

2017 Campus Climate and Diversity Survey Qualitative Data Executive Summary

GENERAL OVERVIEW

A total of **1,903** faculty, staff, and administrators (**a 27.5% response rate**) participated in the 2017 Campus Climate and Diversity Survey; this number of respondents meets the requirements to be considered a representative¹ sample of the University's population. The aggregate quantitative data have been shared with the campus community.

This report provides a summary of the qualitative data (open-ended responses) from the survey, by theme, as is standard best practice. The objective of the thematic qualitative analysis is to provide additional context to the quantitative data. Individual comments in their entirety are not included in order to safeguard the confidentiality of the respondents, which was guaranteed in the survey invitation and opening statement.

On a scale from “very dissatisfied” to “very satisfied,” respondents were asked the question, *“Overall, how satisfied are you with the climate at UofL?”* They then received one follow up open-ended question that asked **why they felt that way about the climate and what, if any, suggestions they had for improvement**. The following is a summary of the responses to that question.

DEMOGRAPHICS

A total of **856²** individuals responded to the open-ended question; their demographics are provided below, along with the **overall UofL percentages displayed in red within brackets for comparative reference**:

Position: **60.6%** [**UofL = 64%**] staff (97.1% FT, 2.9% PT), **35.2%** [**UofL = 35%**] faculty (86.7% FT, 13.3% PT), and **4.2%** [**UofL = 1%**] administrators.

Race/Ethnicity: **77.2%** [**UofL = 78%**] White, **9.3%** [**UofL = 10%**] Black or African American, **2%** [**UofL = 2%**] Hispanic or Latino, **1.8%** [**UofL = 1%**] two or more races, **1.6%** [**UofL = 7%**] Asian, **1.2%** “another race,” **0.1%** [**UofL = 0.1%**] American Indian/Alaskan Native, **0.1%** [**UofL = 0.1%**] Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander, **6.5%** selected “prefer not to answer,” and **0.1%** didn’t answer.

Gender Identity: **64.6%** female, **30.5%** male, **0.4%** non-binary, **0.4%** transgender female, **0.2%** transgender male, **0.2%** different identity, **0.1%** Gender nonconforming, **3.2%** selected “prefer not to answer,” and **0.4%** didn’t answer.

Note: Gender identity was not included in the UofL comparison since UofL official records currently only record “male” and “female”. If you have additional questions regarding the demographic breakdowns, please contact the Office of Institutional Effectiveness at iesurvey@louisville.edu.

METHODOLOGY

The open-ended responses were reviewed by multiple staff members in the Office of Academic Planning and Accountability (OAPA) to ensure agreement on overarching themes and sub-themes that were used to code the data. MAXQDA® Qualitative Data Analysis Software was used to provide a content analysis of the emergent themes to the open-ended responses.

Each response was coded into as many separate themes as applicable, based on the content. This means that in instances where individuals addressed multiple themes within their response, their response was split accordingly and each portion of the comment, or “sentiment” was placed within the appropriate theme. This resulted in a total of 2,226 themed sentiments.

¹ Sample size calculations based on a total faculty and staff population of 6,919, and a 95% confidence level with a 3% margin of error (the range that the population’s responses may deviate from the sample).

² Representativeness is not statistically calculated for qualitative data since the aim is inductive and holistic.

THEMES

A total of 2,226 sentiments (from the 856 respondents) —360 (16.2%) positive and 1,866 (83.8%) negative—were coded into the themes and subthemes below. The percentage to the right of the theme represents the total number of sentiments related to that theme.

Positive Themes

Climate/Environment/Morale (8.8%): feeling of family – we’re going to get through this together; environment in individual departments/offices is good; happy in job; happy with colleagues

Diversity (2.7%): supportive and inclusive environment, diverse faculty/staff/students, diversity policies are good

Leadership (2.2%): executive team [current interims are all hard-working; trying to be open and transparent]; mid-level managers [good supervisors]

Compensation (1.0%)

General Impressions (0.7%)

Staffing (0.5%)

Facilities/Physical Resources (0.2%)

Negative Themes

Leadership (23.6%) : issues with executive leadership team; budget/financial concerns; poor communication/lack of transparency; Board of Trustees; mid-level managers or administrators; lack of shared governance; academic senior leadership; dishonesty/unethical behavior; lack of trust in leadership; “good ol’ boys network”; poor hiring practices; ignoring situations; lacking strategic vision

Climate/Environment/Morale (15.3%): low morale – feeling discouraged; feeling undervalued and unimportant; staff treated like less than faculty; too much uncertainty; exploitation of workers; complaints going unresolved; fear of expressing opinions; lack of respect

Staffing Issues (9.5%): insufficient staff/faculty; lack of advancement opportunities; lack of recognition; poor work/life balance; lack of job security; insufficient professional development; lack of fairness in hiring practices; unreasonable work expectations; poor reward system; good people are leaving

Compensation (9.5%): lack of raises; pay inequities [administration grossly overpaid; gender inequality – women paid less]; low salary; loss of benefits; FLSA issues

Institutional Reputation (8.3%): scandals; negative image in the media; athletics; issues with NCAA; issues with SACSCOC

Diversity (6.2%): lack of diversity in leadership positions; lack of recruitment/retention of diverse faculty; too much focus on differences; lack of/incorrect/insufficient diversity training; too narrowly focused

General Frustration (5.1%): faculty issues [lack of support for research, tenure issues, academic freedom]; lack of innovation; culture of complacency

Discrimination (3.3%): race/ethnicity [both minority and majority]; gender [female, male, transgender]; religious [both non-Christian and Christian groups]; age [primarily older individuals]; conservative: fear of retaliation for conservatism

Facilities/Physical Resources (2.8%): lack of resources, facilities: building upkeep; insufficient technology

EMERGENT CONCERNs FROM THE DATA

Below are the top themes and concerns that were expressed in the open-ended comments on the 2017 Campus Climate and Diversity Survey.

Leadership (23.6%): The general theme of “Leadership” had multiple sub-themes, the top three of which are presented below:

Administration: Many comments in this theme addressed the prior executive leadership team, their abuse of power, corruption, bad decision-making and their misbehavior. There was a strong sentiment of “they made the mistakes, but we’re left paying for them.” Another area of concern was with the “administration” being “top heavy” and overly compensated (especially compared to faculty and staff). There was a sentiment of lack of trust, which was also echoed in a frustration with the closed presidential search.

Budget/Financial Concerns: There are concerns about a lack of fiscal oversight, a feeling of mismanagement of funds, the number of budget cuts, and a strong desire to “fix the budget.”

Transparency: There was a strong sentiment about the lack of transparency within the administration at UofL. This was coupled with a feeling of lack of true shared governance.

Climate/Environment/Morale (15.3%): There were many comments centered on low morale, feeling discouraged with the current climate at UofL, contributing to low morale. There was a strong sentiment about feeling undervalued and unimportant. From staff, there were comments about feeling they are treated as “less than” faculty, feeling like “second class citizens” and faculty “treating staff like help.”

Staffing Issues (9.5%): Comments in this theme included frustrations about the insufficient number of staff and faculty, leading to feelings of being overworked, unreasonable expectations being imposed on employees, and creating poor work/life balance. A number of comments related to the lack of recognition for employees, a “poor reward system,” and lack of professional development. Additionally, it was noted that “we’re losing good people.”

Compensation (9.5%): There were many concerns about the lack of raises, the number of years without raises, and the lack of “decent raises” all while the cost of living has continued to increase. The feeling that the administration is overly compensated compared to the rest of the university employees was also expressed in this theme. Pay inequities between women and men (with men being compensated at a higher rate) were also expressed.