

## Appendix F

### **Highlights of 2004 Faculty Survey Report on Workload and Satisfaction (2005) Study compiled by Barbara Adamcik, PhD**

A university-wide survey was conducted in 2004 to assess faculty “issues, concerns, opinions, attitudes, and needs.” Full and part-time faculties were queried using continuous variables and open-ended questions. While some 40% of the surveys were completed by faculty in CAS, less than half of those polled in the college responded. Three quarters of those responses were tenure-line faculty. CAS respondents were also heavily biased towards male faculty (65%). The report is available at [www.isu.edu/acadaff/reports/FacultySurvey2004.shtml](http://www.isu.edu/acadaff/reports/FacultySurvey2004.shtml)

Many of the questions asked in the 2004 survey were similar to those asked by the Faculty Retention & Recruitment Committee. Not surprisingly, many of the responses were similar.

#### **1. Satisfaction with job at ISU**

Using a ranking system with 1 (not satisfied) and 5 (very satisfied), the majority (41%) ranked their satisfaction as a 4, and more than half (54%) would choose ISU again. Nonetheless, nearly half of the respondents in the college have had second thoughts or would not choose ISU again. Such a response is reflected in that fact that 66% of those surveyed have applied for, or interviewed for, a position elsewhere.

Comments that were consistently cited as “positive factors” that impact retention included a friendly and collegial atmosphere, location, and autonomy. Those “negative factors” that impact retention included low salary, heavy teaching load, and lack of secondary support (library, travel, TAs).

#### **2. Workload responsibilities**

Activities related to teaching, scholarship, and service were addressed in this section of the survey. The majority of respondents from A & S were graduate faculty members who taught on campus.

From a publication standpoint, overall those respondents from the A & S were productive at low or average levels depending on fields. Over the past three years, approximately three-quarters of the respondents had not had a chapter published, had a book, manual, or monograph published, or presented an exhibition or performance in the fine or applied arts. Some improvement was seen in the articles published or accepted for publications, with 32% having three or more accepted, 35% with one or two accepted, but still a third of the respondents had no articles accepted or published in the last three years (2001-2004). Open-ended comments that relate to such findings include needing “more support for conference/research travel, particularly more \$ for international travel,” that the “library is completely inadequate for my research purposes,” and “new course preps (every semester) take time away from my ability to conduct creative work.”

On a positive note, half of the respondents from A & S received a new grant, although the vast majority felt that they had received no recognition for their research, teaching, or service. Again the comments elaborated on this issue expressed an overwhelming emphasis that they felt unappreciated by administration. Some even felt deceived by how the university was portraying itself and the realities once at ISU. One respondent wrote “When I was recruited at ISU I was told that the institution was moving to become a research-intensive university. I was lied to,” while another wrote, “Research support is a joke. Administration wants big grants, but won’t offer support for research-intensive efforts.”

Overall, the respondents from A & S expressed their greatest satisfaction was related to their level of autonomy in determining what to teach and the ability to attract and mentor students. Furthermore, they felt that teaching technology and access to training on such technology were adequate, although the classrooms themselves were not adequately equipped. The respondents from A & S were much less satisfied with their level of funding for research/creative activities and their current level of scholarly productivity—responses that may relate to the low levels of productivity in the college overall. Three-quarters of the respondents agreed or strongly agreed that faculty workloads should be changed to direct one’s efforts toward primarily teaching or primarily research. A reduction in teaching emphasis and more time on research/creative activities was emphasized throughout the related questions in this section. In addition, the respondents from A & S felt that travel funds, availability of teaching assistants/graders, internal funding for professional development, and library resources were the greatest inadequacies affecting their teaching and creative activities.

### **3. Campus Environment and Faculty Participation**

While faculty in the college of A & S seem to feel valued by their department, a number felt that workloads were unevenly distributed and so excessive as to interfere with their personal lives. Many feel burned out, would prefer to teach less, and believe that they are asked to serve on too many committees. Furthermore, they feel that their program is not valued by central administration and that merit pay increases are not fairly allocated.

Respondents from the A & S found the greatest amount of stress to come from first, their own high expectations; second, their teaching load; and third, financial concerns. These stressors were followed closely by research and publishing demands as well as institution procedures and “red tape.”

Factors that A & S respondents found to be most important in their decision to leave ISU were higher salary and improved benefits, to enhance their spouse/partner’s career opportunities, to obtain a better/different type of position, and to join a department or college where they felt more appreciated.