80.0%, respectively.

Faculty service efforts also extend beyond the university; there was a high number of hours per week (5+) of community and public service reported by WU faculty compared to faculty at the comparison group institutions, and this was statistically significant at the $< .05$ level. These differences were

observed among the female faculty; WU female faculty reported 5+ hours of community or public service, a statistically significant difference to the comparison group institutions' female faculty ($< .05$, small effect sizes).

Despite the otherwise positive support from both genders for service reflected in survey results, there were several areas where there were noticeable gender differences, although not statistically significant. Though WU faculty seem to carry slightly lower committee work compared to other universities, the committee work being accomplished was disproportionately handled by women (45.6% of female faculty vs. 32.9% of male faculty). WU male faculty report mentoring undergraduate students more often than women (74.1% vs. 67.0%), but WU female faculty report spending more time advising and counseling students than do WU male faculty (38.6% vs. 28.6%). This discrepancy could be related to an interpretation of terms. Finally, faculty in general report lower engagement in public discourse about their research or their fields of specialization than faculty at both comparison group institutions (47.6% vs. 50.0% and 50.5%, respectively), and men report engagement more often than do women at WU (52.3% vs. 43.6%).

Theme D: Institutional Support and Resources

This theme contains items that gauge faculty involvement and opinions regarding professional development and support for faculty available on campus.

WU faculty report in the past two years they have participated in organized activities around enhancing pedagogy and student learning more than at both comparison group institutions (73.6% vs. 69.2% and 71.7%, respectively). Additionally, WU faculty report engaging in funded workshops outside the institution focused on teaching more so than the comparison group institutions (69.1% vs. 54.1% and 55.7%, respectively). Institutional funding for travel is higher than at both comparison group institutions (70.2% vs. 63.8% and 66.4%, respectively). In addition, WU faculty report they agree strongly or agree somewhat that there is adequate support for faculty development more so than the comparison group institutions and this trend held across genders with statistically significant differences at the $< .001$ level, small to medium effect sizes.

However, a few issues bear scrutiny. Male professors receive more awards for outstanding teaching, even though women implement more student-centered practices in their classrooms. Moreover, a lower number of faculty members are taking paid sabbatical leave (3.7%) than reported by the comparison group institutions (5.5% and 7.3%, respectively). This difference could be attributed to the comparison group institutions' emphasis on research. However, at WU a higher percentage of female faculty (4.9%) are likely to take paid sabbatical leave than male faculty (2.4%). In addition, 10.8% of women faculty at WU report taking time off for more than one year for family reasons; no male faculty at WU reported such a leave.

It is important for the Washburn community to celebrate identified strengths in support of continued commitment to service. Administrative departmental, collegiate and university leadership should be encouraged to utilize current prospects and create new opportunities for spotlighting faculty engagement in service to WU and the community. The institution should consider exploring and revising how service is recognized and rewarded, perhaps by including and standardizing specific benchmarks on faculty evaluations to incentivize engagement in service.

Regarding gender differences, holding public conversations about the gender discrepancies might inform WU about how men and women interpret and operationalize the various themes such as mentoring and counseling students, as well as provide further insight on whether and how the gender differences are manifested. From these conversations specific learning opportunities could be developed around gender for faculty through C-TEL. Including qualitative aspects to the HERI questions, or a WU-specific climate survey could assist in evaluating responses in more depth.

The survey indicates the importance of evaluating how WU recognizes and rewards teaching. Once again, this could be accomplished through revising current faculty evaluations by including specific benchmarks regarding teaching methods, and incentivizing those methods that are effective, and that WU values. Including questions about teaching methods on course evaluations completed by students in order to correlate what is seen as excellent teaching by students with the methods used by faculty might assist in evaluating how excellent teaching is measured by students.

Theme E: Goals for Undergraduate Education

This theme contains items about faculty opinions regarding common goals for undergraduate education.

For indicating the importance of education goals for undergraduate students, 100% of WU faculty responded that it is essential/very important to prepare students for employment after college. These findings were statistically significant when examining differences in the comparison group institutions and among male faculty in that WU faculty reported more so that it is essential/very important to prepare students for employment after college than male faculty in the comparison group institutions ($< .05$ level, small effect size).

Findings were statistically significant for WU faculty who reported it was essential/very important to prepare students for graduate or advanced education, at the $< .05$ level as compared to the second comparison group institutions. However, male WU faculty were less likely than their counterparts at the comparison group institutions to respond that it was essential/very important to prepare students for graduate or advanced education, statistically significant at the $< .05$ level, small effect size.

WU faculty agree strongly/agree somewhat more than the comparison group institutions that the institution takes responsibility for educating underprepared students at the $< .05$ level with a small effect size. Female faculty at WU were also statistically significantly different than female faculty at the comparison group institutions in that WU female faculty agree strongly/agree somewhat more so that the institution takes responsibility for educating underprepared students ($< .05$ level, small effect size).

WU faculty rated developing leadership ability among students significantly higher as a priority than the comparison group institutions at the $< .01$ level. In addition, WU female faculty were statistically significant in their rating of the priority level of developing leadership ability among students. This was higher than the comparison group institutions at the $< .001$ level, small to medium effect size.

Although not statistically significant findings, the following are concerns. WU could take more responsibility for under-prepared students. For encouraging students to become agents of social change, 79.4% of WU faculty indicated this was essential/very important. A lower percent of male WU faculty reported that providing for students' emotional development was essential/very important (68.3%) than WU female faculty (85.6%). Male faculty at WU also reported that enhancing students'

knowledge of and appreciation for other race/ethnic groups was not as essential/very important (82.2%) than female WU faculty (90.8%).

Recommendations to address these differences include hosting more community outreach projects and emphasizing more democratic education practices to assist WU faculty with embracing social change in the classroom and community. Faculty should be encouraged to teach more about self-awareness, cultural humility and cultural awareness, and incorporate assignments that require active participation and experimentation in the community.

Theme F: Diversity

This theme relates to social attitudes and experiences with diversity on campus.

A majority (78.0%) of WU faculty indicated they agree strongly/agree somewhat that the institution takes responsibility for educating underprepared students. This is significantly higher than respondents at the comparison group institutions, at $< .001$ level, and higher for women than at the comparison group institutions at the $< .05$ level. Both male and female faculty at WU answered strongly in the affirmative on this point. However, given WU's mission as an open-admission, municipally funded institution, this investigating group believes the percentage should be even higher.

WU faculty agreed strongly/agreed somewhat (96.0%) that a racially/ethnically diverse student body enhances the educational experience of all students. Research repeatedly suggests that we learn from those whose experiences, beliefs, and perspectives are different from our own, and these lessons can be taught best in a richly diverse intellectual and social environment. Moreover, cross-cultural fluency is one of the top skills employers consider in gauging "career readiness."¹ Women faculty at WU were even more supportive of the above statement—100% of respondents answered in the affirmative, as compared to 91.3% of male respondents, however, these results were not statistically significant. 91.9% of WU faculty respondents (92.6% of women and 91.1% of men) also indicated that they thought it was essential or very important to teach students tolerance and respect for different beliefs. And yet, only 61.2% of women respondents and 52.0% of male respondents indicated that they highly prioritize developing an appreciation for multiculturalism, this finding is significantly lower than the second comparison group institution ($< .05$ level).

Despite the firm commitment WU faculty members exhibited to the positive impact of a diverse student body, they indicated they did not feel there was a strong institutional dedication to recruiting more minority students with 51.3% reporting this as the highest priority/high priority. Similarly, WU faculty respondents indicated they did not feel it was the highest priority/high priority to promote gender, racial, or ethnic diversity among the faculty and administration (42.5% and 45.4%, respectively). In regard to promoting racial and ethnic diversity in the faculty and administration, the differences between WU faculty and the comparison group institutions were statistically significant ($< .05$) in that the comparison group institutions indicated this was the highest priority/high priority more so than the WU faculty. This finding was consistent with WU female faculty and female faculty for the second comparison group institutions ($< .05$).

¹ "Career Readiness for the New College Graduate: A Definition and Competencies," National Association of Colleges and Employers, 2017.

Fewer WU respondents (17.3% as compared to 18.1% and 20.3% of the comparison group institutions, respectively) answered agree strongly/agree somewhat to the statement “There is a lot of campus racial conflict here.” These findings were statistically significant between WU faculty and the faculty in the second comparison group institutions ($< .05$). But WU female faculty (20.5%) agreed more strongly than WU male faculty (13.4%); more WU women also answered affirmatively than women teaching at the comparison group institutions, although this finding was not statistically significant. The fact that greater numbers of WU women faculty indicated they were aware of racial and ethnic conflict on campus suggests there may be additional evidence of the greater emotional and mentoring work done by women when it comes to engaging with students. It may be that women were more aware of the racial conflict because they spend greater time mentoring and listening to students both inside the classroom, by utilizing active learning and discussion strategies, and outside the classroom, by advising. In addition, male WU faculty agreed less that there was a lot of campus racial conflict than both comparison group institutions, statistically significant at the $< .05$ level, small to medium effect sizes.

In an effort to raise the percentage of respondents who agree WU takes responsibility for educating underprepared students, WU should strive to continue to provide and improve academic support for students with the need for enhanced academic support. WU should also work to engage more faculty members in creating, implementing, and improving this support.

The lower number of respondents who prioritize an appreciation for multiculturalism compared to those who value teaching tolerance and respect for different beliefs—arguably the definition of an appreciation for multiculturalism—suggests there may be a negative connotation toward the term “multiculturalism” among faculty respondents, especially men, or a lack of understanding of the term. In an effort to address this, it is important that WU develop a shared definition of multiculturalism and continuously highlight the benefits of a diverse academic environment. WU has recently approved an inclusivity statement that provides a shared definition of a diverse and inclusive campus community. WU should share this statement far and wide.

To demonstrate WU’s commitment to recruit and retain a diverse student body, WU should display its dedication to diversity throughout its website (not just the diversity and inclusion page) and marketing materials. Enrollment Management should continuously strive to enhance its strategic plan to yield more diversity in the student body and share this plan with faculty; Enrollment Management should also request feedback and participation from faculty in order to improve and implement the plan.

In addition, WU leadership should encourage all academic departments to incorporate successful demonstration of a commitment to diversity and inclusion into their faculty evaluation processes, including tenure and promotion and annual reviews. This will have the effect of incentivizing and rewarding such commitment, which will produce a more inclusive academic environment and a curriculum that fosters intercultural fluency and presents minority viewpoints. This is important to recruiting and retaining a diverse student body and teaching critical thinking, as well as an appreciation for multiculturalism.

In an effort to promote gender, racial, and ethnic diversity among the faculty and administration, WU should develop and implement strategic hiring practices aimed to diversify WU’s workforce and leadership. Some of this work has already begun since the completion of the HERI survey with the creation of new language for advertisements of faculty positions that signals WU’s commitment to candidates who value diversity, inclusion, and student success. This work must continue by creating and

implementing trainings that will help search committees recruit diverse pools of applicants and successfully manage the unavoidable implicit bias that contributes to a less diverse workforce.

Theme G: Satisfaction

The items in this theme gauge satisfaction with various aspects of the faculty experience.

When asked if they were to begin their career again, would they still want to come to this institution, WU faculty were more likely to respond affirmatively than both comparison group institutions, and this trend is repeated with female faculty ($< .001$ and $< .05$ levels, respectively).

Only 33.1% of WU faculty reported salary satisfaction, with satisfaction for compensation reported lower for WU female faculty than WU male faculty (30.6% vs. 36.0%). WU faculty in general were less satisfied with salary than the comparison group institutions, a statistically significant difference, at $< .05$ and $.01$ levels, respectively, with a small effect size. When further examining male and female faculty separately, WU faculty were less satisfied than the second comparison group institutions, significant at the $< .05$ level.

WU faculty reported they were very satisfied/satisfied with the health benefits more so than the first comparison group institutions, and further, women faculty report more satisfaction; these were statistically significant at the $< .001$ and $< .05$ levels, respectively. WU faculty were very satisfied/satisfied with retirement benefits more so than both comparison group institutions at the $< .001$ and $< .01$ levels, respectively. In addition, male WU faculty were more satisfied than the second comparison group institutions in regard to retirement benefits ($< .05$) and female WU faculty were more satisfied than both comparison group institutions ($< .001$ and $.05$), small to medium effect sizes.

In regard to the opportunity for scholarly pursuits, WU female faculty reported more satisfaction than the comparison group institutions, statistically significant at the $< .05$ level, small effect sizes.

WU faculty reported more satisfaction with institutional support for work/life balance than the comparable institutions ($< .01$), and this trend was evidenced when examining differences among gender where male faculty at WU were more satisfied than male faculty at the comparison group institutions ($< .05$) and WU female faculty were more satisfied than women at the second comparison group institutions ($< .05$).

WU faculty reported higher job satisfaction than the two comparison group institutions, although these findings were not statistically significant. Moreover, WU male faculty responded they were less satisfied than WU female faculty with relative equity of salary and job benefits (35.2% vs. 40.9%), although these findings were not statistically significant.

WU should continue to promote a collegial environment in all departments and provide ongoing appropriate resources and support. Continuation of the practice of self-care through the collaboration of C-TEL and academic departments offering self-care services should be promoted.

Theme H: Institutional Priorities

This theme focused on faculty opinions on various types of institutional priorities.

Faculty respondents report multiple areas in which WU compares favorably to the comparison group institutions. Many of these areas revolve around WU's relationship with the local community. Faculty

report it is the highest priority/high priority of the university to facilitate student involvement in community service. Similarly, WU faculty report it is a priority to provide resources for faculty to engage in community-based teaching or research, a statistically significant difference from the comparable institutions (at $< .001$ and $< .01$ levels). The percentage of faculty who felt it was a priority of the university to create and sustain partnerships with surrounding communities was significantly higher than responses from other institutions completing the survey, at the $< .001$ level. Additionally, faculty reported it was a priority to develop leadership ability among WU students at statistically significant higher levels than other institutions ($< .01$).

While the responses regarding partnerships with local community groups and community service were extremely positive, the faculty identified some areas that are not considered a priority at WU. These centered primarily around two areas: diversity and pursuing extramural funding, especially with for-profits. Roughly half of faculty respondents indicated it was an institutional priority to recruit minority students. Similarly, less than half of respondents indicated it was a priority to promote gender or racial and ethnic diversity in the faculty and administration. Secondly, the number of respondents who reported pursuing extramural funding to be a high priority for this institution was significantly less than comparable institutions, at $< .001$ and $< .01$ levels. Similarly, significantly fewer respondents agree that it was a high priority to strengthen links with the for-profit, corporate sector, at $< .001$ and $< .05$ levels.

Findings also revealed that WU faculty did not consider increasing or maintaining institutional prestige and hiring faculty 'stars' as institutional priorities. Faculty rated these two areas lower than the comparison group institutions, and these statistically significant findings were maintained when examining the responses of female faculty.

In light of these findings, it is recommended WU continue to build and strengthen relationships with the local community. This can be accomplished through broad participation in HICEP activities that partner both faculty and students with local organizations. Increasing the number of faculty who are involved with such activities will enhance the number of students who are also able to participate. Marketing this large cadre of qualified faculty and willing students to local organizations can show how WU is able to partner with them to help meet their needs. This will continue to further demonstrate WU's commitment to developing leadership abilities in its students.

Embracing diversity is listed as part of one of WU's core values of respect. Despite this, faculty report that recruiting minority students or promoting diversity with regards to gender and race/ethnicity are not high priorities. If these goals are a priority, then changes should be made to better reflect this. With regards to promoting diversity in the faculty and administration, focusing on recruitment efforts is a logical place to start. When advertising positions, it could be beneficial to contact schools and/or professional organizations for underrepresented groups. Along the same lines, using interview questions that allow applicants to discuss how they have previously facilitated efforts to enhance diversity may prove to be beneficial. Once faculty and staff are on-campus, offering professional development regarding these types of issues and potentially monetary encouragements could incentivize individuals to further participate in such activities. With regards to pursuing extramural funding and strengthening links with for-profits, if this is a priority for this institution then highlighting these types of activities would demonstrate to faculty that efforts are being made to secure such funding. If new efforts are needed, then developing a group to closely evaluate potential donors and identifying those with the greatest connection with WU's mission, vision, and values could assist with securing funding.

Theme I: Interaction with Students

The items in this theme related to the amount and types of interactions faculty have with students.

Although the comparative results contained in this theme were not statistically significant, it can be noted that WU faculty respondents reported a couple of areas in which they demonstrated greater interaction with students than faculty at the comparison group institutions.

WU faculty more frequently advise student groups involved in service or volunteer work than the comparison group institutions (64.4% vs. 57.2% and 58.0%, respectively). Additionally, WU faculty are more likely to work with students on their research projects than faculty at the comparison group institutions (62.5% vs. 65.2% and 66.7%, respectively).

While faculty report having higher engagement with students than the comparison group institutions, this was also reported to be an extensive or somewhat extensive source of stress at times. While the percentage of faculty reporting students to be a source of stress was only slightly higher than comparison group institutions, what is noteworthy is the difference between female and male respondents at WU (80.7% and 68.5% respectively).

Working with students on their research projects provides faculty with an opportunity to mentor students in areas in which they demonstrate heightened interest. Thus, support of university programs such as WU Transformational Experience, Apeiron, and others should be continued to further distinguish WU from similar institutions. In regards to findings of students serving as an increased source of stress (along with other stressors identified in other sections) for faculty, professional development offerings focusing on stress reduction strategies or further promotion of the Employee Assistance Program (EAP) benefits available to all employees could be helpful.

Theme J: Habits of Mind

The items in this theme, Habits of Mind, illustrated the extent to which faculty ask students to engage in the behaviors and traits associated with academic success.

Only two statistically significant comparison results were present in the findings for this theme ($< .05$ level, small effect size). WU female faculty reported lower percentages compared with the comparison group institutions for the item: frequency of asking students to support their opinions with a logical argument. WU female faculty were also lower, this time compared with only the second comparison group institutions, with encouraging undergraduates to take risks for potential gain.

Although not statistically significant, findings from this section are as follows. WU faculty report asking students to engage in the behaviors and traits associated with academic success at similar levels as those of comparison group institutions. High percentages of WU faculty report encouraging the use of the following techniques: Asking questions in class (98.3%), analyzing multiple source of information before coming to a conclusion (94.0%), and evaluating the quality or reliability of information they receive (96.7%). Additionally, faculty report encouraging students to seek alternative solutions to problems (96.7%), explore topics on their own even if not required for a class (94.4%) and accept making mistakes as part of the learning process (96.7%).

In light of such high numbers of faculty using techniques associated with academic success, no changes are recommended at this time. However, continued support of professional development programs

such as CTCL and faculty development grants should be maintained to ensure faculty continue to be aware of the most effective techniques at such high levels.

Theme K: Health and Wellness

The survey in this section asked 17 questions related to the theme of Health and Wellness. These findings can be divided into two categories.

The first category asked somewhat independent questions. The first question asked if faculty agreed that they achieved a healthy balance between personal life and professional life. WU faculty as a whole did not show any significant difference from the two comparison group institutions on this question. The second question asked faculty to compare themselves with other faculty related to their perception of whether they felt they needed to work harder than their colleagues to be perceived as a legitimate scholar. Although not a significant difference across comparison group institutions, 48.9% of WU faculty agreed strongly/agreed somewhat they needed to work harder than colleagues. It is important to note that more women agreed than men and this was consistent across comparison group institutions.

The second category of questions related to the level of perceived stress. The 15 questions identified potential stressors and asked faculty to rate the impact of that stressor. The highest stress related item (85.5%) was self-imposed high expectations and the lowest rated item (18.6%) was subtle discrimination (e.g., prejudice, racism, sexism). Other high rated items included increased work responsibilities (80.7%), students (75.0%), lack of personal time (74.0%), teaching load (73.9%), and managing household responsibilities (71.3%). On other items scores were relatively low. These included items on research and publishing demands (53.4%) and job security (32.0%).

All of the items are not identified in this summary unless they appeared to depart in a meaningful manner from the two comparison group institutions. Seven items suggested there were differences between WU faculty and the faculty at the other two comparison group institutions. Two of these indicated that WU faculty perceived their stress to be higher. Neither of these appeared to be statistically significant but the scores suggest the differences may be something to watch in future studies. These were the impact of students and teaching load as stress related factors. Seventy-five percent of faculty indicated that students were extensive/somewhat stressful compared to both comparison group institutions at 70%. However, between men and women, students were identified as a much larger stressor by women both in comparison to WU men as well as to women in the comparison group institutions. The other stress, teaching load, was identified as an extensive or somewhat extensive stressor by 73.9% of the WU faculty in relation to the comparison group institutions of 64.5% and 67.0%, respectively. Again, the most significant difference was between WU women and the two comparison group institutions. Eighty-two percent of WU women identified teaching load as a stressor compared to women in the other groups (66.7% and 69.0%, respectively). The difference between WU women and the first comparison group institutions female faculty was significant at the $< .05$ level. There was no significant difference between WU men and the men in either of the two comparison group institutions.

Five other items were rated significantly lower in relation to faculty on the comparison group institutions. All four items were statistically significant at either the $< .05$ level or higher level of significance. These stress related items were research and publishing demands, institutional procedures and "red tape," child care, review/promotion process, and institutional budget cuts.

Finally, the differences between men and women faculty is worth consideration. Data appear from WU and each of the comparison group institutions to indicate similar differences between men and women faculty. In most cases those differences between men and women faculty are relatively consistent. When men at WU have higher percentage scores on an item in comparison to WU women, then that same variation is seen across the comparison group institutions. When women at WU have higher percentage scores than men at WU, then that relationship is relatively consistent across comparison group institutions.

The HERI survey does not provide information as to why these differences between men and women are present. Often these differences are substantial and raise important questions related to both the at large culture and possible institutional culture. On most items, the identified level of stress was greater for women in comparison to men. Since there are a plethora of research studies suggesting stress is related to health, performance, and more; it does suggest where there are significant discrepancies between men and women, these differences should be both further assessed and addressed.

Theme L: Relationship with Administration

This theme contained items that related to faculty perception and experiences with the campus administration.

WU faculty reported statistically significantly lower agreement than the comparison group institutions (40.5% vs. 54.9% and 51.0%) in that WU faculty had strong agreement or somewhat agreement to the statement: “The faculty are typically at odds with campus administration.” (< .001, small effect size). WU faculty were slightly higher in agreement than the comparison group institutions in regard to administrators considering faculty concerns when making policy, and this finding was statistically significantly different between WU faculty and the faculty at the first comparison group institutions. This statement holds consistent among female WU faculty and the comparison group institutions in that WU female faculty have statistically significantly more agreement to this statement (< .05).

Only 67.1% of faculty say they have seen “institutional procedures and “red tape” as a source of extensive or somewhat extensive stress. This is statistically significantly lower than the comparison group institutions, and this trend holds among both genders (< .05). Although not a statistically significant different finding, 82.6% of WU faculty feel Student Affairs staff have their support and respect at similar levels to the comparison group institutions.

It is noted as a concern that only 61.2% of the WU faculty respondents believe that faculty are sufficiently involved in campus decision making, although this is statistically significantly higher than the comparable institutions (< .01). Additionally, 79.1% of WU faculty agreed strongly or agreed somewhat that the criteria for advancement and promotion decisions are clear. While this is a high percentage, it is important to determine the lack of clarity for 20% of the faculty.

WU should promote and celebrate that WU is an institution where there is a sense of collaboration and respect among faculty, staff, and administration. WU could provide more than one workshop on the promotion and tenure criteria each year. There could be a focus group to find out where confusion might be in the advancement and promotion decisions. For the next HERI faculty survey administration, WU could include a qualitative piece regarding faculty involvement in decision-making where faculty could share examples. This could help clarify where faculty have felt included or left out.

WU Added Questions

WU had the option to add questions to the HERI Faculty Survey. In total, 30 additional questions specific to faculty experiences at WU were added. Results were summarized in total, and by gender.

A large percentage (74.5%) of WU faculty reported they are either very or extremely familiar with the missions of WU and WU Institute of Technology. Additionally, the majority of respondents indicated they incorporate active learning strategies into their teaching frequently or very frequently (77.4%).

The percent of faculty with familiarity of the elements of High Impact Community Engagement Practices (HICEPs) are troublingly low in that only 28.7% were very or extremely familiar. Male respondents reported much lower familiarity than women: 29.7% were not at all familiar compared to female respondents where only 10.6% were not at all familiar. Even lower are the numbers of participation in professional development related to HICEPs with 42.4% never participating.

It is also a concern that 33.2% of all respondents stated that they “rarely” or “never” participated in professional development that focused on diversity and inclusion. Of male respondents, 45.1% said they “rarely” or “never” participated in such training. In addition, only 51.8% of WU faculty agree or strongly agree that “instructors’ needs and desires for technology/teaching tools are being met.”

Overall, scores are lower than expected regarding engagement in professional development. Men attend professional development at a lower rate than women (28.9% of men participated “frequently” or “very frequently,” while 60.7% of women responded this way). Respondents did not feel that adjunct faculty were adequately oriented to the institution, nor did they receive adequate resources (38.1% strongly disagreed or disagreed).

It is recommended that WU investigate why male faculty are not as involved in professional development (for example: do they need more extrinsic rewards?). It is anticipated that professional development regarding diversity and inclusion will increase with recent initiatives such as the new teaching certificate and themester. WU needs to investigate more online modules for professional development and whether these would be popular with faculty who do not participate in C-TEL events. It is also recommended that WU examine how to include professional development in the promotion and tenure process.

More work with the new Coordinator of Community-Engaged Learning to provide more outreach and programming in HICEPs is needed to increase awareness. In addition, creation of a task force to provide recommendations for adjunct faculty, such as orientation, support for teaching, integration into the department, and mentoring, should assist with increasing adjunct and part-time faculty orientation to departments/programs and WU.

WU should ask similar questions in the next HERI Faculty Survey to compare results. However, to more clearly identify participation in professional development activities, the wording of response options should be done in a more quantitative way (i.e. instead of “very frequently, frequently, occasionally, rarely” create responses such as “4-5 times a semester, 2-3 times a semester, 1-2 times a year”).

Campus Climate Module

An additional campus climate module for the 2016-2017 HERI Faculty Survey was provided to all respondents. This module consisted of items referring to the climate of the college in regard to diversity, harassment and discrimination. The results were disaggregated by totals for WU and all other

institutions who participated in the HERI Faculty Survey, WU male faculty and all male faculty, and WU female faculty and all female faculty.

One of the statistically significant results from the campus climate module included an item that asked how often at the institution have you witnessed discrimination. WU faculty were less likely to report that they had witnessed discrimination, and this trend held for female WU faculty ($< .05$ and $< .01$ levels, small effect sizes). Additionally, WU faculty and WU female faculty were less likely to report that they had been discriminated against or excluded from activities because of their gender than their counterparts ($< .01$ and $.05$, small effect sizes).

In regard to administrative response to reports of sexual assault, WU faculty were less satisfied than other institutions, and this was reflected among male faculty in that all male respondents were more satisfied than WU men ($< .01$ and $< .05$). For representation of women faculty, WU faculty were more satisfied than all faculty, and female faculty were more satisfied than all female respondents ($< .01$, small effect size).

Cooperative Institutional Research Program Construct: Diversity Climate

Additionally, contained in the survey, were constructs developed by the Cooperative Institutional Research Program (CIRP). The construct Diversity Climate consisted of items regarding the fair treatment of traditionally underrepresented groups at WU. Although these results were not statistically significant, a strong majority of WU faculty respondents indicated that they somewhat/strongly agreed that faculty of color, women faculty, and LGBTQ faculty were treated fairly here (83.9%, 84.5% and 85.0%, respectively). A smaller percentage of WU female faculty strongly agreed to these statements than WU male faculty; the difference was most pronounced regarding whether women faculty are treated fairly. Less WU female respondents indicated that they strongly agreed that women faculty are treated fairly (31.4%) compared to 57.1% of WU male respondents.

Given that WU's faculty is composed primarily of white, straight individuals with gender identity aligned to their biological sex, the significance of the perception of an absence of discrimination at WU is questionable. For example, in 2017, 81.4% of the faculty and staff self-identified as white—approximately the same percentage as those respondents who indicated that people of color were treated fairly. In 2017, 14.5% of the faculty and staff self-identified as non-white, while 16.9 % of respondents to the HERI survey somewhat/strongly disagreed with the statement that faculty of color are treated fairly.²

The lack of faculty members from historically and modern minority groups is the strongest evidence that WU must take action to eliminate bias and discrimination in its recruiting and hiring practices. Again, it is important that WU take steps to diversify its faculty by demonstrating and publicizing its commitment to diversity and inclusion and by developing hiring practices to recruit a diverse pool of applicants for faculty positions and managing implicit bias that plagues the hiring process. Highlighting the diverse resources Topeka and the region offer may also help, as well as the general satisfaction WU faculty members exhibit toward their jobs, as indicated by the HERI survey results. Increased faculty salaries would also improve efforts to hire and retain the strongest faculty possible.

² 2017 Faculty and staff demographic data from WU Strategic Analysis and Reporting, June 14, 2017.