

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

2007 Faculty Climate Survey

This survey is the second in a continuing series intended to periodically monitor faculty opinion concerning the climate on campus. The survey concept was conceived and authorized by the Faculty Senate in 2001. The aim of conducting periodic surveys remains to provide feedback to the University community regarding faculty perspective on issues and performance measures that affect the campus working environment, as well as to track change and evolution at the University.

The survey was designed to again evaluate the performance of the central administration in order to enable comparison with the results obtained in the 2002 Faculty Climate Survey and to extend the reach of the survey to faculty opinion as it related to their colleges and departments.

All full time faculty were invited to participate in the online survey, which was conducted in December 2006. The overall response was 46% (560 out of a possible 1227) and for tenured and tenure track faculty, the response was 56%. The response rate across academic ranks was somewhat uneven, with more Assistant Professors responding than the other ranks. The response by College was quite variable, ranging from 24 to 89%.

The overall performance rating for the central administration was close to normal. Of 23 performance dimensions, the three top-rated areas were:

- Fostering diversity in the University
- Developing appropriate intercollegiate athletic programs
- Execution of administrator's position with honesty and integrity.

The three lowest rated areas were:

- Allocating resources to colleges
- Obtaining private support and development
- Obtaining financial support from the state legislature

When respondents were asked about nine administrative initiatives for the future, the four most highly rated were:

- Increasing salary and benefits for existing faculty
- Increasing research support
- Increasing undergraduate student quality
- Increasing faculty size

Questions were also asked about the overall job approval for the President and Provost. For the President, 53% approved and 21% disapproved. For the Provost, 34% approved and 36% disapproved. Faculty self-evaluation indicated that more than 70% of respondents made these judgments on an informed basis. These results indicated the prevalence of a far more positive attitude toward senior leadership on campus than in 2002. Improving shared governance was still deemed very important (third highest impact overall in rating the President), but it was not the overriding concern it was in the previous survey.

Faculty rated their college performance more positively than the central administration and their department more highly than their college. Across all colleges, the three most highly rated college performance dimensions were:

- Providing computational and telecommunications facilities
- Execution of the dean's position with honesty and integrity
- Providing a safe college environment

The three lowest were:

- Salary allocation to faculty
- Reward and retention of outstanding faculty
- Obtaining private support and development

Faculty were asked to evaluate seven issues that could affect their immediate working environment in their college. The three most highly rated were:

- I have access to my Dean
- Regular faculty meetings are held in my college
- I feel that I work in a stimulating academic environment in my college

When overall college performance, individual college performance dimensions and issues were analyzed by individual college, considerable variation among colleges was evident.

Across all colleges, the three most highly rated department performance dimensions were:

- Execution of Chair's position with honesty and integrity
- Providing a safe department environment
- Fostering excellence in research and scholarship

The three lowest rated were:

- Obtaining private support and development
- Providing external communications and public relations
- Providing support for grants and contracts

Among department issues, the three most highly rated were:

- I have access to my Chair
- Regular faculty meetings are held in my department
- I am kept well informed of issues that arise in my department

As with college performance, considerable variation was found when analysis of departments by individual college was carried out.

All findings were subjected to extensive regression and correlation analysis and the results are described in the report.