

Appendix F Tenure-Track Faculty Support Survey Results (11-11 to 11-19-04)



Faculty Support Survey Results

Statement	1	2	3	4	5	Avg	N	0	1	2	3	4	5
There is adequate faculty support for <i>Teaching</i> .						3.27	33	1	2	8	6	13	4
There is adequate faculty support for <i>Scholarly and Creative Activities</i> .						1.56	34	0	20	11	1	2	0
There is adequate faculty support for <i>Service</i> .						2.79	33	1	6	8	9	7	3
Faculty support for <i>Teaching</i> is aligned with the University Mission Statement.						3.33	33	1	2	6	8	13	4
Faculty support for <i>Scholarly and Creative Activities</i> is aligned with the University Mission Statement.						2.15	33	1	9	13	8	3	0
Faculty support for <i>Service</i> is aligned with the University Mission Statement.						3.33	33	1	2	7	8	10	6
The Retention, Tenure and Promotion process values and rewards work related to the University Mission Statement.						3.03	33	1	2	8	12	9	2
strongly disagree(1) disagree(2) neutral(3) agree(4) strongly agree(5)													

Comments (numbers added for the sake of summary) :

(1) Question 7 is premature at this point because few, if any PPS's have been approved by the RTP committee. As far as anything being aligned to the university mission (Q 4-6)--it's a stretch to make it explicit for every program and every faculty member. Must we also be reminded that we are more than our mission? And, if things aren't aligned to the mission does that say more

about the support areas or the mission? Otherwise, it is difficult to make assessments when the word "support" has not been defined. Using my own understanding of the word and what I would want for "support" in these areas I do not feel like there is adequate support in any category. I am also dismayed by the word ADEQUATE as being the standard in the criteria for questions 1-3. What kind of support would I want for teaching? How about seminars on using technology, making a web page, sharing teaching strategies and classroom assessment strategies by people on campus who are doing innovative things? What kind of support would I want for scholarly & creative? How about a process that has clearly stated criteria that evaluates minigrant proposals based upon merit? How about a priority system that doesn't give \$\$ away to people who do not have scholarly and creative activities as part of their job retention? How about time and resources that are automatic and don't depend upon how well you beg or whine or complain? How about "signing packages" for those faculty who have already signed on but never received start-up money for their research and scholarly agendas? What kind of support would I want for service? How about a designated assistant for every standing/advisory committee who would keep minutes, send agendas, and post information to a website for all to see? How about sharing a committee copy code so university business isn't paid for out of academic programs?

(2) Faculty have no administrative assistant help, despite a big courseload and students who need our attention badly. More administrative help would free faculty to help students, rather than spend time on paperwork. Teaching 4 courses makes it very difficult to give our students the help they require, and to do the scholarship required of us -especially since we are also doing a great deal of university building. The emphasis here is more and more on committee work and less on our intellectual work and exchange. The mission says students first. But we are asked to value university service and scholarship equally, and that takes away from our time teaching. You can spread faculty only so thin before everyone loses.

(3) The NEW RTP document allows programs to delineate rewards in ways that support the four prongs of the mission. The OLD one does not. The survey should have differentiated between old and new, and it should have made note of the PPS portion of the document.

(4) RTP values teaching most, scholarship second and service a distant third. However, demands for service at CSUCI are quite high. This can make it difficult to dedicate sufficient time and resources towards scholarship as I suspect most faculty will not allow teaching to suffer. I would love to see multiple pathways for RTP that allow faculty and programs to set different amounts of high quality scholarship, teaching & service for different faculty depending on individual, program and university needs. Everyone should do all 3, but perhaps not everyone should be required to do the same amount.

(5) Real support for Scholarly and Creative Activities is valued secondary to service.

(6) I think we need to clarify the fact that part of the "mission" is related to scholarly and creative activities. We need to support these activities more. I know we are in "start up" mode, but we need to start creating a culture of scholarly expectations. We are all on too many committees. But, I think there is excellent support for teaching activities, especially the interdisciplinary kind.

(7) If the mission statement places a value on service-learning and interdisciplinary, international, and multicultural work, then teaching, scholarly and creative activities, and service that is linked to these values in the mission statement should be rewarded more than work that is not linked to these values. There is inadequate support for faculty scholarly and creative activities. All newly hired faculty should be eligible for a 9-9 teaching load their first year of appointment. In addition, faculty reaching their mid-tenure point should be provided a reduced teaching load.

(8) Some questions are not clear - does "faculty support" means "faculty supports it" or "faculty is being supported"?

(9) This survey is premature in that we have never had the opportunity to define what is meant by Mission-related work: How then could we possibly assess the adequacy of support? I may be extrapolating a bit here, but the tone of the survey seems to suggest the development of a set of "criteria" by which we would be labeled as mission-supporters or non-mission-supporters. A rather terrifying notion, especially when we have no common vision of what it means to support the mission. I urge dialog.

(10) It is too early to tell if the RTP process values and rewards work related to the Mission Statement. The new document does not really specify any work that is valued and leaves the judgement of this up to various people, who each have a different interpretation of the Mission Statement and how it relates to RTP. Maybe that is OK, but I think it is premature to ask this question. There are always ways to improve support, and I think we are doing pretty good for new univeristy.

(11) The University should support faculty involvement in interdisciplinary teaching, civic engagement, and international programs more than it has. The new Centers should assist in this.

(12) There is nowhere near adequate material support for the realities imposed by being a new institution. The areas in which these are most profoundly felt are: 1) High teaching load (number of classes, new preps) in addition to high service load and scholarly expectations 2) Little to no support staff for faculty. This will have serious consequences over the long term as at least two things happen-- bitterness develops as efforts to participate in university building

bring harsh consequences for junior faculty and/or as those more junior opt out of participating out of self preservation. The latter will create a greater divide between those (mostly junior faculty and adjuncts) carrying the teaching load and those carrying the service load. The university will also lose out on the creativity and vision these faculty have to offer. I urge the university to make remedying these issues a top priority.

(13) There have been two opportunities recently to receive release time in order to pursue scholarly activities. However, these were competitive and had to be applied for. Otherwise, there has been little support in terms of release time or research assistance. Support for service does not exist either--we serve on committees and do service-oriented work in addition to our regular teaching loads. Some weeks I have spent more than 12 hours of the work week on service-related activities. The only way to get other work done (teaching preparation, scholarly work, etc.) is in the evenings and weekends. This kind of pace is troubling because of the personal toll it takes on families, physical health, and personal well-being.

Summary of the Survey

A total of 34 tenure-track faculty members responded to the survey which consisted of seven statements that individuals evaluated using a Liker scale (strongly disagree to strongly agree). The following results were obtained from this section of the survey:

- A slight majority (52% *strongly agree* or *agree*; 39% *strongly disagree* or *disagree*) agreed with the statement, “There is adequate faculty support for Teaching.”
- Faculty members were largely in consensus in disagreeing (91% *disagree* or *strongly disagree*) with the statement, “There is adequate support for Scholarly and Creative Activities.”
- Responses to the statement, “There is adequate support for Service,” were mixed but more negative than positive (44% *strongly disagree* or *disagree*; 27% *neutral*; 30% *strongly agree* or *agree*).
- A slight majority of the faculty indicated that they agreed (52% *strongly agree* or *agree*; 24% *strongly disagree* or *disagree*) with the statement, “Faculty support for Teaching is aligned with the University Mission Statement.”
- A sizable majority of the faculty disagreed with (67% *strongly disagree* or *disagree*) the statement, “Faculty support for Scholarly and Creative Activities is aligned with the University Mission Statement.”

- Faculty members indicated mixed response (27% *strongly disagree* or *disagree*; 24% *neutral*; 48% *strongly agree* or *agree*) to the statement, “Faculty support for Service is aligned with the University Mission Statement.”
- Responses to the statement, “The Retention, Tenure, and Promotion process values and rewards work related to the University Mission Statement,” were mixed (30% *strongly disagree* or *disagree*; 36% *neutral*; 33% *strongly agree* or *agree*).

Overall, the comments indicate insufficient support and alignment of the reward structure with the mission statement with regard to Scholarly and Creative Activities.

The written comments in the survey fall under the following headlines:

(1) Descriptive adjectives:

Excellent support for teaching activities, especially the interdisciplinary kind. (6)

There are always ways to improve support, and I think we are doing pretty good for new university. (10)

Inadequate support for scholarly and creative activities (7)

Nowhere near adequate material support . . . Bitterness develops . . . greater divide. . . . (12)

Little support in terms of release time or research assistance. . . . Support for service does not exist. . . . Troubling. . . . (13)

(2) Assessment:

No “clearly stated criteria” in the mini-grant review process. (1)

RTP values teaching most, scholarship second and service a distant third. However, demands for service at CSUCI are quite high. (4)

Real support for Scholarly and Creative Activities is valued secondary to service. (5)

We are all on too many committees. (6)

High teaching load (numbers of classes, new preps) in addition to high service load and scholarly expectations. (12)

Little to no support staff for faculty. (12)

(3) Suggestions and recommendations:

Time and resource that are automatic and don't depend upon how ell you beg or whine or complain. (1)

Start-up money for their research and scholarly agendas. (1)

A designated assistant for every standing/advisory committee who would keep minutes, send agendas, and post information.(1)

A common copy code for all committees for printing. (1)

Administrative assistant help for faculty. (2)

Would like to see "multiple pathways for RTP." (4)

"To start creating a culture of scholarly expectations." (6)

mission related activities should be valued more than non-mission ones. (7)

(4) Questions about the survey:

Question number 7 "premature." (1) (9) (10)

Word "support" not defined. (1) (8)

Improper to use "adequate" in the standards. (1)

The survey should have differentiated the old and the new RTP documents. (3)

We are more than the mission. (1)

Not define "mission-related work." But the distinction of mission-related and non mission-related work may also imply mission supporters and non-mission supporters. (9)

Too early to say about the new RTP. (10)