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Executive Summary

The FWIG Workload and Climate Survey builds on previous efforts by the Association of Collegiate Schools of Planning (ACSP) to understand and address issues of diversity and inclusion in the planning academy dating back to the 1980s. This study seeks to examine whether there are racial/ethnic and gender differences in faculty workload and climate in the planning academy using a survey of 414 faculty. In general, the study finds that experiences in the academic and professional settings for Faculty of Color and female faculty are very different than for White and male faculty. A summary of key findings is provided below.

Teaching and Advising: Latinx/Hispanic faculty members reported the highest course load and teaching a large number of students, Asian/Asian American faculty have the next highest course load among Faculty of Color, followed by Mixed-race/Other faculty. Latinx/Hispanic and Mixed-race/Other faculty spend more hours in the classroom than other faculty. Male faculty, as compared to female faculty, had heavier advising loads. Male faculty spent more time advising doctoral students, advised a larger number of Master’s students, and had more undergraduate student advisees.

Committee and Service Load: There was a clear trend towards Faculty of Color and female faculty, relative to White and male faculty, having greater committee and service work. In addition, Faculty of Color, particularly those who identify as Asian/Asian American, Mixed-race/Other, and Latinx/Hispanic, and female faculty spent more hours per week on committee and service work, thereby engaging more frequently with students and community groups.

Faculty Satisfaction with Recognition of Teaching effort, Scholarly Work, Service Contributions, and Work on Diversity and Inclusion by Primary Department: The majority of faculty, across race/ethnicity and gender, indicated that they were satisfied or very satisfied with recognition for the teaching effort by their primary department. However, there were differences in satisfaction with regards to recognition of scholarly work, service contributions, and work on diversity and inclusion, including:

- Asian/Asian American and White faculty were most satisfied with recognition of their scholarly work, while Mixed-race/Other faculty were the least satisfied;
• Black/African American reported the highest satisfaction with recognition for service contributions, while Mixed-race/Other and Latinx/Hispanic faculty reported the lowest rates of satisfaction;
• Mixed-race/Other faculty were the least satisfied with their recognition of work on diversity and inclusion, with Black/African American faculty second least satisfied; and
• Female faculty were more likely than male faculty to report being dissatisfied or very dissatisfied with recognition for work on diversity and inclusion.

Recognition of Research Topics by Colleagues, Chair/Head, Funders, and ACSP: When asked about satisfaction with recognition of research topics, the distribution across response categories was fairly evenly distributed. However, Black/African American faculty were substantially more likely to report being satisfied or very satisfied with their chair/head’s recognition of their research topic than other racial/ethnic groups. White faculty came in next as most satisfied, and Mixed-Race/Other came in last. In regards to satisfaction with recognition of research topic by funders, female faculty reported the highest satisfaction among all groups. However, the opposite was true for recognition of research topics by ACSP, where female faculty reported less satisfaction. Among racial and ethnic groups, Latinx/Hispanic faculty reported the lowest satisfaction with ACSP’s recognition of their research topic.

Fit in the Department and Overall Satisfaction with Primary Department as a Place of Work: Overall, White and male faculty report the highest rates of satisfaction with their fit in the department and overall satisfaction with their primary department as a place of work. All groups reported fairly high levels of overall satisfaction with their primary department as a place of work, with the exception of Mixed-Race/Other and Latinx/Hispanic faculty.

Climate for Faculty of Color in Home Department, University, and ACSP: A majority of faculty reported that the climate for Faculty of Color in the home department is respectful or very respectful. However, in the university setting, faculty indicated that the climate for Faculty of Color is more mixed, polarized, or disrespectful. In general, very few faculty indicated that the climate for Faculty of Color at ACSP was disrespectful.
Climate for Female Faculty in Home Department, University, and ACSP:
A higher proportion of White faculty relative to Faculty of Color indicated that the climate for female faculty in the home department was respectful. Although the majority of faculty indicated that the climate for female faculty at the university was respectful or very respectful, faculty also indicated high levels of mixed or polarized climates at their universities. Among Faculty of Color, Mixed-race/Other and Latinx/Hispanic faculty were more likely to report a mixed or polarized university environment for female faculty. A higher proportion of female faculty relative to male faculty reported a mixed, polarized, disrespectful, or very disrespectful university climate for female faculty.

Observed Bias and/or Discrimination in Hiring, Tenure, Promotion, Retention, and Salary: The results for observed bias and/or discrimination in hiring, tenure, promotion, and retention, show a clear difference across groups. A higher rate of White and male faculty relative to Faculty of Color and female faculty reported that they have never observed bias and discrimination. The results for observed bias and/or discrimination in the tenure process mirror those of the hiring process, with White and male faculty having higher rates of never observing bias and/or discrimination and Mixed-race/other faculty reporting the highest rates of observed bias and/or discrimination. While White faculty were almost twice as likely than Faculty of Color to report that they never observed an incident of bias and/or discrimination in the retention process. A higher proportion of Black/African American faculty reported that they never observed bias and/or discrimination in the retention process than other Faculty of Color.

Observed Basis of Bias and/or Discrimination: The three most common categories of observed bias and/or discrimination were race/ethnicity, gender, and immigration/citizenship status. White faculty most commonly reported observing bias and/or discrimination due to gender, and secondly to race/ethnicity, and third to immigration/citizenship status. In contrast, Faculty of Color observed bias and/or discrimination due to race/ethnicity most frequently, immigration and citizenship status second, and gender third. Unlike all other racial/ethnic groups, a high
Proportion of Asian/Asian American faculty observed immigration/citizenship status bias/discrimination more frequently than other types of bias/discrimination. Female faculty were equally as likely to report observed bias and/or discrimination due to gender as to race/ethnicity. Male faculty were more likely to base their observed bias due to race/ethnicity than to gender.

*Experienced Bias in Hiring, Tenure, Promotion, Retention, and Salary:* The survey asked about whether faculty personally experienced bias and/or discrimination in processes related to hiring, tenure, promotion, retention, and salary allocation or adjustment. Overall, reports of experienced bias are quite low during the hiring, tenure, promotion, and retention process. However, a higher number of faculty indicated that they experienced bias and/or discrimination in salary allocations or adjustments. In the tenure process, female faculty were over 4 times more likely to experience bias and/or discrimination than male faculty. An even greater proportion of female faculty indicate that they experienced bias and/or discrimination in the promotion process than in the tenure process. When race/ethnicity of faculty are disaggregated, Mixed-race/Other faculty report the highest levels of experienced bias and/or discrimination.

*Conclusions & Recommendations:* While the majority of Faculty of Color reported being satisfied or very satisfied with their place of work, fit within their department and work-life balance, Faculty of Color had higher rates of dissatisfaction. This may be due to the amount of time spent on service and community work. While there were some slight differences in teaching and mentoring load between Faculty of Color and White faculty, there were significantly greater differences in hours spent on service and community work. These are duties that are not well recognized in the tenure and promotion processes. In addition, Faculty of Color are less satisfied with the recognition they receive for their research topics by their colleagues, chair/heads, grant funders, and ACSP. This suggests that some Faculty of Color are not receiving positive feedback on their research and that the research topics that are important to them may not be recognized by internal and external agencies. It appears that there is a misalignment with the types of research topics that Faculty of Color are drawn to and
those that are recognized by the academy or profession, such as community engaged research that takes a considerable amount of time in their schedule.

Although there were significant differences in workload and climate for faculty of color, what was striking was that although female faculty are well represented in the academy, their experiences and perceptions about the planning academy and profession are much more negative than male faculty. On a broad range of factors, female faculty are much more dissatisfied than male faculty. Therefore, we cannot simply use measures of representation to indicate that progress has been made in terms of diversity and inclusion, rather, we need to pay deep attention to how faculty are treated once they are hired and as they progress through their careers in the academy. Academic leaders must be attuned to the range of ways that faculty of color and female faculty invest in time consuming work that is necessary for universities to serve their mission that may not necessarily be recognized or rewarded (ie. committee and service work), and revise tenure and promotion guidelines as to recognize and reward their work, rather than ignoring their importance.
Background

The FWIG Workload and Climate Survey builds on previous efforts by the Association of Collegiate Schools of Planning (ACSP) to understand and address issues of diversity and inclusion in the planning academy dating back to the 1980s. This study seeks to examine whether there are racial/ethnic and gender differences in faculty workload and climate in the planning academy.

A number of ad-hoc committees were developed by the Governing Board throughout the 80s and 90s. But, it was not until the creation of ACSP’s interest groups – FWIG (Faculty Women’s Interest Group) in 1997 and POCIG (Planners of Color Interest Group) in 2007 that there was a continuous and sustained commitment towards the advancement of women and planners of color in the planning academy.

POCIG has conducted a series of surveys that informed this most recent survey sponsored by FWIG. The first was a climate survey of planning institutions related to faculty diversity that was completed in 2009. The 2009 POCIG report found that even with a relative increase in the total number of minority faculty compared to the 1980s and 1990s as well as the incorporation of a diversity criterion in the Planning Accreditation Board (PAB) accreditation standards, a significant number of minority faculty felt strongly that the climate in planning programs/departments was not welcoming to them (Wubneh 2009, 2011; Sweet and Etienne 2011).

Furthermore, the study found that there was attrition among Faculty of Color before tenure due to the failure to be reappointed and that the qualitative experience of Faculty of Color affects their retention and advancement in the field. These results...
led POCIG to recommend “...that ACSP support a more comprehensive study that takes an in-depth look at the root causes of racially and ethnically disparate outcomes and that undertakes best practices for redressing disparities.” This survey contains questions on workload disaggregated by race, ethnicity, and gender that will attempt to gain insight into the qualitative experience of Faculty of Color and whether these experiences shape disparate outcomes.

Following the POCIG study, ACSP’s Diversity Task Force completed a report in 2011 that found that African American, Latinx/Hispanic, and Native American faculty members were severely underrepresented in ACSP member institutions. The 2011 report also indicated that Asians/Asian Americans, as a group, appear to be well represented in the planning academy; however, the task force raised caution about the data limitations of using this broad category to make conclusions because Asians/Asian Americans are a diverse group with wide variations in experiences. Furthermore, at the time, there was little data collected on Native Hawaiians and Pacific Islanders.

“ACSP [should] support a more comprehensive study that takes an in-depth look at the root causes of racially and ethnically disparate outcomes and that undertakes best practices for redressing disparities” POCIG Report, 2009
In 2013, the Committee on Diversity, a special committee at ACSP, was established to continue the work of the Diversity Task Force. Using data submitted by planning programs to the Planning Accreditation Board, this committee examined faculty representation across race/ethnicity and foreign-born status between 2008 and 2013. Among full-time faculty, African American faculty increased in representation from 6% to 8% during this period. Similarly, Asian faculty (it appears that Asian Americans were lumped into this category) also increased in representation from 8% to 11% of total full-time faculty. Latinx/Hispanic (6% to 5%) and Foreign (9% to 6%) faculty decreased in representation over this period. While it appears that Asian faculty, as compared to other racial/ethnic groups, are more represented in the planning academy, caution should be taken in interpreting these numbers. Data from the Planning Accreditation Board (PAB) is often submitted by department heads/chairs or staff members and faculty do not typically self-report race/ethnicity. It is unclear how departments collect this data and therefore, PAB data is not verifiable.

There have been a number of other ACSP diversity related initiatives, including:

- A Diversity Retreat as part of the 2013 ACSP administrator’s conference on November 14-16, 2013 hosted by Ohio State University
- A Pre-Doctoral Conference to recruit and prepare Ph.D. students of color hosted by USC in Summer 2013 and thereafter annually
- A POCIG Climate Survey of Students May 2016
  Phase 1: Survey of Planning Students, 451
  Phase 2: In-Depth Interviews, 25 in-depth individual interviews

As a precursor to this survey, FWIG and POCIG co-sponsored the Bias and Discrimination Workshop at the ACSP conference in Portland, Oregon in October of 2016. This workshop was attended by roughly 40 faculty and students and lasted 3 hours. A professional facilitator led a discussion about the varied ways in which planning faculty and students experience bias and discrimination in the academy and the group discussed ways to address bias and discrimination from an individual and institutional level. The discussion in this workshop revealed much anxiety and pain regarding personal and observed experiences with bias and discrimination. The
information obtained from the workshop guided the development of survey questions in this study of faculty workload and climate.

**Methods**

**WEB-SURVEY**

The survey was distributed to a list of 1900 ACSP affiliated faculty, the FWIG and POCIG interest group listservs, and Facebook group pages, such as Planners2040, FWIG, and POCIG. The intended audience was faculty members who have a primary or secondary appointment in a planning department or who received their PhD from a planning department. Fixed-term faculty, lecturers, research professors, and other faculty level appointments were also welcome to complete the survey. Students and post-doctoral fellows were not included.

The web-based survey was developed using Qualtrics and a link to the survey was distributed to faculty between June 21 and July 19, 2018. The survey took an estimated 20 minutes to complete and included a set of questions related to:

- **Demographics.** These questions captured race, ethnicity, nativity, citizenship status, and country of origin for Latinx/Hispanic and Asian/Asian American faculty
- **Teaching, Service, and Research Workload.** Questions about time and effort spent on teaching, service, and research were asked to gauge the distribution of time and responsibilities
- **Experienced and Observed Bias and Discrimination.** Questions were asked about bias and discrimination in a variety of contexts, including in the home department, university, and at ACSP-sponsored events
ADVISORY COMMITTEE

An advisory committee consisting of 9 members guided the development of the survey questions and the data analysis. The advisory committee was convened two times using video conferencing. Advisory committee members were instrumental in refining the survey questions and guiding the data analysis. The advisory committee members included:

Amanda Ashley, Boise State University
Willow Lung-Amam, University of Maryland
Andrew Greenlee, University of Illinois, Urban-Champagne
Anna Kim, San Diego State University
Carissa Shively, University of Minnesota
James Spencer, Clemson University
Elisabeth Sweet, Temple University
Karen Umemoto, UCLA
Anaid Yerena, University of Washington, Tacoma
Survey Results

WHO COMPLETED THE SURVEY?

FACULTY APPOINTMENTS, RANK, AND LOCATION

A total of 414 faculty members completed surveys. Most were full-time faculty (93.2%), and a much smaller number were part-time faculty (3.9%), emeritus (1.4%), and other (1.4%) (see Table 1). Roughly 56.3% of the faculty in the sample are tenured, 31.2% were tenure-track but not tenured, and 9.9% were not on the tenure track. Survey respondents were almost evenly distributed across rank, with 32.9% of Professors, 26.8% of Associate Professors and 32.9% Assistant Professors in the sample. Instructors, lecturers, adjunct and visiting professors represent nearly 6% of the sample. Most respondents have faculty appointments in the United States (87.4%) or Canada (6.8%). The rest of the respondents (5.8%) have faculty appointments in Australia, Asia, Europe, Latin America, or some other place.

COUNTRY OF BIRTH AND CITIZENSHIP STATUS

The survey asked two questions related to nativity. The first asks about country of birth with 230 respondents who indicated United States and 107 indicated “other.” The other category included 28 different countries, therefore planning faculty come from a diverse set of countries. The second question related to citizenship status, with 285 faculty who responded that they are US citizens. Twenty-one faculty are permanent residents and only 5 are current visa holders. The low number of visa holders and the higher count of faculty who are US citizens (285) as compared to who were born in the US (230) suggests that foreign-born faculty are likely to transition to becoming permanent residents or naturalized US citizens over time.
RACE AND ETHNICITY

Among survey respondents, roughly 68% identified as being White and 32% as Faculty of Color. Among the 131 Faculty of Color, the largest group was Asians/Asian Americans who represented 13.3% of survey respondents. The other groups were nearly evenly split among Black/African American (5.8%), Mixed-Race/Other (6.0%), and Latinx/Hispanic (6.0%) faculty.

GENDER, SEXUAL ORIENTATION, AND FAMILY STATUS

Faculty who responded to the survey were nearly evenly split between males (48.8%) and females (50.5%) with a few people identifying as non-binary or “other.” Roughly 9% of respondents identify as a member of the LGBTQIA+ community. A significant majority of faculty in the sample are married or in a civil union (61.1%). Fewer faculty are single (8.7%), unmarried but living with a partner (3.4%), or divorced, separated, or widowed (6.0%).

INSTITUTIONAL CHARACTERISTICS

The majority of survey respondents work at R1 or intensive research institutions (55.6%), and fewer work at R2 or less intensive research institutions (11.8%), and R3 or teaching-focused institutions (6.8%). Most faculty in the sample work at a public university (83%), with only 15% working at a private university.

Roughly half of the faculty in the sample have a degree in urban planning or urban studies (54.1%). The discipline with the next highest number of faculty is geography (4.1%). Faculty in the sample also receive degrees from anthropology, architecture, criminal justice, ecology, economics, education, engineering, environmental design, studies or policy, landscape architecture, law, marine sciences, political science, public administration, public health, public policy, sociology and others. Thus, planning faculty receive degrees from a wide variety of disciplinary fields.

When asked about their primary appointment, 59.7% report urban planning as their primary academic appointment, with urban studies coming in second at 5.1%. There are 26 other types of home departments where faculty hold their primary academic
appointments. Again, this speaks to the diversity of disciplinary fields that planning faculty receive their degrees from and departments where their primary appointments are located. Roughly 13% of faculty hold a joint appointment. Dual appointments may pose challenges to tenure and promotion review processes.

WORKLOAD AND CLIMATE

This study was designed to better understand faculty workload, allocation of teaching, research and service responsibilities, climate for Faculty of Color and female faculty in academic and professional settings, and observed and experienced bias and discrimination. In particular, the analysis below is intended to determine whether differences exist across race/ethnicity and gender. To analyze racial differences, this study compared faculty who identify as White to those who identify as Faculty of Color. Furthermore, the study disaggregated Faculty of Color into more refined racial and ethnic categories based on individual self-identification as Black/African American, Asian/Asian American, Mixed-Race/Other, and Latinx/Hispanic. Once Faculty of Color is disaggregated in the analysis, the numbers in some categories become very small. Therefore, caution should be taken with interpreting these results and generalizing more widely. To examine gender differences, we only compare survey results between male and female faculty. Due to the small numbers of faculty who identified as non-binary or other and concerns with identification, they are excluded in the disaggregated gender analysis.

Teaching Load

Three questions were used to measure teaching load. They relate to: 1) the number of courses in a standard teaching load, 2) the number of students taught in a typical semester, and 3) hours of in-class teaching per week. When looking at these factors by race/ethnicity and gender, substantial differences did not exist. However, in general, Faculty of Color had a heavier teaching load than White faculty.

Roughly 45% of White faculty taught four courses, while 50% of Non-White faculty taught four courses and nearly 24% Non-White faculty taught five or more courses,
while 22% of Whites do so (see Table 2). Among Faculty of Color, Latinx/Hispanic faculty members have the highest teaching load, with 80% teaching four or more courses. Asian/Asian American faculty have the next highest teach load among Faculty of Color, with 78% teaching four or more courses, and Mixed-race/Other faculty following at 76%. Over 58% of Black/African American faculty taught four or more courses. The distribution across number of courses taught (0 to 5 or more course) between males and females is quite similar, with a greater proportion of female faculty teaching more courses. Over 70% of female faculty taught four or more courses, while 67.8% of male faculty did so (see Table 3).

The survey results reveal that a large proportion of faculty teach small classes. When asked how many total students faculty taught last semester, the most common response was less than 30, with 31 to 60 students following, and more than 60 students last (see Table 4). The distribution in the number of students taught between White vs. Faculty of Color was quite similar. When Faculty of Color were disaggregated, a higher proportion of Latinx/Hispanic faculty, 32%, have more than 60 students in their courses. This is compared with 8% of Black/African American, 11% of Asian/Asian American, and 22% of Mixed-race/Other faculty. The number of students taught by male and female faculty were distributed similarly (see Table 5).

In terms of hours of in-class teaching, a slightly higher proportion of Faculty of Color, 22.8%, relative to white faculty, 19.6%, spent 7 or more hours in the classroom. Most notably, a higher proportion of faculty who identified as Mixed-race/Other and Latinx/Hispanic spent more time in the classroom than other groups (see Table 6). The distribution of hours spent in the classroom did not vary significantly between male and female faculty (see Table 7).

**Mentoring and Advising Load**

To measure mentoring and advising load, the survey included seven questions related to 1) hours spent mentoring other faculty, 2) hours spent mentoring doctoral students, 3) number of undergraduate student advisees, 4) number of master’s student advisees,
5) number of PhD student advisees, 6) number of master’s theses advised, and 7) number of PhD theses advised.

When considering the hours spent mentoring other faculty, there were not substantial differences in responses across groups. However, a higher proportion of White faculty (7.8%) spend 7 or more hours per week mentoring other faculty, whereas only 5.4% of Faculty of Color do so. In addition, 8.7% of female faculty spend 7 or more hours per week mentoring other faculty, while only 5.0% of male faculty do so (see Tables 8 & 9). The picture looks a bit different when considering time spent mentoring doctoral students. A higher proportion of Faculty of Color and male faculty relative to White and female faculty spent 7 or more hours per week mentoring doctoral students (see Tables 10 & 11).

When asked about how many undergraduate students faculty advise, the most frequent response was zero. Among white faculty, 49.5%, and among Faculty of Color, 43.4%, reported that they do not advise undergraduates. The second highest category of number of undergraduates advised for both White faculty and Faculty of Color is 1-5 students, 18.4% and 15.5%, respectively. Female faculty (50.7%) are more likely to indicate that they do not advise undergraduates, while only 44.1% of male faculty indicate as such. However, considering the largest advising load, advising 16 or more undergraduates, male faculty (8.9%) are more likely to do so than female faculty (4.8%) (see Tables 12 & 13).

In terms of advising students at the Master’s level, the most frequently reported category for White faculty is advising 6-15 Master’s students (29.0%), while the largest category for Faculty of Color is advising 1-5 Master’s students (39.5%) (see Table 14). The common response among male faculty is to have 6 to 15 Master’s student advisees, while the common for female faculty is to advise between 1-5 Master’s students (see Table 15). Thus, the survey results indicate that a greater proportion of White and male faculty advise a larger number of Master’s students.

When considering the number of doctoral students advised, the category receiving the highest proportion of both White faculty and Faculty of Color is 1-3 doctoral students
with 35.3% of White faculty and 32.8% of Faculty of Color indicating as such (see Table 16). A higher percentage of Faculty of Color (15.3%) advise 4 or more doctoral students (the highest category) as compared to White faculty (11.3%) (see Table 17). The category that was reported most often for male faculty (36.6%) was to advise 1-3 doctoral students, whereas for female faculty (35.9%), it was zero doctoral students.

The survey inquired about the number of Master’s theses advised and the most frequently reported category for both White faculty and Faculty of Color was 1-3 theses (see Table 18 & 19). However, White faculty were more likely to report that they are advising zero theses (26.9%) than Faculty of Color (21.4%). But, Faculty of Color were more likely to report advising 4 or more theses (22.9%) compared to White faculty (19.1%). Both male and female faculty are more likely to report advising between 1-3 Master’s theses. Female faculty are more likely than male faculty to advise Master’s theses. A total of 59.8% of female faculty advise Master’s theses while 51.5% of male faculty do so. These gender trends are reversed when comparing number of PhD theses advised. Among male faculty, 37.6% chair PhD theses while only 32.1% of female faculty do so (see Table 20). The distribution of responses were very similar for number of PhD theses advised between White and Faculty of Color (see Table 21).

**Committee and Service Load**

To assess the time spent on committee work and service activities, the survey asked about the number of: 1) hours spent on committee work, 2) hours spent on community service, 3) hours spent advising students groups, and 4) hours spent collaborating with community groups. As compared to the measures of teaching and advising loads discussed in the previous section, the differences in committee and service loads across faculty race/ethnicity and gender were more pronounced.

In general, Faculty of Color spent more time on committee work than White faculty. A greater percentage of White faculty (42.2%), as compared to Faculty of Color (23.0%), say they spent only 1-3 hours on committee work per week (see Table 22). In contrast, 36.6% of Faculty of Color spent 4-6 hours per week, whereas only 29.8% of White
faculty spent that same amount of time on committee work. Among Faculty of Color, Mixed-race/Other (63.0%), Latinx/Hispanic (48.0%), and Asian/Asian American (45.5%) faculty spent four or more hours per week on committee work as compared to White (37.1%) or Black/African American (37.5%) faculty. While the distribution of hours spent on committee work per week for male and female faculty were somewhat similar, there were differences at the extremes. A greater proportion of male faculty reported spending zero hours on committee work (4.5%) as compared to female faculty (1.9%) and a larger proportion of female faculty reported spending 7 or more hours on committee work per week (15.3%) as compared to male faculty (10.9%) (see Table 2).

There were marginal differences between White faculty and Faculty of color in the distribution of hours spent on community service. However, a higher proportion of Mixed-race/Other (40.7%) faculty spent 4 or more hours a week on community service. This is compared to 25.5% of White faculty and 26.0% of Faculty of Color (see Table 24). There were also marginal differences in hours spent on community service across gender (see Table 25).

When asked about hours spent advising student groups, White faculty, as compared to Faculty of Color, were more likely to respond that they spent zero hours advising student groups. Over 39% of White faculty reported that they do not spend time advising student groups, whereas only 32.6% of Faculty of Color reported the same (see Table 26). A higher proportion of Faculty of Color, 37.2%, as compared to White faculty, 33.9%, spent 1-3 hours per week advising student groups. Among Faculty of Color, Mixed-race/Other (56%), Latinx/Hispanic (48%), and Asian/Asian American (47.3%) faculty are more likely to spend at least one hour a week advising student groups, especially as compared to Black/African American (29.2%) faculty. Female faculty were more likely than male faculty to spend more hours per week advising student groups (see Table 27).

The survey inquired about hours spent each week collaborating with community groups. A greater proportion of White faculty as compared to Faculty of Color indicated that they spent zero hours per week collaborating with community groups,
24.0% and 16.8%, respectively (see Table 28). Faculty of Color, in general, spent more hours collaborating with community groups than White faculty. In particular, a greater proportion of Mixed-race/Other (77.8%) and Latinx/Hispanic (64.0%) faculty spent at least an hour a week collaborating with community groups when compared to other racial and ethnic groups. In addition, female as compared to male faculty are more likely to have spent time on community collaboration. Only 15.8% of female as compared to 28.2% of male faculty spent zero hours per week collaborating with community groups (see Table 29).

Overall, the results for committee and service load indicate that Faculty of Color, particularly those who identify as Asian/Asian American, Mixed-race/Other, and Latinx/Hispanic, and female faculty spent more hours per week on committee and service work, engaging more frequently with student and community groups.

**Faculty Satisfaction**

The next section analyzes responses related to a host of survey questions focused on faculty satisfaction. All of the questions use the following four response categories: very satisfied, satisfied, dissatisfied, and very dissatisfied.

**Satisfaction with Work-life Balance, Allocation of Time, and Number of Courses Taught**

In general, White and male faculty are more satisfied with their work-life balance than Faculty of Color and female faculty (see Tables 30 & 31). Among White faculty, 49.5% report being satisfied or very satisfied with their work-life balance, while a lower proportion of Faculty of Color, 43.5% reported the same. Faculty of Color have higher rates of dissatisfaction, with 38.2% saying they are dissatisfied or very dissatisfied with their work-life balance, as compared to only 33.9% for White faculty. Among Faculty of Color, faculty who identify as Mixed-Race/Other are most likely to say they are dissatisfied or very dissatisfied with their work-life balance (59.3%). Over 53% of male faculty are satisfied or very satisfied with their work-life balance and 27% say they are dissatisfied or very dissatisfied. The percentage of those reporting that they are
dissatisfied or very dissatisfied with their work-life balance is much greater for female faculty at 42.1%.

The survey asked about satisfaction with the allocation of time between teaching, research, and service duties and the results show differences across race/ethnicity. This was particularly true with the very dissatisfied category in which 16.8% of Faculty of Color were very dissatisfied with their allocation of time, while only 9.2% of White faculty reported the same (see Table 32). Interestingly, among Faculty of Color, a high proportion, 58.4% of Black/African American faculty reported being satisfied or very satisfied with the allocation of time. Asian/Asian American, Mixed-race/other, and Latinx/Hispanic faculty were more likely to report being dissatisfied or very dissatisfied with the allocation of time. There were big differences in satisfaction with allocation of time between male and female faculty. Among male faculty, 52.5% report being satisfied or very satisfied, while only 35.9% of female faculty reported the same (see Table 33). In contrast, 48.3% of female faculty but only 30.7% of male faculty said that they were dissatisfied or very dissatisfied with their allocation of time.

All groups reported high satisfaction with the number of courses taught (see Tables 34 & 35). However, White and male faculty were the most satisfied with the number of courses taught. Among Faculty of Color, Asian/Asian American and Latinx/Hispanic faculty were the most dissatisfied, with 30.9% of Asian/Asian American and 32.0% of Latinx/Hispanic faculty responding that they were dissatisfied or very dissatisfied with the number of courses taught. This is compared to 20.8% of Black/African American and 21.9% of White faculty who said so.

_Satisfaction with Recognition of Teaching effort, Scholarly Work, Service Contributions, and Work on Diversity and Inclusion by Primary Department_

The majority of faculty, across race/ethnicity and gender, indicated that they were satisfied or very satisfied with recognition for their teaching effort by their primary department (see Tables 36 & 37). However, there was variability in satisfaction with recognition of scholarly work and service contributions across groups. Among racial and ethnic groups, Asian/Asian American faculty were most satisfied with recognition
of their scholarly work, with 60.0% saying they were satisfied or very satisfied (see Table 38). White faculty were next, with 58% reported being satisfied or very satisfied. Mixed-race/Other faculty were the least satisfied, with only 33.3% reported being satisfied or very satisfied. There were only minor differences in satisfaction of recognition of scholarly work by gender (see Table 39).

Black/African American report the highest satisfaction with recognition for service contributions by their primary department, while Mixed-race/Other and Latinx/Hispanic faculty reported the lowest rates of satisfaction. About 54.2% of Black/African American, while only 44.4% of Mixed-Race/Other and 44.0% of Latinx/Hispanic faculty said they were satisfied or very satisfied with recognition of their service contributions (see Table 40). Five percent more male faculty were satisfied or very satisfied with recognition of their service duties than female faculty (see Table 41).

In reference to recognition for work on diversity and inclusion by their primary department, Mixed-Race/Other faculty were the least satisfied, with 47.8% reporting being dissatisfied or very dissatisfied (see Table 42). The next least satisfied group were Latinx/Hispanic faculty, followed by Black/African American faculty, who reported being dissatisfied or very dissatisfied with recognition for work on diversity and inclusion at a rate of 28.0% and 25.0%, respectively. Female faculty were more likely than male faculty to report being dissatisfied or very dissatisfied than male faculty by over 4% (see Table 43).

**Recognition of Research Topics by Colleagues, Chair/Head, funders, and ACSP**

There was a fairly even distribution in responses across race/ethnicity and gender that indicated satisfaction with recognition for research topics by colleagues, with over 50% of all groups (except Mixed-race/Other) reporting being satisfied or very dissatisfied (see Tables 44 & 45). There was much more variation in recognition of faculty research topics by chair/head, funders, and ACSP. Black/African American faculty were substantially more likely to report being satisfied or very satisfied with their chair/head’s recognition of their research topic (70.8%) than other racial/ethnic groups.
(see Table 46). White faculty came in next, reporting 55.8% satisfied or very satisfied and Mixed-Race/Other came in last (37.0%). There were slight differences across genders in relation to satisfaction with recognition for research topic by chair/head, with Males indicating being very satisfied 3% more often than females (see Table 47).

In regards to satisfaction with recognition of research topic by funders, female faculty reported the highest satisfaction among all racial, ethnic, and gender groups (see Tables 48 & 49). Over 49% of female faculty reported that they were satisfied or very satisfied with funders’ recognition of their research topic. This is compared to 41.6% of male faculty. The opposite was true for recognition of research topics by ACSP, where female faculty reported less satisfaction. Whereas 41.1% of male but only 34.0% of female faculty reported being satisfied or very satisfied with ACSP’s recognition of their research topic (see Table 51). Among racial and ethnic groups, Latinx/Hispanic faculty reported the lowest satisfaction, with only 24% reporting being satisfied or very satisfied with ACSP’s recognition of their research topic (see Table 50).

**Fit in the Department and Overall Satisfaction with Primary Department as a Place of Work**

Feeling that you are a good fit with and belong in a department is important to job satisfaction. Overall, White and male faculty report the highest rates of satisfaction with their fit in the department and overall satisfaction with their primary department as a place of work. Nearly 68% of white faculty as compared to 51.9% of Faculty of Color report being satisfied or very satisfied with their fit in the department (see Table 52). Among Faculty of Color, Latinx/Hispanic faculty were most satisfied, and Mixed-race/Other faculty were least satisfied with fit. A high proportion of male faculty, 66.8%, reported being satisfied or very satisfied with fit, while 59.8% of female faculty reported so (see Table 53).

All groups reported fairly high levels of overall satisfaction with their primary department as a place of work, with the exception of Mixed-Race/Other and Latinx/Hispanic faculty. Only 33.3% of Mixed-race/Other and 52% of Latinx/Hispanic faculty reported being satisfied or very satisfied (see Table 54). This is compared to
60% of all other racial/ethnic/gender groups that reported being satisfied or very satisfied. Female faculty reported more often being dissatisfied or very dissatisfied than male faculty on this measure (see Table 55).

**Climate for Faculty of Color**

The following section discusses the climate for Faculty of Color in the home department, university, and at ACSP-sponsored activities and events. Among all three of these environments, the climate within the home department for Faculty of Color is the most respectful of Faculty of Color. A majority of faculty report that the climate for Faculty of Color in the home department is respectful or very respectful. Among all racial/ethnic groups, except Mixed-race/Other, over 60% of faculty say that the climate for Faculty of Color in the home department is either respectful or very respectful (see Table 56). However, only 44.4% of Mixed-Race/Other faculty say the same. In fact, Mixed-race/Other faculty are the most dissatisfied with the climate for Faculty of Color in the home department. Female faculty (57.9%), as compared to male faculty (67.8%) are roughly 10% less likely to say that the climate for Faculty of Color is respectful or very respectful (see Table 57).

As compared to the climate in the home department, faculty indicate that the climate within the university is more mixed, polarized, or disrespectful. In total 52.9% of faculty indicated that the climate was respectful or very respectful, while 24.6% said that it was mixed or polarized (see Table 58). Disaggregating responses by race and ethnicity showed that Asian/Asian American faculty had the highest rate of reporting that the climate for Faculty of Color was respectful or very respectful (60.0%). Mixed-race/Other faculty had very different experiences than Asian/Asian American faculty with 44.4% of Mixed-race/Other faculty reporting that the university climate was mixed or polarized, and 14.8% indicating that the university climate was disrespectful or very disrespectful. Female faculty were 5% less likely than male faculty to say that the university climate for Faculty of Color was respectful or very respectful (see Table 59).
The survey also asked about the climate for Faculty of Color at ACSP sponsored activities and events. It should be noted that there were a large number of missing or not applicable responses to this question. This may be because respondents are not affiliated with ACSP or they do not attend ACSP-sponsored events. In general, very few faculty (1.4%) indicated that the climate for Faculty of Color at ACSP was disrespectful or very disrespectful (see Table 60). In total, 44.9% of faculty said that the climate at ACSP was respectful or very respectful. However, there were a number of faculty, 16.8%, who reported that the climate was mixed or polarized. This was more common among faculty who identified as Mixed-race/Other (33.3%), Black/African American (16.7%), and (17.7%) female faculty. Female faculty (50.0%) were much less likely than male faculty (40.7%) to say that the climate at ACSP was respectful or very respectful (see Table 61).

**Climate for Female Faculty**

The survey also asked faculty about their perspectives on the climate for female faculty in the home department, university, and ACSP-sponsored activities and events. A higher proportion of White faculty (63.3%) relative to Faculty of Color (55.0%) indicated that the climate for female faculty in the home department was respectful or very respectful (see Table 62). Faculty of Color (24.4%) were more likely than White Faculty (18.7%) to indicate that the climate for female faculty in the home department was mixed or polarized, with Mixed-race/Other faculty (48.1%) reporting highest rate of mixed or polarized climate for female faculty. A higher proportion of male faculty (64.4%) as compared to female faculty (56.9%) reported that the climate for female faculty in the home department is respectful or very respectful. Female faculty were more likely to report that the climate for female faculty in the department was mixed, polarized, disrespectful, or very disrespectful. Combining all of those response categories, 32.1% of female faculty compared to 19.3% of male faculty selected those responses (see Table 63).

Although the majority of faculty (52.9%) indicated that the climate for female faculty at the university was respectful or very respectful, faculty also indicated high levels of mixed or polarized climates at their universities (see Table 64). Among all faculty,
25.6% indicated a mixed or polarized university climate, with more Faculty of Color (32.1%) indicating so. Among Faculty of Color, Mixed-race/Other (37.0%) and Latinx/Hispanic (36.0%) faculty were more likely to report a mixed or polarized university environment. Male faculty (57.9%), relative to female faculty (48.3%), were more likely to report a respectful or very respectful university climate for female faculty (see Table 65). A much higher proportion of female faculty relative to male faculty reported a mixed, polarized, disrespectful, or very disrespectful university climate for female faculty.

Overall, very few faculty, 1.9%, reported that the climate at ACSP-sponsored activities and events was disrespectful or very disrespectful for female faculty (see Table 66). The most common responses among all groups, with a few exceptions, was that the climate at ACSP-sponsored activities and events for female faculty was respectful or very respectful. The exception was that several groups reported higher rates of a mixed, polarized, disrespectful, or very disrespectful climate at ACSP for female faculty. This included Mixed-race/Other (37.0%), Black/African American (20.9%), and female (19.6%) faculty. Male faculty were much less likely than female faculty to report that the climate at ACSP was mixed, polarized, or disrespectful for female faculty, with only 10.9% reporting so (see Table 67).

**Observed Bias and/or Discrimination in Hiring, Tenure, Promotion, Retention, and Salary**

When examining observed bias and/or discrimination in hiring, tenure, promotion, and retention, there is a clear pattern that emerges: White and male faculty report much higher rates of never having observed bias and/or discrimination than Faculty of Color and female faculty. This pattern, however, does not pertain to observed bias and/or discrimination in salary. Among the response categories (Very Frequently, Frequently, Sometimes and Never) the most common response among White (43.1%) and Faculty of Color (32.1%) was that they never observed bias and discrimination in the hiring process (see Table 68). This is also true of Black/African American (33.3%), Asian/Asian American (38.2%), and Latinx/Hispanic (36.0%) faculty. However, this is not true for Mixed-race/other faculty who reported higher rates of observing bias and/or
discrimination in hiring sometimes (37.0%) and frequently or very frequently (33.3%). Female faculty, relative to male faculty, have a higher rate of reporting that they sometimes, frequently, or very frequently observe bias and/or discrimination in the hiring process (see Table 69).

The results for observed bias and/or discrimination in the tenure process mirror those of the hiring process, with White and male faculty having higher rates of never observing bias and/or discrimination and Mixed-race/other faculty reporting the highest rates of observed bias and/or discrimination (see Table 70). There are large gender differences, with 50% of male faculty saying that they have never observed bias and/or discrimination in the tenure process, while only 36.4% of female faculty indicate as such (see Table 71).

The survey did not differentiate between different type of promotions, such as a pre-tenure promotion vs. post-tenure promotion, therefore, the results relate to all promotion. The response patterns across racial/ethnic and gender groups are similar to observed bias and/or discrimination in the hiring and tenure processes, as described above. White (44.2%) and male (48.5%) faculty were the most likely to report that they have never observed bias and/or discrimination in the promotion process (see Table 72. Black/African American (37.5%) and Asian/Asian American (34.5%) faculty also reported high rates of never observing bias and/or discrimination in the promotion process. Mixed-race/Other and Latinx/Hispanic faculty were more likely than other racial/ethnic groups to indicate that they observed bias and/or discrimination sometimes, frequently, and very frequently in the promotion process. Female faculty (33.5%), as compared to male faculty (18.8%), were also much more likely to have observed any level of bias and/or discrimination in the promotion process (i.e. sometimes, frequently, or more frequently) (see Table 73).

White faculty (42.4%) were much more likely than Faculty of Color (28.2%) to report that they have never observed an incident of bias and/or discrimination in the retention process (see Table 74). Among Faculty of Color, Black/African American (45.8%) more often than other groups reported that they never observed bias and/or discrimination in the retention process. Mixed-race/Other (25.9%) and Latinx/Hispanic
(20.0%) faculty most commonly reported that the frequently or very frequently observed bias and/or discrimination in the retention process. Female faculty responded that they observed bias and/or discrimination in the retention process 12.9% of the time, as compared to male faculty who only did so 5.0% of the time (see Table 75).

The next questions asked about observed bias and/or discrimination in salary allocations or adjustments. Compared to previous questions about observed bias and/or discrimination, a smaller proportion of males and Whites indicated never observing bias and/or discrimination in salary considerations. Only 27.6% of Whites and 33.2% of males indicated that they have never observed bias and/or discrimination in salary allocations or adjustments, as compared to 25.2% of Faculty of Color and 20.6% of female faculty (see Table 76). Among all racial and ethnic groups, Black/African American faculty were the most likely to respond that they had never observed bias and/or discrimination in salary allocations or adjustments, with 33.3% saying so. Among the groups that were analyzed, Mixed-race/Other (33.3%) and female (23.9%) were most likely to indicate that they observed bias and/or discrimination frequently or very frequently. Female faculty were over three times more likely to report that they observed bias and/or discrimination in salary allocations frequently or very frequently at 23.9% than male faculty at 7.4% (see Table 77).

**Observed Basis of Bias and/or Discrimination**

If faculty observed bias and/or discrimination, they were asked what the basis was. The choices provided included: Age, Race/Ethnicity, Sexuality, Disability, Immigration/Citizenship, and Other. The three most common basis for observed bias and/or discrimination were race/ethnicity, gender, and immigration/citizenship status. However, different groups observed the rate of bias and/or discrimination due to these factors unevenly. White faculty (36.2%) reported observed bias and/or discrimination due to gender most commonly, with racial/ethnic (33.1%) second, and immigration/citizenship (8.5%) status third (see Table 78). In contrast, Faculty of Color (33.3%) observed bias and/or discrimination due to race/ethnicity most frequently, immigration and citizenship status (23.1%) second, and gender (19.2%) third. Unlike
all other racial/ethnic groups, a high proportion of Asian/Asian American faculty, 44.8%, observed immigration/citizenship status bias/discrimination more frequently than other types of bias/discrimination. Female faculty were equally as likely to report observed bias and/or discrimination due to gender (31.1%) as to race/ethnicity (31.1%) (see Table 79). Male faculty were more likely to base their observed bias due to race/ethnicity (36.0%) than to gender (29.1%).

**Experienced Bias and/or discrimination in Hiring, Tenure, Promotion, Retention, and Salary**

The survey asked about whether faculty personally experienced bias and/or discrimination in processes related to hiring, tenure, promotion, retention, and salary allocation or adjustment. In general, reports of experienced bias are relatively low during the hiring, tenure, promotion, and retention process. However, a higher number of faculty indicated that they experienced bias and/or discrimination in salary allocations or adjustments. There were noticeable differences in experienced bias and/or discrimination across race, ethnicity, and gender.

Faculty of Color were nearly twice as likely to experience bias and/or discrimination in the hiring and tenure process. In the hiring process, 12.7% of Faculty of Color as compared to 6.8% of White faculty indicated that they experienced bias (see Table 80). In the tenure process, 13.6% of Faculty of Color, while only 7.3% of White faculty reported that they experienced bias and/or discrimination (see Table 82). Faculty of Color, especially Mixed-Race/Other faculty, were more likely to experience bias and/or discrimination in the promotion progress than White faculty (See Table 84).

The differences between male and female faculty in levels of experienced bias and/or discrimination in the hiring process was small, only a 3% difference, however, the difference in experienced bias and/or discrimination during the tenure process between gender was pronounced (see Table 81). In the tenure process, female faculty were over 4 times more likely to experience bias and/or discrimination than male faculty, with 14.9% of female and 3.5% of male faculty reporting incidents of bias and/or discrimination in the tenure process (see Table 83). An even greater proportion
of female faculty, 22.2%, indicate that they experienced bias and/or discrimination in the promotion process (see Table 85). This is compared with only 7.1% of male faculty. In the retention process, Faculty of Color and female faculty were more likely to experience bias and/or discrimination than White and male faculty (see Tables 86 & 87).

Relative to all the other questions about experienced bias and/or discrimination, salary discrimination was the most common type of bias and/or discrimination reported for all groups, although Faculty of Color and female faculty experienced the highest level. Among Faculty of Color, 34.3%, as compared to 23.6% of White faculty, experienced bias and/or discrimination in salary allocations or adjustments (see Table 88). A very high percentage of female faculty, 40.7%, experienced bias and/or discrimination in salary allocations or adjustments (see Table 89). This is compared to only 12.4% of male faculty.

Conclusions & Recommendations

The study builds on previous efforts by the Association of Collegiate Schools of Planning (ACSP) to understand and address issues of diversity and inclusion in the planning academy. While other studies have looked at racial, ethnic, and gender representation, focusing on how to promote diversity within the planning academy, this study focuses on the differences in workload and climate across faculty from different racial, ethnic, and gender groups. The results from this study are intended to provide a better understanding about the environment in which planning faculty work and what factors might explain dissatisfaction in the academy, attrition, and slower career progression of Faculty of Color and female faculty.

This study found that White and male faculty have the highest satisfaction with their place of work, fit within their department, and work-life balance. These groups express high levels of satisfaction with recognition of their teaching, research, and service by their colleagues, chair/head, funders, and the professional community. In addition, their experience in the academy involves much lower levels of observed and experienced biases and discrimination, across a range of processes that recognize and
reward faculty for their work, including hiring, tenure, promotion, retention, and salary allocations and adjustments. In fact, a large proportion of White and male faculty report having never observed or experienced bias and/or discrimination.

While the majority of Faculty of Color reported being satisfied or very satisfied with their place of work, fit within their department and work-life balance, Faculty of Color had higher rates of dissatisfaction. This may be due to the amount of time spent on service and community work. While there were some slight differences in teaching and mentoring load between Faculty of Color and White faculty, there were significantly greater differences in hours spent on service and community work. These are duties that are not well recognized in the tenure and promotion processes. In addition, Faculty of Color are less satisfied with the recognition they receive for their research topics by their colleagues, chair/heads, grant funders, and ACSP. This suggests that some Faculty of Color are not receiving positive feedback on their research and that the research topics that are important to them may not be recognized by internal and external agencies. There is a misalignment with the types of research topics that Faculty of Color are drawn to and those that are recognized by the academy or profession, such as community engaged research that take a considerable amount of time in their schedule.

“There is a misalignment with the types of research topics that Faculty of Color are drawn to and those that are recognized by the academy or profession, such as community engaged research that take a considerable amount of time in their schedule.”

When the responses for Faculty of Color are disaggregated, the cells become very small, therefore, these results should be interpreted with caution. With that caveat, a trend that stands out in the analysis is that Mixed-race/Other faculty, relative to other groups, express the most dissatisfaction with their work-life balance, fit within the department, and overall satisfaction with their place of work. This may be a result of
their higher teaching loads, mentoring loads, and amount of time spent on service and community work compared to other racial and ethnic groups. Mixed-race/Other faculty also report the highest levels of observed and experienced bias and/or discrimination in hiring, tenure, promotion, retention, and salary allocation/adjustments. They indicate that the source of the bias is due to race/ethnicity and immigration status. Many faculty that identify as Mixed-race/Other are bi-racial and/or from middle-eastern countries. Therefore, their racially ambiguous and non-US citizen status may lead them to receive less institutional support even though they may need additional support to overcome racial, class, and cultural barriers to succeed and advance in the academy.

Black/African American, Asian/Asian American, and Latinx/Hispanic faculty were more likely to indicate that they are satisfied rather than dissatisfied with their place of work, fit within their department, and work-life balance. However, they also expressed greater dissatisfaction than White faculty members. Among Faculty of Color, Black/African American faculty were most satisfied with recognition for their teaching, scholarly work, service contributions, and work on diversity and inclusion. They were also satisfied with recognition for their scholarly work by colleagues, chair/head, grant funders, and ACSP. Unexpectedly, they were less likely to observe and experience bias and/or discrimination in the various hiring, promotion, and retention processes than other faculty of color. These somewhat more positive findings for Black/African American faculty may point to a greater awareness in the academy and profession about the underrepresentation of Black/African American faculty and the available resources dedicated to support these scholars and their scholarship. Their satisfaction with their work environment and recognition of their contributions may also be a function of Black/African American faculty achieving success in the planning academic and professional settings.

Asian/Asian American and Latinx/Hispanic faculty share some similar characteristics worth noting. Relative to White and Black/African American faculty, they shoulder a heavier teaching and mentoring load. This may explain why over one-third of Asian/Asian American and Latinx/Hispanic faculty indicate some level of dissatisfaction with their allocation of time between teaching, research, and service. These two
groups of faculty also report high levels of dissatisfaction with the number of courses they taught and recognition for teaching efforts. In contrast, however, they are satisfied with the recognition received for their scholarly work and service activities. Future research should examine whether Asian/Asian American and Latinx/Hispanic faculty are being hired to teach greater number of courses and whether this heavier teaching and mentoring load slows down or inhibits their progress towards tenure and promotion.

When male and female faculty are compared, female faculty indicated that they are were much more dissatisfied with their place of work, fit within their department, and work-life balance. Female faculty were nearly twice as likely as their male counterparts to say they were dissatisfied with their work-life balance. Nearly half of female faculty also said that they were dissatisfied or very dissatisfied with the allocation of time between teaching, research, and service. The factors driving this dissatisfaction may have more to do with their time spent on committee and service work than teaching and mentoring load. When compared to male faculty, the teaching loads of female faculty are not substantially different and male faculty have a heavier student mentoring load than female faculty. However, a greater proportion of male faculty indicated that they spent zero hours per week on committee work, community service, advising student groups, and collaborating with community groups. If the responsibility of committee and service work fall disproportionately on female faculty, these activities should be recognized and rewarded in faculty evaluations, promotions, and rewards, such as salary allocations or adjustments. Unfortunately, these important administrative and departmental community building activities that fall disproportionately to female faculty are often overlooked and undervalued in the academy and the profession.

Female faculty feel underappreciated for their work. They report higher levels of dissatisfaction than male faculty on being recognized for a range of job-related duties, including teaching, scholarly work, service, and contributions to diversity and inclusion. Female faculty also express greater dissatisfaction than male faculty with recognition for the topics that they research by their colleagues and at ACSP-sponsored activities and events. Administrators and supervisors of female faculty should consider ways in
which female faculty can be recognized and rewarded for their contributions to serving
the mission of the academy and profession. Rewarding female faculty’s contributions
with increased salaries may be one quantifiable way to show recognition. Another way
would be to value these activities in the tenure and promotion process in ways that are
commensurate with the time and dedication they invest in these activities.

Female faculty are much more attuned to bias and/or discrimination than male faculty.
Female faculty more often observed bias and/or discrimination frequently or very
frequently in the hiring, tenure, promotion, retention, and salary
allocation/adjustment processes than male faculty. They attribute the basis of this bias
and discrimination most often to issues related to race/ethnicity and gender. When
asked about personal experiences with bias and/or discrimination, there was a small
gap between male and female faculty’s experiences in the hiring process, with female
faculty reporting only slighter higher rates of experienced bias and/or discrimination.
However, throughout a female faculty’s career, they report much greater disparities in
experienced bias and/or discrimination at different milestones. Female, as compared
to male faculty, are roughly four times more likely to experience bias and/or
discrimination in the tenure process, over three times more likely in the promotion
process, and over three times more likely in the salary allocation/adjustment process.
Female faculty report the highest rates of experienced bias and/or discrimination in
the salary allocation/adjustment and promotion processes. Thus, for female faculty,
bias and/or discrimination is less prevalent in the hiring process, however, they
experience continued inequities throughout their careers. This may lead to lower job
satisfaction.
This study examined faculty’s perspectives on the climate for Faculty of Color and female faculty within the home department, university, and ACSP. While most faculty indicated that the climate for Faculty of Color and female faculty was respectful or very respectful in all these settings, there were a greater proportion of faculty that indicated that the climate for female faculty was less respectful than even for Faculty of Color (as measured by responses that indicated a mixed, polarized, disrespectful, or very disrespectful climate). The university setting is the least respectful climate for both Faculty of Color and female faculty. As public universities and education have come under attack in some states and budget cuts have impacted all universities during the Great Recession and thereafter, the university climate can be quite polarizing or even hostile to Faculty of Color and female faculty. Department chairs and heads may consider ways to buffer their faculty from the negative climate that sometimes exists at the university level. While a smaller proportion of faculty indicated that the climate at ACSP-sponsored activities and events was negative, Mixed-race/Other faculty and female faculty were much more likely to view the climate at ACSP-sponsored activities and events as mixed, polarized, disrespectful, or very disrespectful.

This study offers evidence that the experiences of faculty across race, ethnicity, and gender in the planning academy and profession varies significantly. Although there were significant differences in workload and climate for faculty of color, what was striking was that even though female faculty are well represented in the academy, their experiences and perceptions about the planning academy and profession are

“Female, as compared to male faculty, are roughly four times more likely to experience bias and/or discrimination in the tenure process, over three times more likely in the promotion process, and over three times more likely in the salary allocation/adjustment process. Female faculty report the highest rates of experienced bias and/or discrimination in the salary allocation/adjustment and promotion processes.”
much more negative than male faculty. On a broad range of factors, female faculty are much more dissatisfied than male faculty. Therefore, we cannot simply use measures of racial, ethnic, and gender representation to indicate that progress has been made in terms of diversity and inclusion, but rather we should consider how faculty are treated once they are hired and as they progress through their careers in the academy. Academic leaders must be attuned to the range of ways that Faculty of Color and female faculty invest in time consuming work that is necessary for the university to stay afloat that may not necessarily be recognized or rewarded (ie. committee and service work), and revise tenure and promotion guidelines as to recognize and reward their work, rather than ignoring their importance.

“On a broad range of factors, female faculty are much more dissatisfied than male faculty. Therefore, we cannot simply use measures of representation to indicate that progress has been made in terms of diversity and inclusion, rather, we need to pay deep attention to how faculty are treated once they are hired and as they progress through their careers in the academy.”