UNT Faculty Separation Report, AY 2021-22

This report includes data from the exit survey questionnaire and face-to-face interviews coconducted by the Office of Faculty Success.

For AY 2021-2022, 82 faculty were contacted and offered to complete the online survey and/or participate in an in-person or virtual face-to-face interview. Of those contacted, fourteen (14) completed the survey process (19.5% response rate) and eight (8) face-to-face interviews were conducted (9.8% response rate).

Caveats:

- As responses to the online survey are anonymous, it is unknown who might have participated in both the survey and the interview.
- For all Likert items across the questionnaire and interview, 1 = strongly disagree/least positive, 5 = strongly agree/highest positive.

SURVEY RESULTS

Respondent Demographics

The responding faculty came to UNT between 1995 and 2021 with the median being 2016. Separation year was defined as September 1, 2021–August 31, 2022.

Of survey participants, 83.3% identified as female (n = 10), 16.7% identified as male (n = 2), 0% identified as transgender/nonbinary, and there were 2 non-respondents. Their stated ethnicity was European American/White (non-Hispanic) (n = 8, 66.7%), Asian American/Pacific Islander (n = 2, 16.7%), African American (n = 1, 8.3%), Hispanic/Latinx (n = 1, 8.3%), 0% identified as either American Indian/Alaskan Native or Multi-Racial (two or more races), and there were 2 non-respondents. One respondent identified as a member of the LGBTQ community. Relative to the population of possible respondents on the complete list, female faculty (83.3%) are overrepresented in our data as compared to percentage of women faculty (45.1%) at UNT. White faculty are appropriately represented in our data (66.7%) as compared to total number of white faculty (62.3%).

The most faculty separations occurred in the College of Liberal Arts and Social Sciences (n = 5, 35.7%). A complete list of the colleges is displayed in Table 1.

Table 1. UNT Colleges in which the Respondents Taught

UNT Colleges Represented	Frequency	Percent
College of Liberal Arts and Social Sciences (formerly part of Arts and Sciences)	5	35.7%
College of Education	3	21.4%
College of Science (formerly part of Arts and Sciences)	2	14.3%
College of Business	1	7.1%



1

College of Merchandising, Hospitality, and Tourism	1	7.1%
College of Music	1	7.1%
Other (please specify)	1	7.1%
College of Information	0	0.0%
College of Visual Arts and Design	0	0.0%
Mayborn School of Journalism	0	0.0%
UNT Libraries	0	0.0%
College of Engineering	0	0.0%
College of Arts and Sciences (Prior to 2017)	0	0.0%
College of Health and Public Service (formerly Public Affairs and Community Service)	0	0.0%
Total	14	100.0%

Half of the respondents (n = 7, 50.0%) had been tenured at UNT. Full professors were the most common respondents (n = 5, 35.7%). A complete list of the respondent titles is displayed in Table 2.

Table 2. Respondent Titles at UNT

Position Title	Frequency	Percent
Lecturer	2	14.3%
Senior Lecturer	1	7.1%
Principal Lecturer	1	7.1%
Assistant Professor	1	7.1%
Associate Professor	2	14.3%
Professor	5	35.7%
Other (please specify)	1	7.1%
Assistant Librarian	0	0.0%
Associate Librarian	0	0.0%
Librarian	0	0.0%
Clinical Assistant Professor	1	7.1%
Clinical Associate Professor	0	0.0%
Clinical Professor	0	0.0%
Total	14	100.0%

Mentoring

Approximately 36% of respondents had been assigned a department mentor (n = 5) with fewer assigned a mentor outside the department (n = 1, 7.1%). Most did not participate in a mentoring-related programs through the Office for Faculty Success (n = 8, 57.1%); however mandatory mentoring for new faculty was put into place by OFS in 2015. Of those that did participate, professional development workshops, such as those covering promotion and tenure and writing strategies were the most commonly noted activity.



Respondents noted mid-level satisfaction with mentoring (M = 3.5, SD = 1.4, with 27% of respondents marking strongly disagreeing or somewhat disagreeing that they were satisfied with the quality of the mentoring) and mid-level satisfaction with annual evaluation feedback (M = 2.9, SD = 1.57, with 41.6% of the respondents marking strongly disagreeing or somewhat disagreeing that they had received quality feedback from annual evaluations).

Experience

In terms of their experience at UNT, respondents were most favorable about their benefits (M = 3.6, SD = 0.9), the orientations they received as new faculty members (M = 3.5, SD = 0.9), the clarity of P & T expectations at the university level (M = 3.0, SD = 1.1) and their salary (M = 2.9, SD = 0.9).

Respondents were least satisfied about the collegiality of others in their department (M = 2.3, SD = 1.2) with 71.4% of the respondents marking very or somewhat dissatisfied. Additional areas of dissatisfaction were being treated with fairness and equity (M = 2.3, SD = 1.2) with 50.0% of the respondents marking very or somewhat dissatisfied and balance between their home life and work (M = 2.3, SD = 1.2) with 50.0% of the respondents marking very or somewhat dissatisfied. A complete list of overall UNT experience means can be seen in Table 3.

Table 3. Satisfaction Ratings across UNT Experiences

*Note: Items are rated on a 4-point rating scale.

How satisfied were you with the following at UNT?	Mean	SD	Max	Min	N
Benefits	3.6	0.9	4	1	12
The orientations I received as a new faculty member	3.5	0.9	4	1	10
The clarity of promotion and/or tenure expectations at the university level	3.0	1.0	4	1	11
Salary	2.9	0.9	4	1	12
The clarity of promotion and/or tenure expectations at the department level	2.8	1.2	4	1	10
The clarity of promotion and/or tenure expectations at the college level	2.7	1.1	4	1	11
The balance between my home life and my work	2.3	1.2	4	1	12
My treatment (fairness, equity)	2.3	1.2	4	1	12
The collegiality of others in my department	2.2	1.2	4	1	12



Work Environment

Respondents tended to rate overall work environment slightly higher than the median in terms of perceived fairness towards and respect for faculty with disabilities, international faculty, and faculty of color. As Tables 4 and 5 indicate, all means are at or above 3.2.

Table 4. Perceptions of Fairness for Faculty Sub-groups

Sub-group	Mean	SD	Max	Min	N
Disabilities	3.5	1.2	5	1	11
International	3.4	1.3	5	1	11
Non-English	3.5	1.2	5	1	11

Table 5. Perceptions of Respect for Faculty Sub-groups

Sub-group	Mean	SD	Max	Min	N
Disabilities	3.5	1.2	5	1	11
International	3.4	1.3	5	1	11
Non-English	3.5	1.2	5	1	11

Female respondents had a slightly higher perception of fair treatment and respect for female faculty relative to male respondents. These statistics are presented in Tables 6 and Table 7.

Table 6. Perceptions of Fair Treatment of Women Faculty

Respondent Group	Mean	SD	Max	Min	N
Overall	2.5	1.2	5	1	12
Female	2.6	1.2	5	1	10
Male	2.0	1.0	3	1	2

Table 7. Perceptions of Respect for Women Faculty

Respondent Group	Mean	SD	Max	Min	N
Overall	2.4	1.3	5	1	12
Female	2.5	1.3	5	1	10
Male	2.0	1.0	3	1	2

With respect to perceptions of fair treatment and respect for faculty of color, the overall mean was 2.9 (N = 11); however, ratings differed across respondent groups (see Tables 8 and 9). White faculty provided the highest ratings of both fair treatment and respect (M = 3.7, n = 7).



Non-white faculty reported relatively lower perceptions of fair treatment and respect (M = 1.5, n = 4), and Black and Hispanic faculty provided the lowest ratings (M = 1.0, n = 2).

Table 8. Perceptions of Fair Treatment of Faculty of Color

Respondent Group	Mean	SD	Max	Min	N
Overall	2.9	1.4	5	2	11
Non-white faculty	1.5	0.9	3	1	4
Black and Hispanic	1.0	0.0	3	1	2
White faculty	3.7	1.0	5	2	7

Table 9. Perceptions of Respect for Faculty of Color

Respondent Group	Mean	SD	Max	Min	N
Overall	2.9	1.4	5	2	11
Non-white faculty	1.5	0.9	3	1	4
Black and Hispanic	1.0	0.0	3	1	2
White faculty	3.7	1.0	5	2	7

Only one respondent identified as LGBTQ. Due to this small proportion and concerns regarding anonymity, comparisons between LGBTQ and non-LGBTQ are not available. However, overall ratings (from both LGBTQ and non-LGBTQ faculty) on fair treatment of and respect for LGBTQ faculty are provided in Table 10.

Table 10. Overall Perceptions of Fair Treatment and Respect for LGBTQ Faculty

Ratings for the extent that UNT treats LGBTQ faculty fairly.	Mean	SD	Max	Min	N
Fair Treatment	3.5	1.2	5	1	11
Respect	3.5	1.2	5	1	11

Overall, respondents rated UNT moderately for providing faculty with professional development to enhance skills in their discipline (M = 2.9, SD = 1.6). They were more positive about UNT as a workplace that encourages diversity and inclusion (M = 3.3, SD = 1.4) and with providing faculty with professional development to enhance skills in creating an inclusive learning environment (M = 3.2, SD = 1.4). When asked about recommending employment at UNT to their peers, respondents provided a moderate rating (M = 2.8, SD = 1.6).



Perceptions of Bias

We assessed perceptions of bias in an item that asked participants if they experienced any type of harassment, discrimination, or bias. Participants could select multiple experiences, if applicable. Six (6) respondents indicated they had *not* experienced any form of harassment, discrimination or bias. Of the respondents that did report this type of experiences, they reported some form of mistreatment based on the following: age (n = 2), job title or position (n = 2), other (n = 2), gender/sex (n = 1), linguistic heritage (n = 1), and race/ethnicity (n = 1). For those who reported "other," further explanations included: unequitable treatment based upon race and international/immigration status.

Reported examples from the types of perceived bias include:

- Poorer working conditions and assignment due to racial discrimination.
- "Junior faculty" having less participation or voice in decision-making.

For those who reported experiencing mistreatment, the most common person perceived to have harassed the faculty member was an administrator (Dean's level or above, n = 4), a supervisor (below the Dean's level, n = 3), a colleague (n = 2), a peer in another department (n = 1), a student (n = 1), and "other" (n = 1). The "other" response specified a dean.

The most common form of reported mistreatment was inequitable treatment as compared to other colleagues (n = 5, 33.3%) and being ignored or excluded (n = 5, 33.3%). Denial of leadership, promotion, tenure, recommendation or other opportunities was also identified as a common form of mistreatment (n = 3, 20.0%). Half of the respondents did not report the mistreatment (3 out of 6 responses, 50%), and all respondents reported that the issue was not resolved (3 out of 3 responses, 100%). One respondent explained that the complaint was not deemed as reaching the level of "harassment" despite having four documented cases of discrimination. Another respondent stated that they informally reported the issue to the Provost, but no resolution was provided.

Separation

Survey participants were asked to identify the main reasons for leaving UNT. Respondents could select multiple reasons and the most commonly reported separation reasons were inhospitable work environments (n = 6, 15.8%). and "other" (n = 6, 15.8%). An additional common reason was inadequate recognition for work (n = 4, 10.5%) and inadequate career advancement (n = 4, 10.5%). When respondents were asked to choose the *single* main reason for leaving UNT, they selected inadequate career advancement (n = 3, 25.0%), inhospitable work environment (n = 2, 16.7%) and "other" (n = 2, 16.7%). For those that selected "other reasons," they reported separating for the following:

- A hostile work environment due to discrimination and harassment by a dean (1)
- Retirement (1)

A complete list of reasons for leaving UNT can be seen in Table 11.



Table 11. Main Reasons for Separation (select all that apply)

Main Reason for Leaving	N	%
Other (please specify)	6	15.8%
Inhospitable work environment	6	15.8%
Inadequate recognition for work	4	10.5%
Inadequate career advancement	4	10.5%
Work environment not inclusive of differences	3	7.9%
Workload assignments were unfair	3	7.9%
Family or personal needs	2	5.3%
Better pay elsewhere	2	5.3%
Career change	2	5.3%
Conflict with other employees	1	2.6%
Conflict with supervisor	1	2.6%
Lack of teaching/research resources	1	2.6%
Personal health issue	1	2.6%
Retirement	1	2.6%
Location	1	2.6%
Denial or anticipated denial of tenure/non-renewal of contract	0	0.0%
TOTAL	38	100%

None of the respondents reported that they were encouraged to leave (n = 10, 100%), and half of the respondents reported having a new position (n = 6, 50.0%). When asked about intended jobs after UNT, 83.3% of respondents reported that they sought another position (n = 5) and 63.6% of respondents (n = 7) reported they were going to another academic institution. Of respondents that answered the question about counteroffers (n = 6), all respondents (100%) indicated that they did not seek a counteroffer and a counteroffer was not made from UNT. Primary reasons given by respondents for why their new employers were more attractive than UNT included career advancement opportunities, a better work climate, and better teaching opportunities.

When asked about what might have persuaded them to stay at UNT, the following themes emerged:

- Improvement in work climate with a focus on decreasing discrimination
- Increased opportunities in teaching courses that match expertise
- Less demand to teach an overload without compensation



INTERVIEW RESULTS

Eight (8) face-to-face interviews were conducted. To protect anonymity, faculty college affiliations are not identified.

All respondents were asked to describe their overall experience while at UNT. All respondents remarked on many positive aspects of their experience and also described their concerns.

Positive Experiences

When asked to describe their experiences and what strengths UNT has relative to faculty, interviewees offered these responses:

- Caring and compassionate faculty
- UNT's commitment to improving diversity and inclusion
- An engaged and diverse study body
- An abundance of resources provided to faculty

Negative Experiences & Reasons for Leaving

When asked what contributed to their decision to leave and how UNT didn't meet expectations, interviewees offered these responses:

- Negative work climate and interpersonal conflict either between faculty or between faculty and administrators
- Lack of administrative support during the grant process
- Difficulty as an international faculty member
- Religious discrimination including: lack of honoring faculty's observance of religious holidays and anti-Semitic comments
- Feeling undervalued or underappreciated
- Feelings of isolation, especially with remote work following the COVID-19 pandemic
- Concern that leaders (at the level of the chair and above) are not held accountable for creating divisive work environments
- Insufficient time to engage in research due to teaching overloads and high service requirements

Department and College Inclusivity and Diversity

Faculty were most satisfied with the level of inclusion in their department. The average rating was 3.0 on a scale of 1-5, 5 being highest (n = 7, 87.5%).

Faculty were mostly satisfied with the level of diversity in their department. (The average rating was 4.25 on a scale of 1-5, 5 being highest (n = 4, 50%).

Several respondents noted pride in working at a minority-serving institution and enjoyed working with a diverse student body and an increasingly diverse faculty. Several respondents also positively noted that the university provides many resources and support-groups for faculty. Suggestions for improvement include:

• Provide specific and increased supports for new faculty who join from industry (rather than an academic background).



- Improve structural changes and hiring practices to decrease the workload and improve work-life balance.
- Encourage chairs to initiate more conversations with faculty and to actively provide support.
- Decrease discrimination received from chairs/deans with a focus on improving relationships with faculty from underrepresented groups.
- Improved hiring practices for international faculty.

UNT Inclusivity and Diversity

For inclusion, of those that provided ratings (n = 6, 75%), the average rating was 3.67 on a scale of 1-5, 5 being highest.

For diversity, of those that provided ratings (n = 6, 75%), the average rating was 4.17 on a scale of 1-5, 5 being highest.

Respondents frequently praised the university's improvements in diversity and inclusion; yet, all respondents noted needed improvements. Suggestions included increasing diversity within upper administration and providing increased support for faculty who report discrimination. Another suggestion included increased equity in research evaluation and a broadened view of research excellence. In particular, a suggestion was offered to value research that foster community engagement. Some respondents perceived misalignments between academic policies and the university's mission toward an inclusive and equitable environment. Suggestions included re-evaluating performance criteria and identify areas where bias may be impacting outcomes. For example, research conducted by female faculty is perceived as been undervalued relative to male counterparts. Finally, an additional suggestion was to decrease the amount of required trainings that all faculty have to complete.

RECOMMENDATIONS

From the responses gathered during interviews and from items across the questionnaire, recommendations based on issues of importance to the respondents include the following:

- Continuing the recent focus on **chair development** so that we encourage and enable leaders who can foster equitable and hospitable work environments.
- Continuing to find ways to **address any harassment situations** that in a way that creates a safe environment for faculty who are reporting.
- Consider evaluating faculty, especially leaders, with respect to their actions, not
 just scholarship, to address behavioral concerns, such as harassment and inequitable
 treatment.
- Continue ensuring that **orientations** are inclusive of all levels of faculty and consider providing additional supports for faculty who join from industry.
- Create **professional development opportunities and training in pedagogy** for faculty.
- Provide **increased recognition/evaluative outcomes** for faculty with a consistent record of excellence in teaching.
- Evaluate departmental promotion and tenure policies and monitor the



- treatment and clarity of expectations by departmental PACs.
- Re-consider the **criteria for evaluating scholarship**; consider broadening the criteria and including additional metrics for research with "added value," such as community-engaged research.
- Investing in salary increases and monitoring the stagnation of salaries so that UNT can remain competitive in terms of faculty retention.
- Continuing to seek out ways to give lecturers a voice and promote **respect for lecturers and clinical faculty** from colleagues and leadership at UNT, including professional development opportunities and involvement with departmental decisions.
- Investigating the possibilities of **counteroffers** to discourage faculty from leaving UNT for another competing school.

