Introduction

This edition of Research Brief reports the results of the 2005 IUPUI Faculty Survey. Following this introduction, the report is organized into seven main sections that correspond with sections of the survey instrument. Each report section includes:

- Highlights of the 2005 results
- Discussion of demographic differences in responses
- Description of differences by gender and rank
- Description of differences by school

The report concludes with overall observations of the survey results. We urge both faculty and administrators to study the survey’s item-by-item results, which can be found in the Campus Report, in addition to reading this report. School reports, available in pdf format, show comparisons between school and campus-wide responses.

The fifth of its kind, this 2005 survey is similar in form and format to previous surveys administered to IUPUI faculty members since 1996. Because many items have changed since the 1996 administration, however, trend analyses include only 1998 – 2005 results. Originally commissioned by the Dean of the Faculties and the Vice Chancellor for Planning and Institutional Improvement, the Faculty Survey is administered and analyzed by the Office of Information Management and Institutional Research (IMIR).

The 2005 survey included a new section that explored faculty members’ perceptions and levels of civic engagement. To make room for these new items, the section related to faculty perceptions of student welfare was removed. Several individual survey items were also added, revised, or deleted. The survey, which was web-based, was sent to all full-time faculty members affiliated with academic programs on the IUPUI campus. Responses were received from 1,001 faculty members, resulting in a 55 percent response rate.
Highlights

Over 1,000 full-time faculty members completed the 2005 IUPUI Faculty Survey. Highlights include:

- A clear majority of faculty members generally experience a collegial environment at IUPUI. Satisfaction with the level of collegiality in their unit and at IUPUI has steadily and significantly increased since 1998.

- Faculty members generally want to spend about 10 percent more of their time on research. Less than half of survey respondents are satisfied with the institutional structures in place to support their research and scholarship.

- Male and female faculty members allocate their time differently. Females spend significantly more of their time teaching and providing services to students and other faculty compared to males. Males, on the other hand, spend significantly more time conducting research and providing professional service.

- The frequency with which faculty members incorporate technology into their courses (68 percent do so often) and communicate with students via email (91 percent do so often) continues to increase.

- A majority of faculty members assign importance to civic engagement and almost three-quarters have provided professional services to a community, business, or government organization in the past three years.

- Considering overall responses by school, Social Work and Education faculty members are among the most satisfied while faculty members in the Medical School reported the least satisfaction on a number of survey items.

Demographics

The proportion of women – 39 percent – among the 1,001 respondents was slightly higher than in previous administrations of the survey. This percentage represents a slight bias in the response pool, since women comprise only 34 percent of the faculty. Respondents were representative of the overall faculty population in terms of rank and race/ethnicity.

Throughout the report, significant differences in responses are compared by gender. It is important that the reader bear in that some of the gender differences cannot be considered as entirely separate from rank and school differences, because distributions by gender vary greatly among the ranks and among the schools. These differences are highlighted below to aid the reader in interpreting the findings presented in this report.
Respondents’ distribution across the ranks differed according to gender.

- Women were more likely than men to be assistant professors (35 percent of women were assistant professors vs. 27 percent of men) and lecturers/instructors (15 percent vs. 6 percent). Men were more likely than women to be professors (36 percent of men were professors vs. 19 percent of women).

Likewise, respondents’ distributions varied across schools according to both gender and race/ethnicity. Table 1 details these differences.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Race/Ethnicity</th>
<th>African American</th>
<th>Asian American</th>
<th>Hispanic</th>
<th>White</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dentistry</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering &amp; Technology</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herron School of Art</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal Arts</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Med., Basic Sciences</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Med., Academic Clinical</td>
<td>412</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phys Ed &amp; Tourism Mgmt</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public and Envtl Affairs</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Work</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Library</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAMPUS</td>
<td>996</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Section 1: Quality of IUPUI

The first part of the survey asked faculty members to rate 12 items related to the quality of various aspects of IUPUI generally and their departments specifically. They indicated their responses on a scale of 4 = Excellent, 3 = Good, 2 = Fair, and 1 = Poor.

2005 Results –Faculty members assigned the highest quality ratings, and virtually the same ratings, to the work taking place within their own departments and programs. Specifically, a large majority assigned good or excellent ratings to the professional service in their unit (88 percent), the teaching in their unit (87 percent), and the faculty service to the institution in their unit (85 percent). Compared to the first three items, however, significantly fewer gave good or excellent ratings to the overall quality of research (69 percent) and advising (66 percent) in their unit.
The four remaining items in this section queried respondents about the quality of various levels of administrative leadership, which faculty rated lower than much of the work taking place in their unit. Comparing the quality ratings of these four items, the more closely faculty members worked with the administrators, the higher they rated them. That is, departmental leadership received the most good or excellent ratings of these four items (74 percent) and IU central administration received the least (53 percent). Of the 12 items in this survey section, faculty assigned the lowest quality rating to the reputation of IUPUI nationally (rated good or excellent by 39 percent).

Demographic Differences – Females gave significantly higher ratings than their male colleagues to 6 of the 12 items, including the overall quality of professional service, teaching, and research in their unit. They also gave significantly higher ratings to the quality of administrative leadership at the campus and IU central administration levels.

Comparing responses by rank, lecturers and instructors rated the national reputation of their units significantly lower than faculty in the other ranks. On the other hand, they rated the quality of administrative leadership in their unit and in their school or program more highly than faculty in all other ranks. This finding is especially interesting, because, nationally, non-tenure track faculty members often experience a lack of status and respect (Baldwin & Chronister, 2001; Gappa, 1996; Shavers, 2000), which might be expected to lower their opinions of leadership.

Differences by School – Faculty from five schools assigned quality ratings to a number of items in this survey section that were significantly above or below the mean:

- **Nursing** faculty gave particularly high ratings to several of the quality items – the overall professional service and research in their unit, the quality of administrative leadership in IU central administration, and the national reputations of their program and of IUPUI.
- **Social Work** faculty also gave particularly high ratings to several items – the quality of overall professional service in their unit, the quality of administrative leadership in their school and in IU central administration, and the national reputation of their program.
- **Herron** faculty gave high ratings to the overall professional service, teaching, and research in their departments, but especially low ratings to the academic advising in their departments and to the reputation of IUPUI in Indianapolis and nationally.
- **Science** faculty gave especially high ratings to the quality of overall research in their departments, but they gave particularly low ratings to the overall quality of professional service in their departments, to the quality of administrative leadership in their school and in IU central administration, and to the reputation of IUPUI in Indianapolis.
- **Engineering and Technology** faculty gave especially low ratings to the overall quality of professional service and research in their departments and to the national reputation of their departments.
Section 2: The Faculty Work Environment

Thirty survey items asked faculty to rate their satisfaction with the work environment. The response scale ranged from 2 = Very Satisfied, 1 = Satisfied, 0 = Neutral, -1 = Dissatisfied, to -2 = Very Dissatisfied.

2005 Results – A clear majority of faculty members were satisfied with the level of collegiality in their unit (78 percent) and at IUPUI (71 percent) and with collaboration among colleagues on projects of mutual interest (73 percent). Most were also satisfied with faculty morale in their unit (65 percent). Faculty attitudes concerning collegiality are significant, because positive interactions with colleagues, as well as perceived positive relations among faculty, generally predict satisfaction (Donohue, 1986; Hult, Callister, & Sullivan, 2005; Olsen, Maple, & Stage, 1995). It is interesting to note that the proportion of IUPUI faculty who were satisfied with the level of collegiality they experienced is in fact very similar to the proportion of faculty (74 percent) who reported that they were satisfied with their job overall.

Far fewer faculty, however, were satisfied with the treatment of part-time faculty. Specifically, only 30 percent were satisfied with the professional status accorded part-time faculty and the adequacy of their support, and only 29 percent were satisfied with the role part-time faculty play in faculty governance. As the proportion of part-time faculty continues to grow nationwide – they now represent 46 percent of faculty (NCES, 2004) – providing adequate support and status for them is becoming an increasingly important issue.

With regard to feeling valued for their work, over half of respondents were satisfied with rewards and recognition for research and scholarly activity (62 percent) and teaching (53 percent), while somewhat fewer were satisfied with rewards and recognition for professional service (45 percent) and institutional service (41 percent). Only 36 percent of faculty members were satisfied with faculty salary levels, but 67 percent were satisfied with the fringe benefits they received.

A majority of faculty members (64 percent) were satisfied with the development opportunities available through their school and at IUPUI generally (59 percent). They were less satisfied, however, with the supports in place for research and scholarship specifically. Only 45 percent were satisfied with development opportunities for research and scholarship, 44 percent were satisfied with the effectiveness of support services for faculty research and scholarship, and 36 percent were satisfied with institutional funding resources for research and scholarship development. Likewise, only 39 percent were satisfied with the time they had available for developing research and scholarly activities.

With regard to technology support, more than two-thirds of faculty members were satisfied with this support as it related to teaching, research and scholarly activity, and for students taking classes. Only 55 percent, however, were satisfied with technology support for administrative activities.

Three other survey items queried faculty about satisfaction with the use of their time spent in committee work. Just under half (49 percent) were satisfied with the use of their time in department committees and task forces, school committees (46 percent), and campus-wide
committees (41 percent). Finally, only half of faculty members were satisfied with the clarity of objectives and plans for the next few years in their school (49 percent) and in their department or program (51 percent).

**Demographic Differences** – Females were significantly more satisfied than males with the technology support available both for students taking classes and for their teaching. They were also more satisfied with faculty development opportunities at both the school and university levels and with IUPUI’s connections with the local community. Males were more satisfied than females with the time they had available for developing research and scholarly activities.

By rank, lecturers and instructors were significantly more satisfied than their tenure-track colleagues with a number of items in this section: technology support for teaching, for students taking classes, and for administrative activities; faculty development opportunities at the school and university level; the use of their time spent in departmental, school, and campus-wide committees and task forces; rewards and recognition for institutional and professional service; and the clarity of objectives and plans for the next few years in their unit.

Assistant professors’ responses, when different from their colleagues’, seemed to reflect the time pressures they experience during the probationary period. They were the least satisfied with the use of their time spent on department, school, and campus-wide committees and task forces. They were also less satisfied than full professors with the rewards and recognition for teaching and for institutional and professional service – activities that take time away from research, which is often most highly rewarded.

Associate professors were also significantly less satisfied than full professors with rewards for professional service, institutional service, and teaching, as well as with the use of their time spent in department committees and task forces. Finally, they were the least satisfied of all the ranks with faculty development opportunities through their school. These responses may reflect challenges that faculty at this rank often face, such as succeeding when they apply for promotion, staying current and interested in their work, and resisting burn-out (American Council on Education, 2005).

**Differences by School** – There were significant differences among the schools for 19 of the 30 survey items related to the faculty work environment. Responses from the faculty in five schools are highlighted below, because their responses were most often significantly above or below the mean.

- **Social Work** faculty members had higher than average responses to 19 of the 25 items. They were particularly satisfied with technology support of all types; faculty development opportunities; rewards and recognition for research and scholarly activity, teaching, and professional service; faculty salary levels; the clarity of objectives and plans; parking; and the collegiality and community they experienced.

- **Education** faculty members reported higher than average responses for 11 of the 25 items and lower than average responses for 3 of the items. They were especially satisfied with technology support for teaching and administrative activities, rewards and recognition for
professional and institutional service, the level of collegiality in their department, the clarity of objectives and plans in their school, and the identity and sense of community at IUPUI. They were less satisfied than average with rewards and recognition for teaching, the professional status afforded part-time faculty, and the cost of parking on campus.

- Law faculty members had higher than average responses on 8 of the 25 items and lower than average responses on 4 items. They were more satisfied than average with various types of technology support, with faculty development opportunities for research and scholarly development, with IUPUI’s connections with the local community, and with institutional funding resources for research and scholarship development. They were less satisfied than average with the level of collegiality and the morale in their unit and with the rewards and recognition for teaching and professional service.

- Medical School Clinical faculty were less satisfied than average on 16 of the 24 items relevant to them. Specifically, they were less satisfied than average with technology support services, faculty development opportunities, institutional funding resources for research and scholarship development, rewards and recognition for teaching and professional service, the use of their time spent in campus-wide committees and task forces, the clarity of objectives and plans for the next few years in their unit, IUPUI’s connections with the local community, and the identity and sense of community at IUPUI. They were also less satisfied than average with the professional status accorded part-time faculty, the role these faculty members play in faculty governance, and the adequacy of their support. They were, however, more satisfied than average with their salaries.

- Medical School Basic Sciences faculty were less satisfied than average on 21 of the 24 survey items relevant to them. This included their level of satisfaction with technology support, faculty development opportunities, rewards and recognition, faculty salary levels, and the treatment of part-time faculty in their school. They were also less satisfied than average with IUPUI’s connections with the local community, the identity and sense of community at IUPUI, and with the clarity of objectives and plans for the next few years in their unit. These faculty members were, however, only slightly less satisfied than average with faculty morale in their unit and they were more satisfied than average with the availability and cost of parking on campus.

Section 3: Time Allocation

Respondents were asked to estimate the percentage of time they currently devote and the time they would ideally like to devote to the following activities: teaching, administration, research, professional service, services to students or faculty, and other institutional service. For this section only, lecturers and instructors were excluded from the analyses, because their responsibilities and therefore their time allocations are different from tenure-track faculty.

On average, tenure-track faculty members spend 28 percent of their time on teaching, 23 percent on research, 9 percent on professional service, and 14 percent on administration. Ideally, faculty
members would prefer to spend less time on serving students/faculty (18 percent of their time instead of the current 21 percent) and administration (11 percent of their time instead of the current 14 percent). They would then allocate more of their time to research (33 percent of their time rather than the current 23 percent).

**Demographic Differences** – Females spend significantly more of their time teaching and providing services to students and faculty than males. Males, on the other hand, spend significantly more time conducting research and providing professional service. Ideally, both men and women would like to spend approximately 10 percent more of their total time on research and about 3 percent less of their time on administration. Women would also like to spend approximately 4 percent less of their total time on teaching.

Considering differences by rank, professors spend the smallest proportion of time on teaching compared to associate and assistant professors and the greatest proportion on administration. Assistant professors spend the greatest proportion of time on professional service followed by associate professors. Ideally, full professors in particular would spend less of their time on administration.

**Differences by School** – Due to space constraints in this report, only current and ideal teaching and research proportions of time are compared by school. *Business, Dentistry, Education, Liberal Arts, Nursing,* and *Physical Education and Tourism Management* faculty members all spend approximately half of their time teaching, which is above average across the schools. Among those who would like to decrease time spent on teaching most substantially, *Dentistry, Education,* and *Social Work* faculty would all like to spend approximately 10 percent less of their total time on teaching. *Herron, Liberal Arts, Medical School Basic Sciences, Physical Education and Tourism Management,* and *Science* faculty members would all prefer to spend between 5 percent and 7 percent less of their total time teaching.

In the area of research, *Engineering and Technology,* *Science,* and both *Medical School Basic Sciences* and *Clinical* faculty members spend the greatest proportion of their time on research. *Physical Education and Tourism Management* and *University Library* faculty spend the smallest proportion of their time conducting research. Faculty in every school would prefer to increase the proportion of time they spend on research, particularly those in *Herron, Social Work,* and *Law.*

**Section 4: Campus Climate**

This section of the survey was designed to assess the campus climate for faculty, particularly those who are in the minority. The first eight items asked faculty for their opinions about the climate in their unit generally and about their treatment in the unit specifically. The scale ranged from 2 = Strongly Agree, 1 = Agree, 0 = Neutral, -1 = Disagree, to -2 = Strongly Disagree. The next ten items in this section asked faculty about their personal experiences with discrimination and social inclusion.
Perceptions regarding the Unit’s Climate

2005 Results – A large majority of faculty members believe that their unit provides a good working environment for diverse faculty members. Specifically, 86 percent agreed that faculty and staff in their unit treat individuals with respect, regardless of their ethnicity, cultural background, or gender orientation. In addition, 80 percent agreed that their unit is a comfortable working environment for individuals of varied backgrounds and perspectives. Only 72 percent agreed, however, that their unit offers a supportive climate for those who want to balance family and career.

While faculty generally agreed that the climate is good in their unit, they were somewhat less likely to agree that they, as individuals, are treated equitably. For example, only 69 percent agreed that the work they do is valued as highly as the work of other faculty members in their unit and only 68 percent agreed that, in their unit, they get as much feedback as other faculty do about their work.

Demographic Differences – There were no significant differences in the way that males and females responded to the campus climate items, which is certainly noteworthy. Other published studies have, for example, found that women report experiencing stress from subtle discrimination more often than men (Lindholm et al., 2005).

When there were significant differences in these survey items by rank, full professors were the most likely to say they were respected and valued. Associate professors were significantly less likely than full professors to agree that the work they do is valued as highly as the work of other faculty in their unit and were also the least likely to agree that they are treated fairly in their unit regarding workload assignments. Lecturers and instructors were the least likely to agree that in meetings people pay just as much attention when they speak as when other faculty speak. They were also the least likely to agree that the work they do is valued as highly as the work of other faculty in their unit.

Differences by School – Only two of the eight items related to the campus climate indicated significant response differences by school. Faculty members in Education and Herron were the most likely to agree that their unit is a comfortable working environment for individuals of varied backgrounds and perspectives and that faculty in their unit regard student diversity as critical to achieving IUPUI’s mission. Faculty members in the Basic Sciences of the Medical School and in Public and Environmental Affairs were the least likely to agree with these two statements.

Perceptions of Social Inclusion

To gain further information about the campus climate, faculty members were asked to indicate whether they had had specific experiences that they believed occurred because of a personal characteristic. Females indicated that they had experienced a number of negative situations. For example, 23 percent of females indicated that they had not been taken seriously because of their gender on at least one occasion and 16 percent had received negative or disparaging comments because of their gender. Eight percent of minorities reported receiving negative or disparaging comments because of their race or ethnicity. As with every other section of this survey, the
Section 5: Teaching and Learning

Items in this section of the survey asked faculty about their teaching approaches, the kinds of work their students do, and their interactions with students outside class. They were asked to respond based on the experiences they had teaching either an upper or lower division course during that academic year. Responses were based on a 4-point scale where 4 = Very Often, 3 = Often, 2 = Sometimes, and 1 = Never. Note: This section was not included on the Medical School version of the survey.

2005 Results – Of the different teaching methods included in the survey, faculty indicated that they most frequently use an electronic medium to discuss or complete an assignment in their class (68 percent use this method often), followed by group projects (53 percent of faculty use this method often). They least frequently have students prepare two or more drafts of a paper or assignment before assigning a grade (30 percent do so often) and participate in a community-based project as part of the course (24 percent do so often).

Faculty members were also asked about the frequency with which they emphasize specific mental activities in their class. For upper division courses, they report most often focusing on the synthesis of ideas into more complex interpretations (88 percent do so often) and the application of theories or concepts to practical problems (84 percent do so often). For lower division courses, faculty report most often focusing on the analysis of the basic elements of an idea or theory (79 percent do so often) and the synthesis of ideas (78 percent do so often). At both levels, they report least often emphasizing the memorization of facts (25 percent do so often at the upper level, 31 percent do so often at the lower level).

Fully 91 percent of faculty members reported that their students communicate with them via email often or very often. (Responses were virtually the same for upper and lower division courses.) Over half of the faculty also reported that students talk about career plans with them quite frequently. Just over a third of faculty reported that students frequently discuss their readings or classes with them outside class and less than a quarter indicated that they work with students on activities other than coursework. Overall, faculty members spend an average of four hours per week with undergraduate students and an average of 3 ½ hours per week with graduate and professional students outside the classroom. These hours exclude regularly scheduled office hours, independent study, and individualized instruction.

The only significant difference between responses for upper and lower division courses relates to student preparedness – faculty reported that students in introductory courses more frequently come to class without having completed readings or assignments than students in upper division courses.

Demographic Differences – When faculty responses to both upper and lower division courses are considered at the same time, significant gender differences exist for almost every question.
related to instructional methods. In all cases, females more often than males reported incorporating the teaching methods described in the survey items, including group projects, class presentations, and asking students to prepare two or more drafts of an assignment in their courses. With regard to upper division courses only, females also indicated that they more frequently communicate with students via email, talk with students about career plans, and provide them with prompt feedback on their academic performance. Many of these differences help to explain the greater proportion of time that females reported spending on teaching. (See section above on Time Allocation.)

There was only one difference by rank and this was at the lower division only. Lecturers and instructors most frequently, and full professors least frequently, indicated that students prepared two or more drafts of a paper or assignment before receiving a grade for the assignment. (This difference likely reflects the fact that many lecturers teach the introductory writing courses at IUPUI.) There were no significant differences by gender, race/ethnicity, or rank for the survey items related to the mental activities faculty members emphasize in their classes.

Differences by School

_Upper Division_ – Responses from faculty in three schools are highlighted, because their responses with regard to an upper division course that they taught were most often significantly above or below the mean. _Science_ faculty members reported that their students less frequently than average ask questions in class or contribute to class discussions; use an electronic medium for assignments; work with classmates on projects; make class presentations; and participate in community-based projects as part of their courses. _Public and Environmental Affairs_ faculty members indicated that their students less frequently than average use an electronic medium for assignments; work with classmates on projects during class; and make class presentations.

_Education_ faculty members, on the other hand, reported that their students more frequently than average use an electronic medium for assignments; work with classmates on projects; make class presentations; and participate in a community-based project as part of their course.

_Lower Division_ – There were significant differences among the schools for only 3 of the 14 Teaching and Learning items for lower division classes.

- _Liberal Arts_ faculty members indicated that their students include diverse perspectives in class discussions or writing assignments more often than _Engineering and Technology_ and _Science_ faculty.
- _Nursing_ faculty members reported that their students make class presentations more often than _Science_ faculty reported their students did.
- _Liberal Arts_ faculty most often reported that their students prepare two or more drafts of a paper or assignment before receiving a grade while _Science_ faculty least often reported their students did.

In responses to the questions about mental activities emphasized in class, the only significant difference was related to the frequency with which faculty teaching upper division courses reported emphasizing the memorization of facts in class. _Public and Environmental Affairs_
faculty reported using this method more often than average and *Herron* faculty reported using it less often than average.

**Section 6: Civic Engagement**

A section new to the survey in 2005 explored faculty perceptions of civic engagement. The first set of survey items focused on the importance faculty ascribe to civic engagement, both for students and for themselves, and the extent to which they believe the university is committed to civic engagement. This scale ranged from 2 = Strongly Agree, 1 = Agree, 0 = Neutral, -1 = Disagree, to -2=Strongly Disagree. The second set of survey items in this section queried faculty on the extent to which they had been personally engaged with their community or in encouraging students to be civically engaged. This scale ranged from 3 = Frequently, 2 = Occasionally, 1 = Once or Twice, to 0 = Never.

*Importance of and Perceived Institutional Commitment to Civic Engagement*

**2005 Results** – A large majority of the faculty (90 percent) agreed that an integral part of the undergraduate experience should be preparing students for responsible citizenship; 87 percent also agreed that they, as faculty members, have a professional obligation to apply their knowledge to problems in society. Fewer faculty members, however, agreed that devoting professional or academic expertise to the community is valued highly in their department (61 percent) or that there is a high level of commitment in their department to promoting the civic engagement of faculty (41 percent).

**Demographic Differences** – Women were significantly more likely than men to agree with 8 of the 9 survey items related to faculty and student civic engagement. For example, a higher proportion of women than men agreed that students should be prepared for responsible citizenship as part of their undergraduate experience and that the university should facilitate student involvement in community service. Women were also more likely than men to perceive a high level of commitment to civic engagement at both the university and department levels. However, because a greater proportion of women than men are in disciplines that generally emphasize community service and service learning, (i.e., education and social work), these survey results may be due to disciplinary as well as gender differences.

Faculty also answered only 1 of the 9 questions differently based on rank. Lecturers and instructors were significantly more likely than faculty in the other ranks to agree that there is a high level of commitment in their unit to promoting the civic engagement of faculty.

**Differences by School** – When responses were grouped by school, there were significant differences in the way faculty answered each of the 9 items in this section. *Social Work* and *Education* faculty agreed most strongly with this set of questions – they believe that they and the institution as a whole have an obligation to be civically engaged and to prepare their students to be as well. They also perceived a high level of commitment, particularly in their units, to civic engagement.
At the other end of the spectrum, Medical faculty in the Basic Sciences and Science faculty disagreed more strongly than average with all of the items in this section. For purposes of comparison, Clinical faculty in the Medical School answered in the average range for 6 of the 9 questions. They were less likely than average, however, to agree that their department and the university are committed to civic engagement.

**Faculty Members' Civic Engagement**

2005 Results – A second set of questions asked faculty members how often, within the past three years, they had engaged in activities related to civic engagement. Table 2 indicates the proportion of faculty who had engaged in specific activities at least once within the past three years.

**Table 2. Civic Engagement**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity Related to Civic Engagement</th>
<th>% engaged in activity at least one time in past three years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gave a talk or presentation to a community organization</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provided professional services to a community group, business or government organization</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participated in a campus- or school-sponsored community service event</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participated in a professional capacity on a board or committee of a business, non-profit, or government agency</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Included in my classes materials or activities that promote civic engagement among students</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advocated for a cause or public issue in the community</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taught a class that included a significant component of community service</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engaged in a research project with a community partner</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Published an article that addressed civic engagement</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participated actively in a campaign for public office</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Demographic Differences** - Women were significantly more likely than men to have engaged in 4 of the 10 activities listed above, including the two related to instructional activities. As with the gender differences cited above, these survey results may also be due to disciplinary differences.

When differences are considered by rank, full professors were significantly more likely to have given a talk to a community organization, provided professional services to an outside organization, and participated as a board or committee member for an outside organization than faculty in the other ranks. Lecturers/instructors were the most likely to have included in their classes materials or activities that promote students’ civic engagement.

**Differences by School** – Social Work and Public and Environmental Affairs faculty members had been more engaged than average with 9 of the 10 civic activities included in this section. Education and Herron faculty also had been more involved than average with approximately half of the activities. On the other hand, Science faculty were less likely than average to have been involved with 10 of the 10 activities and Basic Sciences faculty in the Medical School were less likely than average to have been involved with 9 of the 10 activities. Differences by school in
extent of civic engagement were similar to faculty perceptions of civic engagement discussed in the prior section.

Section 7: Quality and Use of Campus Services

As in the three prior administrations of this survey, faculty members were asked to rate the quality of a variety of campus services they had used within the past two years as poor, fair, good or excellent.

2005 Results – Overall, faculty members gave the highest ratings to the quality of the Medical, Law, and Dentistry Libraries and the University Library. The five highest and lowest ratings are included in Table 3 below.

Table 3. Quality of Campus Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Campus Service</th>
<th>Percent Rating Service Good or Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Medical/Law/Dentistry Libraries</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. University Library</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Information Management &amp; Institutional Research</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Center for Teaching &amp; Learning</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Center for Service &amp; Learning</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Campus Facility Services</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Parking &amp; Transportation Services</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Office of the Bursar</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Student Financial Aid Services</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. Office of the Registrar</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Demographic Differences – Females and males did not rate any of these survey items in a significantly different way. Considering differences by rank, lecturers and instructors rated the professional libraries lower than their tenure track colleagues, while assistant professors rated Sponsored Program Administration more highly than those in other ranks.

Differences by School – Faculty answered four of the 31 questions in a significantly different way when responses were grouped by school.

- University Library – Dentistry, Social Work, and University Library faculty members assigned especially high ratings, while Law and Science faculty members gave especially low ratings.
- University Bookstores – Dentistry, Engineering and Technology, Medical School Basic Sciences, and Nursing faculty members gave higher than average ratings, while Business and Public and Environmental Affairs faculty members gave lower than average ratings.
- Campus Facility Services – Education and Herron faculty members rated this item more highly than average, while Dentistry and University Library faculty members gave it lower than average ratings.
• Parking and Transportation Services – Education, Engineering and Technology, Nursing, Public and Environmental Affairs, and University Library faculty members gave the highest ratings to this service, while Law faculty gave it lower than average ratings.

Summary and Observations

Overall, faculty members are quite satisfied with their work and workplace. They are very pleased with the quality of the teaching and service taking place in their units, although they are somewhat less pleased with the quality of the research. Three-quarters of the faculty are satisfied with the level of collegiality they experience in their unit and the proportion satisfied has steadily increased since 1998. A large majority also believes that their unit provides a comfortable working environment for diverse faculty members; this proportion also grew between 2002 and 2005. The items new to the 2005 survey indicate that a majority of faculty members assign importance to civic engagement and almost three-quarters have provided professional services to a community, business, or government organization in the past three years.

School differences stand out when responses are examined across sub-groups. Social Work and Education faculty members seem to be the most satisfied. For example, Social Work faculty members assigned higher than average ratings to their school leadership, the clarity of objectives and plans in both their departments and their school, rewards and recognition, and the collegiality and community they experience. Similarly, Education faculty members were more satisfied than average with the level of collegiality in their departments, the comfortable environment their departments offered for diverse individuals, and the clarity of objectives and plans in their school.

At the other end of the spectrum, faculty members in the Medical School generally reported the least satisfaction with their work environment. Both Clinical and Basic Sciences faculty members were among the least satisfied with faculty development opportunities, several facets of rewards and recognition, the clarity of objectives and plans for the next few years in their units, and the treatment of part-time faculty in their school. Basic Sciences faculty members were also the least likely of school groups to agree that their unit offers a comfortable environment for diverse individuals.

A theme that wove its way through many of the responses bears mentioning as well: faculty members are experiencing a number of tensions in their work. This theme is evident in at least three areas. First, many faculty members are spending more time on technology-related activities in 2005 than in 2002. For example, 91 percent of faculty members reported that they often communicate with students via email compared to 76 percent in 2002. Likewise, 68 percent often integrate technology into their classes compared with 58 percent in 2002. Faculty expressed decreasing satisfaction, however, with the technology support they receive.

A second tension relates to the time spent on research. On average, faculty members would like to allocate an additional 10 percent of their time to research; only 39 percent were satisfied with the time they had available for developing research and scholarly activities. This difference
between actual and ideal time likely causes tension for many faculty members, but perhaps of more concern to institutional leaders is that a majority are also not satisfied with the research support currently available at IUPUI. Specifically, a majority of faculty members are not satisfied with development opportunities for research and scholarship, the effectiveness of support services for faculty research and scholarship, and institutional funding resources for research and scholarship development.

Concerns specifically about time available for research are especially important for two under-represented groups – females and African Americans. Females spend less of their time on research than males and African Americans spend less of their time on research than other racial/ethnic groups. Females and African Americans also spend the greatest proportion of time teaching and providing services to students and faculty compared to males and other racial/ethnic groups. Not surprisingly, they were both the least satisfied among the groups with the time they had available for developing research and scholarly activities.

These differences are consistent with other studies that have found that female faculty members and those from racial minority groups tend to put a greater emphasis on teaching and service and less emphasis on research activities than White males (Finkelstein, Seal, & Schuster, 1998; Menges & Exum, 1983). Many of these faculty members experience heavy administrative and service loads as one of only a few underrepresented faculty members in a department. In addition, they may feel an obligation to serve underrepresented students, as well as to support and promote diversity in their disciplines or on campus generally (Aguirre, 2000; Antonio, 2002; Daufin, 2001; Johnsrud & Des Jarlais, 1994). These differences in time allocation at IUPUI have important implications for promotion and tenure decisions, as well as for rewards and recognition of female and African American faculty members.

A final tension threaded through the responses relates to time spent on non-research activities. Many faculty members spend more time than they prefer on service activities, but are not satisfied with aspects of the related rewards structure. Specifically, only half are satisfied with the rewards and recognition for their teaching and even fewer are satisfied with the rewards and recognition for their professional and institutional service. A majority are also not satisfied with the use of their time spent in department, school, and campus-wide committees and task forces.

A resolution of these tensions is unlikely – some are an inherent part of the multi-faceted work of faculty. These may be issues to which institutional leaders choose to direct their attention, however, as a result of faculty members’ responses to this survey.
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