

Morale and Job Satisfaction Focus Group and Interview Report

6/6/2006



STOUT
UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN

Report prepared by:

Budget, Planning and Analysis

Institutional Research

Contact:

Meridith Wentz

Wendy Knutson

Tammy Cutsforth

EmmaLee Ericksen

Susan Greene

Report Prepared for:

Morale and Job Satisfaction Task Force
Sponsors

Chancellor Sorensen, Julie Furst-Bowe, Diane
Moen

Survey developed by:

Morale and Job Satisfaction Task Force

Meridith Wentz, chair

Distribution of report:

Committee sponsors, participants, Strategic
Planning Group, UW-Stout campus

Acknowledgements:

The Morale and Job Satisfaction Task Force would like to thank everyone who helped to produce this document.

Contributors include:

Morale and Job Satisfaction Task Force:

| | |
|-----------------------|--------------|
| Meridith Wentz, chair | Bob Johnson |
| Susan Collie | James Tan |
| Tammy Cutsforth | Holly Teuber |
| Kari Dahl | Joan Thomas |
| Woody Haid | Donna Weber |

Committee sponsors:

| | |
|---------------------|------------|
| Chancellor Sorensen | Diane Moen |
| Julie Furst-Bowe | |

Authors of the report:

| | |
|-----------------|------------------|
| Meridith Wentz | EmmaLee Ericksen |
| Wendy Knutson | Susan Greene |
| Tammy Cutsforth | |

Data analysis:

| | |
|-----------------|------------------|
| Tammy Cutsforth | Jim Lenio |
| Wendy Knutson | EmmaLee Ericksen |
| Meridith Wentz | Susan Greene |
| | Randy McCarthy |

Facilitators/Assistant Facilitators:

| | |
|------------------|------------------|
| EmmaLee Ericksen | Jim Lenio |
| Jeff Gianforte | Jennifer Pauly |
| Susan Greene | Angie Przybylski |
| Rebecca Humphrey | Josh Weiler |

Transcribers:

| | |
|------------------|------------------|
| Abby Laib | Kari Kalogerson |
| Kelly Bender | Jim Lenio |
| Rebekah Colianni | Lana Landon |
| Theresa Collis | Randy McCarthy |
| Alex Etzel | Angie Przybylski |
| Ashley Juleff | |

Assistance with project organization:

| | |
|------------------|-----------|
| Angie Przybylski | Jim Lenio |
|------------------|-----------|

Funding:

Chancellor Sorensen

Assistance with finding facilitators, assistant facilitators, transcribers and students to help with the analysis:

Jane Henderson

Joan Thomas

Lou Milanesi

Julie Zack

James Tan

Also thanks to everyone who participated in the focus groups and interviews. These individuals cannot be mentioned by name due to promises of confidentiality but we really appreciate your input in the process!

Job Satisfaction and Morale Focus Group/Interview Project Executive Summary

The following summary highlights the results from the Job Satisfaction and Morale Focus Group and Interview project conducted in spring 2006 by the Morale and Job Satisfaction Task Force. The project included 104 randomly selected faculty/staff with at least 20 people per employment category. A total of 60% of the faculty/staff that were contacted actually participated in the study.

NOTE: Many specific examples of comments and concerns associated with each of the themes and sub-themes were provided during the sessions. Some of these examples are included in this report. However, Appendix D includes a comprehensive listing of all comments within each theme and sub-theme (edited for confidentiality). Readers are encouraged to read the appropriate sections of the appendix for more details.

The authors believe the data support the following general conclusions:

Results were analyzed to identify major themes. The following major themes were identified (listed in order of most common to least common): bureaucracy/processes; relationships; equity; workload; support; trust; physical facilities; what can I do; public perception; overall satisfaction; communication; recognition; no one listens; and appreciate opportunity to participate. The most common themes are described below.

- The theme bureaucracy/processes included comments about: the need to improve our program array and quality of programs; comments about administration; the need to improve the hiring, renewal and promotion process; micromanaging; the need to ask for input and use that input, the state budget situation and the polytechnic initiative. Comments in this theme were mostly negative.
- The theme relationships included comments about the need for collaboration across units. It also included comments about the relationship between faculty/staff and these groups: students, supervisor, department, administration and the external community. Comments in this theme were a mix of positive and negative.

Some patterns were also observed throughout the discussions:

- Most often (but not always) participants provided many examples of things they are unhappy with about their current job and things they would change if they had the power. However, when asked at the end of the session about their overall job satisfaction, most participants reported high levels of satisfaction.
- When asked about the job satisfaction and morale of other faculty/staff on campus, there was the perception that job satisfaction and morale in other departments or units was lower than their personal job satisfaction.
- Participants had no problems coming up with things they would do if they had the power, but had more difficulties coming up with what they could do as an individual to improve their situation. Many said they could do nothing. However, in many cases, they later provided examples of instances where they were proactive and spoke up about their concerns.

Sub-themes were identified underneath each major theme. The most common sub-themes were hiring, renewal and promotion process; relationships between faculty, staff and students; relationships between faculty, staff and department; compensation; physical facilities-office space; and perception of own job and others:

- Comments about the sub-theme of hiring, renewal and promotion dealt mostly with the fact that job security is a problem and that hiring qualifications should change. Comments were also made about the process for moving from one employment classification to another; the perception that tenured faculty get away with everything; the fact that the evaluation process needs to be improved; and the idea that the recruitment process takes too long. This was the most common sub-theme and comments were largely negative.
- Comments about the sub-theme of relationships between faculty/staff and students were mostly positive and dealt primarily with: enjoying working with students; enjoying the fact that faculty/staff are making an impact on the students' lives; personal contact; appreciating feedback from students; and students demonstrating their appreciation of faculty/staff.
- Comments about the sub-theme of relationships between faculty/staff and the department were mostly positive and dealt primarily with the people in the department; the environment; departmental communications; and team work.
- Comments about the sub-theme of compensation were mostly negative and dealt primarily on the need for comparable salary and wages; the need for better benefits and better raises; issues with the unions and civil service employment and the perception that administrators get large raises.
- Comments about the sub-theme of physical facilities in the office dealt primarily with the atmosphere; the need for updated equipment and maintenance; office size; need for a window and for individual office space; concerns with space utilization and office location.
- Comments about the sub-theme of public perception of own job and other's jobs dealt primarily with what the participants perceived the morale of other faculty/staff to be and how they perceive their value in comparison to others. There were also comments about the public perception of UW-Stout.

Observations were also recorded by the facilitators and assistant facilitators throughout the process. Their comments include:

- There were significant concerns regarding confidentiality from the participants. Some were reluctant to provide specific examples for fear of being identified.
- Some participants reported that their primary concern was not confidentiality, but whether or not the results would be used. Many felt their input would not be used. Use of the results from this project was noted as a significant concern.
- There were some concerns about the questions being asked in the sessions. They found it difficult to identify their most important concerns or solutions, because they felt all of their concerns were important. They also found it difficult to come up with suggestions for what they could do as an individual to improve their situation. They also wanted to make sure that everyone's voice was heard, even if they expressed concerns that were mentioned by only a small number of people.

Job Satisfaction and Morale Focus Group/Interview Project Report

The following report highlights the method and results from the Job Satisfaction and Morale Focus Group and Interview project conducted in spring 2006 by the Morale and Job Satisfaction Task Force. *The Task Force would like to thank all of the faculty and staff who took time out of their busy schedules to participate in this important project.* The report includes the following information:

- *Background information and rationale* for the project
- *Detailed information about the methodology*, including the questions asked, the process for selecting participants, the number of participants by employment classification, facilitator and assistant facilitator information, confidentiality, transcription and data analysis
- A narrative summary of the findings
- Identification and description of *major themes* identified from the focus group transcriptions
- Identification and description of *small themes* identified from the focus group transcriptions
- *Observations* throughout the project from the Task Force and facilitators

Background information

Every three years, UW-Stout administers a campus morale survey to all faculty/staff. In the alternate years, a one-minute climate assessment survey is administered. Results from these surveys and others suggest that morale is declining slightly on campus. Results from the morale surveys and other faculty/staff surveys were reviewed with the Chancellor's Advisory Council (CAC) and the group expressed an interest in learning more about what was contributing to the decline and concerns. In November 2005, the Chancellor charged the Morale and Job Satisfaction Task Force to conduct focus groups with a random sample of faculty/staff to determine why morale was declining. The Task Force was charged to develop a proposal to address this issue and to present it to the CAC. A proposal was presented to the CAC and approved on December 19, 2005 (see Appendix A for a copy of the proposal). This report is the Task Force's response to this charge.

Methodology

Participants

The participants were 104 randomly selected faculty and staff members currently employed at UW-Stout. In order to ensure that all employee opinions were heard, the selection process was randomized across colleges, schools and units. The following process was used for random selection:

- BPA obtained a list from Human Resources of all faculty/staff on the payroll as of February 2006.
- Faculty/staff employed by continuing education only and faculty/staff who were not working at UW-Stout as of February (for example, some LTE's on the list were seasonal and not currently working at UW-Stout) were removed from the list. Members of the Morale and Job Satisfaction Task Force and the CAC were also removed from the list.
- The list was separated by employment classification into the following groups: faculty, instructional academic staff, professional academic staff, classified staff, and LTE. The separation was done in order to assure equal representation of each of the five employment classifications.
- A total of 30 employees from each employment classification were randomly selected using a random number generator. The Morale and Job Satisfaction Task Force individually called each of the faculty/staff on the list and invited them to participate. Potential participants were contacted via email if they could not be reached by phone. This selection process continued until 20 from each classification agreed to participate. Participants were given the choice to either contribute their opinions through a group process, or in a one-on-one interview.

The final number of participants is shown in the table below:

| Employment type | Goal | Actual number of participants | # in interview/ # in group | Participation rate |
|-----------------------------|------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|--------------------|
| Faculty | 20 | 20 | 10/10 | 57% |
| Instructional | 20 | 21 | 11/10 | 62% |
| Professional Academic Staff | 20 | 23 | 2/21 | 66% |
| Classified | 20 | 20 | 2/18 | 61% |
| LTE | 20 | 20 | 5/15 | 60% |
| TOTAL | 100 | 104 | 30/74 | 60% |

The participation rate is the percentage of people who were contacted that agreed to participate

Focus Group/Interview Instrument

A hybrid approach, which combined Appreciate Inquiry (AI) and traditional questions, was used to construct the job satisfaction and morale protocol. The AI method focuses on asking questions that look for solutions rather than solely identifying problems. This approach emphasizes participant reflection on what has worked well in the past, what is working well now, what their ideal future work environment would look like, and how they see the ideal being accomplished. The questions from the morale focus group/interview are included in Appendix B. They dealt primarily with job satisfaction,

campus morale, their ideal work environment, what they can do as individuals to make their ideal scenario a reality and what they would do if they had the power to make their ideal scenario a reality.

Focus Group and Interview Procedure

Eight graduate students from the Master of Science in Applied Psychology program were chosen to facilitate and assist the focus groups and interviews. These students were trained by the BPA office in how to implement an AI protocol, how to listen attentively while withholding judgment, how to maintain confidentiality, how to take field notes, and how to conduct interviews and focus groups. They also participated in a mock focus group. The facilitators, assistants and BPA office also met regularly during the course of data collection period to discuss any problems encountered during the process. In most instances, two graduate students, a facilitator and an assistant, conducted each session. The facilitator implemented the protocol and guided the discussion, whereas the assistant was responsible for room set-up, keeping track of the time, and recording the session. Other than the facilitators and participants, no one else was in the room during the sessions.

Both the group and individual sessions were recorded using either an electronic recorder or a tape recorder, and were also recorded by the assistant using paper and pen. The written recordings were used as back-ups in case of equipment failure, and were also used to capture further information of the focus group/interview that could not be revealed by the recordings such as the overall tone and mood of the participants.

The BPA office sent confirmation notifications to the participants prior to their session in the form of phone calls and emails. A reminder was sent on the day prior to the session.

Methods for Assuring Confidentiality

Due to the nature of this inquiry, both in content and implementation, guaranteeing confidentiality was paramount. Therefore, at each step of the process, from initial contact to the conclusion of the interviews, participants were assured that both their participation and any information they shared would be kept strictly confidential; furthermore they were assured there would be no means of identifying them through their involvement in the process. Facilitators began each session by outlining the methods used to ensure confidentiality, asked each participant to honor the confidentiality of their fellow participants, and gave each group member a chance to express any concerns and ask any questions regarding this issue. If during the session it became apparent to the facilitator or assistant that the group member(s) were concerned with confidentiality, they noted it and paused to address to the issue. In closing the sessions, participants were once again assured that their comments would in no way be directly identified with them, and advised to contact the chair of the Morale and Job Satisfaction Task Force with any further concerns.

The specific methods used in this study to maintain confidentiality were as follows.

- First, the facilitators or assistants would not discuss with anyone who the attendees each session were, or what was said in the sessions.

- Second, the participants would not discuss with anyone who attended each session or what was said in the sessions.
- Third, after the tapes of the sessions were transcribed, they were erased; any written notes of the facilitators and assistants used in the sessions were shredded.
- Fourth, no identifying names or other phrases that could identify a participant were revealed to any individual faculty, staff, or administrator at UW-Stout, and they were not included in the final report transcriptions.
- Fifth, the list of participants was deleted upon completion of this report

Implementation

Participants were assigned a focus group based on each of the five employment classifications (faculty, instructional academic staff, professional academic staff, classified staff, LTE). They were further grouped according to their availability and preference for a particular session's time slot. Focus group size ranged from 2 to 11. There were a total of 74 people that attended focus groups and 30 that attended one-on-one interviews.

One and half hours were set-aside for each focus group session. Most sessions took the full 1.5 hours. The one-on-one interview took from 20 minutes to slightly more than one hour, with most of them lasting for 30 minutes.

Each session, whether a focus group or an interview, began with an introduction by the facilitator, and an offer to change from the group setting to a one-on-one interview. For some sessions, additional interviews were conducted in the same time slot; otherwise, the participant was rescheduled for another date. Next, the facilitator presented an overview of who was conducting the project, the purpose of the project, and confidentiality assurances. This introduction also included an outlining of the session procedures, which included encouraging the participants to freely express their opinions whether positive or negative, and asking them to offer only one answer at a time so that all could have the opportunity to participate. Once any questions were addressed, the facilitator began the discussion by asking the first question.

At the end of each session the facilitator presented a comment card to each participant that they could use to make further observations on the session or procedure, or after reflecting to make additional comments regarding specific questions or issues. Each participant also received a thank you gift of \$15 Chamber dollars gift certificate. On behalf of the Morale and Job Satisfaction Task Force, the BPA staff also sent out a thank you note to each participant.

Analysis Method

Upon completion of all of the sessions, students who were hired by the BPA office transcribed the tapes. Each student signed a confidentiality statement prior to beginning his or her work on the project. The session tapes were erased after the transcriptions were finished. Comments from the comment cards were also typed. These transcriptions were then coded for major themes by a team of four individuals from the BPA office. When deemed appropriate, the major themes were also broken down into sub-categories.

The coding team met several times during the process in order to refine the codes and establish definitions. The themes were also sent to the facilitators, assistant facilitators and the Morale and Job Satisfaction Task Force for review and comment. Each transcript was then coded by the team into the appropriate themes using NVivo software. After coding each transcript, the team then reviewed the comments in each theme a second time in order to ensure that all codes met the assigned definitions.

Overall counts were made of the number of comments that were given for each theme and sub-theme. Counts were then calculated for each employment classification per each theme and sub-theme. A total listing of the themes and the frequency of occurrence can be found in Appendix D. Also included in the appendix is a listing of all the comments that were coded into that theme. All identifying or confidential information has been removed, but no other edits were made to the comments.

Results

Overall summary

Results were analyzed to identify major themes. The following major themes were identified: bureaucracy/processes; relationships; equity; workload; support; trust; physical facilities; what can I do; public perception; overall satisfaction; communication; recognition; no one listens; and appreciate opportunity to participate; (see Table 2 for themes and their definitions). Also see Appendix D for comments made within each of these categories.

Table 2. Definitions of Major Themes

| Major theme | Sub-theme | Definition |
|---------------------------|--|--|
| Bureaucracy/ Processes | Program array and quality of programs | Includes comments about the need to improve the quality of new and existing programs; the need to create new programs and international experiences; and needs to look at effective program delivery methods, including cohort method and distance education. Also included are comments about times and days that classes are scheduled and the fact that they are often scheduled around what the faculty want not what the students need. |
| | Administration (positive, negative) | Includes comments regarding UW-Stout having too many administrators; the need for administrators to be more visible by sitting in on classes, stopping by offices, and attending campus events. This section also includes comments about the chancellor as not related to another theme on this list. |
| | Hiring, renewal and promotion (positive, negative) | Includes comments regarding the need to improve processes for hiring, renewal and promotion. Includes comments regarding tenured faculty getting away with anything; the evaluation process; the need to hold people accountable; putting less emphasis on academic degrees (PhD or masters) when hiring new faculty; problems with job security due to late contracts and year-to-year contracts, and the limits this has on participation in University service. This section also includes frustrations with the process of going from LTE to classified staff, and the process of converting from academic staff to faculty, as well as the length of time it takes to recruit. This section also includes comments regarding wanting to be tenure-track or full-time. |
| | Micromanaging | Includes comments regarding too many signatures (examples: travel forms and purchasing); having too many rules; moving too slowly; and how people are always watching over our shoulders. |
| | Ask for input, use my input (positive, negative) | Includes comments regarding decisions getting pushed through with no input; inefficiency in processes compared to industry; and comments regarding not asking employees what they think. |
| | State budget situation | Includes comments regarding problems with allocation of resources from the state, UW System, and UW-Stout. Also includes comments regarding the state budget situation and how it prevents necessary resources. |
| | Polytechnic/branding (positive, negative) | Includes comments regarding feelings toward the polytechnic designation, such as that the process went too fast; input was not asked for; more information is needed; as well as comments about the need to brand UW-Stout in an unique way within the UW System. |
| | Relationships | Collaboration across units (positive, negative) |

| | | |
|----------|---|---|
| | Faculty/staff and students (positive, negative) | Includes comments regarding working with the students; the rewarding aspects of seeing students learn; and having them keep in touch after graduation. |
| | Faculty/staff and supervisor (positive, negative) | Includes comments regarding the relationships with direct supervisor or supervisors higher up in the hierarchy. |
| | Faculty/staff and department (positive, negative) | Includes comments regarding working with co-workers, colleagues and others within the department. |
| | Everyone and administration (positive, negative) | Includes comments regarding working with the Chancellor, division heads and deans; as well as general comments about relationships that don't specify a name. |
| | Faculty/staff and external | Includes comments regarding working with people outside of Stout: business and industry, advisory boards, state government, etc. |
| Equity | Employment classification (positive, negative) | Includes comments regarding the different standards for LTEs, vs. classified vs. academic staff, vs. faculty; the issue that LTE's are not in the directory and they don't have retirement; and that there are different rules in general for LTE's. |
| | Compensation (positive, negative) | Includes comments regarding benefits, classification, pay, merit pay, job advancement, summer courses, overloads, overtime vs. comp time; and the issue of administrators getting big raises and everyone else getting small raises. Also includes comments about union/contract issues. |
| | Federally protected groups (positive, negative) | Includes comments regarding treatment based on gender, race/ethnicity and age; as well as comments about advancements made in hiring women, and the need to bring in more minority faculty/staff. |
| | Advancement and tenure (positive, negative) | Includes comments regarding the processes involved awarding tenure. |
| | Favoritism | Includes comments regarding differences in standards for different people, unrelated to classification or status in a federally protected group. |
| Workload | Comparative (positive, negative) | Includes comments regarding some people having more work to do than others, and the issue of people who don't do their work not being held accountable. |
| | Positions not filled or cut | Includes comments regarding positions not being filled or being cut; workload increases; positions being changed from faculty to academic staff; things falling through the cracks; not having enough time to respond to administrative deadlines; not having enough time with family; as well as general comments related to workload not otherwise specified. |
| | Student/staff ratio (positive, negative) | Includes comments regarding not having enough staff, causing increases in workload; classes being too large and always teaching different classes; as well as any comments related to class size. |
| | Committee work, research, credit load (positive, negative) | Includes comments regarding meetings have increasing workloads; not having time for research; being on committees that do nothing; as well as comments from people who do not have to participate in committees because of their position and they see this as a positive. |
| | Challenge | Includes comments regarding enjoy the challenge in some jobs, and the lack of challenge in other jobs; variety in jobs; and the need to create a challenging atmosphere for faculty and students. |
| Support | From immediate supervisors (positive, negative) | Includes comments regarding financial support and support for decisions and opinions from immediate supervisors. |

| | | |
|---------------------|---|---|
| | From co-workers/department (positive, negative) | Includes comments regarding financial support, support for individual's decisions, and opinions from co-workers and department. Also includes some of the ways individuals feel supported and comments regarding congenial atmospheres and teamwork. |
| | From senior administration (positive, negative) | Includes comments regarding financial support and support for an individual's decisions and opinions from people at the deans level or above. |
| | From other departments (positive, negative) | Includes comments regarding financial support and support for an individual's decisions and opinions from other departments, including ASK5000, research services and learning technology services. |
| | From students | Includes comments regarding asking students for help/support- particularly in the area of technology. |
| Trust | Fear of retribution | Includes comments regarding being afraid of reporting problems; confidentiality issues in this project; fear of being identified from comments made; fear of giving negative feedback to the administration for fear of the consequences; and fear of not being promoted or having contract renewed. |
| | Decision-making ability of superiors (positive, negative) | Includes comments regarding not trusting superiors to make good decisions. |
| | Respect | Includes comments regarding respect toward individual's ideas and ability to do job (second-guessing abilities). |
| | Autonomy and empowerment (positive, negative) | Includes comments regarding appreciating opportunities to make decisions, have choices and determine work, flexibility and variety in job, and comments relating to accountability. |
| Physical Facilities | General comments | Includes general comments unrelated to offices, classrooms or labs. Also includes parking concerns. |
| | Jarvis hall project (positive, negative) | Includes comments regarding the Jarvis Hall project. |
| | Classrooms (positive, negative) | Includes comments regarding classroom utilization, technology (wireless) in classrooms, projectors, and having to travel too far in between classes. |
| | Labs (positive, negative) | Includes comments regarding labs equipment and facilities. |
| | Offices (positive, negative) | Includes comments regarding having or not having window offices; too many people sharing the same office; lighting concerns; office furniture; not having office location next to others in the department; and not having privacy or confidentiality due to sharing offices. |
| What I can do | Monitor Attitude | Includes comments related to serving as a role model for students and faculty/staff, maintaining a positive attitude, and refraining from complaining. |
| | Be proactive, just do it | Includes comments about taking action; seizing opportunities; bringing people together for discussions, and joining and participating in committees. Also includes comments regarding the need to tell someone about problems, which might be a committee or a supervisor, and needs to work within the university structure to voice concerns and do something about them. |
| | Nothing | Includes comments about the fact that nothing can be done; feeling powerless and helpless; and being proactive but having no one listen and nothing work, and as a result determining that there is nothing that can be done to improve the situation. |
| Public Perception | Change from what was to what is | Includes comments regarding perceptions from the public about what UW-Stout used to be compared to what it is now; and the perception that UW-Stout is an easy job or unethical. |

| | | |
|---------------------------------------|---|---|
| | Perception of own job and others' jobs (positive, negative) | Includes comments regarding internal perceptions of how much work people do compared to others, both in regards to the individual and the department as a whole; perceptions of other's job satisfaction and morale; and comments about what anybody else thinks. |
| Overall Satisfaction | High | Includes comments regarding current levels of personal overall job satisfaction, including reference to their specific job as well as generally working at UW-Stout. |
| | High with reservations | |
| | Low | |
| Communication | Filtered on the way up and down | Includes comments regarding communication outside of the department, and information being filtered (edited, altered) on the way up and down. |
| | Up and down | Includes comments regarding a lack of communication outside of the department; the problem of bringing information from the top-down or bottom-up; the issue of communication within the department often being good, but when it gets beyond specific departments someone "drops the ball;" as well as comments regarding the communication from the administration to the campus. |
| | Need to communicate actions (positive, negative) | Includes comments regarding not knowing what happens to committee recommendations after they are submitted. Also includes comments regarding the need to communicate the good news; the issue of too much time and energy being focused on where improvements need to be made rather than what is going well. |
| | Departmental communication (positive, negative) | Includes comments regarding departmental communication and the need to communicate better with part-time staff. |
| | We talk and talk and never make decisions | Includes comments regarding spending too much time talking and never coming to any resolution, which occurs at the departmental level and above. |
| Recognition | Know who I am (positive, negative) | Includes comments regarding the need to get to know employees better by visiting their classes, or stopping by offices. These comments apply to direct supervisors as well as senior administration. |
| | Reward me (positive, negative) | Includes comments regarding recognition of hard work from all levels of administration, through sending emails or stopping by office to say "good job." |
| No one listens | Surveys, data- nothing is done with them | Includes comments regarding the need for real discussion, not just forums; the issue that often input is asked for and then the opposite is done, which occurs at the department and senior administration levels; and comments regarding what happens to the input provided on the morale surveys. |
| | Nothing will happen or change | Includes comments regarding needing people to listen; nothing getting done; making decisions based on politics, not logic at both the university level and the departmental level; and feelings that the Chancellor doesn't really want to know what employees think. |
| Appreciate opportunity to participate | | Includes comments related to the fact that participants were glad they were invited to participate in the focus group; that it is a sign the administration is listening, and they hope the results will be used in meaningful ways. Also includes comments regarding appreciating hearing others' comments, and the use of this process rather than the survey and the use of graduate assistants as facilitators. |

Small themes were also identified. Small themes are items that were brought up by a small number of people (sometimes as few as one person). However, the person making the comment felt that the thought or issue was important to them. In this study, the small themes that were identified were: student diversity, student focus, departmental organization, professional development, laptop program, and criticisms of the method. Definitions of the small themes can be found in the Table 3.

Table 3. Definitions of Small Themes

| Sub-theme | Definition |
|---------------------------|---|
| Student diversity | Includes comments regarding a lack of diversity in the UW-Stout student body that needs to be addressed; that a diverse student body benefits both student and faculty/staff; the need to have more diverse student recruitment, while it is still important to keep in mind the strength of Midwestern students. |
| Student focus | Includes comments primary focusing on the students; the need to put students first; get them excited about learning; find ways to give students more time to be creative and have fun learning. Also includes comments regarding the need for instructors to focus on desired student outcomes – are they being accomplished, and they need to be consistent within and across departments. |
| Departmental organization | Includes comments regarding not understanding or agreeing with the current structure; needs to divide or separate departments to increase efficiently; reorganization issues, and not understanding the process or the new structure; and comments relating to bad processes that created fragmentation or “mini colleges.” |
| Professional development | Includes comments regarding professional development week being helpful or useful, and the need for more opportunities and training. |
| Laptop program | Includes comments regarding technologies pros and cons, such as it can be used to reach multiple students at same time with the same materials, which is good for students, but it can be frustrating for the teacher, can be hard to teach, teachers often feel trapped and fear losing the important student interaction. |
| Criticisms of the method | Includes comments regarding the focus group process and the need for it to have been conducted by an outside professional organization. Also includes comments regarding the process of allowing only one comment per person at a time in the focus groups being “stifling”. |

Overall theme results

Table 4 displays the major themes in descending order based on the number of comments made within each major theme, which is indicated below the theme name. These major themes are then divided into several sub-themes. The number of passages for each sub-theme included within this table is the number of comments made by participants regarding the specific topic or theme. The “documents” column, which follows the “passages” column, refers to the number of different transcriptions or discussion sessions the comments came from. The number of passages for each sub-theme is also separated by employee classification on the right side of the table. Note that several of the sub-themes contain the categories “positive” and “negative”. Positive comments indicate that the employee is currently satisfied with their experiences in the particular sub-theme. Negative comments included both complaints and suggestions for future improvements.

The major theme bureaucracy and processes comprised the largest number of passages in the discussion sessions, with an overall total of 368 passages. The next largest theme category was relationships with 313 unique passages. Equity accounted for 228 response passages, whereas workload had 170 passages. The major theme of support had 156 passages, followed by trust with 151, and physical facilities with 145. Personal responsibility (What I can do) accounted for 126 total passages in the discussion sessions. There were 110 passages that dealt with public perception of UW-Stout; 106 concerning overall satisfaction with UW-Stout; and 101 concerning communication issues. Being recognized had 57 total response passages, whereas feelings that no one listens accounted for 51 total response passages. The last major theme had 23 unique passages where participants expressed their appreciation for the opportunity to participate in the focus group process.

Sub-theme results

The following section summarizes the results from the sub-themes with the largest number of comments. The total frequencies and frequencies per employment category are displayed in Table 4.

Bureaucracy/Process. This category encompassed seven sub-themes, and the results are displayed in Table 4. Of these sub-themes, hiring, renewal and promotion practices had by far the greatest number of passages. There were 145 negative passages in 32 unique discussion sessions and 11 positive passages in 8 sessions. The negative comments were predominantly made by the LTE classification (75 passages), followed by instructional (36), classified (18) and faculty (16). The sub-theme of micromanaging contained 46 passages in 16 unique discussion sessions. Of these comments, 22 were made by LTE, 11 by classified, 10 by instructional and only 3 by faculty.

Comments about administration at UW-Stout were the next highest category, with 38 negative comments and only 6 positive comments. The negative comments were mostly made by LTE with 15 passages and faculty with 10 passages; classified staff made 8 negative comments regarding the administration, and instructional made only 5 negative comments. Of the six positive administration remarks, 4 were offered by LTE. (See Table 4) UW-Stout employee concerns regarding requests for their input and then actually using the provided input produced 29 negative passages in 14 discussion sessions, and 5 positive passages in 4 unique sessions. Similar opinions were expressed in the major theme of “no one listens”, although this category dealt with the more survey-specific aspect of using employee input (see the results in the “no one listens” section below). Table 4 shows that most of the negative passages came from the LTE (13) and faculty (11) categories. Of the five positive comments, classified employees made 3.

There were 32 negative passages in 16 different discussion sessions regarding the state budget situation, of which 18 were made by LTE, and 7 by classified employees. The 2 positive comments were both made in one session and by LTE employees. Discussion of program array and the quality of programs produced 29 passages in 15 sessions. These comments came predominantly from the instructional employees, with 23 passages; faculty contributed 5 passages and LTE made 1 comment. Discussion about branding of

UW-Stout and/or the use of polytechnic led to 18 negative passages in 10 separate sessions, and 7 positive comments in 4 sessions. Instructional employees made 8 negative comments, the faculty made 5 negative comments, and LTE also made 5 negative comments. LTE made 4 positive comments about branding/polytechnic and instructional made 3 positive comments. Table 4 displays the frequency of responses and frequencies by employment category for each sub-theme.

Relationships. There were six smaller relationship categories, or sub-themes; the results are shown in Table 4. Relationships between faculty, staff and departments generated by far the most passages in the discussion sessions. There were more than twice as many positive passages than negative ones; positive passages occurred 92 times in 29 discussion sessions, and negative passages occurred 44 times in 21 discussion sessions. LTE's made the most comments, both positive and negative, with 48 and 28 respectively. Classified made 16 positive and 6 negative comments, faculty made 16 positive and 3 negative comments, and instructional made 12 positive and 7 negative comments. This sub-theme is explored in greater depth in the "most common themes" section that follows.

Relationships between faculty, staff and students also generated a large number of passages, with nearly all being positive (see Table 4). There were 76 positive passages in 35 unique sessions and only 7 negative passages in 6 sessions regarding faculty/staff and student relationships. Breaking this down by employment categories, LTE gave 28 positive and 5 negative responses; faculty gave 21 positive and no negative responses; instructional gave 20 positive and no negative responses; classified gave 7 positive and 1 negative response. This sub-theme is also explored in greater depth in the "most common themes" section that follows.

For the sub-theme of collaboration across units, there were 25 negative passages in 15 discussion sessions and 17 positive passages in 10 discussion sessions. Within employment categories, LTE's gave 10 positive and 9 negative comments, faculty gave 5 positive and 4 negative comments, instructional gave 1 positive and 7 negative comments, and classified gave 1 positive and 5 negative comments. Another type of collaboration that generated discussion was the sub-theme of relationships between faculty, staff and people outside of UW-Stout. This sub-theme had 11 passages in 7 unique discussion sessions. Of the employment categories, LTE's made 8 comments and faculty made 3 comments.

The sub-theme relationship between faculty, staff and supervisor had 16 positive passages in 11 discussion sessions and 11 negative passages in 6 discussion sessions. Classified made 5 positive and 6 negative comments; LTE made 6 positive and 4 negative comments; faculty made 4 positive and 1 negative comment; and instructional made 1 positive and no negative comments. Relationships in general or relationships with administration produced relatively fewer comments, with a total of 7 positive passages in 6 discussion sessions and 7 negative comments in 4 discussion sessions. The total number of responses per employment category was: LTE made 5 negative comments and 1 positive, classified made 4 positive and no negative, faculty made 2 negative and no

positive, and instructional made 1 positive and no negative. These results are displayed in Table 4.

Equity. The largest sub-theme for equity was compensation, where the comments were overwhelmingly negative. As seen in Table 4, there were 117 negative passages in 32 discussion sessions and only 11 positive passages in 7 discussion sessions. Looking at the totals by employment classification, LTE made 59 negative comment compared to only 2 positive comments, classified made 25 negative comments and 5 positive comments, faculty made 19 negative comments with only 1 positive, and instructional made 14 negative and 3 positive comments. This sub-theme is explored in greater depth in the “most common themes” section that follows.

Discussion regarding the classification of employees generated 51 negative passages in 14 discussion sessions and only 2 positive passages in 1 discussion session. Table 4 shows that the responses were primarily given by LTE and classified employees. LTE made 30 negative comments and no positive comments; classified made 19 negative and 2 positive. Both instructional and faculty contributed only one negative comments each.

The sub-theme of federally protected groups had 16 negative passages in 8 discussion sessions and 1 positive comment. Faculty gave most of the responses for this sub-theme, contributing 10 negative and 1 positive comments. The totals for the other categories as shown in Table 4 were: instructional made 3 negative comments, classified made 2 negative comments, and LTE made 1 negative comment.

The advancement and tenure sub-theme was comprised of 15 negative passages in 6 discussion sessions and no positive comments. Table 4 lists the frequencies employment categories, and revealed that there were 9 LTE responses, 4 classified responses, and 2 faculty responses. The final equity sub-theme was favoritism, with 15 passages in 9 discussion sessions. These comments were primarily made by LTE (9), followed by classified (3) and faculty (3).

Workload. The number of comments per sub-theme was fairly evenly distributed for this theme. Response frequencies for each sub-theme are shown in Table 4. The sub-theme regarding comparative workloads had mostly negative comments; there were 40 negative passages in 18 unique discussion sessions, and only 2 positive comments in 2 sessions. The LTE category made the most comments with 19 negative and 2 positive followed by instructional with 8 negative, faculty with 7 negative, and classified with 6 negative comments.

Lack of challenge in the job had 15 positive passages in 6 discussion sessions and 21 negative passages in 13 discussion sessions. The total number of responses per employment category for this sub-theme is displayed in Table 4, and was: classified made 2 positive and 10 comments, LTE made 4 positive and 7 negative comments, instructional made 5 positive and 4 negative comments, and faculty made 4 positive and no negative comments.

Discussions regarding doing committee work, research and the credit load generated 29 negative passages in 13 discussion sessions and 6 positive comments in 5 discussion sessions. Comments for this sub-theme were primarily made by faculty with 18 negative and 3 positive responses, and instructional with 11 negative and 1 positive responses. Changes in workload due to positions not being filled or being cut had 30 passages in 17 separate discussion sessions. Of these, 18 were made by LTE, 6 by instructional, 3 by faculty, and 3 by classified. (See Table 4)

The final sub-theme was student to staff ratio, with 26 negative passages in 15 discussion sessions and 1 positive comment. As seen in Table 4, comments for this sub-theme were primarily made by faculty with 11 negative and 1 positive responses, and instructional with 12 negative and no positive responses.

Support. The largest sub-theme for this category was support from senior administration with 15 positive passages in 6 unique discussion sessions and 37 negative passages in 15 discussion sessions. Table 4 breaks this down by employment category; there were 5 positive and 11 negative responses by classified, 5 positive and 11 negative responses by LTE, 4 positive and 5 negative responses by instructional, and 1 positive and 10 negative responses by faculty.

Table 4 reveals that support from co-workers or people in the department accounted for 30 positive passages in 15 sessions and 12 negative passages in 7 sessions. Of these, LTE made 10 positive and 3 negative comments, instructional made 7 positive and 6 negative responses, classified made 7 positive and 3 negative responses, and faculty made 6 positive and no negative responses.

The sub-theme of support from other departments had 10 positive passages in 8 discussion sessions and 26 negative passages in 8 sessions. Table 4 showed that LTE and faculty made most of these responses; LTE had 3 positive and 18 negative comments and faculty had 4 positive and 7 negative comments. Support from an immediate supervisor had 12 positive passages in 8 separate sessions and 10 negative passages in 6 sessions. Classified and LTE had most of the responses; classified made 5 positive and 6 negative comments and LTE made 6 positive and 3 negative comments. The sub-theme of support from students had 4 passages in 3 unique discussion sessions. The total comments per employment category were: LTE made 2, instructional made 1 and faculty made 1. See Table 4 for complete listings of total sub-theme response frequencies, and frequencies per employment category.

Trust. The theme of trust had four sub-categories; a complete exposition of the frequency of responses is in Table 4. The sub-category of autonomy and empowerment had 53 positive passages in 25 separate discussion sessions and 11 negative passages in 9 discussion sessions. Examined by employment category, LTE made the greatest number of positive responses, and the faculty made the greatest number of negative. The total number of comments per employment category was: LTE made 26 positive and 4 negative responses, faculty made 8 positive and 6 negative responses, instructional made

9 positive and 1 negative responses, and classified made 10 positive and no negative responses.

The sub-theme of fear of retribution had 42 total passages in 17 discussion sessions. The majority of the comments were made by LTE with 28, followed by faculty with 11 comments, classified with 2 comments, and instructional with 1 comment. Issues of respect comprised 25 passages in 10 unique documents. For this sub-theme, as shown in Table 4, the total responses by employment category were classified of 10 comments, faculty made 8 comments, LTE made 5 comments and instructional made 2 comments.

Discussion regarding the decision making ability of superiors had 1 positive passage and 19 negative passages in 8 different discussion sessions. Table 4 reveals that faculty made 8 negative comments, classified made 6 negative comments, LTE made 4 negative comments, and instructional made 1 negative comment. The positive comment was made by classified.

Physical facilities. The theme of physical facilities had four sub-categories; a complete exposition of the content and the frequency of responses are in Table 4. The topic that had the most comments was offices, with 28 positive passages in 18 separate discussion sessions and 63 negative passages in 20 discussion sessions. The employment group that provided the most discussion on this topic was LTE, where they made 18 positive and 29 negative comments. Instructional had 4 positive and 12 negative comments; faculty had 3 positive and 13 negative comments; and classified had 3 positive and 9 negative comments. This sub-theme is explored in greater depth in the “most common themes” section that follows.

The sub-theme of classrooms had 6 positive comments in 6 discussion sessions and 34 negative comments in 14 separate discussion sessions. Instructional and faculty were the most concerned with this sub-theme. Instructional made 26 negative and 1 positive comment and faculty made 5 positive and 6 negative comments. The two sub-themes of Jarvis Hall project and labs on campus had 7 comments each. The distribution on frequencies for these themes can be found in Table 4.

What I can do. This theme centered on opinions of what an individual could do to effect change at UW-Stout. The three sub-themes that emerged were being proactive and just doing something, monitoring one’s own attitude and feeling as if there was nothing that could be personally done. Being proactive had 65 passages in 34 discussion sessions, monitoring one’s own attitude had 35 passages in 19 discussion sessions, and feeling as if there was nothing to be done had 26 passages in 17 discussion sessions. Examination by employment category revealed that LTE and faculty had the most comments regarding being proactive with 21 and 20 responses respectively; instructional had 12 responses and classified had 9 responses. LTE made half of the responses for monitoring own attitude with. Instructional made the most comments (11) on feeling that there was nothing they could personally do to make changes. A complete listing of the frequencies for these sub-themes in total and by employment category is shown in Table 4.

Public perception. This theme encompassed both the current employees' perception of the public views about changes at UW-Stout, and how the employees view their own job and the jobs of others at UW-Stout. Public perceptions regarding the change in UW-Stout from what it was in the past to what it is today had 13 passages in 7 unique discussion sessions. Of these 13 comments, 8 were made by LTE. (See Table 4)

There was considerably more discussion on the topic of perception of own job and others' job, with 25 positive passages in 14 discussion sessions and 72 negative passages in 33 discussion sessions. Of the four employment categories, LTE made the most comments with 14 positive and 37 negative comments. The number of comments for the other categories were: faculty made 16 negative comments, instructional made 5 positive and 12 negative comments, and classified made 6 positive and 7 negative comments.

A complete listing of the frequencies can be found in Table 4. In addition, a more detailed examination of the perception of own job and others' job can be found in the section "most common themes".

Overall satisfaction. Table 4 shows that on the whole, employees at UW-Stout reported high levels of satisfaction. The sub-theme of "high" had 85 passages in 43 unique discussion sessions. This result was consistent across employment categories; LTE had 29 comments, classified made 23, faculty made 20 comments, and instructional made 13 comments. The next category was "high with reservations", and it had 6 comments in 6 discussion sessions; these comments were equally distributed across the job categories. The last sub-theme was low, with 15 passages in 6 discussion sessions. LTE made the most "low" comments with 8, followed by classified with 4 and faculty with 3. Note that no instructional commented on having low overall satisfaction.

Communication. This theme encompassed five sub-themes; a complete display of these sub-themes frequencies are in Table 4. The sub-theme of departmental communication had 17 positive passages in 9 unique discussion sessions and 31 negative passages in 10 discussion sessions. The group that had the most comments on this topic was LTE with 5 positive and 20 negative comments. Classified made 9 positive comments and 3 negative; instructional made 2 positive and 6 negative comments; and faculty made 1 positive and 2 negative comments.

The flow of communication, or the sub-theme of "up and down", had 25 passages in 17 separate discussion sessions. Table 4 shows that almost half of the comments were made by LTE (12). Faculty made 6 comments, instructional made 5 comments, and classified made 2 comments. The need to communicate actions had 9 positive passages in 6 sessions and 7 negative passages in 6 sessions. LTE employees made most of these responses, with 8 positive and 3 negative.

Frequencies for the remaining two sub-themes of "filtered on the way up and down" and "we talk and talk and never make decisions" are shown in Table 4.

Recognition. There were two sub-themes in the recognition theme, and a complete listing of the frequencies is displayed in Table 4. Employee comments regarding the need to be personally rewarded had 15 positive comments in 8 discussion sessions and 26 negative comments in 15 discussion sessions. LTE had the largest number of comments with 13 positive and 10 negative responses. Faculty made 1 positive and 10 negative comments.

The importance of knowing others and being known by them had 4 positive passages in 2 discussion sessions and 12 negative comments in 6 discussion sessions. LTE made nearly all of the negative comments with 10 responses, and faculty made nearly all of the positive responses with 3 comments.

No one listens. There were two sub-themes for this theme. First was the opinion that nothing is done with surveys and the data they produce, which had 26 passages in 9 discussion sessions. Second was the opinion that nothing with happen or change at UW-Stout as a result of employee input, which had 25 passages in 13 discussion sessions. LTE and faculty made the majority of the comments in both of these sub-themes. For nothing being done with the data, LTE made 13 comments and faculty made 11 comments; for nothing changing, LTE made 8 comments and faculty made 11 comments. Table 4 provides a complete listing of all of the frequencies in each sub-theme.

Appreciate opportunity to participate. This theme contained comments by employees regarding their appreciation for being able to participate in the morale focus group process. As shown in Table 4, this theme had 23 passages in 14 unique discussion sessions. Examination by employment category revealed that 8 faculty, 8 LTE, 6 instructional and 1 classified made comments.

Table 4: Summary of Major Themes

| Major theme | Sub-theme | Number of Total Responses Overall | | Number of Total Responses by Employment Category | | | |
|--------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|-----------|--|-----|---------------|---------|
| | | Passages | Documents | Classified | LTE | Instructional | Faculty |
| | | | | Number of Passages | | | |
| Bureaucracy / Processes (368) | Program array and quality of programs | 29 | 15 | 0 | 1 | 23 | 5 |
| | Administration | | | | | | |
| | Positive | 6 | 4 | 1 | 4 | 0 | 1 |
| | Negative | 38 | 19 | 8 | 15 | 5 | 10 |

| Major theme | Sub-theme | Number of Total Responses Overall | | Number of Total Responses by Employment Category | | | |
|---------------------------|-------------------------------|-----------------------------------|-----------|--|-----|---------------|---------|
| | | Passages | Documents | Classified | LTE | Instructional | Faculty |
| | | | | Number of Passages | | | |
| | Hiring, renewal and promotion | | | | | | |
| | Positive | 11 | 8 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 0 |
| | Negative | 145 | 32 | 18 | 75 | 36 | 16 |
| | Micromanaging | 46 | 16 | 11 | 22 | 10 | 3 |
| | Ask for input, use my input | | | | | | |
| | Positive | 5 | 4 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| | Negative | 29 | 14 | 3 | 13 | 2 | 11 |
| | State budget situation | | | | | | |
| | Positive | 2 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| | Negative | 32 | 16 | 7 | 18 | 4 | 3 |
| | Polytechnic/branding | | | | | | |
| | Positive | 7 | 4 | 0 | 4 | 3 | 0 |
| | Negative | 18 | 10 | 0 | 5 | 8 | 5 |
| Relationship (313) | Collaboration across units | | | | | | |
| | Positive | 17 | 10 | 1 | 10 | 1 | 5 |
| | Negative | 25 | 15 | 5 | 9 | 7 | 4 |
| | Faculty/staff and students | | | | | | |
| | Positive | 76 | 35 | 7 | 28 | 20 | 21 |
| | Negative | 7 | 6 | 1 | 5 | 1 | 0 |

| Major theme | Sub-theme | Number of Total Responses Overall | | Number of Total Responses by Employment Category | | | |
|---------------------|------------------------------|-----------------------------------|-----------|--|-----|---------------|---------|
| | | Passages | Documents | Classified | LTE | Instructional | Faculty |
| | | | | Number of Passages | | | |
| | Faculty/staff and supervisor | | | | | | |
| | Positive | 16 | 11 | 5 | 6 | 1 | 4 |
| | Negative | 11 | 6 | 6 | 4 | 0 | 1 |
| | Faculty/staff and department | | | | | | |
| | Positive | 92 | 29 | 16 | 48 | 12 | 16 |
| | Negative | 44 | 21 | 6 | 28 | 7 | 3 |
| | Everyone and administration | | | | | | |
| | Positive | 7 | 6 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| | Negative | 7 | 4 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 2 |
| | Faculty/staff and external | 11 | 7 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 3 |
| Equity (228) | Employment classification | | | | | | |
| | Positive | 2 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Negative | 51 | 14 | 19 | 30 | 1 | 1 |
| | Compensation | | | | | | |
| | Positive | 11 | 7 | 5 | 2 | 3 | 1 |
| | Negative | 117 | 32 | 25 | 59 | 14 | 19 |
| | Federally protected groups | | | | | | |
| | Positive | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Negative | 16 | 8 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 10 | |

| Major theme | Sub-theme | Number of Total Responses Overall | | Number of Total Responses by Employment Category | | | |
|-----------------------|---------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|-----------|--|-----|---------------|---------|
| | | Passages | Documents | Classified | LTE | Instructional | Faculty |
| | | | | Number of Passages | | | |
| | Advancement and tenure | | | | | | |
| | Positive | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Negative | 15 | 6 | 4 | 9 | 0 | 2 |
| | Favoritism | 15 | 9 | 3 | 9 | 0 | 3 |
| Workload (170) | Comparative | | | | | | |
| | Positive | 2 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| | Negative | 40 | 18 | 6 | 19 | 8 | 7 |
| | Positions not filled or cut | 30 | 17 | 3 | 18 | 6 | 3 |
| | Student/staff ratio | | | | | | |
| | Positive | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| | Negative | 26 | 15 | 0 | 3 | 12 | 11 |
| | Committee work, research, credit load | | | | | | |
| | Positive | 6 | 5 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 3 |
| | Negative | 29 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 18 |
| Challenge | | | | | | | |
| Lack of Challenge | 15 | 6 | 2 | 4 | 5 | 4 | |
| Enjoy the Challenge | 21 | 13 | 10 | 7 | 4 | 0 | |
| Support (156) | From immediate supervisors | | | | | | |
| | Positive | 12 | 8 | 5 | 6 | 1 | 0 |
| | Negative | 10 | 6 | 6 | 3 | 1 | 0 |

| Major theme | Sub-theme | Number of Total Responses Overall | | Number of Total Responses by Employment Category | | | |
|--------------------|--------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|-----------|--|-----|---------------|---------|
| | | Passages | Documents | Classified | LTE | Instructional | Faculty |
| | | | | Number of Passages | | | |
| | From co-workers/department | | | | | | |
| | Positive | 30 | 15 | 7 | 10 | 7 | 6 |
| | Negative | 12 | 7 | 3 | 3 | 6 | 0 |
| | From senior administration | | | | | | |
| | Positive | 15 | 6 | 5 | 5 | 4 | 1 |
| | Negative | 37 | 15 | 11 | 11 | 5 | 10 |
| | From other departments | | | | | | |
| | Positive | 10 | 8 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 4 |
| | Negative | 26 | 8 | 1 | 18 | 0 | 7 |
| | From students | 4 | 3 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 1 |
| Trust (151) | Fear of retribution | 42 | 17 | 2 | 28 | 1 | 11 |
| | Decision-making ability of superiors | | | | | | |
| | Positive | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Negative | 19 | 8 | 6 | 4 | 1 | 8 |
| | Respect | 25 | 10 | 10 | 5 | 2 | 8 |
| | Autonomy and empowerment | | | | | | |
| Positive | 53 | 25 | 10 | 26 | 9 | 8 | |
| Negative | 11 | 9 | 0 | 4 | 1 | 6 | |
| Physical | General comments | 19 | 13 | 0 | 13 | 3 | 3 |

| Major theme | Sub-theme | Number of Total Responses Overall | | Number of Total Responses by Employment Category | | | |
|-----------------------------------|--|-----------------------------------|-----------|--|-----|---------------|---------|
| | | Passages | Documents | Classified | LTE | Instructional | Faculty |
| | | | | Number of Passages | | | |
| facilities (145) | Jarvis hall project | | | | | | |
| | Positive | 5 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 1 |
| | Negative | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 |
| | Classrooms | | | | | | |
| | Positive | 6 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 |
| | Negative | 34 | 14 | 0 | 2 | 26 | 6 |
| | Labs | | | | | | |
| | Positive | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 |
| | Negative | 5 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 1 |
| | Offices | | | | | | |
| Positive | 28 | 18 | 3 | 18 | 4 | 3 | |
| Negative | 63 | 20 | 9 | 29 | 12 | 13 | |
| What I can do (126) | Monitor Attitude | 35 | 19 | 5 | 17 | 8 | 5 |
| | Be proactive, just do it | 65 | 34 | 10 | 21 | 14 | 20 |
| | Nothing | 26 | 17 | 5 | 6 | 11 | 4 |
| Public perception (110) | Change from what was to what is | 13 | 7 | 3 | 8 | 0 | 2 |
| | Perception of own job and others' jobs | | | | | | |
| | Positive | 25 | 14 | 6 | 14 | 5 | 0 |
| Negative | 72 | 33 | 7 | 37 | 12 | 16 | |
| Overall Satisfaction (106) | High | 85 | 43 | 23 | 29 | 13 | 20 |
| | High with reservations | 6 | 6 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 |
| | Low | 15 | 6 | 4 | 8 | 0 | 3 |

| Major theme | Sub-theme | Number of Total Responses Overall | | Number of Total Responses by Employment Category | | | |
|----------------------------|---|-----------------------------------|-----------|--|-----|---------------|---------|
| | | Passages | Documents | Classified | LTE | Instructional | Faculty |
| | | | | Number of Passages | | | |
| Communication (101) | Filtered on the way up and down | 4 | 3 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 2 |
| | Up and down | 25 | 17 | 2 | 12 | 5 | 6 |
| | Need to communicate actions | | | | | | |
| | Positive | 9 | 6 | 0 | 8 | 1 | 0 |
| | Negative | 7 | 6 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 3 |
| | Departmental communication | | | | | | |
| | Positive | 17 | 9 | 9 | 5 | 2 | 1 |
| Negative | 31 | 10 | 3 | 20 | 6 | 2 | |
| | We talk and talk and never make decisions | 8 | 6 | 0 | 4 | 1 | 3 |
| Recognition (57) | Know who I am | | | | | | |
| | Positive | 4 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| | Negative | 12 | 6 | 1 | 10 | 0 | 1 |
| | Reward me | | | | | | |
| Positive | 15 | 8 | 1 | 13 | 0 | 1 | |
| Negative | 26 | 15 | 5 | 10 | 1 | 10 | |
| No one listens (51) | Surveys, data-nothing is done with them | 26 | 9 | 1 | 13 | 1 | 11 |
| | Nothing will happen or change | 25 | 13 | 4 | 8 | 2 | 11 |

| Major theme | Sub-theme | Number of Total Responses Overall | | Number of Total Responses by Employment Category | | | |
|---|-----------|-----------------------------------|-----------|--|-----|---------------|---------|
| | | Passages | Documents | Classified | LTE | Instructional | Faculty |
| | | | | Number of Passages | | | |
| Appreciate opportunity to participate (23) | none | 23 | 14 | 1 | 8 | 6 | 8 |

Overall observations: Some patterns of discussion were also observed throughout the discussions. Most often (but not always) participants provided many examples of things they are unhappy with about their current job and things they would change if they had the power. However, when asked at the end of the session about their overall job satisfaction, most participants reported high levels of satisfaction, despite these earlier concerns. Furthermore, when asked about the job satisfaction and morale of other faculty and staff on campus, there was the perception that the job satisfaction and morale in other departments or units was lower than their personal job satisfaction. Additionally, participants had no problems coming up with things they would change if they had the power, but had more difficulties coming up with what they could do as an individual to improve their situation. When asked what they could do as an individual to address their concerns, many participants reported that there was nothing they can do to improve their situation. However, in many cases, they later provided examples of instances where they were proactive and spoke up about their concerns.

Small themes analysis

Analysis of the small themes responses, displayed in Table 5, revealed that the most frequent responses occurred for the sub-theme of departmental organization, with a total of 12 passages that occurred in four different discussion sessions. Faculty accounted for nine of these passages, and LTE accounted for the remaining 3 passages. Issues regarding students comprised the next highest categories. Student focus remarks occurred in six passages and five unique sessions, whereas student diversity comments occurred in five passages and five unique sessions. Faculty and instructional staff made the student-centered comments.

There were 4 passages encompassing professional development; these took place in 4 different sessions, and were made by faculty, instructional and LTE categories. Laptop and technology issues created three passages from three unique discussions, and all of the comments were made by the instructional category. Finally, there were two comments made regarding criticism of the focus group method. These criticisms occurred in two separate discussions, and were made by an LTE and a faculty member. A complete list of the number of responses per sub-theme and employment category can be found in Table 5.

Table 5. Summary of Small Themes

| Sub-theme | Number of Total Responses Overall | | Number of Total Responses by Employment Category | | | |
|---------------------------|-----------------------------------|-----------|--|-----|---------------|---------|
| | Passages | Documents | Classified | LTE | Instructional | Faculty |
| | | | Number of Passages | | | |
| Departmental organization | 12 | 4 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 9 |
| Student focus | 6 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 |
| Student diversity | 5 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 3 |
| Professional development | 4 | 4 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 |
| Laptop program | 3 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 |
| Criticisms of method | 2 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 |

Most common sub-themes

The most common sub-themes were: hiring, renewal and promotion process; relationships between faculty, staff and students; relationships between faculty, staff and department; compensation; physical facilities-office space; and perception of own job and others. Note that these themes are a mix of both negative and positive sub-themes. These sub-themes are explored in more detail in this section. Tables 6 to 11 provide examples of comments contained in these themes, and also provide a deeper analysis through the identification of recurring themes for each of the common theme and total frequencies for each of the recurring themes.

Table 6 provides comment summaries, frequencies and examples of the common theme renewal and promotion process. Two main recurring themes of job security and that changes should be made for hiring qualification accounted for 81% of the total comments given. Problems associated with job security had 60 comments and the need for changes in hiring qualifications had 52 comments. Four other recurring themes were identified: the process of moving from one employment classification to another (12 comments), opinions that tenured faculty gets away with everything and just goes through the motions of teaching (6 comments), the evaluation process needs to be improved (4 comments), and that the recruitment process takes too long (4 comments).

Table 7 provides comment summaries, frequencies and examples of the common theme relationships between faculty, staff and students. The most frequently identified type of comment was the enjoyment of working with students which had 44 total comments, and accounted for 46% of all comments made in this common theme. Making an impact on students was also frequently mentioned (22 comments), accounting for an additional 23% of all comments made in this theme. Employees also mentioned having personal contact with students (12 comments), receiving feedback from students (7 comments), being

appreciated by students (6 comments), feeling there was a lack of relationship with students (3), and comments that students pay faculty/staff salaries (2).

Table 8 provides comment summaries, frequencies and examples of the common theme relationships between faculty, staff and departments. The two most frequently recurring topics were “people” with 53 comments and 33% of the overall total comments, and “environment” with 51 comments and 31% of the overall total comments. “People” included comments about how nice people are and enjoyable to work with, and also comments about working with difficult people. The “environment” topic had comments that ranged from opinions on the environment or culture being good and collegial and fun to those where the culture was inflexible and unfriendly. Another area that had many comments was communications with 20% of the total comments in this theme. Communications focused on the specifics of interactions, both positive and negative. Also mentioned were teamwork (14), having contact with others (7) and treatment of/by others (6).

Table 9 provides comment summaries, frequencies and examples of the common theme employee compensation. Remarks about comparative wages/salaries occurred 38 times, which was 32% of overall total responses for this theme. Comments about benefits occurred 32 times, which was 27% of overall total responses for this theme. Observations about raises at UW-Stout occurred 24 times, which was 20% of the overall total responses. There were 16 comments regarding unions/civil service, 7 comments regarding raises for the administration, and 3 comments regarding merit pay.

Table 10 provides comment summaries, frequencies and examples of the common theme physical facilities in the form of offices. All issues regarding office particulars accounted for 45% of the total comments made in this theme. Specifically, remarks about the size of offices had 21 comments, discussion of windows had 19 comments, and having own space or office had 13 comments. The atmosphere in the office was the single most frequently commented upon topic and had 26 total comments. The need for new equipment and comments regarding the general maintenance of offices had 24 total comments. There were also 9 remarks regarding space utilization, and 5 comments about location.

Table 11 provides comment summaries, frequencies and examples of the common theme public perception of own job and others’ job. The most frequent topic was personal perceptions of others’ morale at UW-Stout with 47 responses, which was 53% of the total comments made for this theme. 40% of the total comments concerned personal perception of how others’ valued UW-Stout; the total number of comments was 35. There were two smaller topics that occurred: 5 comments about personal perception of the public perception of working at UW-Stout, and 2 comments about personal perception of own value at UW-Stout.

Table 6. Most Common Themes: Processes- Hiring, Renewal and Promotion

| <i>Identified by</i> | <i>Frequency</i> | <i>Comment Summary</i> | <i>Examples</i> |
|-------------------------------------|------------------|--|---|
| Job security is a problem | 60 | Includes comments regarding feelings that the budget situation is often used as a threat; that bad leadership or threatening behaviors often leads to turnover among employees; semester-to-semester or even year-to-year contracts offer no guarantee for employees; it is often hard to commit and invest time in the university with no job security; many instructional staff want tenure positions, and the last minute notification of instructional staff hurts students because of the lack of time to prepare, and comments regarding Academic Staff feeling as though the Administration simply want content delivered, without a curriculum developed. Also includes comments regarding feelings of a lack of support from the administration toward making some employees full-time, and these employees feeling unwanted; feelings that cutting faculty and support staff is ultimately hurting the students; many employees feel the divide between employees who have job security and those who do not; feelings that after LTE's have held a job for so many years, they should be brought on full-time, and often positions filled on campus are not advertised. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Then with all the budget stuff, it is almost held over our head like a threat. “The budget is terrible, we are running out of money and I can’t guarantee your jobs guys.” ▪ I guess the one downside is my current position, and it’s just the nature of the position, I’m on a semester to semester contract right now and there’s no guarantee I’ll be coming back. |
| Hiring qualifications should change | 52 | Includes comments regarding feelings that the best candidate for a job is not always hired because of the requirements for a PhD or Master’s degree, which is unrealistic in some departments, and the best candidate should be hired regardless of their degree; some feel as though candidates will be hired regardless of qualifications or test scores; planning ahead for retiring faculty would allow new faculty to learn from them and get up to speed quicker; faculty would prefer to participate in selection process at the end of the process versus the beginning; it breaks the “hands on, minds on” approach to have PhD’s who aren’t experienced in industry. Also includes comments regarding LTE’s feeling as though they don’t get the same shot at | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ And if nobody wants to come in then I have to compete with everyone else that has taken the test that wants to have the job. Well of course from experience, I will get it, hopefully, maybe, but they still have to interview all these people and set out all these notices and you know ▪ What we’re seeing is a lot of the people that have PhD’s have very little industry experience. That’s a |

| <i>Identified by</i> | <i>Frequency</i> | <i>Comment Summary</i> | <i>Examples</i> |
|--|------------------|---|---|
| | | their job as others do; the state testing system does not do a good job evaluating employees because it does not test people skills; students may feel as if the university doesn't care about them because of the large amount of employee turnover; and job descriptions are often too specific. | quality problem because our students are learning from people that really haven't been, that don't have the real world experience to bring into the classroom. |
| Process for moving from one employment classification to another | 12 | Includes comments regarding feeling as though employees are locked into categories and they are typically not evaluated on what they do; transfers are not easy with budget cutbacks; the reestablishment of clerical classification should be changed; feelings regarding the need for support from your department to change classification; feelings about the appeals process; Academic Staff are typically not converted to faculty even if they are good at their job; and comments regarding making it easier for LTE's to become permanent staff. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ I think there is at least a perception of classified that cuts are always at that level, and the administrators you talk about, it never happens at the administrators level. I don't know that to be true, I have not experienced that, but I think that is a perception ▪ We have a policy of not converting academic staff to faculty. Even when there's a position open. |
| Tenured faculty get away with everything; just going through the motions | 6 | Includes comments regarding feelings that tenured faculty can get away with anything; that there should not be a tenure track because there should not be any employee that cannot be fired; tenured faculty often teach material that is out of date; tenure often promotes faculty to look toward retirement and not increase knowledge. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ That's the difference between a tenured faculty member that's ah, putting golf balls in the hall, and then you've got the drones that are hard at work, chain themselves to their desks and eat their lunch there. ▪ I don't really agree with the whole tenure situation, but that's because it its holding on to people who are not, I guess giving the students enough or what they need. And kind of, um not letting the new, fresh people with new ideas and you know, who are a little more driven, in to teach. |

| <i>Identified by</i> | <i>Frequency</i> | <i>Comment Summary</i> | <i>Examples</i> |
|---|------------------|---|---|
| Evaluation process needs to be improved | 4 | Includes comments regarding not having a clear sense of knowing if you are doing your job well. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ But then going through the review process with the personnel committee it doesn't seem like, it doesn't seem like that holds any weight. ▪ There is almost this fear going into that process of, you know, will we be renewed, or will we be promoted? |
| Recruitment process takes too long | 4 | Includes comments regarding how the best candidates are often lost because of the length of the hiring process. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Takes a long time and you lose some good people. I know I've, in the last xxx years I've been through xxx hiring processes and xxx processes I lost my number one and two people because it takes so long. ▪ Make things/processes work faster (it shouldn't take 8 months to hire a faculty member) |

Table 7. Most Common Themes: Relationships of Faculty, Staff and Students

| <i>Identified by</i> | <i>Frequency</i> | <i>Comment Summary</i> | <i>Examples</i> |
|---------------------------------|------------------|---|--|
| Enjoy working with the students | 44 | Most satisfying part of the job is being able to work with the students at UW-Stout. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ I love working with the students. ▪ And um, the students are really great, um, for some reason the students that we attract are all really fun to work with and, um, incredibly intelligent. |
| Making an impact | 22 | Enjoy making an impact on students' lives; enjoy helping the students to learn; enjoy knowing that they make a difference in the students' lives. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ So I like to see students that come in and hate the subject matter to begin with just at the end of the semester say, "oh yeah, now I see where this is really useful." There are little light bulbs coming on and they're getting it... ▪ So there is a general satisfaction just being able to help them through their problems and their development. |
| Personal contact | 12 | Enjoy having personal or one-on-one contact with the students; this includes staying in touch after graduation, and being available for students outside of the classroom. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ I think most of the students in our program know that I'm here to assist and help in any way I can and that kind of the way to look at it. I'm not just here to show up and walk into a classroom and then leave. I'm here to you know, students call me or they call me at home or whatever, I'm there to help them out. ▪ And ah, I think, you know, for me its probably the students more so than the colleagues that I work with because I see that maturity and I stay in touch with them, and I've got students that are working, you know, literally all over the United States some internationally now, and I have stayed in touch |
| Feedback from students | 7 | Appreciate receiving feedback from students regarding their experiences in their classes at UW-Stout, this feedback was via telephone, letters and email. Some feedback was immediate, while others occurred after several years. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Getting emails or comments from students saying I've made a difference in their lives. ▪ And, and um, you know, there was a group of young women who were having an especially hard time and at the end of the semester they wrote me a letter saying, you know, it was really great having you as a teacher and you made it really easy to understand. So that's that was |

| | | | |
|----------------------|---|---|--|
| | | | incredibly satisfying. |
| Appreciate me | 6 | Students express their appreciation of me and the work that I do here at UW-Stout. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ students are always very appreciative when I figure out their xxx problems or having problems their xxx. A lot of people say thank you. ▪ ...when students show appreciation/thanks for the work you do for them |
| Lack of relationship | 3 | Would like to be able to develop relationships with students but lack either the time, or don't have enough contact | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ You know here you see the kids twice a week for a semester and then you know develop a likeness for certain ones but then you never see them again. And that's kind of a difficult thing ▪ I like to work with students. And I don't work with students at all. |
| Salary | 2 | Students are paying the faculty/staff salaries. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ But, and then it's always the kids coming back and saying well it's my wages going to pay your salaries |

Table 8. Most Common Themes: Relationships of Faculty, Staff and Department

| <i>Identified by</i> | <i>Frequency</i> | <i>Comment Summary</i> | <i>Examples</i> |
|----------------------|------------------|---|--|
| People | 53 | People are nice, friendly, good, and helpful. Enjoy working with people, like working with people. People are in bad moods, are difficult to work with, are unhelpful, and are a poor work relational match; people cause trouble for others. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ I really like the people I am working with. ▪ Well on the days that their having their little fits, you just avoid them like the plague (laughing). So then you can't talk to them and you have to try and work around them. And then wait for a better day if you need to ask them something. Makes it hard. |
| Environment | 51 | Overall the environment is good or nice; a collegial and/or supportive atmosphere; people are willing to help; the environment is cohesive and welcoming. People spend time talking to each other; feeling of camaraderie; comfortable. We work to "stay ahead of the game"; good learning environment. Like working in groups; there are opportunities for growth; atmosphere of fun; dedication to excellence. Lack of helpfulness and support; lack of flexibility; lack of enthusiasm due to heavy work load; hostile and/or unfriendly work environment; feeling unwelcome; need better relationships. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Anyways, I think that my job satisfaction is so high is that people are really supportive here of each other and I think it's very sincere. It's just a great environment to work in with people. There is a lot of support and not a lot of competition among people, which is certainly the case in other places. ▪ There is this expectation that you give and give and give and when you need some flexibility it isn't always there. That really kind of altered my thinking on this campus. |
| Communications | 32 | Good interactions with colleagues; enjoyable interactions with people; able to ask questions; people are responsive to inquiries; good processes for conflict resolution. Be able to and/or is important to get to know others outside of the work situation. Be helpful to know and understand others personality types/style. Poor or no communications; need to include all in the process (including part-time staff); little or no responsiveness to inquiries; no good process for conflict resolution. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Locally, my colleagues are happy with all of our daily interactions. People don't complain too much. Just the "good busyness" complaints. ▪ ...another thing that wouldn't be a bad idea is doing the personality tests. You know within working groups. So that people would more understand each others personalities or just things to help with communication and you know that would help with morale and attitude... |

| <i>Identified by</i> | <i>Frequency</i> | <i>Comment Summary</i> | <i>Examples</i> |
|------------------------|------------------|--|--|
| Team work | 14 | People work well together; strong feelings of teamwork. There is no sense of teamwork; there is no actual team work. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ ...I like the people I work with and we work well as a team, the team just changes often enough that you need to keep on top of who knows what. ▪ Most of us work pretty much as a team and I think that's huge in the kind of business that we are involved in, you need to rely on them for resources and that kind of stuff. |
| Contact with others | 7 | Enjoy having contact with others; enjoy the process of interacting with others; intermingling with others. Work hours make contact difficult. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ I like being the center; everybody comes to me... ▪ mostly my interactions with peers is popping in at about this time of day to get things from secretaries, get my mail, you know, get the buzz of what's going on for a couple minutes and going off and teaching |
| Treatment of/by others | 6 | Colleagues treated and thought of as competent; treated with respect in general; treated with respect regarding work hours – not 'watching the clock'; treated like an adult. Treated poorly, lack of respect; lack of confidence in personal skills and abilities. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ ...it's not just the people in your department but it's across campus, they believe that their colleagues are competent and they can do those things... ▪ Except for when the people who have a bad day they start swearing at you they don't do anything about it. |

Table 9. Most Common Themes: Compensation

| <i>Identified by</i> | <i>Frequency</i> | <i>Comment Summary</i> | <i>Examples</i> |
|--------------------------|------------------|---|---|
| Comparative salary/wages | 38 | Includes comments regarding comparative wages in reference to peers at other universities, students at this university, and other departments within this university, such as the hard sciences; faculty members overloading classes to increase their wages; feelings that the University cannot attract above average employees with below average wages; summer pay being cut; qualifications vary by department for what consists of credit hours, which effects pay; and the issue of some employees have raises guaranteed while others typically get no raise. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ I just wish I got paid better. One gripe that I do have that in one of the departments there's students that get paid better than I do to work in the lab and I just think that's ridiculous. You know, these students are just undergrad students are getting paid \$10/hr, it's just, you know, I don't think that's fair. ▪ That people working here have a real concern with the amount of money they are making as related to the expectations that they have, that they work very hard. And they are not seeing some of the raises that staying in education you are not going to make the money that you do somewhere else. |
| Benefits | 32 | Includes comments regarding how participants feel about their benefits package or lack thereof; not making enough to cover benefits, since premium payment increases; having to wait for 6 months for insurance to kick in; feeling that it is not fair that some employees do not have paid time off, holidays, sick leave, etc; and comments regarding having good retirement packages if you have | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ It's been difficult because I don't have any health care, and I have to wait a year of being an LTE to get health care, that is unnerving. I am older...stuff happens. And now I can't afford to go to a doctor. So I have to scramble to find some way to manage when I get a migraine or something ▪ They were wonderful workers, but ah, you know, that was their reasoning to stay here, was to get to be a full-time employee with the benefits. As the benefits just aren't right for an LTE. You don't get health insurance and retirement and that's the main reason they come down here to try and get a job, because of good benefits. |

| <i>Identified by</i> | <i>Frequency</i> | <i>Comment Summary</i> | <i>Examples</i> |
|---------------------------|------------------|--|---|
| | | been here a long time. | |
| Raises | 24 | Includes comments regarding raises and the lack there of for many; feelings that unclassified employees are promised raises, while others do not get raises at all; feelings that the lack of retention is due to low compensation; and the lack of raises in accordance with living costs leads to stress for many employees. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ It's not very fun trying to live on little piddly raises they give us and what's extra frustrating is the fact that the chancellor got mega raise, the unclassified always get at least 4% every year. No matter what. They get their raises why do we have to fight so hard to get a piddly few cents? It's ridiculous. How come there's always money for them in the budget? I find that very irritating. ▪ If I had a wand to wave I would give everybody pay increases. That's the number one thing that people complain about the most. |
| Unions/civil service | 16 | Includes comments regarding employees' feelings toward their representation by the union; feelings that the union may not be ethical or honest in their representation; that contracts often take too long to settle; and the union often protects bad employees. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ I think a lot of people like working here, they're just frustrated with the pay and how long it takes to settle contracts and why we have to fight so hard for everything we get when the unclassified just get handed their raises every year without a fight. ▪ There is so much hand tying with the tenured faculty and the classified being protected by the union. It is like job performance doesn't even play into it and it is frustrating, |
| Raises for Administration | 7 | Includes comments regarding feelings that the Chancellor and upper administration often get large raises during budget crises, while others get none and feelings regarding this lack of equality. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ I also think the raises at the top diminish morale. I think they are treating their chancellors across the board like they are CEO's of private businesses, when they are not. They are in education. This is a non-profit organization and we're education. We are not private business ▪ An administrator, they can give money to keep them here. That has happened too at times when the rest of campus can't seem to get their raise. They can give someone else a bump in salary to keep them here. |

| <i>Identified by</i> | <i>Frequency</i> | <i>Comment Summary</i> | <i>Examples</i> |
|----------------------|------------------|--|--|
| Merit pay | 3 | Includes comments regarding feelings toward the merit based pay system and equity, and the feeling that pay raises should be based on performance. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The system, and another way to look at it is that lets say you have 2 employees, both, one employee, lets say one employee has been here ** years and one has been here ** years, do the same job, roughly speaking they're both going to be paid about the same. If the one that's been here ** years, chances are he or she is going to be kind of a go getter, all fired up, and there's no way of really rewarding that person's hard work. The one here that's ** years, maybe that person has gotten into a rut, doesn't do the job that they should be doing and there is really no way of disciplining the person that's been here ** years. So, you've got the one here that's ** years, a go getter, and the ** years, definitely not a go getter, where do you think the one that's going to be here, that's here ** years, where do you think he's going to be in **years? ▪ Be more performance related. Is that what everybody feels? It seems right. |

Table 10. Most Common Themes: Physical Facilities -- Offices

| <i>Identified by</i> | <i>Frequency</i> | <i>Comment Summary</i> | <i>Examples</i> |
|-------------------------|------------------|---|---|
| Atmosphere | 26 | Overall feeling of buildings and furnishings being outdated and uncared for. Crowded; don't like having to share; too cold; too noisy. Stout does a good job of keeping things updated. Like sharing and being interactive; comfortable; bright and airy; clean; nice office; wonderful building. Physical surroundings not important. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ I guess one thing on the environment, it's...it is noisy. It's like a...it is noisy in my room so sometimes I have to close my door ▪ Well, I'm very comfortable in my office. I enjoy my office very much |
| Equipment & Maintenance | 24 | Need new computer, upgraded computer, choice of computer; Need new chair, office equipment. Stout does a good job of keeping technology updated. Keep furnishings kept up and professional looking – need to do a better job and Stout does a good job. Keep equipment updated/upgraded –need to do a better job and Stout does a good job. Deal with the mold in buildings -- need to do a better job and Stout does a good job. Need enough money for upgrades. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ ...but I think continuing to improve, and sometimes it is just a paint job, or sometimes it is just new carpet, or a new desk or something like that. But looking at people that work here, making their office an environment, I think more livable and more pleasant would make a difference. ▪ My ideal work environment, well physically I think I've pretty much got it. Stout does a nice job of keeping up on things, you know, buildings are in decent shape, I feel safe... |
| Size | 21 | Need more room/space to work; easier to be organized with more space; have no privacy; need a conference room for meetings. Need bigger buildings on campus; need more buildings on campus. Have enough room/space. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ There needs to be more buildings, office space, something needs to give, the offices are very crowded in certain areas. ▪ The current work environment in our office is um lack of space is a huge issue. We have no privacy. We have four cubicles in one open area we deal with a lot of confidentiality and students' one on one so it becomes very awkward when there is an issue that you want to deal with because you know the walls do not even go to the ceiling.... |

| <i>Identified by</i> | <i>Frequency</i> | <i>Comment Summary</i> | <i>Examples</i> |
|----------------------|------------------|---|--|
| Window | 19 | Want a window; need light to be happy/work better. Have a window and enjoy it. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ I, like many of my colleagues, have spent my entire career here in a windowless office. ▪ I have a view which I have never had before, so even though this office is small this is superior to what I had. |
| Own space/office | 13 | Want own space/office. Need own space/office for confidentiality; need appropriate/adequate space for working, to promote a better work environment; create a more inviting atmosphere for others. Like having own space. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ If I had my own office it'd be great (laughing). ▪ I think personal space for individuals who are teaching, so that there are places for their materials, a place where you can meet confidentially with students that would be a real issue. |
| Space utilization | 9 | Use currently unused space better; re-allocate unused spaces faster; consolidate departments so not so spread out; get rid of unused files, etc to free up more space; have current space rearranged. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ I would like to be able to interact more with people in her dept. would be nice if they were all in the same building and not spread out across campus. ▪ Well there's always this, if you're not using that room, we'll take it. |
| Location | 5 | Move the campus away from center of town; have better and less expensive parking. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Wouldn't that have been nice to have everything on campus instead of all over town and no parking? ▪ Parking and associated fees |

Table 11. Most Common Themes: Public Perception of own job and others' jobs

| <i>Identified by</i> | <i>Frequency</i> | <i>Comment Summary</i> | <i>Examples</i> |
|--|------------------|--|--|
| What I perceive others' morale at UW-Stout to be | 47 | Participants seemed to know how a lot about the morale of other people on campus, and for the most part expressed that their morale was better than most other people's. Some people expressed positive feeling about morale, and felt it was higher than it used to be. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ I only know about my little corner of it, and I would say fairly positive. People like each other, people want, you know, they know people's shortcomings but they don't elaborate on them. ▪ Some of the faculty morale I know there's times us in the xxx think they're a bunch of whiners. And don't have a whole lot of sympathy for them. Everyone thinks they're over worked. And I look at them coming on to campus two/three days a week, I mean they may be working at home more than forty hours but they get to work at home. I don't have a lot of sympathy |
| What I perceive others' value to be to UW-Stout | 35 | Participants offered information about the workload of other people at UW-Stout, and how it compared to what they felt their own workload to be, and comparative salaries for that work. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ And I'm not saying, you know, that we're the only hard working people on campus but, um, so I think that, you know, we see that and it's like, well why are we working so hard if nobody, not nobody but, if all these other people aren't working quite as hard. ▪ And I think that's the thing that effects morale more than anything is the relationships that people have with other people they are working with, it's that feeling of I am doing more work than that person is, why is that happening? |
| What I perceive public perception of working at UW-Stout to be | 5 | How participants felt working at UW-Stout was viewed by the public at large. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Also all of the negatives from society because I don't think that higher education are valued like it should be in society ▪ But the general concept outside the, in the Menomonie community isn't very good about us, that's what gets me down. |
| What I perceive my value to be to UW-Stout | 2 | Participants compared their productivity and compensation to that of others. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ I will say this about myself, I think each of us tend to value our own work maybe a little bit more than reality. ▪ So, it's not right to judge people by what it appears they do, but sometimes you can't help from doing that sometimes. Well, that person makes way too much money, and I don't make enough. It's just a human response. |

Facilitator/Recorder Observations

The facilitators, assistant facilitators and BPA office met regularly throughout the data collection period to discuss how the project was going and any changes that needed to be made. A summary of the comments from the facilitators can be found in Appendix C. This section of the report describes some of the observations that were not captured as part of the transcriptions but were observed by the facilitators and assistants.

Facilitators noted significant concerns regarding confidentiality from the participants. Some were reluctant to provide specific examples for fear of being identified. Several commented during the middle of the sessions that “this will identify me.” Many felt more comfortable speaking in a one-on-one interview because of confidentiality concerns. Concerns were partially alleviated when the facilitators explained the process for how their confidentiality would be maintained.

Some participants reported that their primary concern was not confidentiality, but whether or not the results would be used. One person who filled out a comment card said “surprise me, do something with these results.” Participants wanted to know that the time they spent providing their input would be time well spent. Whether or not the results from the focus groups would be used was a significant concern.

Nearly all of the focus groups took the full 1.5 hours. Facilitators felt that some groups would have continued discussing for much longer if they had the time. The interviews took less time, but some took more than an hour. Participants had a lot to say about morale and job satisfaction. Many appreciated the opportunity to provide input.

The facilitators felt that the participants had some concerns with the questions being asked in the focus groups. They found it difficult to identify their most important concerns or solutions. Instead, they felt that all of their concerns were important and all should be addressed. They also found it difficult to come up with suggestions for what they could do as an individual to improve their situation. They also felt that all of their concerns needed to be heard, even if they were only voiced by a small number of people. Some asked questions about if their concerns had been brought up in other groups. (The “small themes” section in the report is intended to address this concern.)

The participants had many comments about the focus group process. Many were appreciative that graduate students were doing the facilitation. Others felt that a consulting group should have been hired. Many liked the focus group format, but others preferred a survey. Some were concerned that 100 people was not enough to draw conclusions. Others felt that 100 was sufficient. Some felt that all data collection should have been done via one-on-one interviews and some felt that all data collection should have been done in a group format. Most of the comments about the process were positive.

The facilitators noted that participants brought up many issues that they felt needed to be addressed with regard to their morale and job satisfaction. However, they also noted that

most participants reported their job satisfaction as being very high, despite these concerns.

Appendix A. Focus Group/Interview Proposal
Presented by the Morale Survey Revision Task Force

Members:

| | |
|-----------------------|--------------|
| Meridith Wentz, chair | Bob Johnson |
| Susan Collie | James Tan |
| Tammy Cutsforth | Holly Teuber |
| Kari Dahl | Joan Thomas |
| Woody Haid | Donna Weber |

Problem:

Surveys indicate that employee morale has declined at UW-Stout over the past several years.

Approach and Rationale:

The group was charged to develop a proposal for conducting focus groups to determine why morale is declining and what we can do about it. The group considered exploring the following issues:

- Morale
- Culture
- Climate
- Job Satisfaction
- Commitment
- Engagement

...and decided to focus exclusively on job satisfaction, with the understanding that job satisfaction is something that the university can have some control over. Furthermore, focusing on one issue made the project more manageable for a one semester project. A combination of focus groups and interviews will be conducted to collect information on job satisfaction.

Definition of job satisfaction for this study:

A pleasurable or positive emotional state resulting from the appraisal of one's job or job experiences." (p. 1300)*

Purpose of the focus groups/interviews:

To improve job satisfaction for employees at UW-Stout through involvement in the improvement process

End goal:

To have employees tell the university how to improve job satisfaction and participate in the implementation of improvement strategies

Questions to be asked in the focus group:

An appreciative inquiry approach to asking questions will be utilized. Specific questions have yet to be determined, but they will revolve around these issues:

- Reflect back on the past
- Discuss the present
- Think ahead to the future, dream big
- How do we get to where you want to go?

Process:

Stratified random selection process, with 5 or 6 groups:

- Faculty
- Instructional Academic Staff
- Non-instructional academic staff
- Classified staff (possibly split into 2 groups)
- LTE

Utilizing a random sample process will ensure that individuals from all colleges/schools/units will be selected. The goal is to include 100 faculty/staff in the data collection process. Each person who is randomly selected will have the option to participate in a 1:1 interview or a focus group.

Training will be provided as to the appropriate questions to use in an Appreciative inquiry session, confidentiality, how to listen without judgment, how to take field notes, and how to conduct interviews and focus groups

Each session facilitated by one graduate student and assisted by one graduate student, and tape recorded. No administrators will be in the room.

Funding needs:

| | |
|---|---------------|
| 1 hour training session with graduate students about focus group facilitation and recording (6 students, \$14.92/hr) | \$90 |
| Graduate students to call focus group participants, facilitate and assist with focus group sessions and/or interview, send reminders (2 students per session, \$14.92/hour) | \$1500 |
| Undergraduate students to transcribe focus group discussion to written form (33 hours of tape, 3 hours to transcribe 1 hour of tape, \$9.00/hr) | \$890 |
| Graduate students to assist with qualitative analysis of transcriptions (20 hours, \$14.92/hour) | \$300 |
| Incentive per person for participation (100 people) | \$1500 |
| TOTAL | \$4280 |

Timeline:

- Dec 19: proposal presented to CAC
- Early January: development of focus group questions
- Late January: solicit participation in the focus groups
- Feb/March: hold focus groups/interviews
- April: analysis of focus group/interview results

- April/May: prepare report

**Locke, E. A. (1976). The nature and causes of job satisfaction. In M. D. Dunnette (Ed.), Handbook of industrial and organizational psychology (pp. 1297-1349). Chicago, IL: Rand McNally College Publishing Company.*

Appendix B. Morale Survey Revision Task Force Focus group/interview questions

PRESENT

- Tell us about two of your most important current job responsibilities at UW-Stout (*this will serve as the warm-up question, answered round robin*)
- Tell us about your current work environment (*prompt: Physical facilities? interactions with others? Culture? Feelings about your work environment?*)
- What is most satisfying about your current job?

FUTURE

- Thinking ahead to the future, describe your ideal work environment at UW-Stout. (*prompt: work environment could include job responsibilities*)
- Reflecting on the ideas you just described, which of these aspects would have the greatest positive impact on your job satisfaction at UW-Stout?

ACTIONS

- What can you do, individually, to make your ideal scenario a reality? (*this question is getting at the Chancellor's request to look at the role of personal responsibility in job satisfaction/morale*)
- Suppose you had the power to initiate changes at UW-Stout, what would you do?
- Reflecting on the changes you just proposed, which of these changes would have the greatest positive impact on your job satisfaction at UW-Stout?

PAST

- Generally speaking, how satisfied are you working at UW-Stout? (*prompt: why? Provide specific examples*)
- What are your perceptions of campus morale? (*prompt: why? Provide specific examples*)

ENDING

- Of all the things we discussed today, what to you is the most important?
- Do you have any additional comments? (*answered round robin*)

A comment card will also be handed out. It will ask for “additional comments” and it will also list which group the person is in (ex: faculty, academic staff, classified, LTE). The cards will also contain information about where to return the completed card. Participants can either fill them out during the focus group or take them back to their offices and return them later to the BPA office.

Appendix C. Comments from facilitators/assistant facilitators about the morale/job satisfaction focus group/interview process:

General comments about the participants:

- Most were passionate about working at Stout—had strong feelings for why they worked at Stout
- Most participants enjoyed being part of this process and were glad they were asked to participate—so long as the information they provided was used to initiate change. The Chancellor must really be concerned about this issue if he is going to all this work to collect these data
- Most participants were honored that they would receive a copy of the report personally
- Participants were pleased with the way the groups were run and the skills of the facilitators/assistant facilitators. They received many compliments.

The biggest concern across all groups was that their input is/was not used in any meaningful way

- They challenged us to implement some of the findings from this project—their participation is meaningless unless there are actions to follow
- They feel that Stout asks for input, but we don't really want to hear what they have to say—suggestions are ignored and decisions have already been made before we ask for input

Committees:

- Committees have the potential to be a valuable resource for Stout. It is an opportunity for Stout to tap into the expertise of the campus. Faculty/staff felt passionate about wanting to be asked for input and want to be used as a resource. They have a lot of valuable experience to offer. Why don't we ever tap into their expertise? They need to be recognized—this was a major issue
- The process breaks down after they submit their report—no changes are made as a result of the report. As a result, they feel like these committees are a waste of their time. Why do you ask for my input if you don't do anything with it? These committees are formed only so that the administration can feel good about what they are doing.

Confidentiality:

- Confidentiality was a big concern across all focus groups. People were concerned that they could be personally identified. They were concerned that their transcripts would be released. They were concerned that the Chancellor would see who participated.
- Much of the concern was alleviated when the facilitators explained how we were protecting their confidentiality. They wished this information was explained in more detail up-front to them when people called asking for their participation.
- A recommendation for improvement is to provide more detailed information about confidentiality in phone conversations and emails to the participants before they show up for the focus group
- Some groups suggested that these focus groups should be done by an outside group. It was not clear if they felt that an outside group would do a better job with confidentiality or if the issue was that they didn't trust Stout.

- There was some reluctance on the part of the participants to provide detailed information about some issues because of confidentiality concerns. The facilitators felt though that the participants were honest on their responses. The problem was only for some people and only on some issues—where they didn't provide enough detailed information for us to understand the issue in enough depth.

Some participants expressed concern that their suggestion would not be heard if it did not surface as a “theme.” They asked questions about if other people had mentioned their suggestions because they wanted to know if enough people brought it up for it to be considered a theme. Suggestions should be reported even if only one person made them.

There were differences in responses between people who had business/industry experience and those who did not. Those with business/industry experience usually had more suggestions about what Stout could do differently. Those without Stout experience typically provided few suggestions for addressing their concerns.

There were also differences by length of time at Stout. People who are new to Stout are generally more satisfied than people who have been at Stout a long time.

Processes:

- Stout's processes and procedures take too long. We need to move quicker and operate on more of a business/industry model. We should seek assistance from the faculty/staff with business/industry experience in adopting better processes and procedures.
- There is too much bureaucracy
- We need a flatter organizational structure

Hiring, turnover, retention

- These were major issues
- We should not require PhD's for faculty positions—we need people instead with business/industry experience.

We provide funding for professional development but there is no funding to implement the things we learn from professional development opportunities

There were lots of different concerns by department. Results need to be broken out by department in some cases to be meaningful (*note from Meridith—we can't break out by department*)

Faculty/staff want more opportunities to get to know others from outside of their department. We need to be more collaborative.

Public perceptions:

- The public perception of Stout is different from what Stout really is. Public expectations are too high—it's really not as good as they say it is

Polytechnic:

- The process was too rushed—we need a lot more information before a decision can be made
- We asked for input from the campus, but we don't really want that input—the decision has already been made

There was a lot of mixed feedback about the Chancellor—administration is to blame for the problems the campus is experiencing.

What they would do differently next time:

- Give the participants more clarity on the process
- Do interviews only (no groups)
- Split up the groups by length of time at UW-Stout
- Revise the questions—don't ask them what's most important—they see this as redundant