



Libraries and School
of Information Studies

The following pages contain materials you requested from Interlibrary Loan via [ILLiad](#).

As these are typically delivered without staff intervention, please report any problems with the copy to the Interlibrary Loan department as soon as possible. You may reply to the delivery email (ill@purdue.edu) or call us at 765-494-2800. In these cases, there is no need to re-request the article.

Need assistance with your research? [Ask a Librarian](#)

Copyright Statement

The copyright law of the United States (Title 17, United States Code) governs the making of photocopies or other reproductions of copyrighted materials. Under certain conditions specified in the law, libraries and archives are authorized to furnish a photocopy or other reproduction. One of these specified conditions is that the photocopy or reproduction is not to be "used for any purpose other than private study, scholarship, or research".

Review Article

Attending to the Teacher in the Teaching: Prioritizing Faculty Well-Being

Brianne H. Roos^a  and Carey C. Borkoski^b 

Purpose: The purpose of this review article is to examine the well-being of faculty in higher education. Success in academia depends on productivity in research, teaching, and service to the university, and the workload model that excludes attention to the welfare of faculty members themselves contributes to stress and burnout. Importantly, student success and well-being is influenced largely by their faculty members, whose ability to inspire and lead depends on their own well-being. This review article underscores the importance of attending to the well-being of the people behind the productivity in higher education.

Method: This study is a narrative review of the literature about faculty well-being in higher education. The history of well-being in the workplace and academia, concepts of stress and well-being in higher education faculty, and evidence-based

strategies to promote and cultivate faculty well-being were explored in the literature using electronic sources.

Conclusions: Faculty feel overburdened and pressured to work constantly to meet the demands of academia, and they strive for work–life balance. Faculty report stress and burnout related to excessively high expectations, financial pressures to obtain research funding, limited time to manage their workload, and a belief that individual progress is never sufficient. Faculty well-being is important for the individual and in support of scholarship and student outcomes. This article concludes with strategies to improve faculty well-being that incorporate an intentional focus on faculty members themselves, prioritize a community of well-being, and implement continuous high-quality professional learning.

In an address at the Center for American Progress, President Obama said: “The single most important factor in determining student achievement is not the color of their skin or where they come from. It’s not who their parents are or how much money they have. It’s who their teacher is” (2005). President Obama’s comments echoed the findings of the seminal Coleman Report (Coleman et al., 1966) that revealed the single most important in-school factor for student success is the student’s teacher. Today, more than 50 years after the Coleman Report, teachers from kindergarten through graduate school continue to profoundly contribute to the lives of their students, albeit in more innovative and contactless ways than ever before.

Faculty members in higher education are the touchpoints with students, the people with whom students interact regularly, and who attend to and notice students’ stress

and well-being in campus classrooms and on computer screens. While faculty attend to the needs of their students, the stress and well-being of faculty themselves are overlooked. A recent article by Jaremka et al. (2020) describes a symposium at an annual academic conference that drew an unusually large crowd and moved its attendees to silence and tears. The panelists were faculty members who shared their experiences of rejection, burnout, and imposter syndrome in academia. They hailed from different types of institutions and were at various career stages, and yet, they all had stories of damaging stress and low well-being that resonated with the large audience of faculty members.

While a moving symposium opens the door to conversation, academic literature and university programming must also focus on faculty stress and well-being to bring the issues to light on a larger scale. Several factors contribute to the dearth of existing research about faculty stress and well-being. First, the culture of higher education is historically structured around a workload model that demands consistent achievement in teaching, research, and service, with promotion and tenure dependent on a record of continual productivity (Sabagh et al., 2018). There is literally no time in the day to attend to well-being, and the age-old

^aDepartment of Speech-Language-Hearing Sciences, Loyola University Maryland, Baltimore

^bJohns Hopkins University School of Education, Baltimore, MD

Correspondence to Brianne Higgins Roos: bhiggins@loyola.edu

Editor-in-Chief: Patrick Finn

Received January 15, 2021

Revision received April 2, 2021

Accepted April 24, 2021

https://doi.org/10.1044/2021_PERSP-21-00006

Publisher Note: This article is part of the Forum: Mental Health and Well-Being: Considerations for Students and Faculty in Higher Education.

Disclosures

Financial: Brianne Higgins Roos has no relevant financial interests to disclose. Carey C. Borkoski has no relevant financial interests to disclose.

Nonfinancial: Brianne Higgins Roos has no relevant nonfinancial interests to disclose. Carey C. Borkoski has no relevant nonfinancial interests to disclose.

publish or perish adage remains relevant today. Therefore, to achieve success in academia, faculty members assimilate into the culture in which the busyness and stress associated with the tenuous balance of scholarly productivity, effective teaching, and university service become the revered norm, and its challenges are not to be acknowledged. Berg and Seeber (2016) note, “Academic training includes an induction into a culture of scholarly individualism and intellectual mastery; to admit to struggle undermines our professional identity” (p. 2).

The professional identity of faculty members is also shaped by the public perception of the life of a professor. For example, CareerCast, a publicly available job rating website, lists University Professor as the third best of 220 jobs ranked in 2019, with “very good” work environment, “very low” stress, and “good” projected growth (CareerCast, 2019). The findings perpetuate an idea of professorial life as one of low stress and ease, which is not how faculty members themselves characterize their jobs. Faculty in studies by Court and Kinman (2008) and Winefield et al. (2003) that note workload, publication demands, and pressure to secure external funding are factors that no longer permit their jobs to be classified as low-stress. The disconnect between the public perception and the reality of academic life may further inhibit the open discussion about faculty members’ well-being and stress.

Regardless of public perception, as we emerge from the COVID-19 pandemic, it is clear that we must pay closer attention to the stress and well-being of faculty members. This review article will briefly contextualize academia during COVID-19, followed by descriptions of stress and well-being in faculty members, and concludes with evidence-based strategies to promote and cultivate faculty well-being.

Academia During COVID-19

In 2020, the COVID-19 pandemic prompted an abrupt pivot in higher education. Overnight, faculty shifted to online teaching, students left campus, and academic communities were collectively thrust into a new and unfamiliar world. Our campuses shut down, we isolated ourselves from one another, stayed in place, and the hustle of activities ceased. At the same time, we had to hurry up and learn how to teach and support our students online; we were suddenly pulled from the status quo and have not stopped planning and doing ever since. The pandemic pace is paradoxical; somehow, we simultaneously grinded to a halt and moved faster than ever.

Articles, emails, and webinars abounded about how to move online and support students through the uncertainty. But what about faculty? In the already tenuous environment in which faculty attempt the critical balancing act of the three legs of the academic stool, teaching, research, and service, COVID-19 may have pulled the rug out from under the stool, exposing the existing stress that faculty experience in their roles as teachers, researchers, and stewards of the university. The pandemic required us to reimagine our academic spaces, delivery systems, and ways of doing our work, and as faculty scramble to rebuild, their stress and

well-being must be acknowledged and addressed. This period of time offers an opportunity to recognize the high levels of faculty stress, consider ways to better manage faculty workload, and attend to well-being. Taking these steps may contribute to a culture that values the faculty members who are responsible for much of the academia’s productivity.

For most faculty, workload includes some combination of teaching, research, and service. For other faculty, particularly in communication sciences and disorders (CSD), there is also consideration for their clinical supervision and practice. Regardless of the role combinations, workload contributes to faculty stress and burnout because of the high stakes and complexity of the balance dictated by promotion and tenure guidelines (Sabagh et al., 2018). Today, as faculty navigate workload in the context of COVID-19, words like crisis and triage characterize education. These terms are admittedly strong, and Toquero (2020) used the phrase “education countermeasures” (p. 1) to describe the process of higher education during the pandemic. This militaristic tone suggests offensive and defensive postures of developing and implementing online and hybrid courses. At the same time as the urgency of teaching increases, scholarship also changes. Research funds are tight due to COVID-19, and producing scholarship is more difficult in an already stressful publish or perish environment.

Faculty have been in go-mode since March 2020, and while the pace and workload feel unsustainable, they continue to push forward. Stuckey et al. (2019) suggest that the ideal worker is dedicated, undistracted, and constantly working, calling to mind the vision of a professor who never leaves campus, in both literal and figurative senses. This might be truer now than Stuckey et al. ever envisioned, as many faculty work from home and the lines between work and personal life are blurred without distinct physical places for each purpose. Faculty feel overburdened and pressured to work constantly to meet the demands of academia and they strive for work-life balance (Stuckey et al., 2019).

Four years before the pandemic, Berg and Seeber (2016) described a growing sense of faculty unwellness, and now is the time for faculty to pause and apply the skills of social science scholarship to themselves. Faculty are trained to examine problems and develop evidence-based theories and solutions; the time has come to prioritize research and programming about faculty stress and well-being. Following is a brief description of stress that precedes a section on well-being in higher education faculty.

Stress

Stress is “an external load or demand on a biological, social, or psychological system” (Lazarus, 1993, p. 2), and individuals feel physical and cognitive symptoms of stress when they perceive the load or demands placed on them exceed what they can handle (Lazarus & Folkman, 1984). Relative to faculty members in higher education, a considerable body of literature exists about stress in K–12 teachers. For example, in 1967, the National Education Association conducted a study and found that 78% of

teachers were under moderate to considerable strain (Coates & Thoresen, 1976). Reglin and Reitzammer (1998) surveyed K–12 regular education, exceptional education, and alternative education teachers in urban, rural, and suburban contexts and found teachers across contexts and settings reported stress. Stress in beginning teachers was examined in an exploratory study by Watson et al. (2010), who found perceived stress was the strongest predictor of teaching satisfaction. More recently, Califf and Brooks (2020) investigated technostressors, or stress related to technology, and mitigating factors in a study that is quite relevant to K–12 teachers during COVID-19.

While literature about stress in K-12 teachers abounds, there are fewer studies about stress in higher education faculty. Gmelch et al. (1986) surveyed 1,921 U.S. faculty members and found that reward and recognition, time constraints, departmental influence, professional identity, and student interactions, respectively, were the five most prominent dimensions of stress. The top two dimensions of stress, reward and recognition and time constraints, relate to rank and tenure and the workload model in higher education. More recently, van Emmerik (2002) found that pressure associated with research demands, time, and reduced collegiality among coworkers contributed to faculty members' stress. Kinman and Wray (2013) conducted a survey on stress and well-being of higher education faculty in the United Kingdom and more than half of the faculty reported high or very high general stress levels, and well-being and work–life balance were worse for faculty with increased stress. Faculty whose jobs required both teaching and research reported lower well-being and higher work–life conflict and stress than faculty who were responsible for either teaching or research exclusively, referring, again, to the stressful balancing act of multiple professional demands.

The demands on higher education faculty increased exponentially during COVID-19 and Johnson et al. (2020) surveyed 897 U.S. faculty and administrators from 672 institutions about their COVID-19 online teaching and learning experience. The survey did not ask about stress, but there was an open-ended question at the end of the survey where participants could share additional concerns. The authors noted, “while we did not perform a formal analysis of these comments, a large volume of faculty respondents expressed feelings of stress and anxiety” (Johnson et al., 2020, p. 16), providing an informal but important data point about the experiences of faculty during the pandemic. Even in a pandemic, in the midst of an international crisis, researchers focused on the work of faculty and the learning of students. It is during this moment, that higher education institutions must consider how to care for their community of students, staff, and faculty. To do this work, it is important to explore the research on stress and well-being.

Well-being

Research on well-being continues to grow and questions remain about how to define this construct (Dodge et al., 2012). The definition of well-being ranges from early

notions of job characteristics and attributes of one's environment to psychological elements including life satisfaction, pleasant or unpleasant affect (Diener & Suh, 1998), and quality of life. While there is a dearth of literature on faculty well-being, some evidence suggests that faculty represent the core asset for higher education institutions, and as such, their well-being is critical to the growth and sustainability of academia (Larson et al., 2019). The following discussion offers a brief review of definitions of well-being and concludes with the concept of well-being used throughout this review article.

Objective well-being relates to an observable characteristic, such as salary or work schedule (Smith & Clay, 2010). However, such a restrictive definition may lead to the assumption that well-being is limited to the presence of positive measurable circumstances and the absence of negative measurable circumstances. Schulte et al. (2015) proposed a more comprehensive heuristic model that places workforce well-being at the center, with health, occupational hazards, environmental, workplace, socioeconomic, host, and demographic factors contributing to well-being. Importantly, the model also includes the influence of workforce well-being on the productivity of individual workers, the organization, the nation, and ultimately, the populations' well-being. Therefore, the well-being of the workforce has widespread influence within and beyond a single enterprise such as a business or university.

Budd and Spencer (2015) and Budd (2011) agree that the binary thinking around objective and subjective dimensions of well-being may not be sufficiently inclusive and they offered a more integrative model. For the purposes of this review article, we rely on a definition of well-being that includes several of the key features of their framework, such as physical and mental health and identity. We also expand this definition to include the influences of researchers Bell Hooks (1994), Parker Palmer (1997), Brene Brown (2018), and Marc Brackett (2019), all of whom discuss one's sense of belonging as critical to well-being. Dodge et al. (2012) define well-being as a dynamic process where individuals have sufficient psychological, social, and physical resources to meet their psychological, social, and physical challenges. Well-being, in their view, is not the prevention or absence of challenges, but having the resources necessary to face these challenges. We propose that well-being should center on valuing the person in the work and institutions should aim to provide and cultivate physical, psychological, and social supports in the service of honoring the value of the individual. That is, the teacher in the teaching and the researcher in the research are at the center of our concept of faculty well-being.

Brief History of Well-being

Attending to well-being in the workplace began as early as the mid 1800s, when reform movements shined a spotlight on poverty wages and unsafe working conditions in the industrialized sectors of the United States, Britain, and Scandinavia, among other nations (Budd & Spencer, 2015; Schulte & Vainio, 2010). In fact, industrial relations emerged, in part, out of concerns over exploitative wages, long hours,

and frequent accidents. Early notions of well-being separated the worker from the tasks and, consequently, policy considered ways to right the problems of low job quality. This early history, according to Budd and Spencer, treated workers as “mere performers of physical and mental activities” (p. 1).

Schulte and Vainio (2010) explain that 100 years later, in the mid 1960s, well-being in the workplace focused nearly exclusively on risk mitigation related to occupational safety. Identifying risks and risk factors was part of a preventative approach to wellness. Then, in the 1980s, wellness programs broadened from a monofactorial risk-mitigation approach to a multifactorial approach that began to emphasize health promotion in addition to occupational safety. More recently, well-being in the workplace has become a multidisciplinary and comprehensive construct that includes quality of work life, health, productivity, and social cohesion (Schulte & Vainio, 2010).

Budd (2011) agrees with the comprehensive perspective on well-being because work itself goes beyond a task that yields a paycheck. Rather, Budd asserts that work includes psychological rewards. He suggests that work may be a source of identity, a means to care for someone, and a way to cultivate agency and connections with wider communities. Budd’s concepts of work align nicely with CSD, as speech-language pathologists’ and audiologists’ days are spent caring for, advocating for, and connecting with clients and their communities. Furthermore, Budd and Spencer’s (2015) concept of well-being shifted away from a set of tasks and towards the inclusion of a deeper importance of well-being to human life. Rothausen (2013) describes job-related well-being as: “go[ing] beyond satisfaction with job tasks to include development and growth, role in society, impact on family and impact on life construction” (p. 2).

The American Psychological Association (APA, 2016) conducted a Work and Wellbeing Survey with over 1,500 working adults in the United States. Although many places of work have well-being programs, less than half of the participants felt their organizational climate supported well-being and one third of the participants report being chronically stressed. David Ballard, Director of the APA’s Center for Organizational Excellence, remarked: “When it comes to building a climate of well-being, employers need to look beyond just physical health to help employees feel recognized, valued, and involved and create opportunities for growth and development” (para. 8), suggesting a comprehensive approach to well-being that includes an explicit focus on employees’ sense of belonging. The APA survey results amplified the need for more supportive organizational cultures and strategies to mitigate stress in leaders and employees. While this survey did include nonprofit organizations and education services, the proportion of employees from these contexts was less than 15%. For this and other reasons previously discussed, it is critical to focus narrowly on the state of well-being in faculty, staff, and leaders in academia.

Well-being in Academia

While research suggests that attending to faculty well-being yields positive outcomes, attention to faculty well-being

is generally not part of the culture of academia. Graduate students’ training, workplace values, and promotion policies prioritize faculty professional roles and output over their well-being, and socialization into academia starts with training future academics. While the formal process may not begin until graduate school, it is likely that undergraduate students could identify the norms, expectations, and cultures within academia just by observing their own instructors. At the graduate school level, Austin (2002) conducted a 4-year longitudinal qualitative study to examine and describe graduate students’ process of socialization into academic careers. In this study, students suggested that they did not experience systematic developmental preparation for their academic careers. For example, students reported feeling confident in developing research questions and designing studies but not skilled in teaching or running courses on their own. Few reported experiences with receiving feedback, mentoring, or guidance and they had very little, if any, time for reflection.

Students in the Austin (2002) study also reported a keen awareness of the relatively higher value placed on research and the pressure experienced by their instructors and research faculty. Graduate students described receiving mixed messages about teaching, as leaders said it was important, while faculty tended to emphasize research because rank and tenure rewards depend on scholarship. Students observed the constant pressure and conflicting demands of academic life and witnessed their faculty mentors trying to be true to their own values while adapting to the dominant values in academia. Austin also pointed out that students felt that there was little time or attention paid to mentoring, feedback, or reflection, which may reinforce the notion of the perceived low importance of care and attention to the well-being of faculty or faculty-in-training.

As faculty enter academia and develop their own professional goals, they face a diversity of requirements, responsibilities, and contexts. New faculty must prepare for a wide variety of situations and demands (Serow, 2000; Vidal & Quintanilla, 2000), and realize that their professional goals may be shaped by external forces rather than their own values and interests. Pace et al. (2019) studied faculty workload and well-being and found that research and teaching are at the core of a faculty member’s work, and when combined with the myriad other responsibilities (e.g., service, meetings, curriculum design, and review), lead to lower faculty well-being. Faculty members’ control and order are diminished and the potential incongruence of their own goals with the values and goals of their institutions diminishes well-being.

Stuckey et al. (2019) suggest a similar connection between individual and organizational well-being by adapting a conceptual framework to education that was developed by Dunn et al. (2008). Faculty members’ control of their work environment, order (i.e., efficiency at work), and meaning in their work increased their well-being by improving satisfaction, decreasing burnout, and increasing the organizational health of their respective universities. When employees feel like the workload and environment are reasonable, when

the context promotes efficient workflow and accomplishment, and when the work itself yields personal satisfaction, well-being improves. The alignment of personal and professional goals in a context in which success is possible because workload is manageable and faculty are well supported seems like a recipe for well-being. However, for faculty who identify as Black, Indigenous, and People of Color (BIPOC), well-being may be even more complex.

BIPOC faculty may face a negative racial climate at their institution, receive little support for family and life circumstances, and experience classrooms where students question their authority or engage in racist remarks or covert actions. Literature also suggests that BIPOC faculty engaging in research often see their areas of interest or research studies devalued and face what Fries-Britt et al. (2011) refer to as a cultural taxation due to their engaging disproportionately in service activities. Kachchaf et al. (2015) noted that there is often a cumulative disadvantage for women of color as they face the aforementioned challenges and are unable to maintain three important factors that contribute to their promotion in the system of academia: long hours, unbroken career trajectories, and constant availability and visibility. In total, these factors contribute to the low well-being of BIPOC faculty.

Acton and Glasgow (2015) suggest that neoliberal structures and approaches tend to downplay well-being and focus instead on measurable traits like student test scores, teaching productivity, and research publications. Even if U.S. higher education institutions do not favor a more humanistic approach to faculty well-being, faculty members' ability to understand their own and students' emotions and cultivate and maintain colleague and student relationships are good for the organization and their classrooms. An economic perspective would suggest that faculty development should not focus exclusively on cognitive ability, skills, and skills formation (Becker, 1962; Mincer, 1958). Rather, Heckman and Rubinstein (2001) suggest personal and professional development of the "whole" person include skills, knowledge, and traits, views, and attributes (e.g., resilience, motivation, persistence) or well-being. Adopting a more holistic view of faculty development requires integration of well-being into graduate and on-the-job training throughout faculty careers.

Well-being in Practice

Seligman and Csikszentmihalyi (2000) introduced the field of positive psychology, and suggested the benefits of focusing on well-being and identifying and nurturing strengths. When faculty members' well-being is strong enough to allow for genuine teacher-student connection, student engagement increases (Cook-Sather et al., 2018) and transformational learning may occur (Hooks, 1994). In fact, Hooks (1994) suggests that transformational learning depends on faculty members' ability to bring themselves to the classroom fully, and then to invite and welcome students to do the same. The best classrooms are democratic places where the instructor believes that the students' insights and experiences are just as valuable as the instructor's prepared content.

Palmer (1997) suggests that the faculty members' ability to conduct such a dynamic, challenging, and effective class depends on their own well-being. We can only teach what we are, and when instructors have strong well-being, they are able to bring their authentic selves to the classroom. They have the capacity to see their students, make connections, build community, and engage in ways that foster trust, which enables deep learning. When faculty members have a strong sense of well-being, the results can be remarkably positive (Brown, 2018; Hooks, 1994).

Cook-Sather et al. (2018) applied positive psychology in higher education through partnerships between new faculty members and students. In a unique setting in which students observe faculty members and provide weekly feedback throughout a semester or a year, students focus on strengths and capacities of the faculty member and ask questions about pedagogical strategies that seem less effective. Students in the study commented on the teaching and the teacher, and specifically emphasized how faculty members facilitated connections with students in class. For example, effective strategies included faculty members explaining why they chose to teach a particular course, demonstrating genuine interest in the material as expressed through verbal (e.g., spoken enthusiasm) and nonverbal (e.g., sitting with students) communication, encouraging students' self-reflection, and incorporating students' lived experiences into the classroom. This study provides evidence that faculty well-being contributes to cultivating student-faculty connections and authentic teaching and learning experiences.

Teaching is nuanced and changes day-to-day, from section-to-section and course-to-course; it is a daily meeting and connection between human beings. Palmer (1997) remarks that students report that their best instructors do not use the same techniques as one another (e.g., lecturing, discussion groups, flipped classrooms) or teach the same subject matter, but rather, the common feature of the best teachers is that they teach authentically. They bring their experiences, their voices, and their heart to the work, and their ability to teach authentically depends on their well-being. Hooks (1994) suggests that "teachers must be actively committed to a process of self-actualization that promotes their own well-being if they are to teach in a manner that empowers students" (p.15). Such authentic and vulnerable teaching is contingent on faculty members' well-being.

Furthermore, Branand and Nakamura (2017) also posited that the success and well-being of students are influenced by that of their teachers, and that teachers' ability to inspire and lead depends on their own engagement and well-being. For example, Duckworth et al. (2009) demonstrated that teachers' positivity, grit, and life satisfaction predicted their students' success. Similarly, Jennings and Greenberg (2009) proposed a model in which teachers' social emotional competence and well-being both influence and is influenced by school and community context, relationships with students, and implementation of social emotional learning. Teachers' social emotional competence and well-being promoted positive development outcomes in their students.

Hooks (1994) provides personal accounts to describe the power of engaged faculty members. She recounts how teachers contributed to her learning experience in segregated and integrated schools, with a marked preference for her time in segregated schools because of the zeal of her teachers to transform and empower hooks and her peers. When she moved to integrated schools, learning became more of a banking system, characterized by cold and impersonal deposits and withdrawals of content. She missed the discussions and lessons about how to be in the world, recognize her own strengths, and leverage those strengths to improve the world. Similarly, Palmer (1997) suggests that, too often, faculty members emphasize the objective view (i.e., the *teaching*, not the *teacher*), the literature and evidence on a particular matter, and fail to integrate and elevate the voices of the instructor and the students in the classroom.

The positive power of engaged teaching and learning via faculty members with strong well-being is evident for students and institutions. Faculty well-being should be a priority for institutions and individual faculty themselves as a way to mitigate burnout, increase faculty personal efficacy, and contribute to faculty mental and physical health. When well-being is not prioritized and faculty stress persists, the consequences may include workaholism and burnout (Sabagh et al., 2018). Workaholism includes a cognitive component of obsession with work due to an inextinguishable motivation, coupled with a behavioral compulsive dimension that manifests in excessive hours dedicated to doing the work (Torp et al., 2018). Not surprisingly, faculty workload is a primary factor related to both workaholism and work–family conflict. Workaholic faculty members routinely work late at night, early in the morning, or both, and they put in so many hours because of a strong drive and need to meet the multiple demands placed on them. The chronicity of such long hours and intensity of work impacts a faculty member's work–life balance, specifically with regards to family, and may not be sustainable.

Strategies to Improve Faculty Well-being

Institutions that invest in faculty well-being signal a culture of care for its individual faculty, a commitment to cultivating a work–life balance for its employees, and an environment that integrates organizational mission, value, and needs with faculty core values. Healthy Campus 2020 is an initiative developed by the American College Health Association (2018) intended to improve holistic wellness at higher education institutions using an ecological model that attends to intrapersonal, interpersonal, institutional, and community-based factors. While wellness programs often target students, several universities have implemented faculty wellness programs that align with Healthy Campus 2020 ideals, such as Case Western Reserve University, Illinois State University, The Ohio State University, and the University of Utah (Amaya et al., 2019), all of which have CSD programs.

Best practices for faculty-oriented wellness programs start at the top, with leadership buy-in and advocacy through

dedicated resources, sheltered time for wellness, role modeling, and commitment to a mission and vision around faculty wellness (Amaya et al., 2019). Additionally, institutions need to dedicate places for faculty to do their own personal work, cultivate community among faculty, and invest in high-quality, long term, continuous professional development. Specific attention should be paid to the well-being of BIPOC faculty, as their experiences of workload and challenges in academia may be more complex than their non-BIPOC colleagues. Zambrana et al. (2017) suggests that institutions need to diversify faculty, as BIPOC only represents 24% of the professoriate.

The focus should be on activities and policies that transform, rather than preserve, institutions. For example, creating equitable environments around allocations of duties, particularly related to service, offering mentoring opportunities, and promoting racial justice are important steps to promote and increase BIPOC faculty well-being. According to Szelényi and Denson (2019), BIPOC faculty who have versatility in their pedagogy are able to teach, connect with, and learn with more diverse students. BIPOC faculty tend to be responsible for much, if not all, of the mentoring of students of color, and often conduct research that promotes social justice, thus becoming agents of positive change. Understanding faculty members' unique experiences is important as universities undertake initiatives to improve well-being. Institutions with a focus on self, community, and professional training together contribute to enhanced faculty well-being, and the following discussion offers some examples of how institutions might enact these practices.

Faculty Heal Thyselves

Clearly, the faculty members themselves matter in the teaching, and instructors' well-being is a critical factor in the education equation. Once the need for instructors' well-being is recognized, the next step is to consider how to improve well-being. Palmer (1997) suggests that when cultivating a practice of well-being, it is critical to acknowledge the teacher in the teaching or the person in the *do-ing*. Our ability to teach authentically requires attention to and care of the individual. Instructors, researchers, and clinicians in CSD are asked daily to attend to the needs of others, to connect, listen, empathize, and care for students, participants, and clients. Now it is time to implement a professional practice that regularly attends to the needs of faculty.

Cultivating a culture of self-care is challenging when the research suggests that faculty resist change (Bok, 2006; Tagg, 2012). Moreover, Fairweather (2005), in his nationwide study of faculty salaries and work patterns, noted that "regardless of institutional type or mission and irrespective of program area, faculty who spend more time on research and who publish the most are paid more than their teaching-oriented colleagues" (p. 67). These two points indicate that joint efforts from institutions, leaders, programs, and faculty themselves are paramount to carrying out the difficult and countercultural work of designing and implementing policies for faculty care. Institutional policies and practices must support faculty to engage in transformative work to

improve their well-being, which will facilitate stronger teaching, a sustainable approach to research productivity, and a healthy university community.

Only when faculty commit to and are supported in transformative work will they be able to show their vulnerability and live a more authentic life that works to align their inner and outer selves. This alignment and bringing of their whole selves leads to improved integrity and promotes faculty well-being. The work of faculty well-being cannot be done alone or in isolation. It requires institutional support and policies as well as a dedicated community of colleagues.

A Focus on Community

Collaborative learning is a familiar and theoretically grounded approach to working with students (Bandura, 1997; Lave & Wenger, 1991; Vygotsky, 1978). Faculty members are accustomed to facilitating students' learning using group work and collaborative projects, developing communities of learners who explore and grow together. Relationships among group members are critical to the success of the group, and faculty experience the same phenomena when they collaborate professionally. An examination of why faculty leave their positions found that 25% of faculty leave due to lack of fit with departmental colleagues and other department-level issues like academic bullying and relationship difficulties (O'Meara et al., 2014). Interestingly, Pifer et al. (2019) also suggest that departments have an opportunity to address faculty well-being through this local level of community and relationship building and yet, much of the research focuses on formal, university-level faculty development. Pifer et al. found that when the department-level culture was perceived as positive, including traditions and norms to welcome new faculty, faculty were more satisfied and expressed a collective commitment to success. Relationships were critical to the culture and values of a department and were also a key factor in faculty satisfaction and well-being.

The development of peer mentoring relationships is another approach to building community to improve faculty wellness. Peer mentoring may offer structured opportunities for feedback and guidance on the wide array of faculty responsibilities, providing anchoring relationships. Fountain and Newcomer (2016) conducted a meta-analysis on developing and sustaining effective faculty mentoring programs and they note several benefits of mentoring programs. Mentoring acculturates faculty members to a university (Lumpkin, 2011) and helps to develop and sustain relationships among mentors and mentees (Borders et al., 2011). In addition to the interpersonal benefits of mentoring, the professional productivity of both mentors and mentees was found to increase among occupational therapy faculty members, a particularly relevant finding for CSD faculty (Falzarano & Zipp, 2012). Collaboration with colleagues is a critical element of work for faculty members, and informal relationships and formal mentoring programs are ways to leverage positive relationships and community to promote faculty wellness.

Professional Learning

In addition to faculty members' attention to themselves and their communities, ongoing high-quality professional learning and mentoring opportunities contribute to faculty well-being. Single dose workshops are a common model of delivering professional development, but literature suggests that follow-up and continuity help to facilitate sustained professional learning, changed practices, and improved outcomes (Darling-Hammond et al., 2017; Desimone & Garet, 2015). Jensen et al. (2016) share several case studies of high performing professional learning systems that center around principles of adult learning, such as relevant problem solving and experience-based reflection. This occurs when professional learning is perceived as purposeful and applicable and the facilitators use and build upon faculty members' experiences. For example, explicit recognition about the university-specific stress related to workload expectations would help to facilitate professional learning about faculty well-being. Effective professional learning systems also have dedicated professional learning leaders, recognition of teacher expertise, and community-based responsibility for professional learning that is prioritized and incorporated into the workload.

One of the key tenets of the high performing systems profiled by Jensen et al. (2016) is that professional learning is an integral part of ongoing improvement cycles, rather than an additive or extra element that occurs periodically via one-and-done workshops. When professional learning is valued and recognized by rank and tenure processes and time is sheltered for continuous learning, consistent improvement becomes part of the culture of an institution and faculty and student outcomes improve. One example of professional learning that may benefit faculty members is a program centered around emotion literacy (Brackett, 2019).

Brackett (2019) advocates for students' social emotional learning and he is clear that faculty must develop their own emotional intelligence before implementing social emotional learning with students. Brackett builds on seminal emotional intelligence literature (Mayer & Salovey, 1993) and discusses the benefits of becoming emotion scientists, or examining emotion consistently and systematically, much like faculty study their areas of subject matter expertise. The relationship between emotional intelligence and job performance is positive and significant, according to the results of a meta-analysis conducted by O'Boyle et al. (2011), and emotional intelligence relates to both grit and resilience, two qualities that facilitate job performance success in academia (Brackett, 2019). Professional development around emotional intelligence may improve faculty members' ability to feel, identify, and name their own emotions, and then help our students to do the same. Overall, institutional policies that explicitly promote individual faculty well-being, collaborative communities that provide opportunities for mentorship and relationship building, and long-term and integrative professional learning would undoubtedly improve the health and well-being of university communities.

Conclusions

In the annals of literature about teaching, learning, and faculty workload in higher education, there are no guides about how to weather a pandemic in academia. Faculty were overloaded and stressed before 2020, focused on the tenuous balance of teaching, research, and service, and lacked sheltered time, resources, and support for their own well-being. The COVID-19 crisis brought faculty stress and burnout to the forefront, and the imperative to prioritize well-being is evident. We propose that university and department leaders attend to individual faculty members, with specific attention to BIPOC faculty, and promote community-based faculty collaboration and ongoing professional learning opportunities to improve faculty wellness.

Faculty members and administrators in CSD programs are well poised to do the work. They understand and teach the importance of aligning clients' goals with their strengths and interests, of appropriately challenging graduate students to stretch and manage multiple clinical and academic demands, and of prioritizing and facilitating effective communication. CSD professionals are driven to help and advocate for others, and they must also attend to and advocate for their own well-being. Several universities with CSD programs have faculty well-being initiatives in place, and peer mentoring is another approach used by faculty in occupational therapy, a closely related allied health field, to promote well-being.

We acknowledge that this review article only scratches the surface of what is needed to design and implement policies, procedures, and programs that contribute to a culture that values and cultivates faculty well-being. Shifting away from a culture that values and rewards faculty who perform for promotion and tenure guidelines of a university to a culture where faculty are honored and rewarded for their unique and diverse contributions takes tremendous intention and effort from an institution and its leadership and faculty. An explicit focus on the faculty members who do the teaching and conduct the research will undoubtedly improve the health of our university communities as we move through and beyond COVID-19.

References

- Acton, R., & Glasgow, P. (2015). Teacher wellbeing in neoliberal contexts: A review of the literature. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education*, 40(8), 99–114. <https://doi.org/10.14221/ajte.2015v40n8.6>
- Amaya, M., Donegan, T., Conner, D., Edwards, J., & Gipson, C. (2019). Creating a culture of wellness: A call to action for higher education, igniting change in academic institutions. *Building Healthy Academic Communities Journal*, 3(2), 27–40. <https://doi.org/10.18061/bhac.v3i2.7117>
- American College of Health Association. (2018). *Healthy campus 2020 ecological model*. https://www.acha.org/HealthyCampus/HealthyCampus/Ecological_Model.aspx
- American Psychological Association. (2016). *Workplace well-being linked to senior leadership support, new survey finds*. <http://www.apa.org/news/press/releases/2016/06/workplace-well-being.aspx>
- Austin, A. E. (2002). Preparing the next generation of faculty: Graduate school as socialization to the academic career. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 73(1), 94–122. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00221546.2002.11777132>
- Bandura, A. (1997). *Self-efficacy: The exercise of control*. Freeman.
- Becker, G. S. (1962). Investment in human capital: A theoretical analysis. *Journal of Political Economy*, 70(5), 9–49. <https://doi.org/10.1086/258724>
- Berg, M., & Seeber, B. K. (2016). *The slow professor: Challenging the culture of speed in the academy*. University of Toronto Press. <https://doi.org/10.3138/9781442663091>
- Bok, D. (2006). *Our underachieving colleges: A candid look at how much students learn and why they should be learning more*. Princeton University Press.
- Borders, L. D., Young, J. S., Wester, K. L., Murray, C. E., Villalba, J. A., Lewis, T. F., & Mobley, A. K. (2011). Mentoring promotion/tenure-seeking faculty: Principles of good practice within a counselor education program. *Counselor Education and Supervision*, 50(3), 171–188. <https://doi.org/10.1002/j.1556-6978.2011.tb00118.x>
- Brackett, M. (2019). *Permission to feel: Unlocking the power of emotions to help our kids, ourselves, and our society thrive*. Celadon Books.
- Branand, B., & Nakamura, J. (2017). The well-being of teachers and professors. In L. G. Oades, M. F. Steger, A. D. Fave, & J. Passmore (Eds.), *The Wiley Blackwell handbook of the psychology of positivity and strengths-based approaches at work* (pp. 466–490). <https://onlinelibrary-wiley-com.proxy1.library.jhu.edu/doi/pdfdirect/10.1002/9781118977620.ch24>
- Brown, B. (2018). *Dare to lead: Brave work, tough conversations, whole hearts*. Random House.
- Budd, J. W. (2011). *The thought of work*. Cornell University Press. <https://doi.org/10.7591/9780801462658>
- Budd, J. W., & Spencer, D. A. (2015). Worker well-being and the importance of work: Bridging the gap. *European Journal of Industrial Relations*, 21(2), 181–196. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0959680114535312>
- Califf, C. B., & Brooks, S. (2020). An empirical study of technostressors, literacy facilitation, burnout, and turnover intention as experienced by K-12 teachers. *Computers & Education*, 157, 103971. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2020.103971>
- CareerCast. (2019). *The 2019 jobs rated report*. <https://www.careercast.com/jobs-rated/2019-jobs-rated-report>
- Coates, T. J., & Thoresen, C. E. (1976). Teacher Anxiety: A review with recommendations. *Review of Educational Research*, 46(2), 159–184. <https://doi.org/10.3102/00346543046002159>
- Coleman, J. S., Campbell, E. Q., Hobson, C. J., McPartland, F., Mood, A. M., Weinfeld, F. D., & York, R. L. (1966). *Equality of educational opportunity*. U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Cook-Sather, A., Schlosser, J. A., Sweeney, A., Peterson, L. M., Cassidy, K. W., & Garcia, A. C. (2018). The pedagogical benefits of enacting positive psychology practices through a student-faculty partnership approach to academic development. *International Journal for Academic Development*, 23(2), 123–134. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1360144X.2017.1401539>
- Court, S., & Kinman, G. (2008). *Tackling stress in further education*. University and College Union. http://www.ucu.org.uk/media/pdf/h/e/ucu_festress_dec08.pdf
- Darling-Hammond, L., Hyler, M. E., & Gardner, M. (2017). *Effective teacher professional development*. Learning Policy Institute. <https://learningpolicyinstitute.org/product/teacher-prof-dev>
- Desimone, L. M., & Garet, M. S. (2015). Best practices in teachers' professional development in the United States. *Psychology, Society, & Education*, 7(3), 252–263. <https://doi.org/10.25115/psyev7i3.515>

- Diener, E., & Suh, M. E. (1998). Subjective well-being and age: An international analysis. In K. W. Schaie & M. P. Lawton (Eds.), *Annual review of gerontology and geriatrics: Vol. 17. Focus on emotion and adult development* (pp. 304–324). Springer.
- Dodge, R., Daly, A., Huyton, J., & Sanders, L. (2012). The challenge of defining wellbeing. *International Journal of Wellbeing*, 2(3), 222–235. <https://doi.org/10.5502/ijw.v2i3.4>
- Duckworth, A. L., Quinn, P. D., & Seligman, M. P. (2009). Positive predictors of teacher effectiveness. *The Journal of Positive Psychology*, 4(6), 540–547. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17439760903157232>
- Dunn, L. B., Iglewicz, A., & Moutier, C. (2008). A conceptual model of medical student well-being: Promoting resilience and preventing burnout. *Academic Psychiatry*, 32(1), 44–53. <https://doi.org/10.1176/appi.ap.32.1.44>
- Fairweather, J. S. (2005). Beyond the rhetoric: Trends in the relative value of teaching and research in faculty salaries. *Journal of Higher Education*, 76(4), 401–422. <https://doi.org/10.1353/JHE.2005.0027>
- Falzarano, M., & Zipp, G. P. (2012). Perceptions of mentoring of full-time occupational therapy faculty in the United States. *Occupational Therapy International*, 19(3), 117–126. <https://doi.org/10.1002/oti.1326>
- Fountain, J., & Newcomer, K. E. (2016). Developing and sustaining effective faculty mentoring programs. *Journal of Public Affairs Education*, 22(4), 483–506. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15236803.2016.12002262>
- Fries-Britt, S., Rowan-Kenyon, H. T., Perna, L. W., Milem, J. F., & Howard, D. G. (2011). Underrepresentation in the academy and the institutional climate for faculty diversity. *The Journal of the Professoriate*, 5(1), 1–34.
- Gmelch, W. H., Wilke, P. K., & Lovrich, N. P. (1986). Dimensions of stress among university faculty: Factor-analytic results from a national study. *Research in Higher Education*, 24(3), 266–286. <https://doi.org/10.1007/bf00992075>
- Heckman, J. J., & Rubinstein, Y. (2001). The importance of noncognitive skills: Lessons from the GED testing program. *American Economic Review*, 91(2), 145–149. <https://doi.org/10.1257/aer.91.2.145>
- Hooks, B. (1994). *Teaching to transgress: Education as the practice of freedom*. Routledge.
- Jaremka, L. M., Ackerman, J. M., Gawronski, B., Rule, N. O., Sweeny, K., Tropp, L. R., Metz, M. A., Molina, L., Ryan, W. S., & Vick, S. B. (2020). Common academic experiences no one talks about: Repeated rejection, impostor syndrome, and burnout. *Perspectives of the ASHA Special Interest Groups*, 15(3), 519–543. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1745691619898848>
- Jennings, P. A., & Greenberg, M. T. (2009). The prosocial classroom: Teacher social and emotional competence in Relation to student and classroom outcomes. *Review of Educational Research*, 79(1), 491–525. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0034654308325693>
- Jensen, B., Sonnemann, J., Roberts-Hull, K., & Hunter, A. (2016). *Beyond PD: Teacher professional learning in high-performing systems*. National Center on Education and the Economy. <http://www.ncee.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/08/BeyondPDWeb.pdf>
- Johnson, N., Veletsianos, G., & Seaman, J. (2020). US faculty and administrators' experiences and approaches in the early weeks of the COVID-19 Pandemic. *Online Learning*, 24(2), 6–21. <https://doi.org/10.24059/olj.v24i2.2285>
- Kachchaf, R., Ko, L., Hodari, A., & Ong, M. (2015). Career-life balance for women of color: Experiences in science and engineering academia. *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education*, 8(3), 175–191. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0039068>
- Kinman, G., & Wray, S. (2013). *Higher stress: A survey of stress and wellbeing among staff in higher education*. http://www.ucu.org.uk/media/pdf/4/5/HE_stress_report_July_2013.pdf
- Larson, L. M., Seipel, M. T., Shelley, M. C., Gahn, S. W., Ko, S. Y., Schenkenfelder, M., Rover, D. T., Schmittmann, B., & Heitmann, M. M. (2019). The academic environment and faculty well-being: The role of psychological needs. *Journal of Career Assessment*, 27(1), 167–182. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1069072717748667>
- Lave, J., & Wenger, E. (1991). *Situated learning: Legitimate peripheral participation*. Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511815355>
- Lazarus, R. S. (1993). From psychological stress to the emotions: A history of changing outlooks. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 44, 1–22. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.psych.44.1.1>
- Lazarus, R. S., & Folkman, S. (1984). *Stress, appraisal, and coping*. Springer.
- Lumpkin, A. (2011). A model for mentoring university faculty. *The Educational Forum*, 75(4), 357–368. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00131725.2011.602466>
- Mayer, J. D., & Salovey, P. (1993). The intelligence of emotional intelligence. *Intelligence*, 17(4), 433–442. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0160-2896\(93\)90010-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/0160-2896(93)90010-3)
- Mincer, J. (1958). Investment in human capital and personal income distribution. *Journal of Political Economy*, 66(4), 281–302. <https://doi.org/10.1086/258055>
- Obama, B. (2005). *Teaching our kids in a 21st century economy* [Speech transcript]. <http://obamaspeeches.com/033-Teaching-Our-Kids-in-a-21st-Century-Economy-Obama-Speech.htm>
- O'Boyle, E. H., Jr., Humphrey, R. H., Pollack, J. M., Hawver, T. H., & Story, P. A. (2011). The relation between emotional intelligence and job performance: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 32(5), 788–818. <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.714>
- O'Meara, K., Lounder, A., & Campbell, C. M. (2014). To heaven or hell: Sensemaking about why faculty leave. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 85(5), 603–632. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00221546.2014.11777342>
- Pace, F., D'Urso, G., & Zappulla, C. (2019). The relation between workload and personal well-being among university professors. *Current Psychology*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12144-019-00294-x>
- Palmer, P. (1997). *The courage to teach: Exploring the inner landscape of a teacher's life*. Wiley.
- Pifer, M. J., Baker, V. L., & Lunsford, L. G. (2019). Culture, colleagues, and leadership: The academic department as a location of faculty experiences in liberal arts colleges. *The Review of Higher Education*, 42(2), 537–564. <https://doi.org/10.1353/rhe.2019.0006>
- Reglin, G., & Reitzammer, A. (1998). Dealing with the stress of teachers. *Education*, 118(4), 590–597.
- Rothausen, T. J. (2013). *Hedonic and eudaimonic job-related well-being: Enjoyment of job and fulfillment of job purpose*. <http://ir.stthomas.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1000&context=ocbmngmtwp>
- Sabagh, Z., Hall, N. C., & Saroyan, A. (2018). Antecedents, correlates and consequences of faculty burnout. *Educational Research*, 60(2), 131–156. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00131881.2018.1461573>
- Schulte, P., & Vainio, H. (2010). Well-being at work: Overview and perspective. *Scandinavian Journal of Work, Environment & Health*, 36(5), 422–429. <https://doi.org/10.5271/sjweh.3076>
- Schulte, P. A., Guerin, R. J., Schill, A. L., Bhattacharya, A., Cunningham, T. R., Pandalai, S. P., Eggerth, D., & Stephenson, C. M. (2015). Considerations for incorporating “well-being” in public policy for workers and workplaces. *American Journal of Public Health*, 105(8), e31–e44. <https://doi.org/10.2105/AJPH.2015.302616>
- Seligman, M. E., & Csikszentmihalyi, M. (2000). Positive psychology: An introduction. *American Psychologist*, 55(1), 5–14. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.55.1.5>

- Serow, R. C.** (2000). Research and teaching at a research university. *Higher Education*, 40, 449–463. <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1004154512833>
- Smith, C., & Clay, P.** (2010). Measuring subjective and objective well-being: Analyses from five marine commercial fisheries. *Human Organization*, 69(2), 158–168. <https://doi.org/10.17730/humo.69.2.b83x6t44878u4782>
- Stuckey, S. M., Collins, B. T., Patrick, S., Grove, K. S., & Ward, E.** (2019). Thriving vs surviving: Benefits of formal mentoring program on faculty well-being. *International Journal of Mentoring and Coaching in Education*, 8(4), 378–396. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJMCE-02-2019-0024>
- Szelényi, K., & Denson, N.** (2019). Personal and institutional predictors of work-life balance among women and men faculty of color. *The Review of Higher Education*, 43(2), 633–665. <https://doi.org/10.1353/rhe.2019.0113>
- Tagg, J.** (2012). Why does the faculty resist change? *Change: The Magazine of Higher Learning*, 44(1), 6–15. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00091383.2012.635987>
- Toquero, C. M.** (2020). Challenges and opportunities for higher education amid the COVID-19 pandemic: The Philippine context. *Pedagogical Research*, 5(4), Article em0063. <https://doi.org/10.29333/pr/7947>
- Torp, S., Lysfjord, L., & Midje, H. H.** (2018). Workaholism and work–family conflict among university academics. *Higher Education*, 76(6), 1071–1090. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10734-018-0247-0>
- van Emmerik, H. I. J.** (2002). Gender differences in the effects of coping assistance on the reduction of burnout in academic staff. *Work and Stress*, 16(3), 251–263. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0267837021000034593>
- Vidal, J., & Quintanilla, M. A.** (2000). The teaching and research relationship within an institutional evaluation. *Higher Education*, 40(2), 217–229. <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1004083631288>
- Vygotsky, L. S.** (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes*. Harvard University Press.
- Watson, J. C., Harper, S., Ratliff, L., & Singleton, S.** (2010). Holistic wellness and perceived stress: Predicting job satisfaction among beginning teachers. *Research in the Schools*, 17(1), 29–37.
- Winefield, A. H., Gillespie, N., Stough, C., Dua, J., Hapuarachchi, J., & Boyd, C.** (2003). Occupational stress in Australian University staff: Results from a national survey. *International Journal of Stress Management*, 10(1), 51–63. <https://doi.org/10.1037/1072-5245.10.1.51>
- Zambrana, R. E., Dávila, B. A., Espino, M. M., Lapeyrouse, L. M., Valdez, R. B., & Segura, D. A.** (2017). Mexican American faculty in research universities: Can the next generation beat the odds? *Sociology of Race and Ethnicity*, 3(4), 458–473. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2332649217716473>

Copyright of Perspectives of the ASHA Special Interest Groups is the property of American Speech-Language-Hearing Association and its content may not be copied or emailed to multiple sites or posted to a listserv without the copyright holder's express written permission. However, users may print, download, or email articles for individual use.