

Appendix E

Ad Hoc Committee on Faculty Retention and Recruitment

Quantitative Survey

March 8, 2006—March 22, 2006

Introduction:

The following information tables are the results from the Arts and Sciences Retention Survey. 105 tenure-track or tenured CAS faculty responded to the survey (one more answered only the first question, which represents a 53.3% response rate). It consists of counts or mean values calculated from the faculty responses to questions posed on the online survey. Included are the comments received from faculty responding to the open-ended invitation to provide other specific recommendations. The information for the tables and comments was supplied by Lisa Lewis and Teri Peterson.

Additionally, the data from the survey was analyzed with the help of Teri Peterson, the statistical consultant for the campus, in an effort to identify significant differences between the mean values calculated from various faculty groups identified by the demographic data. A statistical test value called the asymptotic significance value was calculated for each of the subheadings in the questions regarding satisfaction, dissatisfaction, and recommendations for four demographic groups: gender, subject area grouping, years at ISU, and rank. This information follows the section on specific recommendations.

Generally a asymptotic significance test value above 0.10 means that there is **not** a statistically significant difference in the mean values calculated for the various members of a particular grouping and a value of 0.10 or less means that there is a statistical difference in the mean values. For example under Question #8, the overall mean value, the mean value calculated from responses from male faculty, the mean value calculated from responses from female faculty, and the asymptotic significance test value were calculated for the subheading “Enhance Campus Planning and Design”

Mean Value	Male	Female	Asymp. Sig.
2.9	3.1	2.6	0.06

Here the value of 0.06 indicates that there is a significant difference between the mean value of 3.1 calculated from male faculty respondents and the value of 2.6 calculated from the female faculty respondents.

In the tabulated information presented here, cases where the significance test value was less than or equal to 0.1 are highlighted for your convenience. High values of the significance test are potentially of interest as well, but were not highlighted. Much appreciation should be given to Lisa Lewis, Teri Peterson, and Michael Spall for their gracious help.

Numerical Results from the Arts and Sciences Survey

<u>1. College</u>	<u># of Responses</u>	<u>% of Responses</u>
Arts and Sciences	107*	99
Business		
Education		
Engineering		
Health Professions		
Pharmacy	1**	1**
Technology		

* 107 faculty from Arts and Sciences responded, one answered only the 1st question.

** The data from this faculty member was not included in the rest of the results.

2. Gender

Male	73	68.9
Female	33	31.1

3. What is your position?

Full Professor	39	36.4
Associate Professor	23	21.5
Assistant Professor	43	40.2
Instructor (Non-tenure track)	1	0.9
Administrator	*4	*3.7
Clinical Professor	0	0
Research Professor	0	0

* Administrators also checked one of the Professor Boxes. Not included twice in the totals or percentages.

<u>4. Years at ISU</u>	<u># of Responses</u>	<u>% of Responses</u>
1-3	28	26.4
4-6	26	24.5
7-9	9	8.5
10-15	17	16.0
More than 15	26	24.5

5. Area/Dept. in Arts and Science

Art and pre-architecture, Music, Theatre and Dance	10	9.4
Anthropology, Economics, Museum, Military Science, Political Science, Psychology, Sociology, Social Work, Criminal Justice	19	17.9

Biological Sciences, Chemistry, Geosciences, Math, Physics	51	48.1
---	----	------

Mass Comm., Foreign Languages, History, English and Philosophy, Comm. and Rhetorical Studies	26	24.5
--	----	------

6. Influences on Current Satisfaction mean value (1 not at all - 5 critical)

Quality of Colleagues	4.3
Outdoor Opportunities	3.4
Location of ISU	3.4
Job Autonomy and Flexibility	4.3
Programs and Facilities	3.5
“Turning the Corner” Perception	3.2

7. Influences on Current Dissatisfaction mean value (1 not at all - 5 critical)

Low Salaries	4.1
Administrative Interaction	3.5
Unrealistic Workloads	3.5
Unequal Workloads	3.1
Lack of Experience of Admin	2.8
Inadequate Support for Travel	3.3
Lack of Univ. Community	3.5
Under-prepared Undergrads	3.5
Poor Faculty Benefit Quality	3.4
ISU and Community Disconnected	2.7
Poor Campus Planning and Design	2.5
Faculty Achievement not Recognized	3.4
Poor Classroom Facilities	3.3

8. Importance of Addressing Recommend mean value (1 not at all - 5 critical)

Provide Factual Information	3.6
Culture of Engaged and Motivated Faculty	4.2
Culture of Recognition of Achievement	3.8
Attract More Highly-Qualified Students	3.6
Enhance the Quality of Student Body	3.9
Admin and Faculty Communication	3.8
Showcase Faculty Achievements	3.4
Opportunity for Chair Leader Training	3.2
Administrators Have Credentials	3.5
Faculty Leadership/Professional Training	3.3
Enhance Teaching & Research Infrastructure	4.0
Enhance Campus Planning and Design	2.9
Promote Inter-dept. Interactions	3.1
Provide Meaningful Merit-based Pay	4.2
Enhance Quality of Faculty Benefits	4.1

Create Fair/Flexible Workload Policy	3.7
Provide Policy for Personal Leave	3.2
Strategy for Benefits to Domestic Partners	3.3
Tuition Benefits for Faculty Dependents	3.6
Recognize Community-based Participation	2.7
Achieve 100% of National Mean Salary	4.5
Provide Resources for Professional Expenses	3.9
Coordinate Partner Accommodation	3.0

9. Select 5 High Priority Recommendations # selected % faculty selecting it

Provide Factual Info about State of ISU	5	4.7
Nurture Engaged and Motivated Faculty	45	42.1
Nurture Faculty Achievement Recognition	17	15.9
Attract More Highly-qualified Students	22	20.6
Enhance Quality of Student Body	36	33.6
Admin and Faculty Communication	25	23.4
Showcase Faculty Accomplishments	6	5.6
Faculty Development/Leader Opportunities	14	13.1
Chair Development/Leader Opportunities	4	3.7
Admin Have Appropriate Credentials	12	11.2
Enhance Teaching/Research Infrastructure	45	42.1
Enhance Planning and Design of the Campus	4	3.7
Promote Interdepartmental Interactions	4	3.7
Provide Meaningful Merit-based Pay	45	42.1
Enhance Quality of Faculty Benefits	41	38.3
Create Fair and Flexible Workload Document	33	30.8
Clear Policies for Family and Personal Leave	6	5.6
Clear Strategy for Domestic Partner Benefits	10	9.3
Tuition Benefits to Faculty Dependents	27	25.2
Recognition for Community-based Activities	4	3.7
Achieve 100% of the Mean of National Salaries	71	65.7
More Resource for Professional Travel/Expenses	30	27.8
Coordinate Partner Accommodation Efforts	4	3.7

Coordinated Results from Questions #8 and #9 Sorted by Response to Question #9

<u>9. Select 5 High Priority Recommendations</u>	<u># selected</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>mean from</u>
			<u>. #8</u>
Achieve 100% of the Mean of National Salaries	71	65.7	4.5
Nurture Engaged and Motivated Faculty	45	42.1	4.2
Enhance Teaching/Research Infrastructure	45	42.1	4
Provide Meaningful Merit-based Pay	45	42.1	4.2
Enhance Quality of Faculty Benefits	41	38.3	4.1
Enhance Quality of Student Body	36	33.6	3.9
Create Fair and Flexible Workload Document	33	30.8	3.7
More Resource for Professional Travel/Expenses	30	27.8	3.9

Tuition Benefits to Faculty Dependents	27	25.2	3.6
Admin and Faculty Communication	25	23.4	3.8
Attract More Highly-qualified Students	22	20.6	3.6
Nurture Faculty Achievement Recognition	17	15.9	3.8
Faculty Development/Leader Opportunities	14	13.1	3.3
Admin Have Appropriate Credentials	12	11.2	3.5
Clear Strategy for Domestic Partner Benefits	10	9.3	3.3
Showcase Faculty Accomplishments	6	5.6	3.4
Clear Policies for Family and Personal Leave	6	5.6	3.2
Provide Factual Info about State of ISU	5	4.7	3.6
Chair Development/Leader Opportunities	4	3.7	3.2
Enhance Planning and Design of the Campus	4	3.7	2.9
Promote Interdepartmental Interactions	4	3.7	3.1
Recognition for Community-based Activities	4	3.7	2.7
Coordinate Partner Accommodation Efforts	4	3.7	3

* Average Number of Picks based on 106 faculty respondents was 4.8. Also note that the ordering of Questions 8 and 9 was slightly different and this was accounted for here.

Coordinated Results from Questions #8 and #9 Sorted by Response to Question #8

<u>9. Select 5 High Priority Recommendations</u>	<u># selected</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>mean from #8</u>
Achieve 100% of the Mean of National Salaries	71	65.7	4.5
Nurture Engaged and Motivated Faculty	45	42.1	4.2
Provide Meaningful Merit-based Pay	45	42.1	4.2
Enhance Quality of Faculty Benefits	41	38.3	4.1
Enhance Teaching/Research Infrastructure	45	42.1	4
Enhance Quality of Student Body	36	33.6	3.9
More Resource for Professional Travel/Expenses	30	27.8	3.9
Nurture Faculty Achievement Recognition	17	15.9	3.8
Admin and Faculty Communication	25	23.4	3.8
Create Fair and Flexible Workload Document	33	30.8	3.7
Provide Factual Info about State of ISU	5	4.7	3.6
Attract More Highly-qualified Students	22	20.6	3.6
Tuition Benefits to Faculty Dependents	27	25.2	3.6
Admin Have Appropriate Credentials	12	11.2	3.5
Showcase Faculty Accomplishments	6	5.6	3.4
Faculty Development/Leader Opportunities	14	13.1	3.3
Clear Strategy for Domestic Partner Benefits	10	9.3	3.3
Chair Development/Leader Opportunities	4	3.7	3.2
Clear Policies for Family and Personal Leave	6	5.6	3.2
Promote Interdepartmental Interactions	4	3.7	3.1

Coordinate Partner Accommodation Efforts	4	3.7	3
Enhance Planning and Design of the Campus	4	3.7	2.9
Recognition for Community-based Activities	4	3.7	2.7

* Average Number of Picks based on 106 faculty respondents was 4.8. Also note that the ordering of Questions 8 and 9 was slightly different and this was accounted for here.

Specific Recommendations

Bring tenure and promotion guidelines within a level expected at peer departments (ours are uneven to embarrassingly low). Then, hold faculty to them, as and provide support for faculty's ability to meet meaningful T&P requirements. This would go well with the culture of recognition

Thank you for taking on these issues

I am leaving ISU:

- 1) A glaring lack of support for the creative disciplines.
- 2) Lack of forward and innovative thinking by administrators.
- 3) Forgotten the foundation of what "education" should be.

Make sure Vailas is given a copy of your final report: Highlight comments about administrative mediocrity and cronyism to ensure our house is cleaned.

It's not rocket science, better salaries go a long way!

Develop honest, competent administrators (chairs thru Pres.) with integrity. End administrator's ignorance and neglect of real problems in Art Dept. Make merit considerations less political. Subdivide A&S into College of Fin Arts with Art, Drama, Dance, Music, and Pre Arch.

More meaningful performance review for dept. chairs. Need regular and meaningful review for all Deans that includes faculty input and not just chair perspective.

I think developing a maternity leave policy for full-time faculty and staff is a priority.

Develop a culture nurturing incoming students from the beginning to the end, not one that is mostly deemed appropriate for a community college.

Thank you for accepting our input.

New hires at lower rank in my dept. with starting salaries greater than my own is intolerable.

Push for better K-12 public education in the state. This would help in student retention and reduce the need for two digit courses such as MATH 25 etc.

Major issues: no health care for the first three months. Lack of adequate family and personal leave accommodation.

Faculty are an important resource in improving the condition of A&S. Salaries are a key motivating factor. We cannot expect much from faculty given i) their low compensation, and ii) a pay structure that just does not promote quality teaching, research, commitment to improving A&S, or retention.

Parking at University Place should be free for faculty who teach there.

Continuing Dr. Gallagher's initiative to make administrative decisions transparent is crucial to ISU's current and future health. We all are hopeful that Dr. Vailas will do this.

We need more competitive salaries and meaningful raises, more affordable health care coverage, and tuition benefits for children. We also need to stop making new hires wait for their insurance benefits to kick in while they (and their families) go uninsured!

Thanks for doing this.

1. Didn't anybody mention the problem that Reed Gymnasium (clearly a benefit) is usually closed when anyone has time to use it?
2. Didn't anyone mention providing free parking for faculty?
3. Please don't use 'gender' when you mean 'sex'.

I believe John is going out if his way to do as much for Arts and Sciences as he can. Money is necessary to implement most of what faculty want and I don't believe a survey can help make things better.

Continued close communication between faculty and administration will solve a lot of our problems. This should start with the new president.

I think that Dean Kijinski is doing a great job. Terry Bowyer is an excellent chair for Biology. I think that Dean K and Terry are doing the best they can with what the state and higher admin. provide. Biology could do so much more with a few more resources, and not lose talented junior faculty.

Money talks, titles walk.

Demands/expectations for faculty to be promoted/tenured are unrealistic in some departments = poor teaching and graduate student advising. Pathetic senior faculty salaries and quality of undergraduate/Get serious about adopting entrance requirements/eliminate academically lazy athletes.

Create a climate that fuels change!

ISU must prove to the faculty that it has every intention of becoming a decent and respected university.

Greater support of graduate programs and graduate students are needed as the university increases its research mission. Better support and facilitation of grantsmanship and better organized administration of research budgets and activities.

Thank you for giving faculty this opportunity to express our concerns and hopefully to improve retention and the academic environment at ISU.

In order for ISU to be competitive in recruiting and retaining faculty, especially with our extremely low salaries, we need to reduce teaching loads, increase start-up packages, increase research support, and have a better dialogue with administration.

I would also add increasing the quality of the faculty benefits and a fair, clear balanced workload policy as priorities for the last list-, it was difficult to choose only 5.

ISU is not a satisfying place to work because it does not value or reward faculty effort and success. Hence, I now put little energy or meaning into promoting ISU and see it as a failing institution.

Not enough space

Lobby the public and inform them how poorly Idaho's educational system is supported by our elected officials.

None. This survey process has been, in my opinion very well-conceived, well-developed, and well executed. It has helped me feel that I do have a voice. Thank you!

Try to quit wasting good faculty on remediation courses.

Thank you for your serious consideration and showing concern for improving situation at ISU for faculty, students and administrators.

I don't believe the administration, which keeps espousing a research institution, has a realistic expectation of what it takes to build a research institution. We can't afford a medical school, let's just drop the idea.

This community lacks diversity in terms of business, culture, and population. ISU needs to make MUCH greater efforts to promote a culture of diversity as opposed to one of mediocrity, homogeneity, and cronyism.

I believe the role of our physical surroundings on campus is often underestimated in accountings of faculty satisfaction /dissatisfaction. In a relative sense, investing in landscaping is cheap and provides a pretty major morale boost.

Statistical Analysis of Results for Correlation to Demographic Information

Correlation of Gender to Question 6

6. Influences on Current Satisfaction	#	M	#	F	Mean Values		Test Statistic
					M	F	
Quality of Colleagues	73		33		4.3	4.1	0.28
Outdoor Opportunities	73		33		3.6	3.2	0.43
Location of ISU	73		33		3.4	3.5	0.81
Job Autonomy and Flexibility	72		33		4.3	4.1	0.47
Programs and Facilities	73		33		3.5	3.6	0.57
“Turning the Corner” Perception	73		33		3.2	3.2	0.94

7. Influences on Current Dissatisfaction	#	M	#	F	Mean Values		Asymp Sig
					M	F	
Low Salaries	73		33		4.2	4.0	0.40
Administrative Interaction	73		33		3.5	3.3	0.48
Unrealistic Workloads	73		33		3.4	3.8	0.10
Unequal Workloads	73		33		3.1	3.2	0.77
Lack of Experience of Admin	73		33		2.9	2.6	0.16
Inadequate Support for Travel	73		32		3.3	3.4	0.76
Lack of Univ. Community	72		32		3.5	3.4	0.66
Under-prepared Undergrads	73		33		3.5	3.5	0.90
Poor Faculty Benefit Quality	73		33		3.5	3.2	0.15
ISU and Community Disconnected	73		33		2.8	2.6	0.50
Poor Campus Planning and Design	72		33		2.6	2.2	0.19
Faculty Achievement not Recognized	71		33		3.5	3.3	0.38
Poor Classroom Facilities	72		33		3.1	3.7	0.04

8. Importance of Addressing Recommend	Mean Values:		Asymp Sig	
	M	F		
Provide Factual Information	3.6	3.6	3.7	0.63
Culture of Engaged and Motivated Faculty	4.2	4.1	4.4	0.18
Culture of Recognition of Achievement	3.8	3.8	3.8	0.81
Attract More Highly-Qualified Students	3.6	3.7	3.4	0.18
Enhance the Quality of Student Body	3.9	4.0	3.7	0.23
Admin and Faculty Communication	3.8	3.8	3.9	0.53

Showcase Faculty Achievements	3.4	3.4	3.3	0.91
Opportunity for Chair Leader Training	3.2	3.4	3.0	0.19
Administrators Have Credentials	3.5	3.5	3.6	0.61
Faculty Leadership/Professional Training	3.3	3.4	3.0	0.16
Enhance Teaching & Research Infrastructure	4.0	4.0	4.0	0.92
Enhance Campus Planning and Design	2.9	3.1	2.6	0.06
Promote Inter-dept. Interactions	3.1	3.1	3.0	0.84
Provide Meaningful Merit-based Pay	4.2	4.1	4.2	0.62
Enhance Quality of Faculty Benefits	4.1	4.1	4.0	0.92
Create Fair/Flexible Workload Policy	3.7	3.6	4.0	0.09
Provide Policy for Personal Leave	3.2	3.0	3.6	0.02
Strategy for Benefits to Domestic Partners	3.3	3.2	3.4	0.54
Tuition Benefits for Faculty Dependents	3.6	3.7	3.4	0.22
Recognize Community-based Participation	2.7	2.8	2.7	0.60
Achieve 100% of National Mean Salary	4.5	4.5	4.5	0.80
Provide Resources for Professional Expenses	3.9	3.9	4.1	0.38
Coordinate Partner Accommodation	3.0	3.0	3.0	0.93

Correlations Based on Area

Area 1: Art/pre-architecture, Music, Theatre, Dance

Area 2: Anthro, Econ, Museum, Miltry Sci, Pol. Sci, Psych, Sociol, Soc Work, Crim Just **Area**

3: Biological Sci., Chem., Geosci., Math, Physics

Area 4: Mass Comm, Foreign Lang, History, English, Philosophy, Comm, Rhetorical Std

6. Influences on Current Satisfaction	Mean Values by Area				Test Statistic
	1	2	3	4	
Quality of Colleagues	4.5	4.0	4.3	4.2	0.30
Outdoor Opportunities	2.6	3.5	3.8	3.2	0.01
Location of ISU	3.2	3.2	3.6	3.4	0.42
Job Autonomy and Flexibility	4.3	4.5	4.2	4.3	0.51
Programs and Facilities	4.5	3.6	3.5	3.2	0.01
“Turning the Corner” Perception	3.9	3.3	3.2	2.9	0.22

7. Influences on Current Dissatisfaction	Mean Values by Area				Test Statistic
	1	2	3	4	
Low Salaries	4.4	4.3	4.2	3.8	0.23
Administrative Interaction	3.4	3.2	3.7	3.2	0.28
Unrealistic Workloads	3.6	4.2	3.5	3.0	0.01
Unequal Workloads	3.8	3.0	3.2	2.8	0.26
Lack of Experience of Admin	2.3	2.4	3.2	2.5	0.02
Inadequate Support for Travel	2.4	3.6	3.1	3.7	0.05
Lack of Univ. Community	3.2	3.3	3.7	3.2	0.31
Under-prepared Undergrads	3.4	3.4	3.6	3.5	0.94
Poor Faculty Benefit Quality	2.9	3.3	3.6	3.3	0.37
ISU and Community Disconnected	2.8	2.8	2.9	2.3	0.31

Poor Campus Planning and Design	2.9	2.2	2.8	1.8	0.01
Faculty Achievement not Recognized	3.6	2.9	3.7	3.3	0.27
Poor Classroom Facilities	4.1	3.9	3.0	2.8	0.004

8. Importance to Address Recommend	1	2	3	4	Asymp Sig
Provide Factual Information	3.8	3.6	3.6	3.6	0.96
Culture of Engaged and Motivated Faculty	4.1	4.2	4.3	4.1	0.76
Culture of Recognition of Achievement	4.0	3.4	3.8	3.9	0.32
Attract More Highly-Qualified Students	3.8	3.5	3.8	3.3	0.39
Enhance the Quality of Student Body	4.1	3.7	3.9	3.8	0.79
Admin and Faculty Communication	4.1	3.7	3.9	3.7	0.44
Showcase Faculty Achievements	4.0	2.9	3.4	3.5	0.06
Opportunity for Chair Leader Training	3.6	3.2	3.2	3.2	0.74
Administrators Have Credentials	4.0	3.5	3.5	3.2	0.44
Faculty Leadership/Professional Training	3.7	3.3	3.3	3.0	0.47
Enhance Teaching & Research Infrastruct.	4.1	4.5	4.1	3.3	0.001
Enhance Campus Planning and Design	3.5	2.7	3.2	2.3	0.003
Promote Inter-dept. Interactions	3.2	2.8	3.2	3.0	0.40
Provide Meaningful Merit-based Pay	4.5	3.8	4.2	4.2	0.30
Enhance Quality of Faculty Benefits	4.3	4.2	4.0	3.9	0.79
Create Fair/Flexible Workload Policy	4.5	4.3	3.5	3.3	0.003
Provide Policy for Personal Leave	3.8	3.6	3.0	3.0	0.08
Strategy for Benefits to Domestic Partners	3.3	3.8	3.0	3.4	0.15
Tuition Benefits for Faculty Dependents	3.5	4.2	3.4	3.7	0.09
Recognize Community-based Participation	3.7	3.2	2.5	2.6	0.02
Achieve 100% of National Mean Salary	4.6	4.6	4.5	4.4	0.67
Provide Resources for Professional Expense	4.2	4.2	3.7	4.2	0.06
Coordinate Partner Accommodation	3.1	3.3	3.0	2.9	0.68

Correlations Based on Years at ISU

1: 1-3 2: 4-6 3: 7-9 4: 10-15 5: More than 15

6. Influences on Current Satisfaction	Mean Values by Years					Statistic
	1	2	3	4	5	Asymp Sig
Quality of Colleagues	4.3	4.3	4.6	4.1	4.2	0.62
Outdoor Opportunities	3.5	3.7	3.0	3.3	3.5	0.66
Location of ISU	3.3	3.6	3.4	3.3	3.5	0.73
Job Autonomy and Flexibility	4.2	4.3	4.1	4.2	4.5	0.60
Programs and Facilities	3.8	3.8	2.9	3.6	3.2	0.04
“Turning the Corner” Perception	3.8	3.3	3.3	3.2	2.5	0.01

7. Influences on Current Dissatisfaction	Mean Values by Years					Statistic
	1	2	3	4	5	Asymp Sig
Low Salaries	3.9	4.3	3.6	4.5	4.2	0.15
Administrative Interaction	3.3	3.7	2.9	3.5	3.6	0.59

Unrealistic Workloads	3.4	3.7	3.4	3.5	3.6	0.92
Unequal Workloads	3.2	3.2	3.4	3.2	2.8	0.63
Lack of Experience of Admin	2.7	2.7	2.7	2.9	3.0	0.84
Inadequate Support for Travel	3.1	3.2	3.0	3.6	3.5	0.68
Lack of Univ. Community	3.6	3.2	3.7	3.7	3.3	0.62
Under-prepared Undergrads	3.4	3.4	3.9	3.5	3.6	0.78
Poor Faculty Benefit Quality	3.1	3.8	3.1	3.4	3.5	0.18
ISU and Community Disconnected	2.7	2.8	3.0	2.6	2.6	0.88
Poor Campus Planning and Design	2.4	2.6	2.7	2.7	2.2	0.55
Faculty Achievement not Recognized	3.5	3.4	3.1	3.3	3.6	0.86
Poor Classroom Facilities	3.5	3.5	3.3	3.1	2.8	0.25

8. Importance to Address Recommend	1	2	3	4	5	Asymp Sig
Provide Factual Information	3.6	3.7	4.1	3.5	3.5	0.56
Culture of Engaged and Motivated Faculty	4.4	4.2	4.8	4.1	3.9	0.07
Culture of Recognition of Achievement	3.9	3.8	3.6	3.6	3.8	0.95
Attract More Highly-Qualified Students	4.2	3.3	3.8	3.4	3.5	0.07
Enhance the Quality of Student Body	4.0	3.8	4.0	3.7	3.9	0.91
Admin and Faculty Communication	3.6	4.0	4.3	3.6	3.9	0.32
Showcase Faculty Achievements	3.5	3.4	3.5	3.3	3.2	0.92
Opportunity for Chair Leader Training	3.0	3.3	4.0	3.2	3.2	0.38
Administrators Have Credentials	3.5	3.4	3.4	3.4	3.7	0.88
Faculty Leadership/Professional Training	3.3	3.2	2.9	3.5	3.4	0.79
Enhance Teaching & Research Infrastruct.	4.0	3.8	3.9	4.1	4.1	0.996
Enhance Campus Planning and Design	3.2	2.8	3.3	3.0	2.6	0.36
Promote Inter-dept. Interactions	3.0	3.3	3.1	3.0	2.9	0.77
Provide Meaningful Merit-based Pay	4.4	3.9	3.5	4.3	4.3	0.50
Enhance Quality of Faculty Benefits	3.8	4.5	3.4	4.4	3.9	0.08
Create Fair/Flexible Workload Policy	3.7	3.8	3.8	3.7	3.6	0.95
Provide Policy for Personal Leave	3.1	3.1	3.3	3.4	3.3	0.93
Strategy for Benefits to Domestic Partners	3.3	3.2	3.4	3.4	3.3	0.996
Tuition Benefits for Faculty Dependents	3.6	3.8	2.9	3.8	3.5	0.36
Recognize Community-based Participation	2.6	3.0	2.0	2.8	2.8	0.35
Achieve 100% of National Mean Salary	4.4	4.8	3.8	4.8	4.3	0.02
Provide Resources for Professional Expense	3.8	4.2	3.6	4.4	3.7	0.24
Coordinate Partner Accommodation	3.1	3.3	2.8	2.9	2.7	0.32

Correlations Based on rank at ISU

1: Instructor 2: Assistant Prof. 3: Assoc. Prof. 4: Full Prof.
 (only 1 response from instructor, not included in statistics)

6. Influences on Current Satisfaction	Mean Values by Rank				Test Statistic
	1	2	3	4	Asymp Sig
Quality of Colleagues	3.0	4.3	4.3	4.3	0.88
Outdoor Opportunities	1.0	3.4	3.6	3.5	0.53

Location of ISU	3.0	3.5	3.5	3.3	0.76
Job Autonomy and Flexibility	5.0	4.2	4.3	4.3	0.59
Programs and Facilities	4.0	3.7	3.5	3.4	0.21
“Turning the Corner” Perception	2.0	3.6	3.3	2.7	0.003

Mean Values by Rank

7. Influences on Current Dissatisfaction	1	2	3	4	Asymp Sig
Low Salaries	4.0	4.0	4.3	4.1	0.75
Administrative Interaction	2.0	3.4	3.6	3.4	0.71
Unrealistic Workloads	3.0	3.5	3.7	3.5	0.70
Unequal Workloads	1.0	3.3	3.1	2.9	0.34
Lack of Experience of Admin	1.0	2.7	2.8	3.0	0.52
Inadequate Support for Travel	1.0	3.1	3.4	3.5	0.42
Lack of Univ. Community	3.0	3.5	3.4	3.5	0.76
Under-prepared Undergrads	4.0	3.4	3.6	3.5	0.78
Poor Faculty Benefit Quality	2.0	3.3	3.7	3.4	0.28
ISU and Community Disconnected	1.0	2.9	2.8	2.6	0.57
Poor Campus Planning and Design	1.0	2.5	2.7	2.4	0.68
Faculty Achievement not Recognized	1.0	3.5	3.3	3.4	0.84
Poor Classroom Facilities	3.0	3.6	3.3	2.8	0.04

8. Importance to Address Recommend	1	2	3	4	Asymp Sig
Provide Factual Information	1.0	3.5	4.0	3.6	0.17
Culture of Engaged and Motivated Faculty	4.0	4.4	4.4	4.0	0.13
Culture of Recognition of Achievement	1.0	3.9	3.8	3.7	0.51
Attract More Highly-Qualified Students	2.0	3.8	3.6	3.5	0.33
Enhance the Quality of Student Body	3.0	3.9	3.8	3.9	0.72
Admin and Faculty Communication	1.0	3.8	4.2	3.8	0.17
Showcase Faculty Achievements	1.0	3.4	3.6	3.3	0.54
Opportunity for Chair Leader Training	2.0	3.2	3.2	3.3	0.99
Administrators Have Credentials	1.0	3.6	3.2	3.6	0.43
Faculty Leadership/Professional Training	3.0	3.3	3.0	3.4	0.44
Enhance Teaching & Research Infrastruct.	4.0	4.0	3.9	4.0	0.85
Enhance Campus Planning and Design	1.0	3.0	2.9	2.8	0.62
Promote Inter-dept. Interactions	4.0	3.0	3.4	2.9	0.19
Provide Meaningful Merit-based Pay	5.0	4.3	3.7	4.3	0.35
Enhance Quality of Faculty Benefits	4.0	4.0	4.3	4.0	0.40
Create Fair/Flexible Workload Policy	3.0	3.9	3.8	3.5	0.42
Provide Policy for Personal Leave	4.0	3.2	3.3	3.2	0.87
Strategy for Benefits to Domestic Partners	3.0	3.3	3.3	3.2	0.73
Tuition Benefits for Faculty Dependents	5.0	3.7	3.5	3.6	0.91
Recognize Community-based Participation	3.0	2.7	2.7	2.8	0.96
Achieve 100% of National Mean Salary	5.0	4.5	4.5	4.5	0.71
Provide Resources for Professional Expense	4.0	3.9	4.2	3.9	0.67
Coordinate Partner Accommodation	2.0	3.1	3.3	2.7	0.10