• Discrimination (subtle discrimination, sexual harassment, grievances, favoritism, lack of access to information and resources, double standards, lack of adherence to policies and procedures)

**Differences Across Groups**

As the previous sections have already illustrated, faculty as a whole share some agreement about the factors that support and inhibit their teaching and scholarship, but clear differences emerged in the discussions and interviews depending on the individual faculty member. For instance, assistant professors tend to be more worried about the promotion and tenure process than higher-ranking faculty.

Even though each of these statements is a generalization about a specific group of faculty it should be kept in mind that much variability exists from individual to individual. Thus, it is imperative that we not stereotype faculty by their affiliation with certain categorical groupings. Still, the fact remains that various groups of faculty view the institution quite differently. If we are to fully understand the sources of support and impediments in faculty lives, we must simultaneously take into consideration how faculty construct and make meaning of their experiences. For example, what may appear to one faculty member as a jovial or jocular remark, may appear to another faculty member as a comment of ridicule.

The co-mingling of these independent realities is what embodies faculty’s daily working lives. To refrain from taking into account differences in perspective means placing at risk the loss of a spirited and creative community. Moreover, if we fail to bring into consciousness the possibility of multiple interpretations of experience, we replicate and reinforce inequities and domination that inevitably get subsumed into our teaching, service, and research.

The following descriptions of differences across academic rank, academic discipline, and type of discussion group (faculty with disabilities, lesbian/gay/bisexual faculty, and administrators) are intended to further enlighten our knowledge about faculty life in order to best understand how to positively transform the working domains of all faculty.
Differences Across Academic Rank

While the traditional academic rankings of faculty seem fairly straightforward, the terms of appointment and expectations for advancement can vary considerably depending on whether an individual is located, for instance, in the College of Arts and Sciences or the Medical College. For example, clinical faculty may have a very different set of employment criteria as compared to research faculty, that are, in turn, quite different from an assistant professor in the English department. To further complicate matters and to add to the complexity of faculty employee roles and designations, many fixed-term, continuing status, academic professionals (e.g., library professionals) are considered full-fledged faculty. Thus, the array of faculty appointments can appear quite nebulous to both insiders and outsiders, making research tasks like salary comparisons nearly impossible to determine. Once again, however, the importance of understanding differences in experiences based on employment status can help us construct effective strategies for change, especially as they relate to inequities in compensation and treatment.

Overall, fewer differences existed between the customary academic levels of assistant, associate, and full professors. Broader differences are evident with those faculty who are adjunct and/or lecturers and those who are employed as continuing status or appointed personnel.

Full Professors

Full professors were generally the most insightful and articulate about university politics and leadership issues including the challenges one faces in a departmental leadership position such as chair. Full professors also spoke more eloquently about meeting the demands of service and offered thoughtful definitions for re-conceptualizing scholarship. In contrast, younger faculty appeared more concerned with life balance issues as well as promotion and tenure processes.

Many female full professors pointed to their small numbers on campus, especially full professors of color both male and female. Among others, one of the down sides of having few female and faculty of color full professors is the lack of mentoring for them in their new roles. While most readily offered advice, support, and mentoring to their junior colleagues, there was little consideration as to providing for their own continued growth and development. As might
be expected, full professors focused more often on retirement and generativity issues than their younger counterparts.

“I’m going to raise another issue that I think is an institutional problem. As a department head, I’ve wanted to support things like giving people parental leave and giving junior faculty, junior sabbaticals. The university is actually penalizing students when we try to do that because if I give somebody parental leave I might get $5,000 for a replacement so I usually hire a graduate student. Yes, they can be good teachers but they don’t fill the role in the same way. I think if you’re going to have junior sabbaticals and encourage people to take fellowships and give people parental leave, you should get the full value of their salary so that you can really hire someone to replace them” (female full professor).

“Women are much more likely to be interested in outside community service. We need to see this as a valued part of scholarship. We’re not being rewarded for it” (female full professor).

“As a senior person, I’m trying to spare the young faculty. We have a very young department now and there are only two full professors. And one of them is male. I’m on every committee. There is no escaping it. I have to do it. I see my younger colleagues suffering under this work load burden. So somehow we have to address realistically where these loads are and look at how we manage” (female full professor).

Female full professors stressed that much of their advancement and career success had depended on asserting themselves at the university. Being demure, according to women full professors, made them vulnerable to being denigrated.

“If you’re pushy and you know what you want and you go after what you want, you get it. I’ve been here a long time and I’ve never stopped. But, what if you’re not pushy? Women are more likely to be taken advantage of” (female full professor).

“I go usually as high as I can to get what I want but I also suffer in the long run, but that doesn’t stop me from being pushy. The alternative is to be treated as subservient” (female full professors).

**Associate Professors**

Associate professors expressed grief over being caught or “trapped” in the middle ranks. To them, they may have proven themselves sufficiently in order to garner tenure, but the service expectations increased so exponentially that it was difficult, as well as exhausting, to expend significant energy on scholarly activities to gain the full professorship. Female associate
professors particularly believe that they carry the yeomen’s portion of service in their departments. Associate professors were especially likely to experience salary compression due to inflation. As stated earlier, the option of job searching as a ploy for leveraging a salary increase was distasteful to many faculty.

“I’ve been one of these proverbial associate professors. I took on an active department headship. It doesn’t matter than I helped build six different buildings on this campus. It doesn’t matter that I helped procure a dozen new positions for the department. One doesn’t get promoted for service type activities. But I am not complaining. I grew up with the full knowledge that one gets promoted with research, grants and publications. I’ve accepted my fate” (male associate professor).

“Deans and directors, most of the full professors are male. There are very few full professors that are female because we’re the workers. Even when we’re assistant professors we were the workers that ran the committees, got the policies through, did all these things. Then as associate professors, we’re kind of in this ghetto because we’re still doing all those things and of course, our research was sufficient to get us tenure but it’s not really sufficient to promote us to this exalted status of full professor” (female associate professor).

“The expectations were clearly defined as an assistant professor, but I think that the expectations are different at the associate level and those expectations are not clearly defined” (male associate professor).

**Assistant Professors**

Assistant professors expressed more worry over the tenure process than their higher ranking colleagues. It should be noted that large numbers of faculty from varying academic ranks shared concerns about the pressures on assistant professors. Many faculty decried the subjective nature of performance reviews including the promotion and tenure process.

For the most part, assistant professors struggled with classroom and student management issues, and how to balance their workloads. Others protested against what they viewed as broken promises in the hiring process. Teaching assignments, service requirements, and research support that were assured by administrative leaders to be a part of their contract were never fulfilled. Women assistant professors who did not negotiate strongly at the outset of their appointment, usually found later on that other faculty, often male assistant professors, who requested higher salaries frequently received them. The women were dumbfounded that a public institution could act in such an inconsistent and discretionary manner.
“I thought I was being hired for a professional career. I didn’t know I had to wheel and deal like I was at a used car lot” (female assistant professor).

“For younger, assistant professors there are big demands made on teaching. Not just more courses but the kinds of courses that we wind up teaching. They’re labor intensive because they’re all field based. Every one of them is field based so they’re always out there running around. For an assistant professor it is difficult to focus on research and writing.”

“When I was hired I was promised that it’s going to be a three-legged stool, clinical work, teaching, and research. That’s why I took the job because it’s suppose to be fairly equal. To be honest, when you choose to go into academic medicine, you could have gone into private practice and make lots more money but you’re choosing to come here because this is what you want to do. Shortly after I got here we lost at least half of our faculty from the department and my clinical volume over the last seven years has quadrupled. I was hired on tenure-track and I left it. I told them I was not going to put myself in an impossible situation to have the same requirements that you all have, the same number of publications and everything else. I have a huge amount of clinical responsibility.”

**Lecturers and Adjuncts**

Individuals who have a contract with the University to teach as a lecturer and/or hold positions as adjunct faculty described their place in the institution as “tentative,” “under valued,” and “treated as second class citizens.”

“I have been slurred, slighted, overlooked, and mistreated by certain individuals in the department for whom I teach two courses and teach them well. Maybe it’s because I don’t have the Ph.D. I’m beginning to suspect gender is an issue here with certain individuals who have power over my work.”

“I’m always very aware that I am a second class citizen.”

“We don’t even have the protection of the administrative staff who get 90% if they’re fired.”

“We lose out every single time because we don’t have secretarial staff or we don’t have TAs or we don’t have publishing. There’s no travel money.”

“Grants go only to people who are on a tenure-track line so adjunct faculty aren’t even allowed to apply whether they are major grants or small research grants, 500 bucks for one month during the summer. None of that is available to apply for.”
Adjuncts and lecturers were especially disconcerted by the precariousness of their employment status. This makes personal financial planning as well as life planning extremely challenging. These faculty felt thwarted in their attempts to be contributing members of the University community as opposed to having to serve as “mere cogs in a giant production system.” Indeed, some felt despised by tenure-track faculty in their departments and the opportunity for additional supports such as secretarial or travel funds was deemed “tragically laughable.” Often adjuncts and lecturers were uninformed or misinformed about their role in faculty meetings and the discretion they could exhibit in curricular decisions. Given that women are more often in these adjunct and lecturer positions, female employees are disproportionately effected by all of these issues.

“I think for me the biggest drawback is the lack of job security and it’s hard to function like that. I love my job. But I never know from one year to the next whether I have a job and I have a child to raise so it’s very stressful.”

“I’m busting my ass because I have to make myself indispensable. That’s my job security. Everybody comments on my personal situation and what a travesty it is because of the absolutely idiosyncratic methods by which the university is run. Indispensable doesn’t mean anything. I could be replaced by your water bottle tomorrow and truthfully, I don’t think there would be one person who would raise a voice in my defense. In the end, that’s what indispensability means. If you go they’ll find somebody else indispensable to do your work.”

“I would like to see more clarity in terms of the rules of adjunct lecturers. In our department there are tenured faculty who really hate lecturers and particularly any adjunct lecturers. They debate whether we should be allowed to even attend the faculty meetings and whether we should be kicked out for certain votes and things like that. That’s been a real hindrance to me. I feel disenfranchised.”

“Being a lecturer in the department I’m not sure where I can move to, how I can grow, how my salary can increase or how my compensation can match the work that I do.”

Lecturers and adjuncts contended that the lack of their integration into the educational processes of the institution ultimately results in damaging student growth and learning.

“Students suffer because of tenure-track positions. People have to go out and get grants and therefore they don’t have enough time to give to students, that’s wrong. So those of us who aren’t on the tenure-track can just take care of all these students because
the other people don’t have time. Fine, but set it up. Okay this year, this person’s goal is this. Next year you’re gonna be tenured so you’re going to pick this up again.”

“It looks better for the university to have full professors teaching the undergraduate students when I would like to be doing it and it would be done better. I’m blowing my own horn because I enjoy teaching. I’m not here to do research and my interest is in the students and their education.”

“The University of Arizona’s [department/school/college] is a glorified University of Phoenix. They’ve got these great professors but they don’t teach.”

“There’s no addressing the curriculum. It is an extremely low priority which is reflective of the fact that the non-tenure-track people who are teaching most of the courses are in themselves considered low priority and that’s fundamentally a problem because the research is going to be supported by the money that is generated through credit hours. We are really falling behind in terms of our curriculum design.”

Lecturers and adjuncts complained of low salaries and salary disparities across departments. They also felt exploited by the institution because so few of them are eligible for or receive health insurance benefits. As a factor of their status, individual or collective action for change would likely jeopardize their relationship with the university.

“I have five teaching assistants that have health insurance and I don’t. And there’s obviously no retirement.”

“Our university is now involved in this huge issue of the clothing logos and who is exploited abroad. Which is a huge issue and I don’t mean to demean it in a way but we’re all here and who actually on this campus is paying one ounce of attention to the fact of the exploitation of adjunct faculty and particularly working women on this campus, nobody.”

“For anyone to teach on this campus and not have access to health insurance is criminal.”

“If you open your mouth you’re likely not to be rehired. You don’t have the job security in any way shape or form to even go out and advocate for something different.”

Adjuncts and lecturers also shared why they chose to be in these types of positions. They suggested that the university consider implementing two and three year contracts as a structure for developing educational consistency in programs and departments.

“If indeed there was a tenure-track position that was based on teaching and service I would definitely be the first on the list to sign up. At this point I’m not willing
to compromise the rest of my life to take on a tenure-track position. I do research during the summertime but that’s because I want to do it and because I enjoy it.”

“It was hard originally because I was trained to be a tenure-track faculty member and I took a different route.”

“The non-tenure-track faculty members are not your classic adjuncts. They are not people who are working and then interested in teaching in the evening. These are people who have Ph.D.s. They have terminal degrees. They contribute immensely in seminars. They didn’t buy the academic model of publish or perish. If you don’t recognize the value that your non-tenure-track can bring into play then you’re setting yourself up for a major problem.”

“I would recommend with adjuncts to make a concerted effort to hire and make a contract renewable for 3 years. It makes the department run better if there’s some consistency.”

**Appointed Personnel, Academic Professionals and Continuing Status**

The term "appointed personnel" includes faculty members, academic and service professionals, and administrators. Academic professionals are defined as appointed, non-faculty employees who are involved with research or teaching programs, who require professional and intellectual freedom, and who report to a person below the level of vice-president, including librarians, those working with cooperative extensions, and researchers. Both categories have continuing/continuing eligible employees.

Faculty who are hired under the umbrella terms of appointed personnel, academic professional, or continuing status positions experience a labyrinth of titles and confusing directions over roles, duties, expectations, and review and advancement processes.

“Impediments to success include the confusing definition of academic professionals. The fact that there is no equal type of position at other institutions. Those who are on research appointments do have opportunities for promotion and unfortunately they are held to the same standards as those who are on tenure-track positions. They must have outside reviewers, publications. They must secure grant money, etc. Those who are service professionals on the other hand do not have a clear track to promotion. It’s difficult for both categories of staff since they are neither staff nor faculty to look at salary structures at other institutions for comparative increases.”

“I’m in a position that I have continuing status but I’m in an appointed personnel position. Therefore, I fall in between many cracks because I’m not staff. I’m faculty when they consider me for my salary adjustments and things like that but when it comes
to anything else nobody knows whether to invite me to this or that. If I look for who to go to for a mentor or an advisor I’ve had to do it pretty much on my own. It feels like you’re out there alone and yet I know there are a bunch of other people with unique, odd titles, too.”

Faculty expressed feeling like an anomaly given that their positions were often ill-defined and vague. Similar to adjunct and lecture faculty, many appointed personnel faculty referred to themselves as being treated like second-class citizens or illegitimate. In addition, since many appointed personnel positions are dependent upon research grant monies, faculty were in a constant state of psychological chaos since their continuation at the institution was an ever present question.

“The position I took being an appointed professional is so unique. I think it’s the only title like it on campus. It put me in that quasi-field. I have faculty status because I have continuing status. But I still feel relatively illegitimate.”

“I think the research faculty are a special group that have been neglected and are very poorly treated.”

“Everybody on a research track doesn’t have state funding. We don’t have the continuation of monies so we have to constantly go after grants and in the meantime you have to do all your committee work and all your teaching work.”

“We are judged like tenured faculty. We have to worry about publications. We educate students and do service. On top of that we have to go get money otherwise we don’t get paid.”

“In my position, appointed personnel, there’s no review so nobody’s ever told me I do a good job or a bad job. It’s, you have money. You work until the money is over and it’s over next month so I’m stressed. If you get more money you can keep working but if you don’t that’s it.”

At most institutions, faculty normally have complete autonomy in how they manage their time and schedules. This allows for optimum flexibility in pursuing research opportunities, meeting student needs, and completing writing and creative projects. For appointed personnel, the expectations of their duties and daily schedules are neither up to individual choice nor are they standardized according to roles. This situation creates much confusion and stress.

“The kind of work we do in research is not the same as teaching faculty. On the other hand, we do work forty hours a week. We do work twelve months a year. We
don’t have the summer off. We don’t have the work that typical faculty do so whatever scholarship and service that we do and is required is above and beyond the work week and that is difficult.”

“I’m not staff and I work in an office where everyone is staff. It’s that appointed personnel thing. They don’t know whether to include me in conference calls that the staff all go to and I don’t. Then again, I’m not really faculty.”

“I asked what about sabbatical? They said, ‘Well, we don’t know’ because no one in my position has ever asked for it. However, there are previous administrators in our college who have gotten sabbatical. The other issue is, of course, when would I find the time to take it because who would then take my position.”

Review processes and procedures for salary adjustments and career advancement are just as ambiguous, as stated by faculty, as the job titles and responsibilities.

“You’re supposed to be meeting requirements for service, to present at major conferences, it’s part of what you’re expected to do. You can’t go to major centers like Philadelphia and New York and L.A. inexpensively.”
“It would be helpful if this university would clarify or articulate more clearly the continuing status of the academic professionals’ responsibilities, roles, duties, and relationships. They’ve drawn so heavily on the tenure-track system that I think some folks conveniently conflate a person’s particular interests to match the definitions. It plays out in things like requests for leave time and for support and funding for conference attendance. It gets terribly complicated. What are the parameters of their scholarship and research? How is it supposed to relate either to their job or their level of academic freedom?”

“There needs to be a better balance in the review process of academic professionals with continuing status. I’ve heard comments from tenured faculty saying, ‘What the hell does a curator do? All they do is dust off old pottery. Why should they get tenure? Why should they have continuing status?’”

“I’m really looking forward to what comes about through this post tenure review process. I’m hoping there will be a signal from the campus about the post continuing status process and what that means in terms of a collective understanding of what’s expected and what’s appropriately rigorous.”

One of the other consequences of hazy and obscure processes for determining the relative merit of faculty contributions is that women and faculty of color are at greater risk for being discriminating against. As was clearly demonstrated earlier in this document, procedures that depend upon individual negotiation and discretionary practices will almost always disfavor women and individuals of color.

“The two women who left were clinical faculty and they felt neither respected nor reimbursed. What’s interesting is that when they were leaving or threatened to leave over their salaries, all of a sudden they were offered x amount more money.”

“Faculty perceive all academic professionals as less than. There are clear gender inequities among the service professionals as there is a sense that the service professionals are just glorified secretaries. Perhaps if they were men they would not be perceived as such and receive a higher salary.”

**Differences Across Academic Discipline**

In an attempt to preclude “finger pointing” at any particular program, department, school, or college, faculty perspectives across academic discipline are broadly generalized. Perhaps most prevalent were issues concerning resources. Faculty in the humanities and social sciences tended to complain about the lack of resources for technology, teaching assistants, and travel. They accused the university administration of viewing them as a less important priority than
other disciplines. In contrast, faculty in the sciences tended to complain about the pressures to secure grant funds and contracts including the bureaucratic processes for negotiating overhead costs, space, and equipment.

“There’s a general perception that the administration doesn’t value the social sciences. We’re doing all the general education and we’re not getting any new hires. It isn’t good for the college morale. Faculty are really down that other colleges such as the sciences and engineering get all the benefits” (female full professor).

“In the past, and still in the present, the sciences have been on a higher tier than the humanities, in part because they generate substantially more research revenue for the university. The university needs to do a better job of melding the sciences and humanities. Humanities are an important part of creating an educated person, rather than a person with just technical expertise. There is room to improve, the current administration at least is providing some leadership to think about these issues.”

“It doesn’t matter if you’re the best doctor in the world and saving lives everywhere and teaching the residents. If you’re not bringing in the money you’re not the golden child.”

“I am in a department that is reliant mostly on outside income from grants and also one that is really not an academic department. The measure of success is who is getting the grants and who ends up working with the people who are doing the grants. If you don’t have the same interests you’re of out luck. That effects your professional success and personal success.”

“Hearing people on campus talk about the differences between this college and that college I was like, ‘you’re kidding.’ Then I thought, may our dean’s not such a bad guy after all. He comes across as a brusque male chauvinist sometimes but at least we have computers on our desks.”

Faculty in the humanities and social sciences were the most likely to raise issues about the challenges of diversifying the curriculum. They expressed concerns about how scholarship and course readings with respect to feminism, racial/ethnic issues, and gay/lesbian concerns were valued within departments and within the promotion and tenure process. Faculty involved with interdisciplinary teaching and projects felt frequently marginalized. Women faculty in “traditionally female disciplines” felt especially undervalued and under recognized for the contributions.

“Interdisciplinary programs get very little attention.”
“You’re much better off if you’re in a traditional discipline or department in relation to administration than if you’re in an interdisciplinary program. Women’s programs, departments and colleges that are primarily female are undervalued by the institution.”

“My field seems to them to be obscure. The publications that specialize in my field are not necessarily the ones that they know. This is a very serious problem in terms of how people assess what it is that you’re writing and publishing” (faculty of color).

“We work very hard to have our students find voice and find their female voices as well as their professional voices. To me that’s a very important part of education. But these are not aspects that are valued.”

“I’m in an under-resourced unit and if you look across the campus I think you’re going to find that women and minority faculty are disproportionately located in under-resourced units. That doesn’t mean everyone who is a woman or minority is in such a unit but, for example, the allocation for travel money in the department is $150. Given that our salaries are lower to start with, how can we possibly fulfill our potential as scholars?”

The importance of identifying mentors and colleagues with whom one can collaborate is an issue that cut across disciplines. As women faculty and faculty of color continue to legitimize their role in academe, opportunities for collaborative relationships are critical to their success.

“There is an increasing need for collaboration in research and that collaboration is a very subtle form of discrimination if it does not occur. One token person in a laboratory can easily get lost.”

“I have had young, white male colleagues complain about the lack of mentoring that occurs. The unfortunate thing is that in certain branches of the biological sciences and the medical sciences, collaboration and mentoring is critical.”
“I don’t feel as successful as I could have been if I had been part of a group, had I not been toiling in reinventing the wheel all by myself. Mentoring is very subtle. People will tell you, I will help you, but then you go and ask them and they give you answers that you know good and well are not complete, are not well thought out, or do not come from a perspective of really wanting to encourage you and help you. It becomes extremely difficult” (faculty of color).

**Differences Across Type of Discussion Group**

The majority of faculty with whom we spoke were randomly selected from across the University, but additional discussion groups allowed for a broader range of perspectives to be included in the Project. Discussion groups included meetings with already existing groups such as the Association for Women Faculty, Women in Academic Medicine, and Heads-Up (see Appendix C for a complete listing). Since the comments and observations raised in the discussion groups replicated those of the focus groups, faculty issues have been categorized by topical area throughout the bulk of the report. This format also best maintained the anonymity of faculty.

The next three discussion group types (faculty with disabilities, lesbian/gay/bisexual faculty, and administrators) are presented here to highlight the concerns and viewpoints unique to each of these groups. Due to considerations of privacy and confidentiality, the parameters of the Project (as formed in conjunction with the Human Subjects Committee) did not allow us to inquire on the demographic form of an individual faculty’s disability status or sexual orientation. Faculty who participated in the two specialized groups on these matters were identified through referral by a campus contact.

**Faculty with Disabilities Perspectives**

Faculty members with a disability shared their remarks with openness and candor. Some of the faculty had a permanent physical disability while other faculty were struggling with more recent disabilities due to illness, disease, or accident. When asked what language best describes their challenges (e.g., impairment, handicap, physical difference) they unanimously felt that “disability” most accurately encompassed their situation and clearly mirrored the language of the Americans with Disabilities Act.
“I have found it very up and down. Sometimes there’s lots of help and then sometimes lots of hindrance.”

Faculty experiences for this group are represented here as falling into two dichotomous states, those circumstances that support faculty and those that hinder faculty. Sometimes those elements that were intended to be supports for faculty with disabilities could instead become impediments. As one faculty member humorously stated, “The joke is, Can I help you? No thank you, I’m in a hurry.”

For faculty with disabilities, supports at the institution included collegial relationships that provided assistance with teaching and scholarship. They also included having specific physical alterations made to office and classroom space.

“If it looks like I can’t make it to class, they’re there and they walk me down. They’ll even sit in class with me. As we all get older things can just fall from the sky. It’s gonna be important to know how to find the supports.”

“In my case, I did have a department who was from the start very supportive. When I came in, when I was hired, they redid the office for me to make it really accessible with a special desk and everything. Also, the main department office door was smaller so they made it larger.”

“They put a bar in the classroom that I could hold onto if I needed to stand up and write on the board.”

“The students have always been the most supportive of all. Most of the time when I get in there, they’ll get up and move the chairs and make sure I get in and then move the table.”

As brought to light in discussions with these faculty, the nature of disabilities is not static. Depending on the particular disability, some faculty had days, weeks, or even months where their special physical needs were relatively slight. However, reactions to medications, overwork, negative work environments, and other unexpected events could increase the need for assistance. Given the large aging population of faculty, the institution can come to expect that more faculty will need support, understanding, and guidance about how to realign work load expectations and career trajectories. As one faculty commented, “Most of us are only temporally abled.” The institution faces the ethical, moral, and legal dilemmas of investing in faculty in the long-term who may one day not be able to contribute their expertise at the same rate as earlier days.
“You’re okay and then the bottom falls out. You don’t know where to go temporarily for help. Like I needed a speaking system when I came back to class. There was no place in the university to get a temporary system because there was no back up system. Our professorate is getting older. They’re at retirement age. Statistically it’s gonna happen. I hope it doesn’t but it will.”

“I went to my department head and he basically said, well you look fine to me. Why aren’t you doing your job? All I asked for was a cart because I was carrying these things down on trays for years. He brought in people from the provost’s office, including one university lawyer that just badgered me about, is this a permanent condition? Is this a permanent condition? I still did not know what my diagnosis was. I didn’t know whether it was going to deteriorate or whether I could stabilize it.”

“You’ve gotta ratchet it down and you’ve worked a long hard time to get up to the position you’re at. A lot of this stuff has to do with scaling back and nobody’s ever seen you scaled back before. You were the person who made things happen. Our colleagues and department heads sometimes think that we’re malingering or that we’re trying to get away with something. I mean I sat on the personnel committees and I hear this.”

Faculty with disabilities noted that their requests for assistance or accommodation were met with disbelief, protest, and resistance. Often, faculty were considered to be whining or nagging by others especially if their disability was internal or hidden, as opposed to readily visible.

“I used a motorized wheelchair. I can get around the office without that but I can’t walk the hallway. There has been no accommodation. Even trying to get a laptop computer to accommodate me, everything has been a battle.”

“Regarding the Americans with Disabilities Act, I don’t think they’re compliant at all. You’re always having to over prove yourself. You’re over proving yourself because your legs are not good.”

“People are more likely to realize you need accommodation if you’re in a wheelchair. If you don’t at least have a cast or cane you might be out of luck.”

“A lot of study abroad programs organized by the university are still problematic. If a student wanted to go in a wheelchair with some disability, they would be in a lot of trouble. For example in my department we have a program [overseas]. I can’t even go teach there because the buildings are not accessible and it’s a university program. If a student wanted to go in a wheelchair we have to say no and that student could sue us.”
From an institutional perspective, clearer processes and procedures for assisting faculty with disabilities seems imperative. Most faculty were unaware of the current status of a committee on accessibility issues for the campus. They wondered whether the university was supporting this effort any longer. Other issues included changes in classrooms that create inaccessible situations, the need for training faculty and teaching assistants in meeting the needs of students with disabilities, and reconsidering certain institutional requirements that may be hindering the productivity of a broad range of individuals.

“It was an accessibility group. Together we looked at not only building accessibility but also program accessibility. I happened to be part of that group and we met often. They had a fairly substantial budget. The committee was instituted to help Facilities Management have a mechanism for deciding what kinds of things to do around the campus. We viewed the university as a whole and which building was a no no and which buildings were okay. But also in terms of curriculum there were some serious issues there. I have no idea what happened to that committee.”

“It seems difficult to get a list of people on the campus who need or who might potentially need information about facilities or resources or accommodations because some people consider it an invasion of their privacy which seems to me kind of unfortunate.”

“They raised class size which created a double problem because the renovation reduced the physical size of the classroom. Raising the number of students in class put more chairs and tables into those classes. I’m always thinking about students in wheelchairs and I wonder how they can negotiate that in those classes. You can’t even find the aisle. You can’t even find the door. I tripped over them one day. That was graceful.”

“I work with a lot of TAs, there is not a lot of support to help TAs deal with disabled students in classes.”

“There needs to be a way that faculty who become disabled can find out what is available on the campus, who to talk to, because that’s almost an impossible task. There is just not an awareness. It needs to be addressed at the institutional level.”

**Lesbian, Gay, and Bisexual Faculty Perspectives**

Faculty who identified themselves as lesbian, gay, or bisexual discussed at length the difficulty of being “out” on campus whether one is a student, faculty, or staff member. While pockets of support and acceptance exist within certain departments, the general consensus was that one risked their personal and professional standing by being open and authentic at the
institution. This caused stress, frustration, and at times fear since it was unknown if an individual faculty member might be a target of prejudice whether from a student or a colleague. Indeed, direct and overt discrimination such as name calling or physical threats appeared less frightening to these faculty than subtle and insidious discrimination such as poor teaching evaluations from “conservative minded” students and negative performance reviews as evaluated by their colleagues in the promotion and tenure process. Despite the risks, faculty who are lesbian, gay, or bisexual indicated that not being “out” compromised their own integrity as well as the educational integrity of the university as their presence is one aspect of a pluralistic learning community.

“There is a lack of visibly ‘out’ faculty on campus and a lack of visibly ‘out’ students. It’s actually very easy to go through your day and not know that you’ve encountered any lesbian, gay, or bisexual people here. It may be part of a cultural reticence but I think we’re not sure that the university would back us up if we have a fight with the legislature.”

“Being the visible lesbian token, the ‘official lesbian.’ I felt a tremendous amount of stress. I’m hyper-visible. I’m enormously visible which is stressful in addition to the massive workload.”

“I’ve never heard anything from the deans or anybody about the climate for gay and lesbian people. The word is never even said. It might make things a little bit more open if somebody from above would say something and verbalize that gay and lesbian faculty exist. To say the word lesbian will not make your tongue fall off.”

“I’ve gotten negative comments about lesbian content in classes. I personally feel it’s important to reach out to people where they’re at so to speak. I deal with those as caringly and directly as I can. I attempt to disrupt the homophobia while at the same time respecting their right to come to their own conclusions about things. But all of this has taken a huge toll on me.”

Sexual orientation is included as part of the university non-discrimination policy but the level of acceptance and support varies considerably across campus, especially with respect to the implementation of policies and procedures. Similar to faculty of color, gay and lesbian faculty felt that their workloads are greater since more students seek them out for advising, their scholarship may not be recognized by the department, and involvement with committees attending to diversity issues may not be valued.
“Things that have supported my life here have less to do explicitly with being queer. Last year I adopted a kid and my department has been incredibly supportive in terms of time off and flexible schedules. I’m sure if I had asked for it I could have gotten an extension on tenure and stopped the tenure clock.”

“When my partner and I moved here the department had no partner benefits. We were told that the university absolutely could not include me in her health insurance.”

“Lesbians always wind up with these ridiculous workloads. I don’t know what causes that. Maybe making up for being lesbian, I guess.”

The existence of Lesbian, Gay, and Bisexual Studies has served as a structural support for many faculty. The program has provided an opportunity for faculty to pursue their own scholarly and research issues as well as to meet other colleagues with similar interests.

“The existence of LGB Studies is the first thing I have to speak to regarding what has made life manageable here” (female assistant professor)

“Involvement with LBG students and committees makes it livable but some people might not get involved in any of this stuff because truthfully it is pitted against your getting tenure and then your advancement.”

“I know that the department is very excited about what is being done in Gay Studies and wants to support it. The Lesbian Gay Studies program bought out one of my course slots for the spring so that I could work on lesbian gay curriculum for course design for next fall” (male assistant professor).

“I teach queer content in one of my courses. Having the option, feeling no obligation to teach queer content actually counts as much as feeling free to do it. Having both of those choices has been really important.”

Legitimizing LGB studies is a sensitive political issue. Faculty believe that the institution is willing to support its existence as long as it does not come to the attention of the legislature which frequently attacks the institution for its “liberal” causes. In the end, faculty hopes for a campus that actively supports the learning and working needs of all of its members are often disappointed.

“We have been very much discouraged by the administration from seeking official approval. They just didn’t want to attract the attention of the legislature. It’s really not the Regents that’s the problem. It’s the legislature. Nobody wants to fight that
battle particularly. I think we’re just at the beginning to reach the point where we have to seriously consider doing it anyway and bringing the university around to supporting it.”

“They periodically find themselves under attack from some of the conservative perceptions in the legislature. The purchasing of books for example at a feminist bookstore in the community that also sells lesbian oriented materials. That’s been an issue” (male faculty).

“We have functioned as a committee without the board approval. We got a big $300,000 grant from the Rockefeller Foundation but in fact we are not officially a committee. Our location in the university is very nebulous.”

“The domestic partnership kinds of things is certainly an issue but there is a sense of helplessness given the nature of the state legislature. It doesn’t give one a real sense of hope for change.”

**Administrative Perspectives**

Faculty in administrative roles were asked to reflect upon and respond to the same set of questions with respect to supports and impediments of faculty work life as well as to offer suggestions for change. Administrators included department chairs, deans and vice deans, vice-presidents, provost, and president, and a few others in upper level administrative positions that are not a part of the academic ranks.

Problems with the tracking and equitable distribution of salaries did not allude those who are administrators. In fact, administrators stated that, in many cases, salaries were determined based upon individual negotiation and the lack of institutional salary tracking systems further exasperated the problems.

Administrators were slightly more optimistic than faculty that the inconsistencies are being removed from the promotion and tenure process, but even administrators recognize that a myriad of problems still exist. Furthermore, the drive to be competitive and entrepreneurial impacts faculty relationships as well as advancement opportunities.

“And, in really a relatively short period of time it has become a Research I institution and I am betting that the kind of initiative, entrepreneurial ability and skill and, initiative that was required to move it from the party school to a Research I institution is not always perhaps perfect for building a team-oriented culture. I’m sure it was very individual. I’m going to beat you out. It was competition rather than cooperation, and things like that.”
Administrators noted the challenges associate professors, especially women associate professors, face in trying to climb the academic ranks. There is a sense among some administrators that associate professors are getting “stuck” at that level due to increased expectations without corresponding assistance, like release time and other rewards.

One solution to some of the managerial and administrative issues in the institution is to require professional development training through the Heads-Up and New Head Ed Programs.

“Administrators, from department heads to deans, need to understand what it means to be an administrator and to take their responsibility seriously. I’m afraid oftentimes people think that they’re doing a pretty darned good job and maybe their performance evaluation even says that and then you’re interviewing the person who prepared the performance appraisal, well I was just doing it to be nice.”

The importance of mentoring faculty and providing other institutional supports for faculty were highlighted by administrators. While some administrators believed that it was the obligation of faculty to know how to negotiate when accepting a position with the institution, others expressed concerns about how we train faculty to enter the academic market.

“When you’re going through the P & T process if you have a supportive department head, that person ought to be working with you and mentoring you and coaching so that you do not accept every assignment that comes along.”
“As an assistant professor, it’s something that should have been done before when they were doing their job search. They are not taught to negotiate. Many things are negotiable whether it’s your space, the lab support you need, TAs, negotiating for release time. We don’t prepare our very new faculty for how to enter the workforce.’”

“They’re going through the P & T process and perhaps they are not as successful as they could be because they didn’t have some of the pieces that would have enabled them to be successful. More release time, lighter teaching loads can make a big difference. Having a summer stipend might make a difference in how much research they can produce.”

Sensitivity was demonstrated by many (although certainly not all) administrators with respect to their ability to state the gender-related issues women face on the campus. However, administrators were less aware of the issues facing faculty of color, although some understood that faculty, including faculty of color, leave the institution for far more than mere monetary reasons.

“We found through exit surveys that faculty leave for more money but particularly for women and minorities one of the main factors that would have kept them here is if they would have been received recognition for their work. We need to recognize that rewards and recognition can come in many forms, not necessarily all monetary.”

Creating change on the campus was seen by administrators as entailing the inclusion of women in decision making processes including their advancement into leadership positions. Yet, this creates increased work loads for women. Administrators do see that their senior male colleagues have a particularly crucial role in trying to improve the climate, given their sheer numbers in leadership roles. However, the importance of a collective effort in creating change was also viewed as critical in securing success.

“Very often faculty perceive themselves as independent contractors. Faculty aren’t recognizing that they are members of their community. There are overarching values like civility and fairness that are critical to their success in their department with their colleagues but also in the classroom as they try and mentor and coach students and serve as role models. It is an issue of loyalty to the profession versus loyalty to the institution.”