

Inter Faculty Organization

Campus Climate Report: Results from the Focus Groups Conducted March 2010 – January 2011 and the Online Survey Conducted November 1-20, 2012

Introduction

Three Inter Faculty Organization standing committees, the Feminist Issues Committee (FIC), Multicultural Issues Committee (MIC), and GLBTA (Gay, Lesbian, Bi-sexual, Transgendered and Allies) Issues Committee, address equity concerns. In addition to the three standing committees, the Benefits Equity Committee (BEC) is a Continuing Committee within the IFO charged with dealing with “matters relating to benefits equity (excluding salary equity).” The equity committees meet either once or twice per academic year to discuss statewide and local events and issues of concern pertaining to their charge.

It is within this context, in the normal course of sharing and conducting committee business, that practices at some universities, events at other universities, and personal experiences at several suggested a need for assessing the quality of the work environment for faculty on each campus related to issues of sexual orientation, gender, gender identity, religion, and race/ ethnicity/national origin. In fall 2008, the equity committees held a joint meeting to assess the willingness of all equity committees to sponsor a campus climate study. At that meeting there was agreement for the “need to review the social and cultural climate of our campuses in order to gather information on equity-related matters, accessibility, and whether the actions of our union are in accordance with an egalitarian framework.” At that moment,

the campus climate project was born. Bringing the project from the idea stage to the completion stage involved ten key steps:

- Formation of a Joint Equity Subcommittee tasked with fleshing out the nature and extent of the project.
- The Joint Equity Subcommittee met four times from January 2009 to November 2009 and determined that a two stage project was necessary—a focus group stage and a survey. The focus group stage would help identify key themes that could be used to form the basis of the second stage—a survey of the entire faculty.
- All necessary approvals for the focus group portion of the study were obtained (FIC, MIC, GLBTA, and BEC Committees, IFO Board of Directors, and the Bemidji State University Institutional Review Board).
- 27 focus group sessions were held on all state university campuses beginning March 2010 and ending January 2011 involving 75 faculty participants.
- Sessions were transcribed and analyzed, the literature on climate in work organizations was reviewed, and the resulting phase one report was shared with the IFO Equity Committees and then presented to the IFO Board of Directors in February 2012.
- During summer 2012, key themes emerging from the focus group study were identified with the help of the Equity Committees and IFO staff.
- All necessary approvals for the online survey were obtained from the IFO equity committees, the IFO Board of Directors, and the Bemidji State University Institutional Review Board.
- Data were collected from faculty November 1 – November 20, 2012.
- Preliminary results were shared with and feedback obtained from the Equity Committees on February 6, 2013 and with the IFO Board of Directors at its February 28 – March 1, 2013 meeting.
- Results of the entire study were shared with the IFO Board of Directors in April 2013 and again in September 2013.

The remainder of this document outlines the findings from the focus group and survey studies and it is divided into four sections. Section one contains a review of the literature on climate and relevant climate studies. Section two contains a discussion of the methods used to conduct the focus group and survey stages of the project. Section three presents the results, which is further subdivided into three sections—a presentation of the focus group study findings, presentation of the survey findings, and a comparison of both studies. In the final

discussion section, findings from the Inter Faculty Organization study are compared with the literature on climate and ideas are presented for moving forward.

Review of the Literature on Climate and Climate Studies

As universities have incorporated diverse members into their ranks, campus climate issues have stretched beyond local campuses and have become a matter of concern for statewide and national union organizations. Fostering an environment that facilitates participation and inclusiveness of diversity in membership has become a focus for union organizers, membership, officers, legal staff and committees representing various minority groups. While some successes are evident, (i.e. more women, people of color, gays, lesbians, bisexuals, and transgender faculty present in the academy and in unions), patterns of exclusion and differential treatment remain.

Broader questions about how to maintain an egalitarian environment in a hierarchical organization has driven recent research. Do organizational and interactional patterns on college campuses and in faculty unions evidence an open and responsive climate or does a chilly climate exist for faculty within these organizations? The Inter Faculty Organization (IFO) equity committees, aware of these broader issues, called for an examination of the climate on the state university campuses and at all levels of its own structure. With the support of the Inter Faculty Organization Board of Directors, and with the encouragement of Delegate Assembly, the equity committees designed a two-step research process to answer the following two questions: what are the equity-related concerns facing faculty on the Minnesota state university campuses and within the Inter Faculty Organization; and, what policies and practices

could the existing organizations (i.e., IFO and universities) put in place to address these issues. Responses to these questions are important for the continued vitality of unions, and for the well-being of faculty.

To answer these questions, it is necessary to first explore the current theory and research on campus climate. Chilly climate studies can be traced back to Hall and Sandler's (1982) original work on the "chilly" climate for women in college classrooms. Campus climate studies over the last 30 years have continued to provide evidence of a chilly climate for female, gay, lesbian, bi-sexual, and transgendered faculty (Ewing, Stukas, and Sheehan 2003; Sausa 2002); and for faculty from a variety of racial or ethnic backgrounds (Jayakumar, Howard, Allen, and Han 2009; MadhavaRau 1996; Samuel and Wane 2005).

The research on campus climate spans a range of issues including organizational culture, the behavior of students toward faculty, the impact of race and gender on faculty and student relationships, and the chilly climate of the academy for all minority groups. The negative effect of bureaucratic and hierarchical systems on faculty (well-being) has been documented, and these research findings have been utilized by unions embracing collective bargaining and joint governance. Campus culture has been explored and institutional patterns of disparate application of collegiality have been found. A frequently cited problem is that institutional rhetoric supports inclusion, but clear action facilitating diversity is absent (Hart and Fellabaum 2008).

Definitions of campus climate in the scholarly literature are often broad and inconsistent (Hart and Fellabaum 2008). Recent research has attempted to clarify the definition utilizing a variety of conceptual frameworks. For example, Hall and Sandler (1982:2)

describe climate utilizing a behavioral and psychological framework and define campus climate as, “. . . faculty attitudes and behaviors. . .” Certainly attitudes and behaviors are important to campus climate since the individual attitudes of participants and their behaviors impact interpersonal, small group, and large environment interactions. However, this focus on attitudes and behaviors speak primarily to individual level phenomena, and do not address structural level aspects of campus climate. Recognizing this gap, scholars have recently incorporated institutional history and structural diversity as required elements of campus climate definitions (Hart 2008; Hart and Fellabaum 2008; Hurtado et al. 2008; Sandler 1986).

Institutional history and structural diversity are important elements in understanding the trajectory of organizations. Assessing when an organization was created, its intent, and how it has evolved evidences historic patterns of exclusion. Examining patterns of structural diversity provides insight to contemporary roles, policies, and practices that illustrate "business as usual" or are indicative of an organization's goal of egalitarianism (Castilla 2011; Elliott and Smith 2004; Uggen and Blackstone 2004). Exploring how an organization's goals align with internal strategies sheds additional light on whether an organization is intentionally designing their structures to create diversity.

Scholars utilizing attitudinal and behavioral approaches have defined incivility as behavioral actions that include acts toward others as well as self-feeling (Goffman 1974). Civility, by this definition, is related to self-control, self-restraint and self-discipline (Ferriss 2002; Twale and DeLuca 2008). To act in an uncivil manner, therefore, is to engage in behaviors that lack positive engagement and which result in negative self-feeling for the recipient of the action. Types of incivility include acting indifferently, manipulating information or individuals,

divulging confidential information about another, ignoring or dismissing others' contributions or opinions, using humiliation or rumor, micromanaging others' work, withholding support or resources from colleagues, dismissing colleagues' opinions, establishing exclusive cliques, or shunning. (Twale and DeLuca 2008). Taken together, these types provide a framework through which chilly climate patterns may be explored (Goffman 1974).

Patterns of incivility discussed above are frequently referred to as bullying or mobbing. Workplace bullying is typically defined as pressuring or intimidating, creating discomfort, or undermining another by inferring that they are incompetent or that they are not supportive of organizational objectives (Einarsen et al. 2003; Hodson, Roscigno, and Lopez 2006). Studies on bullying attempt to delineate distinctions between harassment, bullying, and general work conflicts by specifying criteria to mark the boundaries. For instance, Zapf et al. (2003) suggest that to be categorized as bullying actions must occur weekly over a minimum period of six months, and must escalate (p. 103). This criterion is more inclusive of actions that occur between those at differential power levels within an organization (e.g., supervisor to employee) rather than at the same co-worker levels. Keashly and Jagatic (2003) note that actions between co-workers who are on the same level are often difficult to classify as "bullying" due to the relatively equal power distribution contained within the relationship (pp. 47-48).

Other scholars assert that bullying as narrowly defined above does not adequately capture enough workplace conflict. The concept of mobbing is broader in scope and has been used to describe group violence within organizations that is ". . . aggression against anyone rather than based on age, gender, race, creed, disability, or nationality. . ." and...involves the use of behaviors designed to harass, abuse or terrorize particular individuals (Davenport,

Schwartz, and Elliott 2005:24). Mobbing research in the United States and in regions of Europe suggests that perpetrators of harassing hostile behavior often have an underlying sense of moral exclusion and fail to incorporate victims within their scope of justice, often because of ascribed characteristics (Einarsen et al. 2003).

Davenport et al. (2005) discuss how aggressive actions within organizations often begin with management inappropriately handling conflicts or management structures that use mobbing as a strategy to accomplish established goals. Organizational cultures framed to encourage mobbing often include a solely symbolic diversity ethic, an excessive profit orientation, a focus on silencing opposition and troubling issues, an emphasis on individualism, and a belief in hard work and associated stress as a good. When this frame is accompanied by hierarchical structures with poor communication channels, singular projects (an absence of teamwork), and an emphasis on maintenance of existing work divisions with few challenges, the organization is conducive to mobbing. Downsizing may also promote mobbing as employees attempt to protect themselves (Davenport et al. 2005:66).

Hostile behaviors defined as mobbing parallel actions described in "chilly climate" studies on college campuses. Many of these studies have examined the direct impact hostile attitudes and behaviors have on female faculty, faculty of color, and gay, lesbian, bisexual and transgender faculty (Chilly Collective 1995; Goltz 2005; Mintz and Rothblum 1997; Sandler 1986; Sausa 2002). While similarities exist across all categories of individuals who experience negative workplace dynamics, there are some elements of mobbing unique to specific groups, making it imperative to examine research documenting the experiences of each population—female faculty, faculty of color, and lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender faculty. We will

start by examining research on the hostile workplace experiences of female faculty, describe how incivility is played out for people of color, and explore how lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender faculty find themselves marginalized and isolated by the actions of their peers and supervisors.

Female professors experience students as disruptive, dismissive, and condescending in the classroom. Expectations are problematic for female faculty on both ends of the continuum, both from those students who think women are to act feminine to those students who think female faculty should constantly police misogynistic actions (Nierobisz and Hagan 2005; Sandler 1986). In addition, scholars note that female students evaluate female professors more highly than male students do. This is particularly the case with respect to speech, fairness, and thought stimulation, with male students rating these behaviors least positively. While male students rank female faculty low on these characteristics, they give male faculty higher overall rankings, and they rank male faculty particularly highly on course organization. Female faculty often receive higher rankings on sensitivity and encouraging idea sharing. In the overall evaluative ranking process female and male faculty receive evaluation summaries that are comparable, but it is because students dichotomize faculty by sex, associate each with particular characteristics, and then provide rankings that are skewed by sex but which look comparable in the overall end analysis. It is how female faculty obtain evaluation summaries comparable to male faculty. In essence, playing on gender stereotypes pays off for some female faculty in the overall structure, but it is detrimental to an overall evaluation that is based on instrumental understandings which posit “. . . demonstration of] knowledge of the subject matter” as a core element of the profession (Basow 1995:663).

Students' stereotyping of female faculty is problematic, but when this pattern is coupled with lower female-to-male faculty ratios, differential pay, lower levels of university resources, exclusion from formal and informal functions and networks, and the discrediting of achievements and intellectual work, female faculty are left vulnerable in the academy (Backhouse et al. 1995; Chilly Collective 1995; Nielsen et al. 2005; Sandler 1986). Additional literature on female vulnerability cites the lack of women in important roles, fears of reprisal, intimidation, appropriation of scientific production, and direct sexual harassment (Chilly Collective 1995; Drago et al. 2006; Prentice 2000; and Romito and Volpato 2005). While the number of women in the academy has increased, and formal rules and policies have been established to limit discriminatory patterns, the culture is not necessarily welcoming to female faculty. This is demonstrated by the informal rules that define acceptable patterns with programs, departments, and within the university.

Women who seek recourse through formalized university processes often encounter an absence of policies and procedures or ineffective ones. Goltz (2005) notes that, "...ineffective handling of complaints may be the primary way tolerance is manifested" (p. 764). University procedures are often excessively detailed and involve extensive paperwork, which may inhibit resolution or which may result in retaliation. The evidence notes that often there are more adverse effects to females due to patterns of organizational tolerance of sexual discrimination than to the immediate and direct effects victims experience. This is not to say that the initial encounter does not create adverse job effects and/or a decrease in the psychological well-being and health of the victim, but it indicates that there are significant compounding effects when

organizations do not enact anti-discrimination policies and procedures or when they stall in response to incidents (Cortina and Magley 2003; Goltz 2005).

There is a significant amount of literature on workplace climate for racial and ethnic minorities. Climate in these studies usually places first emphasis on examining dominant-subordinate relations between management and workers. Studies that emphasize these positional relationships point to the fact that minority peoples often find it difficult to obtain management positions within organizations. Stainback and Tomaskovc-Devey (2009) illustrate this aspect of climate noting that black men are most likely to gain access to managerial opportunities when a large percentage of black men are employed at the work site as well as a large percentage of black women who are not in management positions. Of all categories of males, Asian males are most likely to be managed by black men.

Social position in organizations matters in terms of power dynamics and in terms of opportunities for workers, and it is a factor in setting the stage for the presence or absence of discrimination. In the United States race is one of the markers that is used to justify discriminatory work structures, and scholars have long noted that there is an underrepresentation of people of color in all faculty positions across all disciplines and ranks (Turner, Gonzalez, and Wong (Lau) 2011). Acker (2006) refers to this process as the construction of organizational inequality regimes (pp. 442-445). People of color are often ignored, blocked from access, and segregated. Hurtado et al. (2008) finds that the presence of diversity (people of color) is necessary but not sufficient for creating more positive environments (p. 207). Key considerations are the extent to which people of color have access

to programs, are retained, are represented at all levels in the system, and are seen as performing at a high level (Hurtado et al. 2008:207-208; Worthington 2008).

Even if positive interactions are occurring at multiple levels in the organization, a negative climate may exist. People may hesitate to report due to the degree of marginalization or to implicit understandings that exist within the organization about diversity as well as about the structure of the organization and its processes (e.g., hiring, retention, tenure, promotion, curriculum, and program planning). The disconnect between perception and reality suggests a less than complete institutional commitment to racial and ethnic diversity as discussed in strategic plans, policies, as well as in practices, and interactions. Significant indicators, therefore, include who is associated with organizational structure, what type of culture is present, and more specifically, the subtle patterns associated with stereotype threat (Hurtado et al. 2008; Massey et al. 2003).

Studies of campus climate for lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender faculty have examined the extent to which discrimination exists in terms of hiring, pay, retention, benefits, harassment, and discomfort at the work site. While the academy has created opportunities for some GLBT faculty to teach, to engage in research on GLBT issues, and to provide support to students interested in these issues, other GLBT faculty have experienced discrimination and blocked access to full community participation (Badgett et al. 2007; Geller 1990; LaSala et al. 2008; Sears 2002). Sometimes the discrimination is blatant, but often more subtle pressures of exclusion are at work. Bilimoria and Stewart (2009) find in their study of GLBT faculty in science and engineering that it is the invisibility, the pressure to hide, and the discomfort of faculty colleagues around discussions of sexual identity that create a less positive climate.

GLBT faculty often struggle with the extent to which coming out to students and peers will increase tolerance within the academy or expose them to further acts of mobbing. In a study of university education departments and their focus on diversity, Jennings (2010) finds that the presence of “out” GLBT faculty does not directly lead to the incorporation of sexual orientation as diversity in their academic programs. Instead, another form of targeting occurs as colleagues, recognizing the GLBT faculty as symbolic of diversity, assign the handling of sexual orientation topics to GLBT faculty. In essence this reinforces the token status of the GLBT faculty in the programs and creates an isolating, and chilly environment.

For female faculty, faculty of color, ethnic minorities, and GLBT faculty, university environments represent both an opportunity for engaging in teaching and scholarship and a threat as they are held hostage by hostile actions and stereotyping. While many faculty have developed ways to accommodate these chilly environments, Acker (2006) shows inequality regimes are not only detrimental to targeted peoples, but also to the organization itself through lost productivity, and challenges in retaining and hiring minorities. Organizational solutions to chilly climates involve targeting a limited set of issues, coordinating outside pressure (e.g., legislation, social movements) with inside efforts to adjust policies, procedures, and language forms, and coercive pressure or threat of loss (e.g., financial) (Acker 2006; Sausa 2002). Unions and professional associations may be able to help reduce power differences, but their efforts may be limited by their own internal structures that have historically privileged white men (Acker 2006: 447).

Methods

How information was gathered

The project consisted of two distinct stages, a focus group study and an online survey. Prior to the implementation of each stage, the IFO equity committees, the IFO Board of Directors and IFO staff reviewed and approved the planned data collection processes, instruments, and related materials for each study. Bemidji State University's Institutional Review Board (Human Subjects Committee) approved both studies. The materials developed for each stage and copies of the necessary approvals can be found in Appendix A (focus group) and Appendix B (survey).

Implementation of the focus group study followed the same procedure for each campus. Researchers worked with faculty on each campus to identify dates and locations for the campus visits, and once selected, local faculty associations and equity committees publicized the focus groups and recruited faculty. Recruitment materials spelled out the purpose, dates and times of the focus groups; how information was going to be used; an assurance of confidentiality; and, the name and email address of a researcher to contact to reserve a spot in a session. Those who registered were told where the focus group sessions were going to take place. Attempts were made on each campus to find locations that would maximize confidentiality protections for participants. Prior to each focus group, the only people with awareness of all participants were the researchers conducting the focus groups for that campus.

In all, 27 separate sessions were conducted and 75 faculty participated. Deb Peterson and Colleen Greer conducted the focus groups on all campuses but Bemidji State University. Vicky Brockman and Sangeeta Sinha conducted the Bemidji State University focus groups. The timing of the focus groups was as follows:

- Winona State University. Two sessions were held on March 29, 2010 and two more were held on March 30, 2010. Ten people registered for the sessions; six participated.
- Metropolitan State University. Two sessions were held on March 31, 2010 and another two were held on April 1, 2010. Ten people registered and these same ten participated.
- Bemidji State University. Four sessions were held overall—two on April 5 and two on April 6. Six faculty registered and four participated.
- Minnesota State University Moorhead. Five sessions (one by special request) were held during April 5-6. Twelve people registered and eight participated.
- Southwest Minnesota State University. A total of three sessions were held during October 25-26, 2010. Seventeen faculty registered and 16 participated in sessions.
- Minnesota State University Mankato. A total of three sessions were held during November 2-3, 2010. Sixteen faculty registered and 11 participated.
- St. Cloud State University. Four sessions were held—two on January 26, 2011 and two on January 27, 2011. Twenty-two faculty registered and 20 participated in the sessions.

Each focus group session followed a similar format. At the beginning one of the researchers welcomed the participants and asked them to sign one informed consent form and keep a second copy for future reference. Once the signed forms had been collected, researchers reminded participants of the need for confidentiality, and the sessions began.

During each session, one of the researchers asked questions with follow-up probes as necessary and the other researcher took notes on a computer. All but five of the focus group sessions were audiotaped. Researchers asked each focus group nine substantive questions: 1. When someone asks you about the campus climate for faculty, what do you think is meant by the term “climate?” 2. Using your definition of climate, how would you characterize the climate for faculty on this campus? Can you give some specific examples? 3. What is a positive campus climate? 4. What is a negative campus climate? 5. What factors exist on this campus that may lead or have led to the development of a positive campus climate? 6. What obstacles/problems exist on this campus that might compromise the development of a positive campus climate? 7. What role should faculty members play in the creation of a campus climate? 8. What role should the local faculty association play to create a more positive climate? 9. What additional steps can be taken to create a positive climate on this campus?

While these questions were used to frame the focus group sessions, the responses provided for one question often led to the discussion of other questions that had yet to be asked. For example, sometimes in the discussion of climate definitions, faculty also discussed what the climate was like on their campus and the specific examples provided may have been an example of a positive or negative climate. This is a typical finding in focus groups where researchers are seeking rich data about a topic of interest and the processes whereby certain actions occurred or decisions were made (Berg 2007). The process itself allows for the exploration of multiple interpretations by participants and the intricacy of cultural realities (Christians 2003; Charmaz 1983).

After the completion of the focus groups, researchers transcribed the audio recordings and then used an open coding process to identify key concepts that emerged from participants' voices. After open coding, researchers used focused coding to make sure that already identified codes aligned with themes and to make sure that any alternative understandings that would typically be outside the topic of the research were incorporated into the analysis (Berg 2007; Katz 1983). During spring 2012, the IFO equity committees, the IFO Board of Directors, and IFO staff reviewed the focus group findings and offered feedback.

Researchers began work on the campus climate questionnaire during summer 2012 relying on the emergent themes and codes from the focus groups to aid in question development. Equity committee members, IFO staff, and the IFO Board of Directors all reviewed drafts of the instrument. The final questionnaire included 20 questions of which thirteen were substantive questions regarding climate perceptions and experiences with MnSCU, their universities, the IFO and local faculty associations, and with their colleagues. The instrument also contained seven demographic questions.

To encourage faculty participation in the upcoming online survey, IFO President Dr. Nancy Black emailed a prerelease letter to all state university faculty. On November 1, 2012 all faculty received a second email message from President Black containing the link to the online survey and informing them of the survey's history and purpose. Faculty also received several assurances: that their participation was voluntary, that they could leave questions blank if they wished to do so, that their answers were anonymous as IP tracking was turned off, that they could use their home computers if they wished to do so, that information they transmitted

would be secure, and that findings would be reported only in summary aggregate form. Faculty had until late evening November 20, 2012 to respond.

Description of Focus Group and Survey Participants and a Comparison of Survey

Participants with the State University Faculty Population

The 75 participants in the 27 focus groups represented the full demographic spectrum of faculty. Attendees included the newly hired and those with considerable experience, all faculty ranks and statuses, men and women, faculty from various racial/ethnic groups, GLBT and heterosexual individuals. Some faculty had no administrative experience, while others had served as chairs, coordinators, directors, and even deans. Faculty participation in the online survey was also quite robust. Usable surveys (those who answered at least question 1) were returned by 1133 individuals, representing a response rate of approximately 28 percent (out of a total of 4040 minus those faculty who were on leave).

Each campus and the MnSCU central office collects demographic information pertaining to the protected class status of its faculty. Thus, information is available on the number of faculty according to sex, racial/ethnic background, and disability status. No information is available on religious preference or on GLBTQ status. Table 1 provides information on the number of faculty in each of the protected categories.

Table 1. Number and Percent of Faculty in Protected Categories, 2010¹				
State University	Women	Minorities	People with Disabilities	Total
Bemidji ¹	83 42%	16 8%	2 1%	196
Mankato	287 46%	74 12%	10 2%	620
Metro	83 53%	37 23%	5 3%	158
Moorhead ¹	124 43%	34 12%	4 1%	291
St. Cloud	279 46%	132 22%	-- --	613
Southwest (Marshall)	59 42%	19 14%	4 3%	140
Winona	170 46%	36 10%	0 0%	374

1. Data are from 2010-2012 Affirmative Action Plans for each university

As Table 1 data show, women comprise less than 50 percent of the faculty at six of the seven state universities. In addition, minorities make up as few as 8 percent of the faculty (at Bemidji) and as many as 22 percent at St. Cloud and 23 percent of the faculty at Metro. The percentage of minority faculty hovers closer to 10 percent than it does to 20 percent at five of the seven state universities. Finally, very few of the faculty claim disability status.

The availability of MnSCU data provides an opportunity to evaluate the representativeness of the survey by comparing it with a known population. With respect to race or ethnicity, 15.2 percent of the survey participants designated that they were in one of the minority categories compared to 12.9 percent for the state universities overall. This difference is not statistically significant, which suggests that people of color participated at

about the rate relative to their proportion in the population. With respect to sex, however, female faculty participated at a rate that is higher than their proportion in the system. As MnSCU does not collect information on religious preference or on GLBT status, these comparisons cannot be made. Even so, 9.0 percent of the respondents reported gay, lesbian, bisexual, transgender, or queer status. The survey did not ask questions about disability status.

The Minnesota State Colleges and Universities central office also reports on faculty status. Information from the FY 2009 Demographic Report is found in Table 2.

Table 2. Number of State University Instructional Faculty by Faculty Status, FY 2010					
	Tenured/ Tenure Track	Non-Tenure Track	Fixed Term	Adjunct	Totals
Professor	929	4	2	0	935 (25.1%)
Associate	621	9	32	0	662 (17.8%)
Assistant	516	9	227	0	752 (20.2%)
Instructor	1	1	168	0	170 (4.6%)
Adjunct	0	0	0	1203	1203 (32.3%)
Total	2067 (55.5%)	23 (0.6%)	429 (11.5%)	1203 (32.3%)	3722

Source: MnSCU Human Resources Demographic Report FY2010

As the data indicate, approximately 56 percent (2067) of the faculty in the state university system hold tenured or tenure track positions. This means that in FY 2010 44 percent of faculty hold less permanent positions (12 percent are in fixed term positions and 32 percent are in adjunct positions). Fully 25 percent of the faculty have professor status. Data from the fall 2012 campus climate survey show that a higher percentage of professors, associate professors, and assistant professors and fewer adjunct/community faculty participated in the survey relative to their proportions in the state university population.

The Minnesota State Colleges and Universities (MnSCU) central office also provides information on the rank and gender of faculty. These data and comparison data from the fall 2012 campus climate survey (for those who responded to this question) are found in Table 3.

Table 3. Faculty by Rank and Gender: A Comparison of Population and Survey Information						
	Minnesota State Universities, March 1, 2011			Fall 2012 Campus Climate Survey		
Rank	Number of Females	Total Number	Percent Female	Number of Females*	Total Number	Percent Female
Professor	332	910	36.5	152	298	51.0
Associate Professor	313	674	46.4	133	226	58.8
Assistant Professor	395	703	56.2	142	203	70.0
Instructor	107	171	62.6	15	23	65.2
Adjunct/ Community	789	1399	56.4	54	86	62.8
Total	1936	3857	50.2	496	836	59.3

The data in Table 3 show two things. First, the higher the faculty rank, the lower the percent of positions occupied by women. And, second, the numbers echo the data in Table 1—a greater percentage of female faculty participated relative to their proportion in the population, and they did so across all faculty ranks.

Finally, available data from IFO Membership records allow for an examination of the relative participation in the fall survey according to university. Of the 855 faculty who responded to the question regarding the state university they teach at or are assigned to 9.2 % were from Bemidji, 21.8% were from Mankato, 14.0 percent were from Metro, 12.0 teach at Moorhead, 22.3 are at St. Cloud, 6.8 percent are employed at Southwest, and 13.8 percent are at Winona. These participation rates mirror fairly closely their actual population percentages according to IFO membership data for FY2013 (Bemidji 6.94 percent, Mankato 22.52 percent,

Metropolitan 17.52 percent, Moorhead 12.23 percent, St. Cloud 21.74 percent, Southwest 5.25 percent, and Winona 13.80 percent) and the slight differences are not statistically significant. The similar participation rates on the variables race/ethnicity and university increase confidence in an ability to generalize findings to the population of faculty as a whole on those items. However, the greater percentages of female and more senior and permanent faculty should lead the reader to view significant findings on these variables as suggestive.

The remainder of this document discusses the focus group and survey findings. The focus group portion of this report is divided into several key sections. First, the various ways in which faculty describe what they mean by the term “climate” is discussed. The second section contains descriptions of what the climate is like for faculty on the campuses. Third, as the origin for this project was at the request of the IFO equity committees, the overarching equity concerns are discussed as well as are concerns that pertain to each of the specific equity committees. Fourth, concerns associated with union structure and process are addressed. Fifth, other matters of concern are addressed. Sixth, the images of what a positive campus climate is are presented. Seventh, participants offer suggestions for the role to be played by the local faculty associations and the statewide IFO. Throughout the focus group results section, faculty quotes are used to help make key points. Steps have been taken to protect the confidentiality of participants by randomly assigning a number to represent the university at which the faculty member works.

The discussion of the survey results is divided into four sections. First is a discussion of faculty perceptions of the climate they work within. The second section contains information on the experiences faculty have had that affect climate. The third portion more closely

examines both the local union and university structures. The last section presents faculty perceptions and suggestions for their local faculty associations and the Inter Faculty Organization.

Following a discussion of the results, are two final sections. Immediately following the discussion of the separate findings from the focus group and survey studies is a section that compares the findings from the two stages. The final section of the report compares the current study results to the extant literature on this subject and offers concluding remarks.

Results From the Focus Group Study

How do faculty define “climate?”

Faculty differed in their sense of how encompassing climate is. While some see climate as something that can characterize the entire university, others see universities as containers in which several microclimates exist by department, discipline, college, and school. There is also some acknowledgement that climate experiences may differ according to age, sex or gender, sexual preference, racial or ethnic group, religion, and cohort.

Faculty participants provided similar understandings of climate as is found in the extant literature—as consisting of attitudes or beliefs that the administration has toward faculty and that faculty have toward the administration and toward colleagues. Along these lines, descriptions of climate included “the prevailing mood or current,” “the atmosphere,” “the presence of support or dismissiveness,” “what it feels like to work at the university, especially if you are in one of the protected categories,” whether “people feel embraced, included, valued, listened to, brought to the table,” the “general friendliness,” the presence of “tension between faculty members,” and the “sense of community (as defined by the vision and mission) or lack thereof amongst all members of the community.” One faculty member defined climate as

a somewhat coded language for identity issues ...whether it is friendly and welcoming to people of color, LGBT, to people with disabilities and to women. Do they feel safe on campus, are they accepted, are they encouraged to participate fully in the campus?” (University 7)

Faculty also included behaviors, “things done,” as a part of their understanding of climate and as “affect[ing] the climate.” Included as behaviors are the quality of interaction that faculty have with one another, with their students, with staff, and with the administration. High quality interactions are characterized both by things that are absent (a lack of hostility and adversarial relations, a lack of condescension, a lack of cliques) as well as by things that are present (hospitality, academic freedom, respect that is due in accordance with your status, being valued, being mentored, a desire to interact with one another outside of work, inclusivity, friendliness, civility, and respect for education and for the people who deliver it).

Faculty also acknowledge that institutional history plays an important role in the understanding of present day climate, and that history is both local and statewide. They note the shifts in higher education’s value to “the community,...the state legislature,...the people of the state legislature,...and...the executive branch” as important. At the local level each university exists as a separate entity with a unique historical trajectory and mission having its own change or lack of change in administrative personnel, in the demographic make-up of their administrative, faculty, staff, and student bodies, in their institutional mission and vision, and in their relationships with local communities. At the statewide level, each university exists within a much larger system that is fairly recent in its creation and that over time has taken on more of a business perspective and within a state that has seen historical support for state-funded higher education dwindle as time has gone by—with consequences for universities, faculty, students, administrators, and staff.

Faculty report that campus climate also has to do with structural diversity—“the roles, policies and practices that suggest business as usual or a goal of egalitarianism” (Hart and

Fellabaum 2008; Hurtado et al. 2008; Sandler 1986). Faculty note institutional practices such as the provision of equal access (to people, resources, information about committees and events), of equal support (for promotion and tenure), and of commensurate salary, and the presence of justice and attempts to build and maintain diversity among staff, administration, and faculty all affect climate. Climate also depends on the policies in place—whether “...policies accommodate all members of the community,” whether there are “policies in place that...make people feel welcome,” whether “bullying or harassment [is] tolerated or challenged,” and whether the “symbols present on campus match the diversity statements.” In this vein, climate is seen as the “public affective ways in which the institutionalized isms show their face.”

The conditions under which faculty work also affect climate perceptions. Included are the quality of the workspace and physical space and how geographically dispersed the campus is. Also included are the presence/absence of social supports (e.g., an open, nurturing, and empowering environment) and the adequacy/inadequacy of resources such as mentorship opportunities.

In sum, climate has to do with prevailing attitudes and beliefs existing on campus that either suggest the presence or absence of a welcoming environment for faculty. It also includes the quality of interactions/behaviors that faculty have with various entities on the campus. The extent to which institutional policies and practices support or contradict institutional equity statements also affects the climate. Finally, the present campus climate is also acknowledged as variable depending on the history of a particular campus and structural shifts in the larger MnSCU system and state.

How do participants describe the climate for faculty on the various campuses?

The climate is affected primarily by three levels of organizational hierarchy within which Minnesota state university education takes place—the MnSCU Chancellor/system level, the local university administration level, and the local faculty relationship level. Also affecting climate is the faculty union at both the local level (the Faculty Associations) and the statewide level (the Inter Faculty Organization). Participants also acknowledge the context within which the seven state universities operate (e.g., the difficult economy, a state legislature that appears pitted against public employees and publicly provided services, the communities within which their universities are housed, and participation in a system that also encompasses technical and community colleges). At this broad level faculty note a superficial approach to diversity that ties all actions to costs.

I think there is this illusion of valuing diversity and Minnesota is really good at that because of a lot of superficial things that go on. But I don't think that there is a real gut feeling of really valuing diversity. I honest to goodness think that the bottom line has to do with money. It's not really about taking people and enriching their lives so that they can go out and be productive citizens which is going to help us sustain our democracy. (University 1)

Comments focused at this level occur less frequently, however, than do those directed at the university or system level.

Concerning the relationship with MnSCU (the Chancellor's Office, the central office, and the Board of Trustees), participants admit the "need [for] closer working relationships" on the one hand but the reality that "we always seem to be at cross-purposes" on the other. Faculty assert that the central office has become "more organized and directive" taken on the

“corporate model,” “does not care for the campus,” and by continually changing the rules for campuses, is “abusive to employees.”

At the campus administrative level, focus group participants posit administrators are disingenuous with respect to equity concerns as they “verbalize inclusiveness” without “tak[ing] it to heart.” There is “talk about civility but...little education to accompany” the talk. There is interest in “cosmetic changes, not real changes,” and there have been denials of equity-related problems such as racism. Focus group participants note that “conservative belief system[s]” are in operation at the state universities, and that these get reproduced with changes in administrative personnel. The only thing that changes is the “focus and tone” of administrative statements and there are no mechanisms to guard against the “default mode” in which “no attention is paid to equity.” As a participant from University 1 notes:

I think the relationships are very inauthentic...So the leadership has been very top down. It has not literally engaged the community in the decision making process. It pretends to do so by hosting these events and things that that I quit going to because they never take our suggestions and actually do anything with them. That makes me even more resentful, frankly. Don't waste my time, my very valuable time, if you aren't going to even be interested in what I said. Decisions are basically made behind closed doors and then this show goes on of pretending there's engagement, when there isn't at all...[U]nfortunately, I don't think there is anyone at the leadership level that I trust right now to mean what they say. (University 1)

Faculty understand the importance of having good administrative leadership and note its absence on many of the state university campuses. Competent leaders can set the direction for the university and can bring important categories of people together for discussion. Often, however, the administrators seem incompetent —making bad decisions and/or failing to make

necessary decisions. This may happen in part because many administrators are “home grown,” which may mean either, that they lack the necessary skills and abilities and/or that they are compromised in their ability to make necessary decisions. Many of these leaders also rely on a very small circle of (nonrepresentative) faculty to help make decisions.

Focus group participants also express concern about the ways by which administrative personnel exercise their authority and use manipulation and power plays to get the business of the university accomplished. The top down atmosphere that is present on many campuses is problematic and key meetings are often scheduled for times or places that make faculty attendance challenging or impossible. Faculty note several specific actions of concern—being patronized, administrative attempts to coopt complainers, the use of “bait-and -switch” tactics, inappropriate resolutions of appeals (e.g., grade) in favor of students, and the creation of new rosters to isolate senior faculty making them vulnerable for cuts. Some deans also engage in questionable behaviors—using information inappropriately to pit faculty against one another, telling faculty to solve their own problems, and “chewing out” faculty before adequate information is collected. Some concerns faculty express are reminiscent of factory worker complaints—the constant need for adaptation, the use of “work speed up as a tactic to keep faculty from looking at issues,” the “increasing demands for credit hour production,” and the “union-busting approach” used by administrations.

Faculty also express concern about administrative decision-making processes and communication styles. Participants chide administrations for failing to create democratic, inclusive, decision-making processes, for “never tak[ing] faculty suggestions,” for making decisions “behind closed doors,” for making decisions that lack “transparency,” for listening

only to “loud voices” when making decisions, and for failing to rely on faculty expertise—“even in areas where it might be useful.” Administrators may also pressure faculty to be at the table for decision-making purposes only to ignore their contributions, suggesting to faculty that the decisions had already been made and that their presence was required only for appearances. With respect to communication styles, at times there is simply a “lack of communication.” At other times missives may lack transparency, communication patterns may often break down, and there are no or ineffective institutionalized mechanisms for feedback.

Universities both lack resources and may distribute those resources unequally. Participants note that some groups of faculty may have greater access to informal resources than others—especially in those situations in which control over the resource is located at the department level. Funds for research may be distributed unevenly by gender as was the case at one institution. The unequal distribution may also include other resources. A faculty member at that same institution went on to report,

Females in [the department] have less research space, have less access to resources... (University 5)

Faculty also note that “course reassigned time is not given out systematically across the colleges and departments.” Participants also note several indicators signaling a lack of resources. There is increasing “financial pressures to use adjuncts,” “inadequate structural supports for [faculty] scholarship” at the same time that expectations for research have been increasing, a “lack of recognition for faculty achievements,” “reduced scope to searches,” decreasing “emphasis and resources for faculty development,” and decreasing support for “collaborations and partnerships.” Other concerns include heavy committee obligations, heavy

teaching loads, thesis supervision and committee leadership positions that are expected to be done on top of load, chair duties that have no clerical help, and decreasing overload funding levels that negatively impact the ability of small departments to teach their majors and meet demand. Administrators also expect faculty to expend the energy necessary to make change happen without the certainty of administrative commitment. The very act of making budget cuts may also cause divisiveness among groups of faculty.

The layout of campuses and accommodations for faculty also affects the climate. Some faculty are expected to carry materials to other buildings for teaching. Others have no access to wireless internet, have no office space, and/or have been provided with inadequate space. Many of the campuses lack adequate meeting spaces for faculty. In addition, the physical separation of faculty from one another fosters a sense of “alienation” from other colleagues and creates a problematic sense of being “siloeed.”

Focus group participants also expressed concern about the way in which the five areas of the contract get interpreted. In general, research is rewarded more highly than service (e.g., committee work). The locus of the problem, however, may be at the department level as it is for some, while for others it may be at the dean level. Participants also note that the one-size fits all approach to the provision of faculty development funds unfairly impacts faculty on the rural campuses. Funding does not stretch as far for rural faculty as it does for those at campuses closer to the metropolitan area, particularly if travel is required.

The end results of these decisions and realities are a “disconnect between administrative leadership and the faculty,” and an increasingly “tense” faculty-administration relationship. “[V]ery low faculty morale” is present as well as is growing faculty hostility to

requests for participation. Some faculty assert that what remains is a “good old boy” administrative system that benefits “the less competent.”

Finally, the relationships that faculty have with one another also affects the climate experience. Focus group participants confess that faculty put up with a lot of “very unprofessional behavior” including simple cliquishness and passive-aggressive behavior; shouting and the use of loud voice in small and large group meetings; using students, staff, or other faculty as spies; conflict-avoidance; harassment; and bullying and mobbing. Personality disorders or tendencies might explain some of the behaviors (e.g., being authoritarian or autocratic, having an inflated ego, being self-interested, using intimidation, and being angry) but institutional structures and practices can create and perpetuate these practices (e.g., listening to the complainers, tenuring people who do not have departmental support, providing few opportunities for faculty to come together for campus-wide conversations, and forcing faculty groups to compete with one another for limited funds). While faculty often have to muddle through these situations without administrative help, at other times the help is ineffectual or involves merely creating physical separation of faculty who are at odds with one another. For one faculty member campus climate comes down to issues of safety, acceptance, and encouragement for people who fall outside the norm.

In my mind I think climate is everything in terms of do faculty, particularly faculty of color or different sexual orientation, or anyone that’s different from white, homogeneous, Minnesota nice, do they feel safe on campus, are they accepted, do they...are they encouraged to participate fully in the campus...I think there’s still a lot of discrimination and bigotry on campus. (University 4)

For another faculty member union practices may affect the climate experience.

Faculty here tend to see all meetings with administration as an “us” versus “them” relationship. Some faculty are quite hostile to participating in initiatives, and events related to GLBTA and diversity are not well attended by the larger faculty. (University 2)

In sum, the descriptions of the climate offered by focus group participants are overwhelmingly negative at all levels. They believe that the MnSCU system does not care for the campus and is abusive to its employees. University administrators may often verbalize inclusive messages but then fail to incorporate lasting changes to organizational structures and processes. The consequence is a default mode in which little to no attention is paid to equity. Faculty recognize the importance of good administrative leadership, but see the way in which it is exercised as lacking that quality. Manipulation, power plays, patronization, and cooptation are often used administrative ploys. Poor or absent communication, questionable decisions, and decision-making processes that lack transparency seem to be the norm. In addition, faculty believe their input is sought only after important decisions have already been made. Campuses are described as having too few resources (e.g., teaching times, courses, actual dollars) and some faculty perceive those resources are distributed unequally. Tight budget times have created divisiveness among faculty, tense relationships with administrations, and a growing faculty hostility toward requests for participation. Adding to these challenges is the unprofessional manner by which some faculty treat one another.

What are some of the overarching equity concerns?

People who work on equity issues understand that there are issues specific to certain equity groups (e.g., salary equity adjustments for female faculty). Even so, some concerns cut across equity groups. For example, a lesbian faculty member may experience attitudes and behaviors of others directed at her sexual identity on one occasion, her sex/gender on another occasion and both on yet a third. Given this reality it is important to identify attitudes and behaviors that are mentioned in all equity arenas.

Many of the expressed concerns are aimed at campus administrators. Faculty perceive that university administrators “talk a good game” but are only interested in “cosmetic changes” and have only a “superficial adherence to diversity.” Furthermore, faculty accuse administrators of largely ignoring diversity issues, and as mostly incapable of addressing equity matters except within narrow “scripts.” The scripts fail when issues involve more than one equity group, and university offices as well as the MnSCU central office seem ill-prepared to handle these matters. As a faculty member from University 4 noted:

I think with respect to Blacks, African Americans,...there's a standard line, a script that [administrative staff] can follow. I think the same is true of other nonwhites. There's a script that we can follow and people are more comfortable with that script. Not so with GLBT. And when I say script I mean that pejoratively because it ceases to be a script when it's internalized...(University 4)

Faculty also perceive university leadership as lacking in diversity and too tolerant of hostile work environment situations for female faculty, for racial and ethnic faculty, and for

GLBT faculty. In addition, perceptions are that diversity concerns are neglected and diversity is often not seen as central to university budget considerations when positions that could provide advocacy on these matters are eliminated and programs that address diversity are eliminated. Faculty point out that intolerance still exists and structures are still needed to address those intolerances.

[T]here are intolerances in this community that are subtle, difficult to articulate, difficult for people to ‘fess up to, admit to. And in that context I think it is important that we have...formal procedures so that if I have a minority student I can ask people to address the needs of this student, because as we...make progress discussing race relations, gender [relations]...it gets more difficult to address. [H]omophobia still exists, but nobody wants to ‘fess up to it. Racism still exists and cultural biases are still prevalent, but it’s difficult for people to ‘fess up to these things. We need somebody to be able to step in and call a spade a spade and who knows what to do. (University 6)

While efforts have been made on some campuses to promote diversity, those efforts are not lasting. As one participant notes:

I think the lesson there is that if we are going to make the campus climate better for everybody there needs to be conscious policy and choice made by people in the administration to attract different people and support different people, and make them feel welcome. There is something to be said for having greater numbers of people on campus....They are making efforts...I guess I wish the efforts were more sustained. I’m not convinced that we are making efforts to recruit nonwhite faculty. I look around and I certainly don’t see that that is happening. (University 4)

While universities are often seen as “liberal enclaves within large conservative communities,” the lived perceptual reality for many groups of faculty is less than positive. Participants assert that many students and some faculty have antiquated attitudes and that

many faculty are nice “only to their faces, but not behind their backs.” The perception is that there is a lot of discrimination on campus. Expressions of feeling bullied, of existing within a climate of fear, of feeling that nothing will be done to those who bully or participate in mobbing, and of feeling that there are no protections for whistleblowers, or for those who are bullied or mobbed are quite common. Faculty report often “feeling alone,” and not feeling represented. There are also fears of pushing equity concerns (the “isms”) too hard, especially in times when jobs are on the line. In short, faculty suggest that the climate on the university campuses is “not nurturing to faculty who are outside the mainstream.”

Even the 1B.1 policy that prohibits discrimination (“Conduct that is directed at an individual because of his or her protected class and that subjects the individual to different treatment by agents or employees so as to interfere with or limit the ability of the individual to participate in, or benefit from, the services, activities, or privileges provided by the system or colleges and universities or otherwise adversely affects the individual’s employment or education.”) and harassment (“verbal or physical conduct that is directed at an individual because of his or her protected class, and that is sufficiently severe, pervasive, or persistent so as to have the purpose or effect of creating a hostile work or educational environment”) are viewed as essentially unhelpful as the situations that are considered “sufficiently serious to deny or limit a[n] employee’s ability to participate in or benefit from the services, activities, or privileges provided by Minnesota State Colleges and Universities” are perceived as vague.

Faculty experiences validate these perceptions. Participants report a growing level of incivility on campuses, a hostility that is covered up by “surface level politeness” and “inauthentic relationships.” They note instances where colleagues say overtly homophobic and

misogynist statements in class, and other situations where colleagues are ruthless to those who are viewed as out of step. They identify situations of physical and verbal aggression of some faculty toward women, ethnic and racial minority, and GLBT faculty as well as instances that do not rise to the level of a 1B.1 complaint but still have a negative impact. One faculty member discusses the peculiar challenge faculty face when union leaders behave as bullies

There is a sense that you are really on your own when union leaders take particular positions against you as a person and against the ideas that you support. The consequences can be brutal for the victims. Even if others acknowledge that this is happening, there is no clear understanding of how to proceed or where to turn. (University 2)

The reality is that informal and sometimes formal complaints have been filed against certain faculty in the past, but little or nothing has been done beyond telling the “bully” to stop the behavior, or physically separating the parties in some fashion (e.g., changing departments, changing offices). It has sometimes been written off as “boys being boys.” Faculty members may also be advised at the futility of pursuing action. As one faculty member reports:

When I brought up [the situation] to the dean, [I was warned] that you know there is going to be backlash...and you know we already have this all on record. And so it’s an understanding that nothing will be done. People don’t even bother reporting things to our HR anymore because nothing seems to happen. (University 7)

Chairs and some administrators (most commonly deans) are ineffective in their responses to these situations. In response to one bullying situation, a faculty member reports:

There was no safety...The bullies were told to stop and go figure it out...that was the response. There was no follow-up so things went back to business as usual. (University 3)

Faculty report numerous instances of trying to use available procedures to deal with these situations—the grievance process when the situation involves administrators and the 1B.1 process for issues of harassment and discrimination. Certainly these processes are not without their flaws, but at least faculty have an avenue through which to seek redress. More challenging and also more common are the situations where the bully/mobbers and the bullied/mobbed are both faculty members. In some instances the bully may be a chair. In other instances, the bullies/mobbers may be the tenured faculty and the bullied/mobbed those who are probationary track, or filling fixed term or adjunct positions. In both instances faculty may use their positions as a club to create an intimidating atmosphere. Neither the IFO contract nor the 1B.1 policy and procedure are adequate to handle the full range of faculty-on-faculty conflicts.

Given these perceptions and realities, participants offer a variety of suggestions to deal with incivility. Some promote the development of mediation systems. Others encourage the development of a panel that monitors inappropriate behavior. Still others ask for additional supports (emotional and otherwise) for the recipients of bullying behavior. Many participants suggested the use of mandatory trainings for faculty on equity-related matters. Others ask for more intensive trainings for department chairs. Some also suggest including climate responsibility as part of the evaluation process. Additionally, faculty ask for greater support and advocacy from the IFO for the bullied rather than for the bullies, and urge local faculty associations to avoid taking sides in faculty-to-faculty conflicts.

In sum, several of the concerns identified affect faculty in more than one equity group. Administrators are seen as having only a superficial adherence to diversity, largely ignoring

diversity issues and seemingly incapable of addressing equity matters except within narrow scripts. Administrative personnel lack diversity and have been too tolerant of hostile work environments for women, for racial and ethnic faculty, and for GLBT faculty. Faculty note the presence of discrimination on campuses. Of grave concern are the instances of bullying and mobbing and the perception that current policies and practices both within the universities and within the union protect bullies and mobbers more so than their victims. Where policies do exist in the system, the reality is that they often are not followed and there is not sufficient training at any level to address these issues.

What are the matters of concern for female faculty?

Participants noted a variety of attitudes, behaviors and structural realities that are of concern to female faculty. With respect to attitudes, faculty spoke of a pervasive perception of ill-treatment of women faculty by male faculty on their campuses. These include: patriarchal and misogynist attitudes, perceptions that women are “less than,” feeling unwelcome as committee members, and fearing for personal safety. One faculty member reports that:

I don't feel like it is very nurturing to...female faculty...[T]here are a lot of people I have to stay away from because they do not think that women should work. They don't think this...they don't think that. There are comments made repeatedly that I am shocked at... (University 1)

Another faculty member discusses the way in which male colleagues discuss assigning women faculty to committees.

[The committee] was not diverse enough. [He said] what women can we put on that committee. [That statement] just stopped [me] in my tracks. (University 1)

Another faculty member notes treatment of her work by a male colleague in a department meeting.

[T]his person...called my research simplistic...He describes me as an incompetent teacher; a person who does research that doesn't matter...This went on for an hour and a half. (University 5)

Yet another faculty member discusses this matter:

[T]here is a...lack of respect for one's...expertise or scholarship...I have been in circumstances where people will say all I have to do

is look at a few books and I can teach that course, but, you can't teach my course because you don't have an expertise in my area. (University 3)

Participants also perceive that comments and ideas expressed by women are not taken seriously, that female faculty have to constantly prove themselves to male faculty, that female faculty face less certain tenure and promotion decisions, that they are differently treated with respect to organizational rewards and resources, and that they cannot speak up prior to getting tenure. One faculty member from University 6 states:

I've been here long enough to have been here with a lot of men deans and there wasn't fair treatment on how women got promoted. Women were not given those kinds of opportunities even within...the last 15 years. There was a much bigger salary for men, much more promotion done than for women. A couple of women administrators got in and it seemed like things changed. Now we got some men back. I'm not saying they are going to do that again, but...it's kind of a concern to me. (University 6)

Another faculty participant notes

I really feel the college is detrimental to aging women, women who are near retirement, and just the hostility that they experience as they go toward full professor. (University 6)

In addition to these perceptions, faculty note a host of behaviors directed at women faculty by their colleagues. At the department level, faculty report greater scrutiny of female faculty prior to tenure and less mentoring from colleagues with requests for more evidence for tenure and promotion decisions and receipt of less funding for research projects. There are reports of uneven distributions of the department workloads. Women faculty are more likely to be assigned teaching the large introductory-level courses, new preparations, and to have greater committee and department work obligations. As one faculty member discusses

[A]cross campus we have a slightly male-biased faculty in terms of sex ratios. There are more women on committees...more women doing committee work and in the XXX department that is not respected and it's pretty much verbalized that it's not respected. The only thing that is respected is...research. (University 5)

Ill-treatment of female faculty also occurs outside departments. Focus group participants have either witnessed or experienced the hostile treatment of women in positions of power. One faculty member reports overhearing male colleagues discuss female administrators:

Their hostility was barely contained. They were angry at having women in the power positions on the campus. (University 2)

Faculty also report being bullied/mobbed by both colleagues and administrators (experiencing verbal putdowns and attacks; being shut out and shut down; being intimidated; receiving fewer resources and not hearing of available resources; having courses taken away from them; experiencing a lack of respect for their expertise, their gender-based scholarship, and their discipline; and, being ignored). One faculty member noted the difficult situation faced by female faculty members.

We have a dean who has not been supportive of some women victims of bullying and so bullying becomes acceptable in our college until some bully gets reprimanded and then the norms change for a while. Currently it is open season. (University 7)

Focus group participants report having received unwanted sexual advances. When female faculty have filed complaints with chairs or deans, they have also experienced backlash and witnessed male faculty and administrators attempting to "play the victim."

Participants noted as well that female faculty face challenges from students. Students are more likely to play on the sympathies of female faculty and want to be treated differently. Students are more likely to question female faculty authority and knowledge. Male students are more forward with female faculty. One faculty member reports:

[A]s a young woman I've never been inappropriately approached by one of the students in my classes, but I have been approached by students who did not know that I was a professor. Some men have actually been fairly aggressive...I have received somewhat aggressive attention from some of the male students and saying that I am a professor doesn't really sway them. This doesn't feel great. (University 6)

Students are surprised when female faculty contradict male colleagues. And, students are more likely to call female faculty Mrs. instead of by their academic title than they are to call male faculty Mr.

Faculty participants also identify structural realities of concern to female faculty which affects their ability to perform their work. First, chairs are not effectively trained to deal with harassment of female faculty (and may be the harassers). Second, deans often do nothing with the information they have been given—they allow the bad behavior to continue. The dean may also be one of the parties engaging in sexist and bullying behavior. Third, female faculty report “having to do all of the work” in dealing with harassment. Fourth, there is an understanding that the 1B.1 process does nothing to fix the situation as administrators let harassment and sexist behaviors go unaddressed publicly. There is a perception that the 1B.1 policy only addresses sustained patterns of behavior. In sum, participants feel that administrative words and actions related to gender equity matters are not in alignment.

The structural realities also pertain to the centrality of women-focused programming and centers. Women's issues and resources are rarely seen as a central component of university budgets and are rarely if ever flush with funding. Even worse, they are prone to trimming during tight budget times. A participant from one university notes the perennial lack of resources in this way:

[The university response can be characterized] as neglect...
(University 6)

In sum, faculty note a variety of attitudes, behaviors and structural realities that are of concern to female faculty. With respect to attitudes, faculty point to a pervasive perception of ill-treatment of women faculty by male faculty on their campuses. Accompanying these attitudes are a whole host of behaviors at the department level that include greater scrutiny of work, less mentoring, fewer resources, greater demands for departmental service (e.g., committees and advising), and a greater proportion of large-lecture classes and new course preparations. Outside the department, other common reports include verbal putdowns, attacks, being shut down and shut out, intimidation, and a lack of respect for their expertise, scholarship, and discipline. Female faculty have also faced unwanted sexual advances from colleagues and gender-based challenges from students. While there are structural mechanisms in place to deal with many of these situations, mishandling is common due to a lack of training, a lack of action, and complicated scenarios in which administrators may be the perpetrators of the negative behaviors.

What are the matters of concern for GLBT faculty?

Faculty participating in the focus groups pointed out several attitudes, behaviors, and structures of concern to GLBT faculty. With respect to attitudes, some faculty perceive that GLBT faculty have been sacrificed by their union colleagues with respect to domestic partner benefits; that administrators are afraid of transgender faculty; that trans faculty feel vulnerable; that gender is a larger issue than sexual orientation—whether people “fit” the prescribed gender behavior; and that many GLBT faculty hide their identity or decide to wait until tenure to work on GLBT issues with students. One faculty person discusses this in terms of being dismissed by others.

I think it's easy to be dismissed...There's not many out gay men on campus. Very few that are out to their students. I can understand being dismissed by my students, but it's actually been the IFO that has been the most dismissive...sometimes the administration, colleagues, too. (University 3)

There is a perception that significant pockets of homophobia exist among students, staff, faculty, and administrators, but this often goes unacknowledged, even by some GLBT faculty.

One faculty person states:

I attempted to talk to faculty...I was told that we do not have that issue on our campus. Gay and lesbian faculty told me that they did not need support. (University 2)

Faculty also note several behaviors on the university campuses that affect GLBT faculty. For instance, students find it acceptable to criticize gays (e.g., That's so gay!). Poor treatment, however, is not limited to the student ranks. Colleagues are also ignorant of GLBT matters and yet unaware of their ignorance as they interact with GLBT faculty. Beyond “simple” ignorance,

some faculty are known to make insensitive comments and openly promote reorientation therapy for GLBT individuals. One faculty member notes:

I mean really we have some faculty that there's no problem...they are accepting of others. There's others that have a little bit of a problem, but they try. But it's very evident sometimes. And then there's a whole segment that you know that will do everything they can to actually provoke bullshit. (University 4)

Participants report several structural concerns at the university level and politically at the statewide level. At the university level, faculty identify a lack of support for GLBT presence on campuses and an unwillingness on the part of the administration to see homophobia on campuses. One faculty person put it this way:

I don't think the GLBT...presence is acknowledged, supported, or in any way helped along. I think that people who are gay and lesbian, students who are gay and lesbian...just stay very quiet about their lives, and I think that is extremely unfortunate, and backward, and weird. (University 6)

There is a real sense that same-sex couples cannot engage in couple-like behavior without risking a threat to their personal safety; there is also a sense that university officials do not know how to respond to these threats. In addition, unlike other equity concerns, there are no positions on search committees for someone who is GLBT identified. As one faculty member reports:

[A]s a lesbian faculty member I see nothing...going on in terms of embracing the LGBT faculty community. There is some stuff that goes on with students, but we are a nonentity and on our own. Even on search committees we are not considered an "other" enough to be represented as the other on the search committee. Just nothing...just absolutely nothing. (University 3)

Identifying with GLBT concerns or being a GLBT faculty member has its own challenges. For instance, others assume that you must be GLB or T if you champion partner benefits.

While there are some acknowledged positive elements on some campuses (e.g., administrators and allies who are helpful, trainings and activities, an official position with reassigned time for help), by and large faculty note a lack of help and advocacy for gay, lesbian, bi-sexual, and transgender faculty. In addition, there is a lack of support from Human Relations and the administration for faculty who are transitioning or for transgender awareness. The historical failure to acknowledge same-sex relationships on the statewide level also got translated to the university level. For instance, same-sex partners could not take advantage of “family” memberships at campus recreation centers. Other benefits were also not available to them either as one faculty member states:

Being a lesbian...my partner can't do tuition waivers, state benefits...because what I am doing is “immoral” and “sinful”...it costs too much to be able to afford me benefits as well as my heterosexual counter (person 1 University 7)...That was the response I got...[it] cost too much money. But somehow it doesn't cost too much for the same thing for heterosexuals. (person 2 University 7)

At the statewide level, faculty note that the lack of health care coverage for domestic partners is of great concern, with real and severe negative financial consequences and stressors for some. One faculty person reports:

Domestic partner benefits...[I am] disappointed in the IFO...[because at one point] they accepted a resolution that it not be used as a bargaining chip. It's still being used as a bargaining chip when it fact it's a violation of [a] human rights statute. (University 4)

In addition, state health care coverage is not adequate for transgender individuals. At the time of the focus groups, faculty experienced the Minnesota climate for same-sex relationships as quite negative with its lack of support for same-sex marriage and lack of support for GLBT people in general. Given these situations, faculty ask that their colleagues and the union make strong statements for partner rights and benefits.

In sum, faculty point to several attitudes, behaviors, and structures of concern to GLBT faculty. The lack of domestic partner benefits stands as a symbol for the lack of respect that many faculty feel exists for GLBT faculty and for the ongoing discrimination they experience. Insensitive comments and behaviors by students, staff and faculty colleagues are prevalent. Unlike other equity concerns, there are not positions on search committees for someone who is GLBT identified. The help that is available is on a person-by-person basis rather than institutionalized. It is as if the failure to acknowledge same-sex relationships on a statewide level gets translated to the university level, which makes for an overall negative experience for many GLBT faculty.

What are the matters of concern for ethnic and racial minority faculty?

Participants note several attitudes and behaviors of concern for ethnic and racial minority faculty on their campuses. With respect to attitudes, faculty suggest that race and ethnicity might indeed be the “elephant[s] in the room.”

[Race is] the elephant in the room. Strategically, I personally don't even sometimes bring the issue to relationships or interactions or whatever happens on campus. But there are issues related to race, there are issues related to how we treat each other and how we treat under-represented groups. I think Minnesota nice gets in the way... (University 3)

Students are perceived as xenophobic, ignorant of white privilege, and struggling when their beliefs are challenged. One faculty member reported on stories heard around his/her university.

Sometimes I hear stories about faculty if they have a strong accent or may be from another country. [In those circumstances] I feel maybe there isn't the same level of respect or there's an assumption that the person may not be as smart. (University 4)

There is a perceived religious insensitivity and an assumption that everyone is from a Christian faith tradition and is an active church-goer. One faculty member notes:

I have felt more out of place because I am not particularly Christian than I do because I am in the LGBT category. (University 5)

Another faculty member notes:

The students will tolerate Buddhists, they will tolerate Hindu[s], but they will not tolerate atheists. I am an atheist but I don't bring that up in class... (University 5)

The aforementioned perceptions apply to some faculty as well. As one faculty member attests:

Immigrants, folks from a different country face real xenophobic responses from faculty, sometimes in the form of a compliment... I remember being told, "You use such big words," as a compliment...I said are you kidding me? What a ridiculous thing to say, but it permeates. If you are from another country there is this sense that you are the "stranger" in a negative way. The "other."

To address these matters, there is also a perception that faculty need training on racial and ethnic issues as there is a lack of cultural awareness and proficiency. There are also perceptions that many faculty are determined to refuse training on racial and ethnic matters and lack a desire to connect with ethnic and racial minorities. Faculty believe that some of their colleagues see diversity as pertaining only to Blacks and Whites and see one ethnic and racial and minority faculty person as capable of speaking for the entire group or as capable of teaching particular courses. There is also little understanding that differences of opinion exist within different racial or ethnic groups. Finally, participants perceive that there are higher requirements for tenure for ethnic and racial minority faculty than there are for white faculty.

In general, there is a perception that the climate is not friendly to faculty who are ethnic and racial minorities and it does not embrace cultural diversity. Faculty note that "people other than German or Scandinavian have a tough climate" and point out that:

[I]nstead of dealing with an issue...we don't deal with issues...I think this is a regional, cultural thing. (University 3)

[I] have friends who say Minnesota knife by way...particularly minority people. (University 3)

Even more concerning is the perception that administrators do not see racism on campus. As highlighted by a faculty member at University 4:

The president said we didn't need racism training on this campus, that we needed to focus on positive efforts...rather than on the negative, anti-racism. (University 4)

While attempts have been made at some universities to address ethnic and racial minority concerns, there is a perception that much of what has been done has been to pay "lip service" to a need, to engage in "window dressing." The perception is that administrative efforts to promote diversity are insincere and that the "lite motifs are superficial." As a faculty member at University 1 reports about an administrative decision:

I really thought the perception of their actions was...an example of institutional racism. And they pretended not to get it....It was a top down assertion of power and no genuine engagement and listening to and use of a relational approach with the community...They're not operating in a partnership sort of way. I personally think those top down structures have to die if we are going to undo racism, sexism, heterosexism, all of those things. I think at a minimum that it's easier to keep all that stuff in place, and the people on top think they run everything and they don't have to bother to pay attention to "you" people. And then they use their institutional power to silence you, which has very effectively gone on around a variety of issues here.

In short, participants perceive the presence of institutional racism on campuses as well as a reluctance to address racism present in the broader community. Students have been heard to espouse that these concerns no longer exist—we are beyond racism—we live in a postracial society.

Faculty also enumerate many examples of concerning behaviors. Some of these behaviors pertain to the classroom setting where students remark that faculty members “have an accent” and are asked repeatedly “what did you say?” There are also instances outside the classroom setting—in which fellow colleagues remark on their “exuberance” [passion].

Some of these behaviors of concern occur within department settings. There are instances in which racial and ethnic minority faculty have been excluded from department social functions and have been excluded from conversations. Participants also point to examples where new department policies were implemented because there was a new minority faculty person, searches were failed to avoid hiring minority faculty, the credentials of international faculty were overlooked, teaching assignments were given to international faculty that were outside their known areas of expertise, and where Christian faculty attempted to infuse certain areas of the curriculum with aspects of their beliefs.

Concerning behaviors involving faculty also occur outside the department setting. In an effort to hear the voice of ethnic and racial minority faculty, they are often “asked” to sit on many more committees than Whites resulting in unfairly high committee work expectations. In other venues related to teaching and curricula, participants report some support for efforts to change curricula and to incorporate more inclusive pedagogies at the same time that there are significant pockets of resistance. Curricula pertaining to cultural diversity has become a political football in some situations. As one faculty member notes:

[Y]ou are a person of color so you are qualified, or you are not a person of color...no matter what your scholarship is, you can't teach that. (University 3)

In some situations, faculty have refused to attend events in which speakers are discussing issues pertaining to race or ethnicity and in some cases faculty have blamed racial and ethnic minority faculty for the existence of these trainings.

In general, participants admit that racial and ethnic minority students and faculty are poorly treated by some faculty and that female ethnic and racial minority faculty get treated least well. NonChristian faculty and atheist faculty also report the stifling nature of Christian beliefs, a lack of tolerance for their own beliefs, and cases in which they have been verbally attacked for their differing views. Participants note that some faculty have become adept at knowing how to not overtly verbally offend at the same time that their behavior has not changed. One acknowledged consequence is that ethnic and racial minority faculty and faculty from other faith traditions are in hiding and have learned how to be quiet and not comment publicly.

Behaviors of concern also extend to the university and university administrations. On the one hand campus administrations claim a goal of increased diversity. Toward that end, they engage in recruiting efforts to attract diverse students. On the other hand beyond that level of engagement, there are few sustained efforts and, instead, many actions that belie their claim. Faculty point to instances of burying equity study findings, removing programs that meet the needs of students of color, removing people of color from administrative positions, dismantling programs and curricula put together by people of color, targeting people from other countries during budget cuts, providing less certain appointments to international faculty, allowing the presence of offensive art work, inadequate staffing of Affirmative Action Offices, failing to provide places for nonChristian groups to meet, failing to provide food choices that

meet the needs of diverse racial and ethnic groups, and failing to create calendars that take religious holidays of other religious groups into account and allow faculty to be away without having to take personal days. As one faculty member notes:

I don't know that there is much effort to include...sometimes I've had students in class who were Jewish who said to me Rosh Hashana is coming up and I'd like to go home, could I have that as an excused absence and I've said yes...We have some faculty members who are Jewish identified and I don't know what they do on those days. Do they take personal days, sick days? And I do think about those sorts of issues. I've never eaten in the cafeteria. I don't know what happens with the food service. I don't know about people who have dietary restrictions, like if you had a Muslim or a Jewish student who didn't eat pork. (University 4)

Another faculty member notes:

When I look at the list of approved vendors...caterers...I don't see a lot of diversity reflected there. (University 1)

Another faculty person at a different university identified the problem as unacknowledged white privilege:

There are people who [don't] want to have the conversation. There is a lot of white privilege on this...university. (University 1)

For all of these reasons, faculty suggest that universities are interested in cosmetic change and not real change with respect to diversity.

Unfilled administrative positions and a high rate of administrative turnover also provide challenges to sustained efforts at tackling racism. While frustrating, this is at least understandable. Participants note other administrative actions that are more problematic: pitting one minority group against another in fights over resources, using positions of power to

silence ethnic and racial minority faculty, and providing greater levels of scrutiny in the promotion and tenure process for some racial and ethnic minority faculty. University administrators also fail to acknowledge the poor treatment of minority group students and faculty in the broader communities within which their campuses exist.

Participants offered some ideas for helping to bring about change. First, they encouraged the IFO to endorse anti-racism training. Second, while it may be challenging in some circumstances, they encourage universities to hire as many faculty and administrators from diverse racial and ethnic groups, with a belief that doing so may help bring about acceptance of diversity sooner rather than later.

In sum, faculty note several attitudes, behaviors, and structures that are of concern to ethnic and racial minority faculty. Faculty state that race and ethnicity might be the “elephant in the room.” Certainly some faculty openly embrace cultural diversity and multiculturalism. Yet, it is common to hear reports of ignorance and cultural insensitivity on the part of students, faculty, staff, and administrators. It is also common to hear reports of unacknowledged white privilege and racism at the individual level. Of grave concern are instances where some faculty refuse to participate in events or trainings aimed at addressing racism and refuse to think about diversity issues it pertains to curricula. At the institutional level faculty express concerns that administrative efforts to promote diversity are insincere or may be lacking and that tight budgets may be one excuse offered to dismantle the curricula and structures that exist. In other instances, minority groups have been pitted against one another for scarce resources or have been silenced through the use of administrative power. A similar situation is experienced by faculty who are atheists or who have beliefs that are not Christian. Faculty report a lack of

tolerance for their beliefs and cases in which they have been verbally attacked for having differing religious views. Universities and the MnSCU system by and large do not take other faith tradition's holidays into account, nor do they accommodate dietary restrictions or provide places for religious practices to occur.

What other matters of concern exist for faculty?

Focus group participants also identify concerns not covered specifically by the IFO equity committees such as disability status, marital status, and faculty status. With respect to disabilities, focus group participants report that university offices are trained to address the needs of students more so than those of faculty. For faculty with disabilities there is a perceived paucity of information and resources available to help them continue working. Campuses are physically challenging to negotiate for differently-abled faculty and students, and there are often too few or inadequate accommodations for people with wheel chairs.

Participants also note the unacknowledged privileges accorded to faculty with children. In departments, faculty who are single often receive requests to bend their preferred teaching and research schedules around the schedules of those faculty with children without any like accommodation for them and their needs. Faculty who are married with children also have more benefits they are able to take advantage of than do faculty who are single.

With respect to faculty appointment, the primary concerns identified have to do with exploitation and voice. Participants acknowledge that fixed-term and adjunct faculty are not paid much especially given the number of students they teach, and their pay has been relatively stagnant. Faculty also question the extent to which fixed-term faculty receive the same benefits (e.g., professional development) unless they are at approximately two-thirds of a position. There are other signs of disrespect: a lack of or inadequate office space, exclusion from department meetings and department social events, a lack of useful information like the process to follow if they need to cancel a class. Many are not asked for their preferred times

and topics to teach—these are usually just provided—and students may have difficulty accessing them as their names often do not appear in campus phone directories unless they teach during fall semester and their information is often absent from the department websites. Even if they wish to participate in campus activities, adjunct faculty may not hear of events until it is too late. Students may also treat adjunct and fixed term faculty differently than they do tenured and probationary track faculty. Given their temporary and tenuous status, adjunct faculty often do not feel they can complain.

There are also distinct challenges for probationary track faculty. Some note a lack of clear and consistent expectations. In some cases dean and department expectations might be in conflict. In yet other cases, faculty have experienced three or more deans with three differing visions for their future in a three year timeframe. Faculty perceive the promotion and tenure process as cutthroat and competitive—certainly important in terms of its consequences for individuals. Yet, they find that the amount of time and attention paid to materials put forward for review at the department level to be out of step with their personal importance.

There are also several structural factors noted that affect the potential for successful retention and tenure. There is a lack of assistance and mentorship for junior faculty and this problem may be even greater for female faculty members. High teaching loads compromise an ability to engage in scholarship—and scholarship demands are also perceived as increasing. Being the only faculty member with a certain area of expertise may also make it challenging to find colleagues with whom to conduct research.

Focus group participants also report several extraneous factors they believe affect promotion and tenure decisions. Being liked, being visible, being collegial, “playing well with

others in the sandbox,” and “having the right actions and emotions” are all mentioned as critical. Things to avoid are disagreeing with the administration, being argumentative or causing interpersonal problems. These structural and extraneous factors lead junior faculty to “play it safe,” be hesitant, and to perceive a lack of academic freedom. Faculty report that the current system creates a tyranny of the minority...those who have tenure have the power.

In sum, participants note several categories of concerns that fall outside the scope of current equity committees. Faculty point out the very real challenges our campuses pose for faculty with disabilities. Inadequate information and few resources are available to help them continue working. Faculty who are single and childless also identify how department scheduling often flexes to help faculty with children, unfairly burdening them with early morning, late afternoon or evening courses. Faculty note that single people are also discriminated against in terms of benefits. Fixed term and adjunct faculty also face challenges—low pay, few or no benefits, inadequate office space, and classes with large numbers of students without adequate resources for their delivery. These faculty often have no input on the courses or times they are to teach and are excluded from departmental (and university) rosters and social gatherings. Many faculty feel they cannot complain given their temporary and tenuous status. Probationary track faculty often feel an absence of clear and consistent expectations and feel caught between the differing desires of a department and a dean. The road toward tenure is experienced as competitive, lacking in guidance, and the teaching load is experienced as unreasonably high given the scholarship demands required for successful tenure and promotion. Faculty also identify extraneous factors that appear

important to the tenure decision which lead junior faculty to “play it safe” on their journey toward tenure and promotion.

What concerns do faculty have about local faculty associations and the statewide Inter Faculty Organization?

Focus group participants identified several ways in which union processes and practices are of concern. Many of the offered comments are focused at the local faculty associations. One way in which the problematic nature of the local faculty associations becomes apparent is when local union leaders use their positions as a “stepping stones” to attain administrative positions and as a vehicle to “play out personal agendas.” As one participant states:

It seems to me that often the president of the [faculty association] ends up in a directorship somewhere in the university, so that their reason for going up there is to find a niche in administration...They are trying to find their new role [rather] than trying to speak for the faculty. They don't want to ruffle the feathers of the administration. [Are they really] in the trenches with you or are they...looking at their next job? (University 7)

In this as well as in other instances, focus group participants note that faculty association leaders on their campuses are sometimes “too close” to the administration to effectively reflect faculty concerns. Conversely, some faculty see union leaders as creating additional levels to problems or situations that do not have to be present. As one person notes:

Unfortunately on this campus, tension is a result of the union leadership. The union leadership works to get people to hyperventilate about everything. (University 2)

A second way in which local faculty associations are of concern is their lack of inclusivity. Participants note that the faculty associations have cliques or power structures that compromise the efforts to develop solidarity. They see the union as exclusive rather than as inclusive in some situations:

[The] union structure [has] become closed. The same people serve in the same positions...our committee structures look that way, too. It's not an easy thing to open up. We constantly find the same people serve and are available and the same people serve on the union executive board...That leaves an exclusionary climate. It's not for want of trying but it's a reality that people don't feel represented by the people who are supposed to represent them...[T]here is a closedness to the union structure. (University 3)

In addition, participants perceive that leadership positions at the local level tend to be filled by whites and males and that key committees also lack diversity. This "climate of whiteness" implies that racial or ethnic issues do not get adequately addressed. Other diversity concerns also do not get addressed, especially as there is no mandate for FIC, GLBTA, and MIC voices to be a part of local executive committees. This diversity void may simply be unintentional, but it may also be intentional as when "local leaders act to limit or exclude participation from diverse others." As with any organization, the exclusion of some advantages the agendas and issues of others. Indeed, the perception is that some diversity concerns get filtered out and only those that are labeled as "pressing" make it to the IFO Board level. The problem of a lack of inclusivity is seen as ongoing as "the same people tend to occupy positions of power" at the local level. Participants fear that the lack of inclusivity may lead some faculty to back away from union participation.

A third way in which participants see local faculty associations as of concern is the one-size-fits-all strategy of opposing any administrative action. Examples include refusing to participate in mandated events and using confrontation in almost all situations in which administrators are present. In this manner all relationships with administrators become contentious rather than collaborative, and the meet and confer process itself constrains dialogue and joint administrative-faculty goal achievement. Focus group participants suggest a more nuanced approach in dealing with the administration—“forging partnerships” and “working with” when possible.

A fourth way in which focus group members see local faculty associations as of concern is the manner by which work gets done or does not get done. The faculty senates (assemblies) on the campuses are viewed as factional—representing department interests rather than the interests of faculty as a whole—and not very forward thinking. Committee membership is solicited, but the work assigned to the committees is often not very meaningful. In addition, faculty often sit on “downstate” IFO committees, but there may or may not be mechanisms in place requiring them to report back to the local faculty associations/senates/executive committees.

A fifth way in which the local faculty associations are of concern has to do with the lack of training many leaders have for the positions they hold. Grievance officers need training not only on the contract, but also on how to represent faculty on issues, especially equity-related issues. Presidents and other members should receive training for the roles that they play. Participants think training is an essential component for helping articulate faculty and union concerns.

Focus group participants also shared some concerns about the statewide IFO. First, faculty express some confusion related to what being a member of this particular union means. On the one hand, at the local level the union is known as an association despite the fact that it is unlike the discipline-based associations to which many faculty also belong. On the other hand, the solidarity and activism levels that are often present in other unions does not seem as strong in the IFO and local faculty associations which leads faculty to question whether the organization is truly a faculty association or a faculty union. In the minds of some, faculty unions are supposed to “advocate on behalf of faculty and not just on behalf of the contract.” In addition, members express genuine concern over the lack of information that is provided. Participants address this concern when they say:

Here is what we need...every faculty member should have a little booklet [detailing] what is the IFO, what is the history of the IFO, why are we unionized, and what is a union? (University 3)

Faculty state that it is often very unclear where they should go when they have certain kinds of issues. They question whether there is an organizational chart for the IFO and the various Faculty Associations.

Participants offer a second group of comments to the IFO Board of Directors. Faculty note that the IFO Board of Directors also lacks diversity. The proportion of white males on the board is far greater than their proportion on any of the state universities. One suggestion is to build diversity requirements into IFO leadership positions. One participant describes the situation and a potential remedy in this way:

On the inside of the IFO Board one of the things I am aware of is the need for greater diversity and I can't say it loudly enough and I can't say it often enough...[T]here is really a need for much more diversity on [the board] and I would like to see every campus make a concerted effort to make sure that at least one person of color is represented from each campus on the board...and not just a person of color but a person with diverse perspectives. (University 3)

Another suggestion is to include a position for an adjunct representative on the IFO Board of Directors. Yet, participants also identify that simply having categorical representation is no guarantee that categorical concerns will be addressed. If one is female, obtaining a union leadership position may not translate into representing the interests of women. As one participant acknowledges:

The IFO has gotten to be a good old boys system...Even women who have penetrated [it] are good old boys. Appointments and major committee assignments are based on established networks instead of abilities and set criteria. (University 7)

A third group of comments pertain to the IFO Committees. Members suggest greater efforts to "meet at the intersections of MIC, GLBTA, and FIC" concerns. In other words, there is a perceived need for more coordinated efforts on diversity issues as well as a need for more joint conversations.

A fourth group of comments are related to how central diversity concerns are relative to all union matters. Participants urge more attention to developing safe, supportive work environments for women and more support for valuing women's issues in relation to the PDP (Professional Development Plan) and PDR (Professional Development Report) process. Support

for safe-space training is also suggested. Participants also express disappointment and anger at the lack of domestic partner benefits for same sex partners, and question the disparity in use of tuition credits for heterosexual but not gay and lesbian families. Participants urge continued attention to address these as well as other discriminatory practices.

In addition, participants would like to see better mechanisms for addressing bullying and mobbing situations and they recognize that the contract does not address faculty-to-faculty disputes. Union protection, then, extends only so far, and in the absence of organizational mechanism for handling these situations

it allows tenured professors who engage in these [bullying] behaviors to remain here totally protected. (University 7)

Another faculty member wonders if the union might be configured somewhat differently to handle bullying and mobbing situations:

I would like to see a greater attention paid to faculty-to-faculty disputes and how the faculty who is complaining gets treated. While I am thrilled that the Faculty Association will support anyone who is accused, and they have to defend their members, I would like that support and defense to be extended to the complaining faculty member as well. It's discouraging to think that, if I make a complaint, I'm all alone out here while that person gets union representation and resources. (University 7)

Whether it is the role of the union or MnSCU to referee faculty-to-faculty disputes, faculty are simply identifying the fact that whatever mechanism is in place is not working in these types of situations.

In sum, faculty identified five broad categories of concerns related to local faculty associations. First, many faculty leaders use their role in the faculty association to move into administrative positions. This is seen as compromising their ability to effectively reflect faculty concerns. Second, the leadership positions in faculty associations are predominantly filled by white males. The concern is that equity concerns are not addressed or inadequately addressed. Third, the one-size-fits all strategy of opposing administrative actions is seen as inappropriate in all circumstances. Fourth, the process by which local faculty associations do their work or not is of concern. Faculty senates may not work well, committee work may not be meaningful, and reporting mechanisms may be missing. Fifth, many of the local leaders lack adequate training for the positions they hold.

Faculty also identify four concerns related to the statewide IFO. First, faculty express confusion over the difference between the local and state levels of the organization. What is the hierarchy and how do the two levels work together? More information is necessary. Second, the lack of diversity at the local level also carries over to the IFO Board of Directors. Board members are predominantly white and male raising questions about how well all members are represented. Third, faculty identify a lack of discussion at the intersection of the equity committee concerns. This study is seen as a positive step in that direction. Fourth, faculty assert the need to make diversity concerns more central to all union matters.

What does a positive campus climate look like?

Faculty participants offered several ideas for what a positive campus climate would be like. Many of these comments pertain to the quality of interactions they would have with each other as well as with students and administrators. Relationships with others would be genuine and trust-filled. Interchanges would be respectful. Contributions would be valued. There would be a tolerance of and respect for different opinions and idea explanation and exploration would be encouraged. People would receive feedback without getting defensive. There would be tolerance of and respect for people from diverse backgrounds. People would be “out.” People would talk with others across disciplines and collaboration rather than division would be present. There would also be a notable lack of intimidation and power plays.

According to faculty participants, a positive campus climate would also be one in which diversity is valued throughout the university. All levels of the university community would see the relevance of and need for global diversity/multiculturalism in the curriculum, and the need for a curriculum that “challenges systems of oppression.” There would be greater diversity among students, faculty, and administration. In addition, the university would be characterized as committed to and working toward being inclusive in both word and deed—“the lite motifs are not superficial but real;” all voices are welcome; all voices are present “at the table;” institutional policies are supportive of the welcoming statements; there is an intolerance of oppression; diversity training is required and faculty develop capacity to address non-inclusive statements; and, funding is provided for diversity offices, diversity initiatives, and for reassigned time for faculty who work on equity-related matters. In the process of working toward being

inclusive, the university would not expect people from a category to speak on behalf of the whole category. Accommodations would be made on each campus for people from diverse faith communities, including physical space for worship, recognition of important holidays, and the availability of important foods. On an individual level people challenge themselves in terms of their internalized biases and are trained on the “isms.”

The university emphasis on diversity would be all-inclusive. With respect to gender diversity a positive campus climate is one in which there are more women in leadership positions. At the department level, a positive campus climate is one in which women receive their fair share of department resources and course assignments and men shoulder their fair share of department-related burdens (e.g., committee work, advising). For faculty with varying physical abilities, there would be support and accommodation for their needs. For gay, lesbian, bi-sexual, and transgender faculty there would be domestic partner benefits. For single faculty and faculty who are in a cohabiting GLBT or heterosexual relationship there is provision of benefits equal to those granted to heterosexual married faculty.

Leadership at the university also looks different when a positive campus climate exists. Under that condition, the state universities would hire administrators from the outside; and, these individuals would be talented and know how to administer and build consensus. They would have an open door policy and “lots of conversation” would exist—there would be lots of questions, lots of listening, and lots of meetings in which all participants felt like they were pursuing common solutions to common problems. The administrators would exhibit respect for all disciplines. Knowledge of and respect for the IFO contract would exist. Deans would be committed to the campus community and supportive of their faculty. Under these

circumstances faculty would not be punished for dealing with difficult equity-related conversations and all faculty would be treated equally with respect to salary, promotions, and other discretionary benefits. There would also be administrative support for faculty initiatives and resources would be present to meet expressed faculty needs. Leadership would be service-oriented and caring of all others. There would be a willingness to have conversations about the climate and change would be implemented arising from these conversations. Finally, leadership among the faculty would also be present and faculty would step forward who are willing to do the work of the union and college outside of teaching and research obligations.

When a positive campus climate exists, policies and processes are in place to protect faculty. Faculty would have a sense that people are “looking out for you.” First year faculty are not expected to advise students and are given time to develop courses and move forward on their research agendas. Systems would also be in place to mentor first year faculty regarding the contract and expectations and to foster partnerships/mentorships with other faculty. Development opportunities are available to aid in faculty growth. When bullying or mobbing occurs, the “transgressions” are dealt with quickly. In this situation, adjunct faculty are not exploited and are given greater recognition in terms of pay and benefits. Research, service, and the development of pedagogies are encouraged and supported through lighter teaching loads. Faculty would experience work-life balance.

In sum, participants offer several ideas for the description of a positive campus climate. First, there would be open and meaningful interactions with colleagues, students, and staff that could also be characterized by the presence of genuineness, trust, tolerance, and respect for and valuing of difference. In addition, diversity would be valued throughout all levels of the

university, not just in words, but in actions. It would also be the case that administrative leadership would have the knowledge and skills they need to do so in a way that builds consensus. Decisions would be made in a respectful manner and would be respected. Leadership would also be evident in other sectors of the university as faculty step forward to take on necessary tasks outside of teaching and scholarship. Finally, in a positive campus climate faculty would feel supported in their primary obligations of teaching, research, and service and policies and procedures would be in place to protect faculty from the unique situation in which negative behaviors occur.

How might the union be seen as a mechanism to help bring about a positive campus climate?

How might the local faculty association and IFO be seen as a mechanism by which to help bring about that positive campus that focus group participants envision? Faculty note several ways in which the union could be helpful—both at the local faculty association level and the state level. At the local level, recommendations can be grouped into four general categories: fostering solidarity, strengthening local structures, promoting diversity awareness, and action.

Participants suggest several ways to counter the exclusivity tendencies of local associations and build solidarity. First, actively solicit ideas from faculty. Second, provide “safe environments” for faculty to ask questions. Third, mentor faculty and probationary faculty into the union. Fourth, offer forums about how to create a positive campus climate. Fifth, create organizational mechanisms that allow feedback to come forward. Sixth, hold social events for all faculty and social opportunities for new faculty, recognize faculty for accomplishments, build alliances across groups, foster a general climate of respect, and help to create physical spaces in which faculty can gather to have conversations. Seventh, get more faculty involved in union activities as a counter to complacency. One of the ways by which this could be done is to mentor junior faculty into local union activities and structures. In these times, faculty note an important need for collegiality, for honesty and openness in addressing difficult topics such as climate, and for calm discussions. Solidarity would also be improved through a dismantling of

the “good old boy system” present on the local level and by representing the needs of all faculty.

Several ideas are also offered on the topic of promoting diversity awareness and strengthening diversity efforts. To accomplish this faculty suggest more diversity training offerings. They disagree, however, on whether the trainings would be voluntary or mandatory (e.g., faculty need to attend a certain number of trainings with diversity being one of several topics offered). Faculty also suggest diversity-related orientation sessions as a part of orientation to higher education. Finally, faculty who represent/defend other faculty on equity-related matters may need to be educated on feminist and multi-cultural issues.

Faculty also offer several recommendations related to strengthening local faculty association structures. One is to make sure that decision making processes are transparent. A second is to make sure that all committees are active. A third is to institutionalize the manner by which diversity concerns are addressed.

Many focus group participants also recommend that the local associations “act.” By this they mean having leaders engaging in efforts to save faculty positions, and having leaders exhibiting “personal courage” by having difficult conversations and asking questions about administrative decisions without walking away from the table. Participants encourage faculty leaders to offer to “do less” when fewer resources are given. Participants emphasize the need for their leaders to advocate on behalf of faculty as a whole, instead of simply serving as protectors of the contractual elements that emphasize individual benefits. Participants encourage their local leaders to move beyond a focus on self, and encourage leaders to guard against discrimination. In addition they urge their local faculty association leaders to “be

energetic in...support of faculty and unworried about who is in charge,” and defend the contract against administrative actions and hostile deans.

At the state IFO level, participant recommendations can be grouped into five categories: contractual issues, information, operating policies and procedures, staffing, and action. With respect to contractual issues, faculty encourage the need for fair contracts to be negotiated. A fairer contract would include improvement in pay and faculty development and other benefits available to adjunct faculty. In response to increasing scholarship pressures at the local level, faculty suggest negotiating changes in the contract (e.g., a decrease in teaching load, stronger acknowledgement of service). In addition, participants suggest that negotiators help reconstruct what it means to be a faculty member taking the complexity of faculty lives into account (e.g., the need to be single parent and professor, the way the language around duty days is constructed, and the requirements for tenure and promotion). Several participants note the lack of domestic partner benefits for same-sex faculty members and the inadequacy of healthcare benefits for trans faculty. One faculty member acknowledged the desire as well as the difficulty of making this request:

If we could work together across campuses we could be stronger, but I don't know how to make that work when we can't even work across departments or within programs. That's what we need to do. If all seven campuses said you know what...partner benefits...that's how it's got to be...you know what gender equity is how it's got to be...There will be resistance. The people in charge won't want change because they are benefiting from it. Certainly we would be stronger if we could stand together as seven campuses.

Finally, faculty suggest including reassigned time for more duties as a lot of faculty work is done “out of hide.”

The quantity and quality of union provided and solicited information is also a matter for discussion. Faculty members encourage the statewide IFO to continue the use of focus groups as a way of soliciting information from members. As it pertains to information provided to faculty, participants suggest that some issues are complex enough that more information may need to be provided than is currently. Ultimately, faculty said they need more information on the IFO and on the Faculty Associations and how the two levels are related to one another (e.g., chain of command). They also request information on support that exists for faculty at both levels. In addition, they ask for more information on what the IFO does for its members and why it is in the best interest of faculty to belong and urge the IFO to increase faculty awareness of the contract.

With respect to operating policies and procedures, participants offer a few suggestions for change. First, they encourage a two-year waiting period requirement for faculty who have been in leadership positions in the union prior to becoming administrators. Second, they suggest that the composition of the IFO Board and committees be discussed. It is too easy for the complexion of the board and committees to appear unrepresentative of the entire faculty. Third, they suggest that mechanisms be put in place for faculty to be aware of how and whether faculty complaints/issues are being addressed. Fourth, they encourage mechanisms be put in place to protect the victims of bullying, mobbing, and discrimination. Participants perceive that union structures are better able to protect the perpetrators of these actions rather than the victims.

As it pertains to staffing, participants commend IFO staff for the great job that they do. Faculty note that some staff are greatly overworked and they encourage the union to hire more

staff such as an official spokesperson as is necessary. Other faculty suggested the hiring of an ombudsman to help mediate the conflicts between faculty. The location of this person—local or state level—is unclear. Staff are encouraged to continue doing the great work they are doing—with the legislature, with implementing anti-racism training, with the MnSCU system office.

Faculty participants also request a call to action to address diversity as well as general union concerns. They suggest that the IFO sanction the anti-racism training workshops that are occurring on several campuses. They encourage actions against the MnSCU business model and encourage more communication of the unique missions of the state universities. They encourage more support for transgender faculty. They desire greater commitment to progressive social change so that all faculty benefit. They advocate vigorous defense of academic freedom and intellectual property and revisiting the allocation model as the current model is unfair to the smaller state universities.

In sum, there are several ideas for how the local and statewide levels of the union might be helpful in bringing the positive campus climate into existence. At the local level, it will be critical to engage in efforts that build solidarity and to put mechanisms in place that allow people to respectfully discuss ideas without fear of having to do so. It will be necessary to hold social events to greet new faculty, recognize faculty for accomplishments, build alliances across groups, foster a general climate of respect, and create the physical spaces in which faculty can gather to have conversations. Local faculty associations should also encourage faculty to attend faculty-initiated diversity awareness trainings and events where faculty learn the knowledge and skills necessary for working in this increasingly diverse world. Mechanisms will

need to be put in place at the local level that helps ensure that local faculty association leadership looks as diverse as the faculty they represent and to improve the transparency of the decision making processes. Committee participation will need to be more actively solicited and committee efforts will need to be supported. Finally, local union leadership and members will need to become action-oriented, advocating for faculty, exhibiting personal courage to say the difficult things that need to be said and to represent people and issues with which they may not personally agree but that advance the union cause.

Results From the Online Survey

This section of the report discusses the results from the online survey of state university faculty conducted during November 2012. The findings are presented in four parts. First is a discussion of faculty perceptions of climate. The second contains a discussion of faculty climate experiences. The third discusses faculty reactions to the structures within which they work. In each of these first three sections overall findings are presented as well as are differences according to protected group status, faculty status, faculty appointment type, and university. In the last part the perceptions faculty have of the IFO and the local faculty associations is discussed as well as is suggestions for improvement.

Subsection 1: Faculty Perceptions of Climate

Several items on the questionnaire addressed faculty perceptions of work environment, or climate, on their campus and within the Minnesota State Colleges and Universities system. The very first question asked faculty to describe the climate for faculty on their university campus as it pertains to equity matters. The data in Table 4 report these findings for faculty overall, and then according to sex, race/ethnicity, gender preference, religious affiliation, faculty appointment, faculty status, and university.

Table 4. Faculty Description of Campus Climate as it Pertains to Equity Matters					
Faculty Overall and Faculty by Equity Group Status	Very Positive	Somewhat Positive	Neither Positive Nor Negative	Somewhat Negative	Very Negative
Overall (n = 1133)	16.0%	32.1%	15.0%	23.7%	13.2%
Sex of Faculty					
Females, Transsexuals, & Intersexuals (n = 489)	12.7%	33.7%	13.1%	26.6%	13.9%
Males (n=337)	18.4%	31.8%	14.2%	21.1%	14.5%
No significant differences					
Race/Ethnicity					
Faculty of Color (American) (n = 59)	10.2%	23.7%	10.2%	27.1%	28.8%
Faculty of Non U.S. Origin (n = 52)	19.2%	26.9%	11.5%	17.3%	25.0%
European American (n = 611)	14.9%	36.5%	13.3%	23.9%	11.5%
X ² (df = 8) = 23.468, p = .003, CV = .127					
Gender Preference					
Gay, lesbian, bisexual, transgender, or queer (n = 77)	9.1%	33.8%	10.4%	28.6%	18.2%
Heterosexual (n = 752)	15.4%	32.8%	13.8%	24.2%	13.7%
No significant differences					
Religious Affiliation					
Other than Christian (n = 86)	12.8%	39.5%	8.1%	19.8%	19.8%
Christian (n = 428)	17.1%	30.6%	14.5%	23.8%	14.0%
No religion (n = 253)	11.5%	37.5%	12.6%	26.9%	11.5%
No significant differences					
Faculty Appointment					
Adjunct/Community Faculty (n = 86)	27.9%	30.2%	10.5%	22.1%	9.3%
Fixed Term (n = 90)	17.8%	32.2%	20.0%	18.9%	11.1%
Non-Tenure Track, Tenured, Tenure Track (n = 665)	13.2%	32.9%	12.6%	26.0%	15.2%
X ² (df = 8) = 19.619, p = .012, CV = .108					
Faculty Status					
Adjunct/Community Faculty (n = 83)	27.7%	28.9%	12.0%	22.9%	8.4%
Instructor/Assistant Professor (n = 223)	16.1%	35.0%	14.8%	22.9%	11.2%
Associate Professor (n = 230)	12.2%	32.6%	15.7%	26.5%	13.0%
Professor (n = 296)	13.2%	33.1%	10.8%	24.7%	18.2%
X ² (df=12) = 22.169, p = .036, CV = .094					
University					
Bemidji (n = 75)	13.3%	44.0%	9.3%	26.7%	6.7%
Mankato (n = 184)	20.1%	27.7%	12.5%	25.0%	14.7%
Metro (n = 111)	18.0%	30.6%	15.3%	25.2%	10.8%
Moorhead (n = 101)	22.8%	31.7%	14.9%	22.8%	7.9%
St. Cloud (n = 191)	4.7%	28.3%	13.1%	30.9%	23.0%
Marshall (n = 57)	12.3%	31.6%	14.0%	22.8%	19.3%
Winona (n = 115)	17.4%	44.3%	13.9%	16.5%	7.8%
X ² (df = 24) = 62.435, p = .000, CV = .137					

In general, 48 percent of the faculty describe the climate as either somewhat positive (32 percent) or very positive (16 percent), 15 percent describe the climate as neither positive nor negative, and 37 percent describe the climate as either somewhat negative (24 percent) or very negative (13 percent). Standpoint, however, is crucial. The perceptions of faculty of color differ from the general view as 56 percent describe their work environment as either somewhat or very negative. In addition, there are different perceptions according to faculty appointment. Faculty with more permanent appointments are more likely to describe the climate in negative terms (41 percent) than are fixed term (30 percent) or adjunct faculty (31 percent). Faculty status also makes a difference in perception as the higher the faculty rank, the more likely a negative report. The extent to which negativity is perceived also varies across campuses from a high of 54 percent at St. Cloud to a low of 24 percent at Winona.

In a follow-up question, faculty were asked to describe the climate for faculty on their university campus as it pertains to the fair and equal treatment of faculty from several groups: faculty of color; gay, lesbian, bi-sexual, and transgender faculty; female faculty; faculty from other countries; and, faculty who practice a non-Christian faith or who may be atheist or agnostic. The overall responses to this question are reported in Table 5.

Equity Groups	Very or Somewhat Positive	Neither Positive Nor Negative	Very or Somewhat Negative
Faculty of color (n = 914)	59.5%	18.6%	21.9%
Gay, lesbian, bi-sexual, and transgender faculty (n = 896)	63.2%	19.4%	17.4%
Female faculty (n = 1031)	58.2%	17.5%	24.3%
Faculty from other countries (n = 896)	55.9%	20.9%	23.2%
Faculty who practice a nonChristian faith or who may be atheist or agnostic (n = 826)	54.4%	29.5%	16.1%

The general perception by over half of the overall respondents is that faculty are treated fairly and equitably. Just as before, however, standpoint is critical. How positively or negatively one views the climate for faculty in protected group categories varies according to whether the respondent is a person of color; female, transsexual or intersexual; GLBT-identified; nonChristian, or teach at Marshall or St. Cloud. This information is presented in Table 6.

Table 6. Description of Campus Climate on University Campuses for Faculty in Equity Groups According to Equity Group Status, Fall 2012					
Faculty by Group Status	Faculty of Color	GLBT Faculty	Female Faculty	International Faculty	NonChristian No Religion
<i>Sex of Faculty</i>					
Females, Transsexuals, & Intersexuals	X	X	X	X	X
Males					
<i>Race/Ethnicity</i>					
Faculty of Color (American)	X	X		X	X
Faculty of Non U.S. Origin	X			X	X
European American					
<i>Gender Preference</i>					
GLBTQ	X	X	X	X	X
Heterosexual					
<i>Religious Affiliation</i>					
Other than Christian	X	X		X	X
Christian					X
No religion	X				
<i>Faculty Appointment</i>					
Adjunct/Community Faculty					
Fixed Term					
Non-Tenure Track, Tenured, Tenure Track	X				X
<i>Faculty Status</i>					
Adjunct/Community Faculty					
Instructor/Assistant Professor					
Associate Professor	X			X	
Professor	X			X	
<i>University</i>					
Bemidji					
Mankato					
Marshall	X		X	X	X
Metropolitan			X		X
Moorhead					
St. Cloud	X	X	X	X	
Winona					

An "X" indicates a more negative evaluation as compared to the other categories within sex, race/ethnicity, gender preference, religious affiliation, faculty appointment, faculty status, and university.

Protected group status makes a difference in how one views the climate for faculty. A significantly greater percentage of faculty of color, GLBTQ-identified faculty, nonChristian faculty, and female, transsexual and intersexual faculty provide more negative evaluations than comparison groups of faculty. In addition, faculty at Marshall and St. Cloud are also more likely to report negative evaluations for colleagues who are members of protected groups.

A third set of questions asked faculty if they strongly agreed (1), somewhat agreed (2), neither agreed nor disagreed (3), somewhat disagreed (4), or strongly disagreed (5) with how supportive of equity matters their academic program, department, college or school, academic administrators, or administrative service staff are. Responses are found in Table 7.

Table 7. Faculty Perceptions of Support for Equity Matters Across the Campus, Fall 2012					
	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree Nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
My academic program is supportive of equity matters (n = 838)	50.2%	25.3%	8.7%	8.4%	7.4%
My department is supportive of equity matters (n = 986)	49.8%	26.0%	6.9%	9.3%	8.0%
My college/school is supportive of equity matters (n = 959)	36.0%	29.7%	11.4%	12.0%	10.9%
My academic affairs administrators are supportive of equity matters (n = 854)	29.0%	27.8%	17.1%	13.0%	13.1%
Administrative services staff at my university are supportive of equity matters (n = 827)	30.0%	29.1%	20.1%	11.7%	9.1%

Two general conclusions can be drawn from the data in Table 7. First, over half of the respondents perceive that various sectors of the campus are supportive of equity matters. Second, the perceptions of support are stronger at the program and department levels than they are in organizational levels more removed from the department.

To obtain an understanding about how perceptions of support might differ among groups of faculty, responses to these items were summed and reverse coded so that higher scores refer to higher perceptions of support. The resulting scale (Cronbach's alpha = .92) ranges from a low of 5 to a high score of 25 ($M = 18.77$, $SD = 5.73$). Independent group t tests or analysis of variance tests were then conducted to identify the extent to which faculty perceptions differed by protected group status, faculty appointment type, faculty status, or university. These data are presented in Table 8.

Groups Being Compared	<i>t</i> or <i>F</i>	Degrees of freedom (between, within)	<i>p</i>
Comparison of females, intersex, and transsexuals to males	ns		
Comparison of LGBTQ faculty to heterosexual faculty	ns		
Comparison of faculty of color, international faculty, and European American faculty	15.08	2, 484	.000
Comparison of faculty who have no religion, claim a religion other than Christianity, or are Christian	4.88	2, 515	.008
Comparison of adjunct/community faculty, fixed term faculty, and faculty who are either non-tenure track, probationary or tenured	ns		
Comparison of adjunct/community faculty, instructor/assistant professors, associate professors, and professors	ns		
Comparison of faculty by university	5.25	6, 554	.000

ns refers to findings that are not statistically significant at $p \leq .05$.

The data in Table 8 show that perceptions of support for equity matters do vary according to protected group status. Faculty of color perceive lower levels of support for equity matters than do faculty who are White, and faculty who are not Christian perceive lower levels than faculty who are either Christian, espouse no religion, atheist, or agnostic. Perceptions of support also vary by university. Faculty at St. Cloud perceive lower levels of support for equity concerns than faculty at Bemidji, Moorhead, or Winona.

A fourth set of questions asked faculty if they strongly agreed (1), somewhat agreed (2), neither agreed nor disagreed (3), somewhat disagreed (4), or strongly disagreed (5) with how supportive of equity matters MnSCU is. Faculty responses to these items are displayed in Table 9.

Table 9. Faculty Perceptions of MnSCU Support for Equity Concerns, Fall 2012					
	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree Nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
MnSCU central office staff are supportive of equity concerns (n = 603)	17.2%	19.4%	28.9%	18.2%	16.3%
MnSCU central office staff provide state university faculty with a voice in equity matters that pertain to them (n = 580)	16.4%	19.0%	26.6%	18.3%	19.8%
The MnSCU organization has adequate mechanisms in place to protect the victims of bullying and mobbing (n = 613)	11.9%	14.8%	21.9%	18.8%	32.6%
The MnSCU organization has adequate mechanisms in place to mediate faculty-to-faculty conflict	10.9%	14.9%	23.1%	18.7%	32.4%

For the first two items—support for equity concerns and having a voice in equity matters—faculty are fairly evenly split on whether they agree or disagree. That is not the case for the last two items, however. Over half of the faculty (51.4 percent) do not think MnSCU has adequate mechanisms in place to protect the victims of bullying and mobbing. In addition, over half of the faculty (51.1 percent) do not think MnSCU has adequate mechanisms in place to mediate faculty-to-faculty conflict.

In order to flesh out how responses differ by group, responses to the four items noted above were reverse coded so that higher scores indicate greater perceptions of support and then summed (Cronbach’s alpha = .93). The mean for this scale is 11.21 (*SD* = 4.92) and scores range from 4 to 20. The data in Table 10 depict the results from analyses conducted to identify the extent to which faculty perceptions differed by protected group status, faculty appointment type, faculty status, or university.

Groups Being Compared	t or F	Degrees of freedom (between, within)	p
Comparison of females, intersex, and transsexuals to males	ns		
Comparison of GLBTQ faculty to heterosexual faculty	-2.56	370	.011
Comparison of faculty of color, international faculty, and European American faculty	6.95	2, 316	.001
Comparison of faculty who have no religion, claim a religion other than Christianity, or are Christian	7.85	2, 316	.000
Comparison of adjunct/community faculty, fixed term faculty, and faculty who are either non-tenure track, probationary or tenured	5.37	2, 376	.005
Comparison of adjunct/community faculty, instructor/assistant professors, associate professors, and professors	4.15	3, 369	.007
Comparison of faculty by university	3.77	6, 370	.001

ns refers to findings that are not significant.

Focusing first on differences by protected group status, the data indicate significant findings for GLBTQ status, race/ethnicity, and religious preference. Further statistical analyses show that GLBTQ faculty, faculty of color, and faculty who are not Christian perceive lower levels of support from MnSCU for equity matters. Significant differences in perceptions also exist according to faculty appointment type, faculty status, and university. Further statistical tests reveal that non-tenure track, tenured and tenure track faculty, professors, and faculty who work at St. Cloud perceive less support from MnSCU than the other groups against which they were compared.

In another question faculty were asked to review 10 characteristics and note whether they were very, somewhat or not descriptive of program and department members. To avoid the possibility of response set, six of the items were phrased so that “very descriptive” is the most positive response (e.g., friendly, homogeneous, collegial, non-sexist, collaborative, and cooperative), and four were worded so that it would be the least positive response (e.g., racist, disrespectful, homophobic, and not supportive). The overall responses are found in Table 11.

Table 11. Characteristics Faculty Use to Describe Their Programs or Departments, Fall 2012			
Characteristic	Very Descriptive	Somewhat Descriptive	Not Descriptive
1. Friendly (n = 1005)	56.2	31.8	11.9
2. Racist (n = 994)	2.7	11.4	85.9
3. Homogeneous (n = 987)	19.8	43.0	37.3
4. Disrespectful (n = 997)	7.7	22.5	69.8
5. Collegial (n = 1001)	47.9	38.0	14.2
6. Non-sexist (n = 989)	54.1	31.7	14.2
7. Collaborative (n = 999)	40.8	41.0	18.1
8. Cooperative (n = 999)	43.4	40.2	16.3
9. Homophobic (n = 981)	3.0	11.7	85.3
10. Not supportive (n = 994)	10.6	26.2	63.3

Responses indicate that over half of the participants would characterize their departments as not racist (85.9 percent), not homophobic (85.3 percent), not disrespectful (69.8 percent), supportive (63.3 percent), very friendly (56.2 percent), and non-sexist (54.1 percent). More than 40 percent but less than 50 percent of the faculty also describe their departments as very collegial (47.9 percent), very cooperative (43.4 percent), and very collaborative (40.8 percent). In large measure, the overall responses suggest fairly congenial relationships at the program or department level; however, faculty perceptions do vary by protected group status.

Analyses run according to group status suggest a more nuanced understanding of the data are necessary. The data in Table 12 depict findings for each of the same 10 descriptor terms but this time according to group status. To interpret Table 10 the numbers in the column headings refer to the same numbered characteristic presented in Table 9: 1 = friendly, 2 = racist, 3 = homogeneous, 4 = disrespectful, 5 = collegial, 6 = non-sexist, 7 = collaborative, 8 = cooperative, 9 = homophobic, and 10 = not supportive. The presence of a “0” or a “+” also

carries a particular meaning—findings are interpreted from the perspective of protected group status. Thus, the presence of a “+” indicates a greater likelihood and a “0” means a lower likelihood that protected group members apply particular descriptions to departments.

Faculty by Group Status	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
<i>Sex of Faculty</i>										
Females, Transsexuals, & Intersexuals		+	+	+		0			+	
Males										
<i>Race/Ethnicity</i>										
Faculty of Color (American)	0	+								
Faculty of Non U.S. Origin	0	+								
European American										
<i>Gender Preference</i>										
GLBTQ	0	+		+	0		0	0	+	
Heterosexual										
<i>Religious Affiliation</i>										
Other than Christian		+		+			0	0	+	
Christian										
No religion		+					0	0	+	
<i>Faculty Appointment</i>										
Adjunct/Community Faculty										
Fixed Term				+						
Non-Tenure Track, Tenured, Tenure Track		+		+					+	
<i>Faculty Status</i>										
Adjunct/Community Faculty										
Instructor/Assistant Professor				+						
Associate Professor		+		+						
Professor		+	0	+						
<i>University</i>										
Bemidji										
Mankato		+		+						
Marshall		+		+	0					
Metropolitan		+								
Moorhead		+								
St. Cloud		+	0	+	0					0
Winona				+						

Columns 2 and 4 have a great many “+” signs. This indicates that faculty in protected groups are more likely than other faculty to describe their departments as racist (column 2) and disrespectful (column 4). Faculty with more permanent positions or who are more senior in rank are also more likely than their junior colleagues to label their departments as racist and disrespectful. University also appears to make a difference with a greater percentage of faculty at Mankato, Marshall, Metropolitan State, Moorhead and St. Cloud noting racism as a departmental descriptor term, and a greater percentage of faculty at Mankato, Marshall, St. Cloud and Winona reporting disrespect as a departmental descriptor term. In addition, faculty who are female, intersexual, or transsexual as well as faculty who are either gay, lesbian, bisexual, or transgender, and faculty who claim no religion or a nonChristian religion are more likely to describe their departments as homophobic (column 9). Thus, while the overall description of departments appears quite positive, a less positive view results when one differentiates according to group status. Labeling a department as racist, disrespectful, or homophobic is more likely if one is a member of certain protected groups, a faculty member at some universities, faculty appointment type and status.

In another set of nine questions, faculty were asked what conditions were like in their program or department. They were asked to either strongly agree (1), agree (2), neither agree nor disagree (3), somewhat disagree (4) or strongly disagree (5) on: I am reluctant to bring up issues that concern me for fear that it might affect my promotion/tenure; my colleagues expect me to represent “the point of view” of my sex (e.g., male or female); my colleagues expect me to represent “the point of view” of my race/ethnicity; my colleagues expect me to represent “the point of view” of my sexual orientation; my colleagues expect me to represent “the point

of view” of my religious affiliation; I constantly feel under scrutiny by my colleagues; I have to work harder than my colleagues do in order to be perceived as a legitimate scholar; there are many unwritten rules concerning how one is expected to interact with program (or department) colleagues; and, others seem to find it easier than I to “fit in.” Faculty responses to these items are found in Table 13.

Table 13. Faculty Perceptions of Department Conditions, Fall 2012					
	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree Nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
I am reluctant to bring up issues that concern me for fear that it might affect my promotion/tenure (n= 790)	17.6%	22.8%	11.0%	11.5%	37.1%
My colleagues expect me to represent “the point of view” of my sex (n = 897)	6.6%	9.8%	18.1%	13.7%	51.8%
My colleagues expect me to represent “the point of view” of my race/ethnicity (n = 830)	4.9%	6.1%	21.2%	11.7%	56.0%
My colleagues expect me to represent “the point of view” of my sexual orientation (n = 828)	4.5%	5.8%	22.3%	10.7%	56.6%
My colleagues expect me to represent “the point of view of my religious affiliation” (n = 831)	2.5%	6.1%	22.9%	11.0%	57.5%
I constantly feel under scrutiny by my colleagues (n = 951)	10.7%	15.4%	12.3%	12.9%	48.7%
I have to work harder than my colleagues do in order to be perceived as a legitimate scholar (n = 948)	14.5%	17.7%	14.6%	10.8%	42.5%
There are many unwritten rules concerning how one is expected to interact with program (or department) colleagues (n = 954)	20.8%	25.1%	12.9%	10.9%	30.4%
Others seem to find it easier than I to “fit in” (n = 944)	9.5%	15.0%	20.0%	12.5%	42.9%

An examination of the items in the table above shows two items of concern to half of the faculty—bringing up issues of concern for fear for how it affects promotion or tenure and the presence of many unwritten rules regarding interaction with colleagues. Three other items are notable for at least one-fourth of the faculty: constantly feeling under scrutiny, having to

work harder than others do to be perceived as a legitimate scholar, and finding it more challenging to fit in than it is for others. These findings suggest that department conditions are difficult for some faculty.

To get a better sense of how department climate conditions vary by group status, faculty responses to the items mentioned in the previous table were summed and reverse coded so that higher values were associated with positive evaluations of climate conditions. The resulting scale (Cronbach’s alpha = .91) had a possible low score of 9 and a high score of 45 ($M = 33.74, SD = 9.44$). Then, independent group t tests or analysis of variance tests were conducted as appropriate. These data are presented in Table 14.

Table 14. Faculty Perceptions of Conditions in Their Programs or Departments According to Sex, LGBTQ Status, Race or Ethnicity, Religious Preference, Faculty Appointment Type, Faculty Status, and University, Fall 2012

Groups Comparisons	t or F	Degrees of freedom (between, within)	p
Comparison of females, intersexuals, and transsexuals to males	-4.81	514, 135	.000
Comparison of LGBTQ faculty to heterosexual faculty	-2.18	542	.030
Comparison of faculty of color, international faculty, and European American faculty	3.75	2, 473	.024
Comparison of faculty who have no religion, claim a religion other than Christianity, or are Christian	4.26	2, 503	.015
Comparison of adjunct/community faculty, fixed term faculty, and faculty who are either non-tenure track, probationary or tenured	4.14	2, 548	.016
Comparison of adjunct/community faculty, instructor/assistant professors, associate professors, and professors	2.88	3, 542	.036
Comparison of faculty by university	ns*		

* ns refers to findings that are not significant.

The data in Table 14 depict a consistent difference in perception of departmental climate conditions by protected group status, faculty appointment type and faculty rank. Less positive evaluations of climate conditions are noted for female, intersexual, or transsexual faculty, LGBTQ faculty, for faculty of color, and people who adhere to a nonChristian religion (as opposed to those who are not religious, atheist, or agnostic). With respect to faculty appointment, fixed-term faculty report lower levels of department support relative to those

who hold non-tenure track, tenured, or tenure track positions. While the test for faculty status was significant overall, further tests did not reveal significant differences in means between groups.

Subsection 2: Faculty Experiences

Several items were included in the survey to tap faculty experiences related to equity matters. The survey asked faculty whether female faculty, GLBT faculty, faculty of color, and faculty from various religious affiliations are disadvantaged in their program or department on eight items: access to resources, treatment in the areas of recruitment and promotions, availability of mentoring from colleagues, attention that is paid to spoken thoughts, the percentage of senior positions held, the presence of discrimination, the division of programmatic administrative duties across groups, and the division of teaching-related duties (e.g., course assignments and advising). The information is found in Table 15.

Experience	Female Faculty Are Disadvantaged	GLBT Faculty Are Disadvantaged	Faculty of Color Are Disadvantaged	Faculty From Some Religious Affiliations Are Disadvantaged
Access to resources	89	38	76	35
Treatment in the areas of recruitment and retention	134	53	112	47
Availability of mentoring from colleagues	103	49	108	42
Attention that is paid to spoken thoughts	157	55	105	51
The percentage of senior positions held	133	73	132	45
The presence of discrimination	108	58	118	52
The division of programmatic administrative duties across groups	125	44	82	33
The division of teaching-related duties (e.g., course assignments and advising)	111	26	73	24

There are at least two ways one might examine the data in Table 15. First, if each expression of disadvantage is treated as a separate experience one could simply add across

each line to find the overall number of experiences by item. After adding across each line, each item could then be ranked to find out which are the most and which are the least experienced.

This procedure results in the following rankings:

1. The percentage of senior positions held (n = 383)
2. Attention that is paid to spoken thoughts (n = 368)
3. Treatment in the areas of recruitment and retention (n = 346)
4. The presence of discrimination (n = 336)
5. Availability of mentoring from colleagues (n = 302)
6. The division of programmatic administrative duties across groups (n = 284)
7. Access to resources (n = 238)
8. The division of teaching-related duties (n = 234)

The top five ranked experiences all were noted by over 300 faculty participants and all have serious ramifications for faculty in protected groups.

A second way to examine these data is to add the number of experiences down within each column to find out the overall number of disadvantaging experiences reported for each equity group. After doing so, there are 960 experiences reported for female faculty, 806 for faculty of color, 396 reported for GLBT faculty, and 329 for faculty from some religious affiliations. The sheer number of disadvantaging experiences reported for female and faculty of color is hard to ignore. These data suggest that work remains to be done at the department level to make sure all faculty are treated equitably.

To understand the extent of incivility (including bullying and mobbing) faculty encounter from five different groups (other faculty, department chairs, local faculty union leaders, university staff and academic administrators), participants were asked whether in the last five years they had experienced any one of eighteen itemized situations at their university. Faculty could check the same item for each group. The incivility situations and the number of noted experiences are found in Table 16.

Table 16. Number of Incivility Experiences Reported With Faculty, the Department Chair, Local Faculty Union Leaders, University Staff, and Academic Administrators, Fall 2012					
	Other Faculty	Department Chair	Local Faculty Union Leaders	University Staff	Academic Administrators
This person or these persons acted indifferently toward me	313	157	128	138	269
This person or these persons manipulated information in a manner that negatively affected me	260	150	63	69	213
This person or these person manipulated other individuals in a manner that negatively affected me	242	125	56	53	177
This person or these persons divulged confidential information about me	86	58	20	26	65
This person or these persons ignored my contributions	236	152	45	45	219
This person or these persons humiliated me front of others	150	85	25	26	58
This person or these persons spread rumors about me	164	77	21	42	65
This person or these persons micromanaged my work	93	104	11	40	161
This person or these person withheld support and/or resources from me	88	111	28	44	177
This person or these persons was/were dismissive of my point of view	264	149	60	57	214
This person or these person established a clique from which I was excluded	199	105	40	23	71
This person or these persons shunned me	152	67	20	27	65
This person or these persons pressured or intimidated me	175	104	37	27	136
This person or these persons created a situation in which I was uncomfortable	280	134	58	57	176
This person or these persons implied that I was not competent to do my job	149	71	15	27	77
This person or these persons implied that my actions were not in keeping with organizational objectives	115	69	21	20	111
This person or these persons engaged in behaviors that were intended to harass, abuse, or frighten me	161	85	30	22	107
This person or these persons engaged in unwanted and uninvited sexual attention toward me	24	12	2	5	9

Again, there are at least two ways one might examine the data in Table 16. If each experience of incivility is treated as a separate incident one could simply add across each line to find the overall number of experiences. (This may or may not result in double counting some incidents, particularly if more than one category of individuals was involved in a single incident.) After

adding across each line, each item could then be ranked to find out which incivility examples are the most and which are the least experienced. Following this procedure results in these rankings:

1. This person or these persons acted indifferently toward me (n = 1005)
2. This person or these persons manipulated information in a manner that negatively affected me (n = 755)
3. This person or these persons was dismissive of my point of view (n = 744)
4. This person or these persons created a situation in which I was uncomfortable (n = 705)
5. This person or these persons ignored my contributions (n = 697)
6. This person or these persons manipulated other individuals in a manner that negatively affected me (n = 653)
7. This person or these persons pressured or intimidated me (n = 479)
8. This person or these persons withheld support and/or resources from me (n = 448)
9. This person or these persons established a clique from which I was excluded (n = 438)
10. This person or these persons micromanaged my work (n = 409)
11. This person or these persons engaged in behaviors that were intended to harass, abuse, or frighten me (n = 405)
12. This person or these persons spread rumors about me (n = 369)
13. This person or these persons humiliated me in front of others (n = 344)
14. This person or these persons implied that I was not competent to do my job (n = 339)
15. This person or these persons implied that my actions were not in keeping with organizational objectives (n = 336)
16. This person or these persons shunned me (n = 331)
17. This person or these persons divulged confidential information about me (n = 255)
18. This person or these persons engaged in unwanted and uninvited sexual attention toward me (n = 52)

What is perhaps surprising is the sheer volume of incivility experiences faculty report.

The kinds of incivility reported most frequently are some of the more “minor” forms. The first six overall rankings produced above are almost the same six items for each of the separate categories of individuals (i.e., other faculty, department chair). With the exception of creating situations in which faculty are uncomfortable, the more severe forms that are often included as

examples of bullying or mobbing (pressuring or intimidating; implying incompetence; implying that actions are contrary to organizational objectives; engaging in behaviors designed to harass, abuse or frighten; or, engaging in unwanted and uninvited sexual attention) occur less frequently than more minor forms. Even so, the number of experiences reported ranges from a low of 52 to a high of 705.

Another way this information might be examined is to simply report the percentage of reported incidents by source. Of the 8764 reports of incivility (some duplications are possible), 36.0 percent were experiences with other faculty, 27.0 percent were with academic administrators, 20.7 percent were with a department chair, 8.5 percent were with university staff, and 7.8 percent were with local faculty union leaders. While the number of reported experiences is highly variable, the data suggest that incivility is not limited to interactions with any one group.

Subsection 3: Faculty Evaluation of the University Structure

In addition to gauging perceptions and understanding experiences, the survey asked faculty two sets of questions to ascertain the nature of their university structures. As the literature reviewed at the beginning of this report identified, there are several aspects of organizations that if present are often conducive to bullying and mobbing behaviors. Faculty were asked their level of agreement/disagreement with whether their university administrators have a continual focus on the “bottom line,” are open to constructive criticism, maintain effective communication channels, believe that employees work better under stress, create a cooperative/supportive environment, encourage/empower faculty, emphasize collaboration, handle equity disputes/problems effectively, and handle hostile behaviors of faculty effectively. Faculty responses to these statements are reported in Table 17.

Table 17. Extent of Faculty Agreement or Disagreement with Descriptions of Their University Structures, Fall 2012					
Descriptions of University Structure	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree Nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
My university administrators have a continual focus on the “bottom line” (n = 881)	43.6%	34.7%	10.9%	6.6%	4.2%
My university administrators are open to constructive criticism (n = 876)	8.0%	22.0%	15.5%	23.2%	31.3%
My university administrators maintain effective communication channels (n = 930)	10.4%	25.2%	16.2%	24.3%	23.9%
My university administrators believe that employees work better under stress (n = 761)	16.7%	17.0%	32.2%	16.7%	17.5%
My university administrators create a cooperative/supportive environment (n = 928)	9.4%	25.3%	17.6%	21.8%	26.0%
My university administrators encourage/empower faculty (n = 923)	9.3%	25.1%	16.0%	21.0%	28.5%
My university administrators emphasize collaboration (n = 921)	14.1%	34.2%	19.8%	15.0%	16.9%
My university administrators handle equity disputes/problems effectively (n = 693)	6.9%	13.9%	23.1%	22.7%	33.5%
My university administrators handle hostile behaviors of faculty effectively (n = 711)	4.6%	10.7%	21.4%	22.8%	40.5%

A clear pattern emerges that suggests university structures are indeed conducive to bullying and mobbing. Over three-fourths of faculty state their administrators have a continual focus on the bottom line and approximately two-thirds of faculty report inadequate administrative handling of hostile faculty behaviors. More than one-half note a lack of openness to constructive criticism and ineffective handling of equity disputes/problems. In addition, about one-half of the faculty find administrators to be ineffective at maintaining open communication channels, at creating cooperative/supportive environments, and at encouraging/empowering faculty, at the same time that collaboration is emphasized. The university structures themselves need to be modified in order to address issues related to bullying and mobbing.

In order to understand whether status in particular groups has an effect on responses given, the items noted in the table above were recoded if necessary and responses to the items were then summed so that higher scores equate to workplaces conducive to bullying and mobbing. Scores on the resulting scale could range from a low of 9 to a high of 45. The relatively high score for the mean of 31.43 (SD = 9.10) echoes the findings from the previous table and implies that university structures are seen as conducive to bullying and mobbing.

Table 18 shows the results of these group comparisons.

Table 18. Are University Structures Conducive to Bullying and Mobbing? Faculty Responses According to Sex, GLBTQ Status, Race or Ethnicity, Religious Preference, Faculty Appointment Type, Faculty Rank, and University, Fall 2012			
Groups Being Compared	<i>t</i> or <i>F</i>	Degrees of freedom (between, within)	<i>p</i>
Comparison of females, intersex, and transsexuals to males	ns		
Comparison of GLBTQ faculty to heterosexual faculty	ns		
Comparison of faculty of color, international faculty, and European American faculty	7.16	2, 400	.001
Comparison of faculty who have no religion, claim a religion other than Christianity, or are Christian	4.90	2, 429	.008
Comparison of adjunct/community faculty, fixed term faculty, and faculty who are either non-tenure track, probationary or tenured	6.66	2, 466	.001
Comparison of adjunct/community faculty, instructor/assistant professors, associate professors, and professors	3.07	3, 458	.028
Comparison of faculty by university	4.88	6, 458	.000

ns refers to results that are not statistically significant

The data in Table 18 indicate that race/ethnicity and religious preference are significant factors in understanding university structure. Faculty of color report considerably higher scores (see the university structure as conducive to bullying and mobbing) than do faculty who are white. In addition, faculty who are not Christian report higher scores than do faculty who are.

Significant differences are also found according to faculty appointment type, faculty rank and university. With respect to faculty appointment, non-tenure track, tenured, and tenure track faculty report higher scores than do adjunct or community faculty. While faculty

rank also makes a difference, further analyses are unclear as to which groups' scores are statistically different. Results are more clear with respect to university differences. Faculty at St. Cloud report higher scores than faculty at four other schools—Bemidji, Mankato, Moorhead, and Winona.

A second set of 13 questions gauged universities' commitments to diversity and equity matters. Faculty were asked their level of agreement/disagreement on whether their university provides adequate training on equity matters, provides adequate training on handling hostile behaviors, provides adequate help to victims of equity disputes and/or hostile behavior, has adequate policies and/or procedures for handling faculty-to-faculty conflict, has policies and procedures in place that show a commitment to diversity concerns, has adequate funding in place to meet diversity goals, includes meeting diversity goals as a part of its strategic plans, is committed to recruiting and retaining diverse faculty, is committed to recruiting and retaining diverse senior administrators, is committed to recruiting and retaining diverse mid-level administrators, encourages the development of curricula that meet diversity goals, creates a cooperative/supportive environment, and encourages/empowers faculty. The extent to which faculty agreed or disagreed on each of these items is found in Table 19.

Table 19. Extent of Faculty Agreement or Disagreement with Descriptions of Their University Structures Commitment to Diversity Concerns and Equity Matters, Fall 2012					
Descriptions	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree Nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
My university provides adequate training on equity matters (n = 815)	18.5%	30.2%	22.6%	16.4%	12.3%
My university provides adequate training on handling hostile behaviors (n = 797)	8.2%	19.8%	19.2%	27.9%	25.0%
My university provides adequate help to victims of equity disputes and/or hostile behavior (n = 675)	9.6%	16.7%	20.7%	23.1%	29.8%
My university has adequate policies and/or procedures for handling faculty-to-faculty conflict (n = 728)	8.8%	15.7%	18.0%	23.1%	34.5%
My university has policies and procedures in place that show a commitment to diversity concerns (n = 842)	23.9%	39.3%	15.9%	11.4%	9.5%
My university has adequate funding in place to meet diversity goals (n = 642)	16.8%	18.1%	22.3%	18.1%	24.8%
My university includes meeting diversity goals as a part of its strategic plans	31.4%	38.0%	14.9%	6.5%	9.2%
My university is committed to recruiting and retaining diverse faculty (n = 765)	27.3%	31.9%	16.5%	13.3%	11.0%
My university is committed to recruiting and retaining diverse senior administrators (n = 835)	19.7%	21.4%	22.9%	17.6%	18.3%
My university is committed to recruiting and retaining diverse mid-level administrators (n = 737)	20.6%	23.1%	22.4%	18.0%	15.9%
My university encourages the development of curricula that meet diversity goals (n = 744)	20.7%	38.1%	20.3%	10.5%	10.4%
My university provides trainings on equity-related matters (n = 827)	30.2%	37.2%	16.1%	8.5%	7.9%
When equity concerns have arisen at my university my administrators have taken appropriate action (n = 742)	15.0%	24.0%	21.0%	19.5%	20.5%

The data in Table 19 show that over one-half of the faculty agree that their universities have policies and procedures in place that show a commitment to diversity concerns, include diversity goals as a part of their strategic plans, are committed to recruiting and retaining diverse faculty, encourage the development of curricula that meet diversity needs, and provide training on equity matters and just about of one-half of the respondents would call that equity

training adequate. In addition, approximately 40 percent of the faculty agree that their universities are committed to recruiting and retaining diverse senior and mid-level administrators, and disagree that their universities have adequate funding in place to meet diversity goals. Over one-half of the faculty disagree, however, that their universities provide adequate training on handling hostile behaviors, provide adequate help to victims of equity disputes and/or hostile behavior, or have adequate policies and/or procedures for handling faculty-to-faculty conflict. In examining these responses, faculty give administrations credit for developing policies and plans, offering encouragement in certain contexts, attempting to hire and retain diverse administrators, and for providing certain kinds of training. It is in the difficult contexts that more work is needed—trainings for handling hostile behaviors and faculty-to-faculty conflicts and helping victims.

As has been done previously, additional analyses (independent group t tests or analysis of variance) were conducted to see if there are significant differences among faculty groups. To do so, all of the answer categories to the statements in Table 19 were recoded and then summed. Higher values on the resulting scale reflect a greater commitment to diversity and equity. The mean of the scale is 40.43 (SD = 13.66) and scores could range from a low of 13 (low commitment) to 65 (high commitment). Data from these analyses are found in Table 20.

Table 20. Does the University Structure Evidence a Commitment to Diversity and Equity Matters? Faculty Responses According to Sex, GLBTQ Status, Race or Ethnicity, Religious Preference, Faculty Appointment Type, Faculty Status, and University, Fall 2012			
Groups Being Compared	t or F	Degrees of freedom (between, within)	p
Comparison of females, intersex, and transsexuals to males	ns		
Comparison of GLBTQ faculty to heterosexual faculty	-4.02	363	.000
Comparison of faculty of color, international faculty, and European American faculty	14.08	2, 317	.000
Comparison of faculty who have no religion, claim a religion other than Christianity, or are Christian	8.31	2, 336	.000
Comparison of adjunct/community faculty, fixed term faculty, and faculty who are either non-tenure track, probationary or tenured	5.62	2, 365	.004
Comparison of adjunct/community faculty, instructor/assistant professors, associate professors, and professors	ns		
Comparison of faculty by university	3.12	6, 358	.005

ns refers to statistical findings that are not significant

The scores for GLBTQ faculty and faculty of color are lower than their comparison groups, which means they find their universities to be less committed to diversity and equity matters than their colleagues. Lower scores are also reported by non-tenure track, tenured, and probationary faculty and by faculty at Southwest (Marshall).

Subsection 4: Perceptions and Suggestions for Local Faculty Associations and the Inter Faculty Organization

Survey respondents were asked two sets of questions to highlight areas of strength and weakness for the seven local faculty associations and the statewide Inter Faculty Organization. In the first set, faculty were asked how well (very well, somewhat well, or not well) their local faculty association was doing in each of 18 areas. Table 21 presents the percent of faculty who answered “very well” on each statement and these responses are divided out by university.

Table 21. Percent of Faculty at Each University Who Answered that Their Local Faculty Association is Doing “Very Well” on Each of 18 Items, Fall 2012

Area Evaluated	Bemidji	Mankato	Metro	Moorhead	St. Cloud	Southwest	Winona
1. Soliciting ideas from faculty	34.5	18.3	44.8	33.3	24.5	50.0	29.5
2. Providing safe environments for faculty to ask questions and have conversations	28.6	41.5	29.5	35.8	23.0	35.2	41.3
3. Mentoring faculty into the union	21.8	21.0	15.1	16.9	9.0	31.3	23.5
4. Offering forums about how to create a positive climate	12.2	18.6	11.9	12.1	10.6	14.0	16.7
5. Creating opportunities for feedback	30.9	33.6	24.4	38.7	19.3	37.3	22.4
6. Holding social events for faculty	21.7	19.7	6.9	16.9	3.4	41.5	68.4
7. Recognizing faculty accomplishments	20.0	22.3	14.1	13.7	7.0	54.9	13.0
8. Building alliances across faculty groups	17.0	19.0	14.7	8.8	3.4	15.2	7.9
9. Encouraging faculty attendance at diversity trainings	35.1	33.3	35.5	35.4	35.0	40.4	30.8
10. Making decision making processes transparent	22.2	39.8	26.5	42.1	22.7	35.3	25.0
11. Encouraging committees to be active	40.4	60.8	39.5	53.3	37.2	50.0	51.3
12. Encouraging university leaders to retain personnel that would strengthen the university’s diversity goals	41.4	40.7	31.5	22.7	25.5	38.1	23.5
13. Supporting equity concerns	48.8	37.5	36.5	43.4	36.8	51.1	45.8
14. Including diversity voices on committees	38.2	42.6	41.2	47.0	44.4	50.0	37.7
15. Including diversity voices in local union leadership positions	35.9	34.7	30.6	32.8	34.9	40.4	22.4
16. Working with the administration on tasks when possible	20.0	62.4	34.7	56.5	25.2	51.0	36.4
17. Having adequate training for union leadership positions	32.1	21.0	11.1	22.6	4.7	15.8	17.1
18. Being a positive voice for faculty concerns	33.3	47.2	40.7	48.2	24.5	58.5	44.9

One thing that is immediately noticeable by looking at the percentages is that there is great variation among universities as to how well they are doing on each item; in some instances there is over a 40-point difference. As the primary purpose of this survey is to clarify the climate for faculty as it relates to equity concerns, it is important to note that many of the items with the highest percentages pertain to equity matters (e.g., items 9, 13, and 14). There are

some items, however, that suggest there is room for improvement across all state universities—mentoring faculty into the union, offering forums about how to create a positive climate, holding social events for faculty, building alliances across faculty groups, and having adequate training for union leadership positions.

For each of the same 18 items, faculty were asked whether they thought their local faculty association needed to do more. The percentage of faculty who answered affirmatively is reported in Table 22.

Table 22. Percent of Faculty at Each University Who Want Their Local Faculty Association to do More in a Particular Area, Fall 2012

Area Evaluated	Bemidji	Mankato	Metro	Moorhead	St. Cloud	Southwest	Winona
1. Soliciting ideas from faculty	48.8	51.8	60.9	47.5	78.3	32.5	62.9
2. Providing safe environments for faculty to ask questions and have conversations	56.5	53.3	70.3	47.5	74.5	45.2	50.7
3. Mentoring faculty into the union	55.8	65.9	75.8	64.2	84.8	58.3	73.8
4. Offering forums about how to create a positive climate	65.0	65.9	74.1	64.7	81.8	60.5	68.9
5. Creating opportunities for feedback	47.7	62.2	69.5	48.3	77.7	44.7	64.1
6. Holding social events for faculty	43.2	44.8	59.7	52.6	61.7	21.4	24.3
7. Recognizing faculty accomplishments	65.1	56.3	74.6	66.1	77.8	23.7	82.3
8. Building alliances across faculty groups	70.0	71.1	82.5	80.8	87.9	74.4	76.3
9. Encouraging faculty attendance at diversity trainings	48.5	45.0	46.8	40.0	45.5	54.3	45.6
10. Making decision making processes transparent	67.4	50.5	72.6	51.0	75.2	50.0	57.4
11. Encouraging committees to be active	41.5	26.4	42.9	37.5	50.6	35.0	41.7
12. Encouraging university leaders to retain personnel that would strengthen the university's diversity goals	56.7	48.5	58.5	59.5	65.5	53.3	62.8
13. Supporting equity concerns	44.4	54.2	59.6	44.2	63.9	55.6	55.0
14. Including diversity voices on committees	43.3	40.8	54.2	35.3	49.4	36.4	45.3
15. Including diversity voices in local union leadership positions	54.3	53.6	66.0	40.4	58.4	42.4	51.1
16. Working with the administration on tasks when possible	61.0	34.5	63.3	35.6	68.8	33.3	64.8
17. Having adequate training for union leadership positions	53.8	65.5	81.1	69.2	89.7	75.0	75.8
18. Being a positive voice for faculty concerns	74.4	55.9	70.8	53.3	82.0	40.0	50.0

Again, there is great variation in percentages according to university for each item. It is not uncommon for there to be 20 to 30 point differences on any one item. But, probably the more important point is that a majority of faculty answering each item (with rare exception) at each university encourage their faculty associations to do more. The highest percentages are associated with mentoring faculty into the union, creating forums about how to create a

positive environment, building alliances across faculty groups, having adequate training for union leadership positions, and being a positive voice for faculty concerns.

In the second set of questions faculty were asked how well (very well, somewhat well, not well) the Inter Faculty Organization was doing at meeting the needs of faculty in each of 14 areas. Table 23 depicts the percentage of faculty who responded “very well” to each item.

These data are also separated out by university.

Table 23. Percent of Faculty at Each University Who Answered that the Inter Faculty Organization is Doing “Very Well” on Each of 14 Items, Fall 2012

Area Evaluated	Bemidji	Mankato	Metro	Moorhead	St. Cloud	Southwest	Winona
1. Seeking health care and other benefits for faculty with domestic partners (n = 525)	60.9	47.5	44.3	54.5	34.7	58.0	46.1
2. Using focus groups to gather information on equity matters (n = 320)	38.5	24.6	32.5	28.2	9.1	32.1	23.1
3. Seeking input from diverse groups of faculty (n = 367)	46.4	39.7	44.4	33.3	27.9	36.1	26.5
4. Addressing the concerns of faculty of color (n = 298)	41.7	46.0	30.0	36.4	34.1	31.0	40.7
5. Addressing the concerns of female faculty (n = 424)	32.5	36.8	35.3	43.1	23.3	36.8	32.2
6. Addressing the concerns of GLBT faculty (n = 336)	46.4	47.1	34.1	54.1	30.5	41.9	38.6
7. Addressing the concerns of less senior faculty (n = 422)	15.4	25.6	11.5	23.1	13.3	18.6	17.9
8. Addressing the concerns of fixed term, adjunct or community faculty (n = 447)	16.7	14.8	10.1	14.8	5.8	9.8	19.6
9. Lobbying for benefits for transgender faculty (n = 237)	52.6	37.7	34.5	47.4	28.3	61.5	44.7
10. Working with MnSCU Central Office staff on tasks when possible (n = 280)	38.5	46.6	28.6	56.4	26.0	31.0	36.1
11. Encouraging diversity voices in IFO leadership positions (n = 342)	37.5	38.5	40.9	31.0	23.6	36.4	36.6
12. Being a positive voice for equity concerns in discussions with MnSCU (n = 401)	47.4	46.1	55.3	59.6	22.4	55.8	44.2
13. Being a positive voice for equity concerns in discussions with my university’s administrators (n = 366)	33.3	43.4	42.9	45.9	28.2	39.5	35.4
14. Being a strong advocate on equity issues in discussions with Minnesota state legislators (n = 414)	45.9	46.7	56.5	57.1	38.4	59.5	39.1

Consistently fairly high percentages of faculty give the IFO strong marks for seeking health care and other benefits for faculty with domestic partners, addressing the concerns of GLBT faculty,

being a positive voice for equity concerns in discussions with MnSCU, and being a strong advocate on equity issues in discussions with Minnesota state legislators. Lower percentages appear for addressing the needs of less senior faculty and addressing the concerns of fixed term, adjunct or community faculty.

For each of the same 14 items, faculty were asked whether they thought the Inter Faculty should do “more.” The percentages of those answering in the affirmative are reported in Table 24.

Area Evaluated	Bemidji	Mankato	Metro	Moorhead	St. Cloud	Southwest	Winona
1. Seeking health care and other benefits for faculty with domestic partners (n = 407)	30.6	51.9	69.2	50.0	72.0	52.9	63.1
2. Using focus groups to gather information on equity matters (n = 270)	44.0	50.0	63.6	58.6	75.4	45.5	61.4
3. Seeking input from diverse groups of faculty (n = 296)	44.0	50.9	61.1	41.2	74.3	55.6	60.5
4. Addressing the concerns of faculty of color (n = 255)	42.1	44.4	67.6	48.3	68.6	59.1	63.6
5. Addressing the concerns of female faculty (n = 324)	53.8	48.4	63.0	44.7	76.6	63.0	58.7
6. Addressing the concerns of GLBT faculty (n = 268)	36.4	40.4	69.2	34.4	73.8	57.1	57.1
7. Addressing the concerns of less senior faculty (n = 357)	76.5	62.7	82.9	69.0	78.8	67.6	80.4
8. Addressing the concerns of fixed term, adjunct or community faculty (n = 357)	73.3	70.8	86.3	71.7	84.1	87.1	78.3
9. Lobbying for benefits for transgender faculty (n = 241)	38.9	44.4	65.7	36.4	70.8	50.0	55.0
10. Working with MnSCU Central Office staff on tasks when possible (n = 226)	50.0	48.8	70.0	50.0	78.8	63.6	60.6
11. Encouraging diversity voices in IFO leadership positions (n = 282)	50.0	54.7	64.9	40.6	73.2	45.8	62.2
12. Being a positive voice for equity concerns in discussions with MnSCU (n = 311)	37.0	50.8	61.0	40.6	81.4	51.5	53.3
13. Being a positive voice for equity concerns in discussions with my university’s administrators (n = 305)	41.7	61.9	60.0	57.1	77.6	59.4	61.9
14. Being a strong advocate on equity issues in discussions with Minnesota state legislators (n = 323)	46.4	55.2	61.0	48.5	78.1	59.4	67.3

The responses to these items suggest that faculty would like the Inter Faculty Organization to do more on all items. The items producing the highest percent responses are addressing the concerns of less senior faculty and the concerns of fixed term, adjunct or community faculty. A focus on university indicates that a greater percentage of Metro and St. Cloud faculty ask that more be done as compared with the other universities.

Comparison of Focus Group and Survey Findings

There are several similarities between the two studies. **First, a significant percentage of faculty perceive the climate in general and as it pertains to equity matters as negative.** In general, 48 percent of the faculty describe the climate as either somewhat positive or very positive, 15 percent describe the climate as neither positive nor negative, and 37 percent describe the climate as either somewhat negative or very negative. Focus group participants identify negative factors at multiple levels. At the broadest level, the MnSCU central office is perceived to be directive and uncaring of campus realities. At the campus level, administrators are seen as speaking the language of diversity, but as failing to make the real changes necessary to align organizational structures and policies with inclusive statements. Campus administrators may also use the power associated with their positions in negative ways (e.g., manipulation of faculty, power plays), make questionable decisions or follow processes that lack transparency and inclusivity when making decisions. Campuses lack adequate resources for necessary work, and some faculty perceive that resources may be inequitably distributed. Adding to these challenges is the unprofessional manner by which some faculty treat one another.

Second, standpoint is crucial to perceptions of the work environment. In general, focus group participants perceive that the climate is more negative for female faculty, faculty of color, international faculty, LGBTQ faculty, and nonChristian faculty than it is for other faculty. Survey findings affirm these perceptions only when examining responses according to protected group status. The perceptions of faculty of color differ from the general (more

positive) view as over one-half describe their work environments as either somewhat or very negative. In addition, faculty with more permanent appointments and more senior in rank are more likely to describe the climate in negative terms than other faculty. The extent to which negativity is perceived also varies across campuses with over half of the faculty at St. Cloud describing the climate as either somewhat or very negative.

A follow-up question asking faculty to describe the campus climate for faculty in protected groups yields similar results. Responses by the faculty as a whole paint a positive picture of the climate for faculty in protected groups. However, female, transsexual, and intersexual faculty; faculty of color; GLBTQ faculty; and faculty at Southwest (Marshall) and St. Cloud paint a campus climate picture that is more negative.

Focus group participants also perceive that female faculty are treated poorly on their campuses and note patriarchal and misogynist attitudes, a lack of respect for female faculty and their work; and perceptions of unequal treatment with respect to teaching assignments, advising, and tenure and promotion decisions. Survey findings lend credence to some of these perceptions as female, intersexual, and transsexual faculty are more likely than males to label their departments as “sexist.” In addition, when asked their perceptions of several department conditions (a reluctance to bring up issues because of their impact on tenure/promotion, an expectation that they will represent “the” view of a particular category, feeling under scrutiny, feeling they have to work harder than others, feeling there are unwritten rules surrounding interactions, and feeling others may “fit in” more easily) female, intersexual, and transgender faculty report more negative perceptions of department conditions than males.

Focus group participants also perceive that the climate for faculty of color, international faculty, and nonChristian faculty is more negative than it is for European American/White faculty citing numerous challenges—xenophobia, ignorance of privilege, insensitivity, a lack of cultural awareness and proficiency, and institutional racism. In general the climate is perceived as unfriendly and as one that does not embrace diversity. Some focus group participants describe race as the “elephant in the room” about which no one wishes to speak.

Survey results parallel the focus group findings. Faculty of color and international faculty provide a more negative view of the climate for themselves as well as for GLBT and nonChristian faculty. In addition to these two groups, faculty who espouse no religion and faculty who adhere to a faith other than one based in Christianity are more likely to describe their departments as racist. Being a person of color or one who is not Christian also yields more negative perceptions of departmental conditions on such matters as being reluctant to bring up issues because of their impact on tenure/promotion, feeling expected to represent “the” view of a particular category, feeling under scrutiny, feeling they have to work harder than others, feeling there are unwritten rules surrounding interactions with others, and feeling others may “fit in” more easily. Faculty of color also report lower levels of support for equity matters across campus and together with nonChristian faculty perceive lower levels of support for equity matters from MnSCU.

Focus group participants note more negative perceptions of the campus climate for faculty who are either gay, lesbian, bisexual, or transgender. Feeling fearful and vulnerable, feeling dismissed (by colleagues, their universities, MnSCU), and perceiving a need to hide and fit some prescribed gender behavior were mentioned as examples. The data on perceptions

from the survey affirm the perceptions from the focus group study. GLBT identified faculty provide a more negative view of the campus climate for themselves as well as for faculty in all other equity groups. They are also more likely than other faculty to describe their departments as racist, disrespectful, and homophobic and less likely to label their departments as friendly, collegial, collaborative, and cooperative. In addition, faculty who identify as either gay, lesbian, bisexual, or transgender have more negative perceptions of departmental conditions (being reluctant to bring up issues because of their impact on tenure/promotion, feeling expected to represent “the” view of a particular category, feeling under scrutiny, feeling they have to work harder than others, feeling there are unwritten rules surrounding interactions with others, and feeling others may “fit in” more easily) than do heterosexual faculty.

Negative perceptions of campus climate also depend on other factors. Focus group participants discuss situations in which fixed term and adjunct/community faculty feel exploited (low pay, fewer or no benefits depending on the benefit, large classes, little or no advance notice of teaching duties), feel lacking in resources necessary for job performance (no or inadequate office space, little or no information on policies), and feel lacking in “voice” (in course assignment, in preferred teaching times, in department matters). Contrary to focus group findings, however, 58 percent of the adjunct/community faculty and 50 percent of the fixed-term faculty describe the climate for equity matters as very or somewhat positive. It is the more permanent faculty (non-tenure track, probationary, and tenured faculty) who indicate more negative campus evaluations of climate for faculty of color and faculty who are not Christian or who are atheist, agnostic, or claim no religion. This same group is more likely to describe their departments as racist, disrespectful, and homophobic. They also perceive

MnSCU as less supportive on equity matters than adjunct/community faculty and fixed-term faculty.

Faculty rank also affects campus climate views. Focus group participants identify several factors that impact climate perceptions: a promotion and tenure process that both lacks clear and consistent expectations and that may be cutthroat and competitive, a lack of good mentoring, and unreasonably high research expectations for the teaching load.

Participants also mention several “extraneous” factors falling outside of the five formal evaluation criteria that affect tenure and promotion decisions: being liked, being visible, being collegial (“playing well with others in the sandbox”), and having the right actions and emotions. Things to avoid include disagreeing with the administration, being argumentative, and causing interpersonal problems. There are some differences by faculty rank in the survey, but these are not the same mentioned in the focus group. In the survey, associate and full professors are more likely to describe the climate for faculty of color and international faculty as negative and describe their departments as racist. Associate and full professors as well as instructors and assistant professors are more likely to describe their departments as disrespectful. Finally, professors are less likely than faculty in other groups to see MnSCU as supportive of equity concerns.

The university at which faculty teach also makes a difference in climate perceptions. This item was not specifically addressed in the focus group study, but is clearly identifiable in survey findings. More than one half of the faculty at Winona, Bemidji, and Moorhead would describe the climate as it pertains to equity matters on their campuses as positive. More than 40 percent but less than 50 percent of the faculty at Mankato, Metropolitan, and Southwest

(Marshall) describe the climate as it pertains to equity matters on their campuses as positive. Only 33 percent of the faculty at St. Cloud describe their climate in positive terms. In addition, faculty at St. Cloud and Southwest provide more negative evaluations of the climate for faculty of color, female faculty, and international faculty on their campuses than do faculty on other campuses. Relative to faculty on other campuses, faculty at St. Cloud also report a more negative climate for faculty who are GLB or T identified, are less likely to see their departments as supportive, find lower levels of support for equity concerns on their campus and from MnSCU. Faculty at Southwest report a more negative climate for faculty with nonChristian religious affiliations. Faculty identify racism as problematic at St. Cloud, Southwest, Mankato, Metropolitan, and Moorhead. Disrespect is seen as an issue at St. Cloud, Southwest, Mankato, and Moorhead.

Third, universities appear to have a superficial interest in diversity. Focus group participants speak to this concern in a variety of ways. In some instances administrators largely ignore diversity issues or address equity matters only within narrow scripts. In other instances, tight budgets are used as excuses to dismantle diversity curricula, offices, structures and people (e.g., faculty and staff). At best, diversity is addressed superficially without addressing the necessary deep structural changes that have to occur to university structures and processes to produce lasting change. For instance, calendars allow for the celebration of some important Christian holidays, but not the holidays of other religious groups. Universities may also not accommodate dietary restrictions or provide places for religious practices to occur. Curricula may continue to celebrate the histories and knowledge of particular areas of the world.

Responses from the online survey differ somewhat from the focus group findings. In general, over half of the faculty agree that their universities have policies and procedures in place that show a commitment to diversity concerns, include diversity goals as a part of their strategic plans, are committed to recruiting and retaining diverse faculty, encourage the development of curricula that meet diversity needs, and provide training on equity matters. These general understandings differ according to group status, however. GLBTQ identified faculty, faculty of color, and nonChristian faculty believe their universities are less committed than do faculty who are not members of protected groups.

Fourth, faculty identify many troubling experiences regarding incivility. One such troubling experience focus group participants discuss that affects faculty across equity groups is bullying and mobbing. To find out how common bullying and mobbing are the survey asked faculty to identify which of 18 forms of incivility they had experienced over the past five years. They were also asked to identify the source of that behavior (i.e., other faculty, department chair, local faculty union leaders, university staff, and academic administrators). Results from the survey support the focus group findings and suggest that incivility is a fairly common experience for faculty. As might be expected, the most frequently reported forms of incivility tend to be classified as “minor” (e.g., indifference, manipulation of information that reflects negatively on a person, dismissing a point of view, ignoring contributions, manipulating other people in a manner that negatively affects an individual, withholding support or resources, excluding individuals, and micromanaging the work of individuals). While fewer in number, survey participants also note experiencing more severe forms of incivility that are often included as examples of bullying or mobbing: situations in which a faculty person felt

uncomfortable; being pressured or intimidated; being harassed, abused, or frightened; implications of incompetence; implications that actions are not in keeping with organizational objectives; and, receiving uninvited/ unwanted sexual attention. Of the 8764 reports of incivility, 36.0 percent were experiences with other faculty, 27.0 percent were with academic administrators, 20.7 percent were with a department chair, 8.5 percent were with university staff, and 7.8 percent were with local faculty union leaders.

Focus group participants also indicate that some faculty may be treated differently at the program or department level. Female faculty, faculty of color, GLBT identified faculty, and faculty of nonChristian backgrounds report being the victims of minor and severe forms of incivility and receiving differential treatment at the program or department level. Survey responses affirm the focus group findings. Survey respondents report that female faculty, GLBT faculty, faculty of color, and faculty from some religious backgrounds are disadvantaged in terms of the percentage of senior positions held, attention that is paid to spoken thoughts, treatment in the areas of recruitment and retention, the presence of discrimination, the availability of mentoring from colleagues, the division of programmatic administrative duties across groups, access to resources, and the division of teaching-related duties such as course assignments and advising. Of the 2491 experiences noted, 38.5 percent are disadvantages noted for female faculty, 32.4 percent are for faculty of color, 15.9 percent are for GLBT faculty, and 13.2 percent are for faculty from some religious backgrounds.

Fifth, current university structures are inadequate to handle either bullying/mobbing situations or equity disputes and university structures may actually be conducive to hostile behaviors. The many noted instances of both minor and severe forms of incivility lead faculty

to conclude that university policies and practices are inadequate. Policies in place may not be followed or may be ignored; mishandling occurs potentially due to a lack of training; and, there may be complicated scenarios in which administrators may be the perpetrators of or complicit in the negative behaviors of others. Survey data are in keeping with the focus group results. More than one-half of the faculty note a lack of adequate training for handling hostile behaviors, a lack of adequate help to victims of equity disputes and/or hostile behavior, and a lack of adequate policies/procedures for handling faculty-to-faculty conflict.

The survey also asked faculty several questions to address whether university structures themselves might be conducive to bullying or mobbing, and the findings suggest that conclusion has merit. In addition to the items noted in the previous paragraph, over three-fourths of faculty state their administrators have a continual focus on the “bottom line” and more than one-half note a lack of openness to constructive criticism. In addition, about half of the faculty find administrators ineffective at maintaining open communication channels, at creating cooperative/supportive environments, and at encouraging or empowering faculty. The data suggest that university structures need modification in order to produce more positive working environments.

Sixth, local faculty association leadership and processes could be improved on some items and at some universities. In the focus groups faculty identify five categories of concern. One concern is that some faculty leaders use their role in the faculty association to move into administrative positions, which may compromise an ability to effectively reflect faculty concerns. This particular concern was not addressed in the survey. A second concern is that leadership positions at the local level are filled predominantly by white males, which may mean

that equity concerns are not addressed or inadequately addressed. A third concern is that local faculty associations may rely too heavily on one strategy—opposing administrative actions—for situations that may call for a more nuanced approach. A fourth general concern expressed in the focus group has to do with local faculty association processes. A fifth concern expressed in the focus group is that many of the local leaders lack adequate training for the positions they hold.

In response to focus group concerns, the survey asked faculty how well their local faculty associations were doing on each of 18 activities: soliciting ideas from faculty, providing safe environments for faculty to ask questions and have conversations, mentoring faculty into the union, offering forums about how to create a positive climate, creating opportunities for feedback; holding social events for faculty; recognizing faculty accomplishments; building alliances across faculty groups; encouraging faculty attendance at diversity trainings; making decision making processes transparent; encouraging committees to be active; encouraging university leaders to retain personnel that would strengthen the university's diversity goals; supporting equity concerns; including diversity voices on committees; including diversity voices in local union leadership positions; working with the administration on tasks when possible; having adequate training for union leadership positions, and being a positive voice for faculty concerns. As might be expected faculty perceptions of how well their local associations were doing on these matters varied considerably. Even so, consistently high percentages of faculty across the campuses identified five items as needing more attention. These are: mentoring faculty into the union, offering forums about how to create a positive climate, building alliances

across faculty groups, making decision making processes transparent, and having adequate training for union leadership positions.

Seventh, the Inter Faculty Organization is doing good work at representing equity concerns, but improvements could be made on some items and with some universities. Focus group participants have two primary concerns regarding the Inter Faculty Organization. First, they identify a lack of diversity among local and statewide union leadership positions and express concern for how that may translate into a lack of representation for diversity and equity matters. Second, while the statewide union and some of the university campuses have committees that deal specifically with equity/diversity matters, faculty express concern that the issues may not be as central to union matters as they need to be. Faculty also identify that cross-cutting or intersectional concerns exist and need further attention at both the local and statewide levels. They commend the IFO for implementing the focus group and online survey studies as a means by which to gain knowledge.

Information obtained from the survey support the focus group findings. Faculty were provided with fourteen statements and they were to report whether the Inter Faculty Organization is doing very well, somewhat well, or not well on each. Areas evaluated were: seeking health care and other benefits for faculty with domestic partners; using focus groups to gather information on equity matters; seeking input from diverse groups of faculty; addressing the concerns of faculty of color; addressing the concerns of female faculty; addressing the concerns of GLBT faculty; addressing the concerns of less senior faculty; addressing the concerns of fixed term, adjunct or community faculty; lobbying for benefits for transgender faculty; working with MnSCU Central Office staff on tasks when possible; encouraging diversity

voices in IFO leadership positions; being a positive voice for equity concerns in discussions with MnSCU; being a positive voice for equity concerns in discussions with university administrators; and being a strong advocate on equity issues in discussions with Minnesota state legislators. Consistently fairly high percentages of faculty give the IFO strong marks for seeking health care and other benefits for faculty with domestic partners, addressing the concerns of GLBT faculty, being a positive voice for equity concerns in discussion with MnSCU, and being a strong voice on equity issues in discussions with Minnesota state legislators. Two items received lower marks: addressing the needs of less senior faculty and addressing the concerns of fixed term, adjunct or community faculty. When asked which items the IFO should “do more” on, the two items that stand out from the rest are addressing the concerns of less senior faculty and the concerns of fixed term, adjunct or community faculty.

Discussion and Conclusions

Two substantive questions served as a guideline for this study. First, what are the equity-related concerns facing faculty on the Minnesota State University campuses and within the Inter Faculty Organization? Second, how might the existing organizations incorporate policies and practices to address these concerns?

A review of the literature reveals that initial studies on organizational climate often focus on attitudes and behaviors (Hall and Sandler 1982) and how these might contribute to an overall sense of an organization as positive or negative. The findings from the IFO studies lend support to a perceptual understanding of climate. While 48 percent of the Minnesota state university faculty describe their work in positive terms and 15 percent in neutral terms, a significant amount (37 percent) describe the climate as negative as it pertains to equity matters. This perception crosses system levels. At the broadest level, the MnSCU Central Office is seen as unkind and uncaring toward its employees. At the campus level there is also a general sense of a negative climate, although the extent to which these negative perceptions exist varies by category. Focus group participants perceive that the climate is more negative for female faculty, faculty of color, international faculty, GLBTQ faculty, and nonChristian faculty than it is for other faculty. Survey findings affirm these perceptions. When asked if all faculty are treated fairly and equitably, female, transsexual, and intersexual faculty; faculty of color and international faculty, and GLBT faculty report consistently more negative evaluations for themselves and for colleagues in other protected groups than do faculty who are not part of these groups. The negative climate perceptions for faculty in protected group categories are more problematic at some universities than at others.

More recently, scholars have begun to broaden their examinations of organizational climate to include institutional history (historical patterns and trajectories), structural diversity (contemporary roles, policies, and practices) (Sandler 1986, Hurtado et al. 2008, Hart and Fellabaum 2008), and instances of incivility (behavior that lacks positive engagement and which results in negative self-feelings for the recipient of the action) (Twale and DeLuca 2008) of which bullying and mobbing are but two examples. Again, findings from the focus group sessions reveal uneven patterns of addressing equity-related concerns historically speaking. Gains were made in some places only to disappear with tightening budgets or changes in administrative leadership. Organizational policies and practices currently in place are viewed as highly inadequate—cosmetic, superficial, and insincere—to meet the needs of equity-related matters. Incivility and bullying and mobbing behaviors directed toward faculty are also present.

Survey data also support the conclusion that incivility in its minor forms (e.g., indifference, manipulation of information that reflects negatively on a person, dismissing a point of view, ignoring contributions, manipulating other people in a manner that negatively affects an individual, withholding support or resources, excluding individuals, and micromanaging the work of individuals) is a fairly common experience for faculty. For survey participants, the more severe forms of incivility (often referred to as bullying or mobbing) are less commonly reported but also present. Experiences of incivility occur more commonly with other faculty, academic administrators, and department chairs and less commonly with university staff and local faculty union leaders.

Davenport et al. (2005) discuss the fact that the presence of certain elements in an organization's culture can create conditions that facilitate the use of mobbing as a way to

accomplish goals. These elements include a solely symbolic diversity ethic, an excessive profit orientation, a focus on silencing opposition and troubling issues, an emphasis on individualism, and a belief in hard work and associated stress as a good. The descriptions focus group and survey participants provide match the conditions Davenport et al. discuss. Faculty focus group participants describe universities in which there is a superficial adherence to equity matters, an increasing emphasis on educational costs, and numerous attempts to silence or simply ignore equity concerns. They also note these work sites as settings in which individual hard work and achievement are celebrated through the tenure and promotion process, and as settings within which the expectations for faculty performance are constantly ratcheted upward. Of those who responded to the survey, three-fourths state their administrators have a “continual focus on the bottom line.” In addition, while over half of the faculty agree that diversity is a part of strategic plans, policies, and procedures, that diversity trainings occur, and that efforts exist to hire diverse faculty, more faculty disagree than agree as to whether adequate funding exists to meet diversity goals and faculty are equally split as to whether administrators take appropriate action when equity concerns arise.

When these elements of the organizational culture fit within an organizational structure that has many hierarchical levels, poor communication channels, an absence of teamwork and the presence of individual projects, and an emphasis on the maintenance of existing work divisions with few challenges, the organization is conducive to mobbing (Davenport et al. 2005). Additional pressures to downsize may also promote mobbing by individuals in an attempt to protect themselves (Davenport et al. 2005). Again, faculty comments from focus groups discuss the complexity of the state university hierarchy, the

presence of poor communication, the “siloes” nature in which organizational work gets accomplished, and the ever-present budget concerns. Of the faculty responding to the survey, about half of the faculty agree that their administrators emphasize collaboration; however, about half of the faculty disagree that effective communication channels are present and that administrators create cooperative/ supportive environments. It appears that conditions on state university campuses are somewhat conducive to the presence of uncivil behaviors in both its minor and severe forms.

While many faculty have developed various patterns of accommodation to these chilly environments, these inequality regimes (Acker 2006) are not only detrimental to targeted peoples, but the organization itself suffers through lost productivity and an inability to successfully retain and hire minorities. Organizational solutions to chilly climates involve targeting a limited set of issues that may be addressed effectively within a particular time frame. Organizations need to coordinate responses to outside pressure (e.g., legislation, social movements) with inside efforts to adjust policies, procedures, and language forms. Through these organizational efforts they will be better situated to handle coercive pressure or threat of loss (e.g., financial) (Acker 2006; Sausa 2002). Acker (2006) asserts that unions and professional associations may be able to reduce power differences, but may find it difficult to do so if their own internal structures privilege certain groups.

It is in the spirit of improving the union structure and function and the places within which they work that focus group and survey participants offered several pieces of advice for local faculty associations—work on building solidarity among members and leadership capacity in those holding leadership positions; encourage faculty-initiated diversity training efforts; be

positive voices for faculty expressing faculty concerns and work with administrations on tasks when it is possible to do so; recognize faculty accomplishments; offer forums about how to create positive climate; develop mechanisms to increase the diversity of faculty union leadership and participation; and, address the incivility, bullying, mobbing, discrimination, and harassment faculty face as well as the organizational structures that support these practices. The Inter Faculty Organization is encouraged to continue its work on seeking input from and addressing the concerns of female faculty, faculty of color, GLBT identified faculty and to use mechanisms like focus groups and this survey to collect that information. The statewide organization is also strongly encouraged to address the concerns raised by probationary faculty and faculty who hold less permanent positions such as adjunct or community faculty and fixed-term.

Changing work climates is complex and cannot happen overnight. Nevertheless, the robust and growing literature on this topic offers guidance for where to begin. Climates can change and will change once the system and organizational structures within which faculty work are improved and undergo continual improvement. This complex task requires the determined and coordinated efforts of faculty, the union, university administrations and MnSCU officials. The rewards for faculty employees, as well as for the students they teach, the universities at which they work, and the MnSCU system will make these efforts worthwhile.