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Introduction

Women and faculty of color have consistently been under-represented in higher education. Those who do make it into the academy have often faced subtle, as well as overt discrimination. Indeed, Olsen (1991) revealed that race and gender affect the amount of compensation received, independent of whether personal and professional goals fit within institutional values and norms. More recently, the Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT) acknowledged that female faculty in its school of science earn less salary, have smaller offices, and are less likely to be granted departmental awards and distinctions than their male counterparts (Miller & Wilson, 1999). One of the dangers to any type of discrimination is that even small differences can result in large disparities in salary, prestige, and promotion over time (Valian, 1999); so it is critical to identify and address all forms of discrimination as quickly as possible.

Some academics may have the impression that women are making considerable progress. One reason for this is that more women than ever are on college campuses. However, because there were such small percentages of women in tenure-track positions in the past, even small increases seem noticeable (Valian, 1999). Yet those small differences are just that, small. National data indicate that women are under-represented at the top ranks; in fact, the disparity of tenured men to women has not changed since the early 1980s (Valian, 1999). The University of Arizona has been more successful than this, but women are still over-represented at the bottom ranks and tend to be involuntarily under-employed.

As a public research institution, the University of Arizona represents a large-scale model of the challenges facing faculty in higher education at the start of the second millennium. The institution has recently undertaken a systematic study of the experiences of women faculty and faculty of color to examine issues of equity and career advancement. The aim of the “Millennium Project” at the University of Arizona (UA) is to enhance the development of an institutional culture that fosters productivity, creativity, and academic excellence. The Project supports the university’s goal of achieving an enabling academic climate that will allow all faculty, staff, and students to be productive, and unhindered by any impediments due to considerations of gender, race/ethnicity, or any other reason.

Project Background
The aim of the Millennium Project is to enhance the development of an institutional culture at the University of Arizona that fosters productivity, creativity, and academic excellence. The Project supports the university’s goal of achieving an enabling academic climate that will allow all faculty, staff, and students to be productive, and unhindered by any impediments due to considerations of gender, race/ethnicity, or any other reason.

Commissioned by President Peter Likins, the Millennium Project is jointly supported by the Association for Women Faculty (AWF) and the Commission on the Status of Women (CSW). The Project was internally funded by President Likins, CSW, the Provost, Vice-presidents, and the Deans. The collaborative leadership for the Project has been provided by Project Director Christine Cress (Portland State University); Association for Women Faculty Past President Naomi Miller, Co-Chair, and Commission on the Status of Women Immediate Past Chair Myra Dinnerstein, Co-Chair. The Steering Committee consisted of the two Co-Chairs, Mary Poulton, CSW Past Chair, and Kari McBride, Past Chair, Equity Committee, CSW. Jeni Hart, Center for the Study of Higher Education, has served as Graduate Associate. The Millennium Project Campus Advisory Board, composed of AWF and CSW representatives and other university faculty and administrators supported the overall development of the Project (see Appendix A for a list of the Millennium Project Campus Advisory Board members). In addition, the Millennium Project relied upon the expertise of other local and national colleagues who provided their input and support.

The Millennium Project Community Advisory Board included: former Arizona Regent, Esther Capin; Marty Cortez, Past President of the UA Hispanic Alumni Club and member of the Pima Board of Governors; the Honorable Margaret Houghton; former UA President Dr. John Schaefer; Dr. Noelia Vela, President, Downtown Campus, Pima Community College; and Dr. Laurel Wilkening, former Chancellor UC, Irvine, and former Vice-president for Research, UA.

The National Advisory Board provided oversight and direction to the Project with their cumulative expertise in the areas of campus climate, organizational change, and faculty issues. In particular, the Board assisted with the Project design, methodology, and review of the data analysis. The ensemble included: Dr. Helen Astin, Professor of Higher Education and Associate Director of the Higher Education Research Institute at UCLA; Ms. Carol Hollenshead, Director of the University of Michigan Center for the Education of Women (CEW) and Chair of the University of Michigan President’s Advisory Commission on Women’s Issues; Dr. Laura
Rendon, Veffie Milstead Jones Endowed Chair at California State University, Long Beach and Professor of Educational Leadership and Policy Studies at Arizona State University; Dr. Donna Shavlik, former Head of the Office on Women at the American Council on Education; Dr. John Slaughter, former President, Occidental College, The Irving R. Melbo Professor of Leadership Education at the University of Southern California, and the President and Chief Executive Officer of the National Action Council for Minorities in Engineering; and Dr. Laurel Wilkening, former Chancellor UC, Irvine, and former Vice-president for Research, UA.

Project Scope

Over the course of the last two years, the Millennium Project has gathered and analyzed comprehensive quantitative and qualitative data from all fifteen colleges at the University of Arizona. Quantitative data were collected from existing data sources from the Office of Decision and Planning Support (DAPS) and the University of Arizona participation in the National College and University Faculty Survey (Higher Education Research Institute, University of California, Los Angeles). Qualitative data were collected from a random sample of women and men faculty through individual interviews and focus groups, and from additional faculty who participated in discussion groups. In all, over 270 faculty participated in the Project.

This report represents Phase 1 (Faculty) of the Millennium Project. Recognizing that campus climate issues affect more than just faculty, the administration has committed to an investigation of similar issues in Phase 2 (Academic Professionals and Classified Staff). The second phase of the Project began in Fall 2001.

Theoretical Perspectives

University and college learning environments are often referred to in the literature as campus climate or campus culture, and these terms are often used interchangeably. While campus culture and climate are at times relatively synchronous, influencing the attitudes and behavioral choices of the participants (e.g., faculty and students), there are some important distinctions between the two concepts.

Campus culture has been defined as the “collective, mutually shaping patterns of norms, values, practices, beliefs, and assumptions that guide the behavior of individuals and groups in higher education and provide a frame of reference within which to interpret the meaning of
events and actions” (Kuh & Whitt, 1988, pp. 12-13). Further, campus culture gives meaning to its members by emphasizing the institution’s unique characteristics, is deeply embedded, and changes only through repeated and consistent long-term efforts (Peterson & Spencer, 1990).

Campus climate, on the other hand, is the current perceptions, attitudes, and expectations that define the institution and its members. Whereas the examination of culture entails viewing the organization from a holistic perspective, climate focuses on interpersonal interactions (Bauer, 1998). According to Peterson and Spencer (1990), campus climate: 1) is the common attitudes, beliefs, perceptions, behaviors, and/or observations that can be compared across groups over time; 2) focuses on current patterns of beliefs and behaviors; and 3) is often ephemeral or malleable in character.

To sum up the differences, campus culture consists of the organizational values that are deeply embedded in the organizational structure and fairly resistant to change. Campus climate, by contrast, is the atmosphere or style that permeates the moment, but is more susceptible to influence and change. Thus, by attending to campus climate and addressing the issues at hand, an institution may effect long-term change that eventually reshapes the campus culture.

Of course, one of the challenges of studying campus climate is that the perception of climate is the elusive dimension “where the individual mind, the social group, and the organizational structure meet and interact” (Baird, 1988, p.45). Earlier work by Rychlak (1968) grappled with the issue of whether the environment is best understood as “real”--actually existing independent of observation, or “ideal”--existing only in terms of perceptions.

Tierney (1987), however, contends that there is no difference between reality and perception: “Reality is not something objective or external to the participants” (p.64). Instead, environmental climates are actively constructed or interpreted by members; thus, one person may evaluate a setting as “friendly,” “warm,” and “unrestricted,” whereas another person may evaluate that same environment as “distant,” “cool,” and “confining.” The importance of this distinction is that such perceptions may affect how individuals respond to a given environment. Negative perceptions and interpretations are likely to contribute to dissatisfaction, instability, and the desire to leave a particular environment; positive perceptions are more likely to be linked with satisfaction, stability, and the desire to remain in an environment (Strange, 1994).

A litany of research exists demonstrating the relationship between negative (or hostile) campus climates and the likelihood of women and racial/ethnic minorities leaving or being less
successful in institutions of higher education, including more frequent experiences of high stress and low satisfaction with the college or university (Astin, Antonio, Cress, & Astin, 1997; Astin & Cress, 1998; Astin, Trevino, & Wingard, 1991; Cameron, Mets, Jones, & Ettington, 1986; Cress, 1999; D’Augelli, 1989; Drew & Work, 1998; Eliason, 1996; Green, 1989; Nora & Cabrera, 1996; Riger, Stokes, Raja, & Sullivan, 1997; Sax, 1994; Sax & Chun, 1991; Tierney, 1993; Tierney & Rhoads, 1993; Toren, 2000; Turner & Thompson, 1993; Walsh, 1978).

Since perceptions of the institution are inextricably linked with a number of outcomes such as retention rates of faculty (Tierney & Bensimon, 1996) as well as with students’ cognitive and affective development such as knowledge acquisition and critical thinking skills (Kuh, Vesper, Connolly, & Pace, 1997), enhancing campus climate is directly related to improving the academic excellence of the institution. Consequently, the Millennium Project was designed not merely to assess the campus climate, but, more importantly, to identify ways to rectify inequities. To that end, the Millennium Project examined numerous data sets and engaged hundreds of campus members in various discussions to develop the recommendations for positive institutional change highlighted in this report.
Methodology

Study Design

The Project design evolved in consultation with the three Advisory Boards, the Steering Committee, and the President. It became apparent in these meetings that in order to comprehensively examine campus climate issues, the Millennium Project methodology had to assess both quantitative and qualitative data.

The quantitative data allowed for statistical analysis and comparison within and outside the institution across gender and race/ethnicity on a number of issues (e.g., self-reported teaching loads, perceptions of discrimination, institutional values). The qualitative data allowed for purposive samples of faculty to share their experiences at the institution and to offer insights and suggestions for institutional improvement. Thus, the methodology allowed for statistically testing whether inequities exist, and for gaining greater insight into the daily realities of faculty life. Moreover, the emphasis on engaging a wide variety of faculty in conversations about campus climate highlighted institutional strengths and opportunities for enhancing the environment for academic excellence.

It should be noted that, prior to data collection and analysis, the Project initiators submitted the study design and received formal approval to proceed from the University of Arizona’s Institutional Review Board. The majority of data were collected during Spring, 2000. However, data from two additional discussion groups (faculty with disabilities and gay/lesbian/bisexual faculty) were collected in Fall, 2000, since Human Subjects approval for interacting with these groups was not received until later in the process.

Quantitative Data

To efficiently and effectively expedite the project, it was decided to utilize existing institutional data rather than to engage in a new survey initiative. This determination was based on a number of factors: 1) multiple salary, teaching load, faculty retention, and campus climate studies had already been conducted over the last few years; 2) development of a new survey instrument is costly, time consuming, and often falls suspect to reliability and validity issues; and 3) recent participation in the National Survey of College and University Faculty allowed for data analysis within the institution and in comparison to peer institutions.
Existing University of Arizona Data

To contextualize the study and findings, some demographic, salary, and teaching load data available from the Decision and Planning Support (DAPS) Office at the University of Arizona are highlighted in this report (see Findings chapter).

National Survey of College and University Faculty

In 1998-99 the University of Arizona participated as one of 378 institutions nationwide in the National Survey of College and University Faculty conducted by the Higher Education Research Institute (HERI) at the University of California, Los Angeles (UCLA). In addition to demographic and biographic information, the questionnaire focused on how faculty members spend their time, how they interact with students, their preferred methods of teaching, their perceptions of the institutional climate, and their primary sources of stress and satisfaction. This was the fourth in a series of faculty surveys conducted on a triennial basis by HERI that resulted in 33,785 responses including 837 from the University of Arizona.

Since this survey was designed to create a normative profile of the American faculty population, “faculty member” was defined as any full-time employee of an accredited college or university who spends at least part of his or her time teaching undergraduates. Thus, the first project undertaken by the University of Arizona Office of Decision and Planning Support (DAPS) was to determine how representative UA faculty responses to this survey were with respect to the general population of faculty at the University of Arizona. Statistical analyses indicated a strong positive correlation (see details below).

Statistical testing of the hypothesis that the characteristics of the UA HERI sample mimic those of some definitions of the UA population suggests that the General Faculty (Faculty with Faculty Senate voting rights, excluding those without salary and on leave without pay) who teach undergraduates and the IPEDS Faculty (Regular faculty tenured or tenure-track) who teach undergraduates, including those on sabbatical, permanent full-time lecturers and instructors, excluding medicine faculty) populations are good matches.

1 IPEDS--The Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System, National Center for Education Statistics, U.S. Department of Education is an integrated data system of surveys from areas such as enrollments, program completion, faculty, staff, and finances for all institutional and educational organizations whose primary purpose is to provide postsecondary education. The University of Arizona is a participating IPEDS institution.
Furthermore, this evidence is best shown by the HERI sub-sample of female faculty. Out of four separate analyses, the sub-sample distributions of female faculty were not statistically different from those of the IPEDS faculty three times, and all four times for the General Faculty (see Appendix H for additional details).

In short, the HERI sample matches the characteristics of the General Faculty population from which it was randomly selected. The IPEDS Faculty population follows quite closely as a match with just one less matching variable. In other words, we can feel confident that the HERI data represent the responses of the General Faculty at the University of Arizona.

Individual items from the HERI survey were then analyzed internally and externally. First, faculty responses across gender and race/ethnicity were compared within the institution, while considering academic rank differences. Next, UA faculty responses were compared with faculty outside of the institution at other public universities (see Findings chapter for full explanation of procedures and results).

**Project Participant Survey Data**

Participants in the Project (with the exception of administrative groups) were asked to complete a demographic form. The form replicated some of the questions (10 items) from the HERI National Survey of College and University Faculty. This was done for comparison reasons to see if Project participants responded similarly or differently from those faculty who completed the HERI survey. Analysis of the data across gender indicated that Project participants shared very similar views with those faculty who completed the national survey (see findings chapter).
Qualitative Data

Statistical data provide an important glimpse into views of the institution regarding predetermined statements and queries. Qualitative data, on the other hand, allow for a more comprehensive picture of the intricate workings and interaction patterns of the members of a campus community. As will be evidenced below, the qualitative data actually confirmed and further illuminated the findings from the quantitative data.

Qualitative research is an effort to understand a particular context or environment as an end in itself. “It is not attempting to predict what may happen in the future necessarily, but to understand the nature of that setting—what it means for participants to be in that setting, what their lives are like, what’s going on for them, what their meanings are…(Patton, 1985, p.1).”

A number of researchers have argued that understanding the nature of institutional culture and climate is necessary for furthering a sense of community on campus which, in turn, can impact the learning outcomes of students (Cress, 1999; Kuh & Whitt, 1988; Moran & Volkwein, 1988; Tierney, 1993; Wolf-Wendel, 2000). Essentially, if we can come to understand through individual interviews and group dialogues the dynamic elements that create or distract from a harmonious working and learning environment, then we are much better positioned to be able to effect positive change.

To gain insight into how faculty think, feel, and make meaning of their experiences at the institution, faculty were asked to address three primary questions: 1) what factors support their work at the University of Arizona; 2) what factors inhibit their work; and 3) what recommendations do they have for change.

Given that academic climate issues have been shown to affect women and faculty of color differentially. However, any institutional change effort requires the involvement of entire campus community. Therefore, qualitative data were gathered via a stratified random selection of faculty and also from existing campus groups, including those in administrative positions. One hundred sixty-five randomly selected faculty and an additional 109 faculty and administrators (274 total) participated in the qualitative portion of the project through focus groups, discussion groups, and individual interviews. These data were subsequently coded and analyzed utilizing computer-aided software (Non-Numeric Unstructured Data Indexing Searching Theorizing System).

Randomly Selected Faculty
In order to achieve a representative cross-section of faculty perspectives at the institution, individuals were randomly selected from various academic cluster groupings and academic ranks (16 groups in total) according to gender and race/ethnicity. Since generalization in a statistical sense is not a goal of qualitative research, probabilistic sampling is not necessary or even justifiable in qualitative research (Merriam, 1998). Instead, purposive (Chein, 1981) or purposeful (Patton, 1990) sampling is most appropriate since “data are not to answer questions like ‘how much’ and ‘how often’ but to solve qualitative problems such as discovering what occurs, the implications of what occurs, and the relationships linking occurrences” (Honigmann, 1982, p. 84).

LeCompte and Preissle (1993) prefer the term “criterion-based selection” where a list of attributes essential to the study are created and then samples are drawn from the population that match that criterion. Given that campus climate issues have been shown to differentially affect women and faculty of color, we intentionally over represented these groups while still including a broad range of voices (both tenure and non-tenure-track faculty). Anticipating that each individual selected might not be able or willing to participate in the study, we sampled four times as many (40) individuals within each group that we hoped would participate.

The Office of Decision and Planning Support (DAPS) created for the Project a list of 640 randomly selected women and men faculty based on the characteristics of the groups below. Faculty were then invited to participate in a focus group for the particular group for which they were randomly selected. The categories and focus groups are listed below (see also Appendix C). In addition, definitions of position descriptions follow.

- **Race/Ethnicity**
  - Women of Color
  - Men of Color

- **Academic Cluster (Female Only)**
  - Engineering and Physical Sciences
  - Biological Sciences and Agriculture
  - Social Sciences and Education
  - Humanities, Arts, Architecture, and Arizona International College
  - Law and Business
  - Health Professions

- **Academic Rank Groups (By Gender)**
  - Female Full Professor
  - Female Associate Professor
  - Female Assistant Professor
Female Non-Tenure-track (continuing/continuing eligible status\textsuperscript{2})
Male Full Professor
Male Associate Professor
Male Assistant Professor
Male Non-Tenure-track (continuing/continuing eligible status)

While some universities do not make a distinction between tenure/tenure eligible and continuing/continuing eligible employees, the University of Arizona does. Thus, unlike other institutions where all faculty types are tenure/tenure eligible, including librarians, extension workers etc., (\textit{i.e.}, jobs that generally do not require classroom instruction), in this case, many continuing/continuing eligible employees technically are not faculty but professionals. However, they are often still thought of as faculty and do “faculty” work (\textit{e.g.}, in Agriculture, research centers, the writing program) at the University of Arizona. Therefore, a separate discussion group was created to provide a venue for their experiences to be heard.

For each individual who was randomly selected in the sample, the following information was provided to the Millennium Project:

- First and Last name
- Department
- Building and Room Number
- Campus PO Box
- City, State, Zip Code
- Office Phone
- Department Phone

At the beginning of March, 2000, each individual sampled was sent a letter (via campus mail or U.S. mail for those with department addresses in Phoenix, Yuma, Sierra Vista, or other satellite locations) inviting her or him to participate in the focus group for which she or he was sampled (see Appendix D for a copy of the letter). The letter also listed the other groups for which she or he may also be suited (\textit{e.g.}, the female associate professors also received the names, dates, and times of all other female groups).

\textsuperscript{2} Continuing status is defined as a member of the professional staff who is employed under a continuing appointment with the expectation that the president will renew the appointment for successive appointment periods, except when renewal is precluded by reason of retirement, resignation, release for budgetary reasons or reorganization, or dismissal for just cause. Continuing-eligible means full-time probationary and state-funded appointments and refers to those same persons described as probationary in ABOR-PM 6-301. These individuals include lecturers, senior lecturers, clinical instructors, librarians, and instructors.
It was explained in the letter that each focus group would be led by an outside (non-university) facilitator, and would last for approximately 90 minutes. The questions would focus on three primary areas: 1) their roles as a scholar, teacher, and colleague; 2) policies and procedures that support or hinder those roles; and 3) ideas for change (see below and Appendix E for protocol). Further, it was emphasized that participation in a focus group was completely voluntary and that all discussion group information would be held in the strictest confidence.

Each faculty member was requested in the letter to contact the Millennium Project by e-mail or phone to verify agreement to participate in the study or to get the location for another focus group in which she or he could participate. If none of the focus group times were convenient, she or he was then offered the option of an individual interview. Also, since not all individuals feel equally comfortable with group discussions, individual interview slots were made available for those who preferred this option.

In the first round of mailings, 130 individuals agreed to participate (in either a focus group or an individual interview). Another 12 individuals declined participation.

As a follow-up, on April 16, 2000, an e-mail was sent to all individuals in the sample who had not responded to again invite them to participate. In this message, a list of all remaining focus groups, dates, times, and locations was included and individuals were requested to contact the Millennium Project to confirm their participation. The e-mail also offered potential participants the opportunity to be included in the study by responding to the focus group/interview protocol via e-mail.

Since the original sample information from DAPS did not include e-mail addresses, these were attained by looking through the on-line campus directory or the published campus directory. In many circumstances, no e-mail addresses were available (about 250). These individuals received a second letter in the mail containing the same information as the e-mail invitation. From this invitation, 39 additional participants agreed to attend a focus group or an individual interview, some of whom agreed to participate but failed to attend a group from the initial round of invitations. Thirty-eight individuals declined participation after this second round of invitations.

In total, 219 individuals (34%) who were randomly sampled contacted the Millennium Project Office to find out more about participating, to schedule an individual interview, to agree to participate in a focus group, or to decline the invitation to participate. While a few of those
interested in participating were still unable to attend a session, in the end, 165 faculty (26%) of those randomly selected participated in the project. The demographic break-downs for these faculty are as follows (see also Appendix G):

**Gender**
139 Women (84%)
26 Men (16%)

**Race/Ethnicity**
124 White (Non-Hispanic) (75%)
40 non-white (24%)
  16 Hispanic
  13 Asian American/Pacific Islander
  3 African American/Black
  1 Native American
  4 Multi-racial
  3 other
  1 no response

**Academic Rank**
46 Full Professor (28%)
46 Associate Professor (28%)
35 Assistant Professor (21%)
11 Lecturer (7%)
  3 Instructor (2%)
24 Other\(^3\) (15%)

**Discussion and Administrative Groups**
Because of the potential for existing groups on-campus to bring insight into the current challenges and opportunities facing faculty, as well as prove instrumental in future efforts to create change, faculty in these groups were invited to participate in Project discussions. The groups included those specifically organized to support the professional needs of female faculty (e.g., the Association for Women Faculty, Women in Science, Women in Academic Medicine, Humanities Women). Other groups (e.g., Faculty of Color, Faculty with Disabilities, and Lesbian/Gay/Bisexual Faculty) were brought together by lead coordinators who assisted the Millennium Project. Finally, administrative groups on campus such as the Academic Deans Council, the Faculty Senate, and the President’s Council also participated in the discussions (see\(^3\)

---

\(^3\) The category, “other” are predominantly academic professionals who are defined as appointed, non-faculty employees who are involved with research or teaching programs, who require professional and intellectual freedom,
Appendix C for a complete list of discussion groups). Each of the discussion and administrative groups were asked to address the same items from the Project protocol as did the randomly selected faculty, although administrative groups were not asked to complete demographic forms and were not tape recorded.

Forty-one faculty (21 men and 20 women) attended the administrative discussion groups. An additional 68 faculty attended the other discussion groups. Below are the demographic break-downs for the 68 faculty who completed demographic forms (see also Appendix G).

**Gender**
55 Women (81%)
12 Men (18%)
1 no response

**Race/Ethnicity**
51 White, non-Hispanic (75%)
15 non-white (22%)
  4 Hispanic
  3 Asian American/Pacific Islander
  5 African American/Black
  2 Native American
  1 Multi-racial
2 no response

and who report to a person below the level of vice-president, including librarians, those working with cooperative extensions, and researchers.
**Academic Rank**

12 Full Professors (18%)
7 Associate Professors (10%)
15 Assistant Professors (22%)
5 Lecturers (7%)
28 Other (41%)
1 no response (1%)

**Total Participation**

The total number of Project participants in all groups (Focus Groups, Individual Interviews, E-mail, Discussion Groups, Administrative Discussion Groups) was 274 individuals. Faculty from every college and professional school participated, including participation from over 80 departments and offices. The total demographic break-downs are as follows (see also Appendix G):

**Gender (n = 274)**
214 Women (78%)
59 Men (22%)
1 no response

**Race/Ethnicity (n = 233)**
175 White, non-Hispanic (75%)
55 non-white (24%)
20 Hispanic
16 Asian American/Pacific Islander
8 African American/Black
3 Native American
5 Multi-racial
3 Other
3 no response

---

4 In order to further ensure anonymity, administrators were not asked to fill out demographic surveys. Consequently, information about race/ethnicity and rank are not available.
**Academic Rank (n = 233)**

58 Full Professors (25%)
53 Associate Professors (23%)
50 Assistant Professors (21%)
16 Lecturers (7%)
3 Instructors (1%)
52 Other (22%)
1 no response

(These data include those gathered from specialized discussion groups in Fall, 2000: Faculty with Disabilities, and Lesbian, Gay, and Bisexual Faculty. According to a 1998 Campus Community Profile of University of Arizona employees, 3.5% of women and 5.5% of men report having same gender partners. According to the University of Arizona Disability Resource Center, nationally, approximately 8% of faculty have permanent disabilities, although when taking into consideration short-term illnesses and accidents that may require some kind of accommodation, this figure is somewhat higher.)

**Participation and Confidentiality**

On the whole, most participants felt comfortable with the confidentiality of the process, although a few individuals noted that they worried that even their mere participation in the Project might result in retaliation from other faculty and/or administrators. One group asked half-jokingly, “Is the door locked?”

When asked why faculty chose to participate in the Millennium Project there was a general sentiment that faculty believe in the potential of the university and the importance of fostering change. Faculty who attended the focus and discussion groups stated that they dedicated another two hours to the institution in the midst of their busy lives because they felt there was hope for positive improvement on the campus.

“It’s a good university and that’s the bottom line. At the same time, I think that changes can be made to make this a better place. I hope that this Project actually has some result in that respect” (male full professor).
“I guess I came because I get up every morning and I love going to work. I feel like I have the best job in the world. Now there are problems such as I think I should be paid more, and there are always some frustrations with interpersonal interactions, but almost every day I feel like I’ve enjoyed it” (female associate professor).

“We want to leave this university more user-friendly for women and the diversity of others that come after us” (female full professor).

“I think this is potentially a very good university. There’s terrific people here and a lot of really high quality programs. There are certainly some gender and minority inequities but what needs to be conveyed to the campus and to the legislature is the stress that is inflicted upon the faculty and the staff here by some of the resource and structural issues at this university. Ultimately that’s going to result in decreased productivity or retention issues which is going to lower the quality of the institution. I think it’s important that faculty have a chance to express what their quality of work life is here and what they think can be done” (female associate professor).

“Anything I can do for the university, I’ll do. I can’t always make financial contributions but I’ll sure find any way I can to contribute because I think it’s a great place. It’s getting stronger every day and I’m very proud to be a part of the University of Arizona and what it stands for.”

On the other hand, some faculty indicated that they did not want to participate in the Millennium Project, not just because they were too busy, but because they had lost hope for the institution. Thus, those who might have been most disgruntled or pessimistic were probably the least likely to participate.

“After almost 30 years at the University of Arizona, I am $20,000 underpaid with little hope that decompression will ever help. I am told to look for another job to increase my pay. I have a dean that doesn’t support me. What good will come of meeting with other women in the same fix” (e-mail response to invitation to participate).

“I have given up on the place, so please leave me alone” (e-mail response).

Some faculty noted that their participation was a kind of catharsis. As in most institutions, faculty have few opportunities for meeting others across campus. The Project served as a kind of forum for faculty to share their experiences, affirming for them both the strengths of the institution and that they are not alone in their concerns.
“Listening to all you, you’ve had at least fifteen of the problems that I’ve had. You know, just telling it makes you feel better” (female assistant professor).

Due to the pledge we made to participants to guard their anonymity and confidentiality, the names of specific individuals, departments, programs, and colleges have been eliminated. The result is that in some places where credit for positive efforts was given, those individuals are not recognized. Similarly, when specific examples of negative circumstances were described, those individuals involved remain here unnamed. The one exception to this is the specific inclusion of the president of the institution. President Peter Likins was noted multiple times in multiple venues for his support of the faculty including his support of the Millennium Project. Indeed, his leadership was noted frequently in faculty comments as having already improved the morale of the campus significantly, giving faculty hope for positive campus change.

**Protocol**

Upon arrival at the focus group, individual interview, or discussion group, each of the participants were asked to read and sign a consent form (see Appendix B) as a part of the university's Human Subjects Policy. This form allowed us to tape record the discussions, with the exception of the administrative groups where notes were taken by a trained recorder. We also asked participants (with the exception of administrative groups) to complete a demographic background form that included a few questions on how each individual currently viewed and experienced the campus (see Appendix F). All consent forms were kept separate from demographic background forms in order to guarantee faculty anonymity.

Once these forms were completed, the facilitator gave an overview of the Project and protocol, and had participants briefly introduce themselves. (It should be noted that the protocol varied slightly depending on the type of group, see Appendix E for examples.)

At this point in the process, the tape recorder was turned on to begin recording the conversation. Participants then began addressing three general topics:
Factors at the University of Arizona that have contributed to faculty success
Factors at the University of Arizona that have hindered or impeded faculty success
Ideas, strategies, and recommendations for change

Each of the topics was introduced by the facilitator and additional questions and probes were asked in order to explore faculty perspectives and experiences more fully (see Appendix E for a complete copy of the protocol). In concluding the sessions, faculty were asked if there was anything else they wanted to add that they had not had an opportunity to share.

The number of participants in each session ranged from three to 19, and as noted earlier, each of the focus and discussion groups lasted from 60 to 90 minutes. The sessions were held at various times during the week and in various locations across campus primarily during Spring, 2000. In addition, one mixed gender focus group was offered in the Group Decision Making Lab where faculty responded to the protocol and to one another anonymously and simultaneously (parallel processing) in writing. In total, 18 separate focus groups were conducted. (See Appendix C for a complete list of focus and discussion groups.)

Analysis

Qualitative research draws from the philosophy of phenomenology in its emphasis on experience and interpretation (Merriam, 1998). The assumption is that there is an essence or essences to shared experience which provide core meanings to the participants. Thus, the experiences of different people are bracketed, analyzed, and compared to identify themes and patterns of experience and meaning within a given environment or setting (Patton, 1990). The process is both inductive and deductive: inductive in the sense that emergent themes are constantly compared (Glasser & Strauss, 1967) with other categories and other incidences, and deductive as tentative categories, properties, and hypotheses are tested against the data to insure sufficient support (Merriam, 1998).

The tapes of all focus/discussion groups and interviews were transcribed and the data coded and analyzed during Summer and Fall, 2000. Qualitative software (Non-Numeric Unstructured Data Indexing Searching Theorizing System/N4 Classic) assisted the process of indexing thematic categories and identification of relevant quotations. Recorder notes, field notes, and facilitator journals further aided the data analysis as well as reliance on hand-coding of the actual printed transcripts. Field notes and journals can serve to “isolate the initially most
striking, if not ultimately most important, aspects of the data” (LeCompte, Preissle, & Tesch, 1993, p. 236). While some categories and themes from the protocol framed and organized the initial analysis, all existing and emerging themes from the data were checked and compared across respondent and constituent type.

**Reliability and Validity**

Two common qualitative research techniques were utilized to ensure that data collection and analysis were “credible”: triangulation and peer examination (Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Merriam, 1998). While no researcher can be absolutely certain that the evidence is completely representative, triangulation of multiple sources of data (i.e., HERI, participant surveys, and qualitative) demonstrated great convergence. Interpretations and project conclusions were also reviewed by the National Advisory Board which was deemed broadly knowledgeable about the site as well as the research design, methodology, and analysis, further confirming the dependability of the findings.