

SUMMARY OF COMPARATIVE FINDINGS TAKEN FROM  
HERI FACULTY SATISFACTION SURVEY  
ADMINISTERED SPRING 2002

---

(Emphasis is on areas in which there is a 9-10 percentage point difference between IPFW faculty and national norms or on areas in which differences are negligible.)

Sample

- 172 of 333 full-time faculty (51.7 %) responded to the survey.
- The sample slightly under-represents female associate professors (28% of the sample v. 36% actual), otherwise the sample is representative by gender and rank.

Demography

- Age, race, marital status, and year of initial appointment of IPFW faculty are similar to that of faculty at other 4-year institutions. Exceptions are explained by IPFW's age and periods of growth.
- Fewer IPFW faculty have parents who were academics (11% v. 21%).
- More IPFW female faculty have master's degrees than at other 4-year institutions (37% v.24%), thus reducing the overall percentage of women with PhD's (47% v. 63%), reflecting IPFW's program mix.
- 17% of IPFW faculty vs. 36% of faculty nationally are full professors.

Teaching

- Areas in which IPFW faculty are very similar to their peers:
  - Interests lie very heavily in teaching (28% IPFW vs. 26% nationally).

- Opportunities for teaching was an important reason for pursuing an academic career (70% vs. 68%).
- Being a good teacher is a very important or essential personal goal (99% vs. 97%).
- My teaching is valued by my department (86% vs. 85%).
- The institutional emphasis on teaching was very important in my decision to work at this university (46% v. 49%).
- IPFW faculty are more likely than their national peers to use multiple-choice mid-term and/or final exams (40% IPFW v. 28% nationally).
- Gender differences concerning preferred evaluation methods are more pronounced at IPFW than at other institutions. For example:
  - Use multiple choice (30% men, 52% women at IPFW v. 28%/29% nationally).
  - Use student presentations (23% men, 45% women at IPFW v. 33%/49% nationally).
  - Require term papers (28%/ 40% at IPFW v. 38%/ 42% nationally).
  - Have students evaluate each other's work (4%, 23% at IPFW v. 12% 22% nationally).
  - Grade on a curve (23% /4% at IPFW v. 23%/11% nationally).
- The gender differences regarding instructional methods reflect national patterns: Examples:
  - Use class discussion (57% men to 78% women at IPFW, v. 68%/80% nationally).
  - Use small group learning (27%/60% at IPFW v. 33%/56% nationally).
  - Experiential learning (17%/28% at IPFW v. 18%/30% nationally).
  - Independent projects (31%/51% at IPFW v. 32%/44% nationally).
  - Extensive lecturing (55%/43% at IPFW v. 55%/32% nationally).
  - Multiple drafts of written work (10%/21% at IPFW v. 16%/25% nationally).
  - Readings on women and gender issues (13%/22% at IPFW v. 13%/29% nationally).

- Student selected projects for course content (5%/15% at IPFW v. 8%/14% nationally).
- Community service as part of coursework (4%/14% at IPFW v. 4%/8% nationally).
- IPFW faculty spend more time in teaching and in teaching preparation and less time in advising than faculty at other 4-year institutions. Examples include:
  - 55% IPFW faculty spend 9-12 hours teaching vs. 38% nationally. 62% spend 9 or more hours a week in preparation vs. 49% nationally.
  - 73% of IPFW faculty vs. 61% of peers spend 1-4 hours a week advising; 16% IPFW vs. 27% nationally spend 5-8 hours advising.
- IPFW faculty are less likely than their peers to consider helping students develop personal values (46% to 58%) or preparing them for graduate or advanced education (49% to 58%) as important undergraduate goals.
- IPFW faculty are less likely than their peers to believe that teaching students the classic works of Western civilization is an important goal (19% vs. 30%).
- More IPFW faculty (66% vs. 56%) have participated in a teaching enhancement workshop.

### Curriculum

- Fewer agree that most students are well prepared academically (19% vs. 37%).
- Fewer IPFW faculty than faculty at other 4-year institutions have developed a new course in the last two years (62% vs. 73%).
- Fewer have taught an interdisciplinary course (28% to 42%).
- Fewer have team-taught (26% to 38%).
- Fewer are “very involved” in general education (18% v. 27%).
- Fewer believe that the university should place a priority on
  - helping students examine and understand their personal values (38% v. 51%)
  - developing a sense of community among students and faculty (31% v. 47%)
  - developing leadership ability among students (28% vs. 46%)
  - facilitating student involvement in community service (21% vs. 39%)
  - helping students learn how to bring about change in society (17% to

28%).

- Fewer agree that IPFW courses involve students in community service (22% vs. 37%).
- Fewer believe that students are committed to community service (11% to 31%).

### Research

- IPFW faculty parallel national norms in interests that include teaching “but leaning toward research” (30% vs. 29%) and “very heavily in research” (4% vs. 5%) and as a reason for pursuing an academic career (48% vs. 47%).
- IPFW faculty are only slightly below their national peers in research productivity, e.g. 35% vs. 31% have published 1-2 professional pieces in the last two years and 17% vs. 22% have published 3-4. 16% of IPFW faculty and 15% nationally have never published an article; 57% vs. 53% have never published a book. Other examples of similarities:
  - Only 13% (vs. 22% nationally) chose to work at IPFW because of its emphasis on research.
  - 74% (vs. 71% nationally) say that “my research is valued by faculty in my department.”
  - 64% IPFW faculty (vs. 58% nationally) felt that research or publishing demands were a source of stress during the last two years.

### Services

- Satisfied or Very Satisfied with services at rate of 75% plus:
  - Safety and Security (87%)
  - Helmke Library (83%)
  - Physical Plant (80%)
  - Web access at Helmke Library (79%)
  - Help Desk through ITServices (76%)
- At rate of 67%% plus:
  - Helmke resources (74%)
  - CELT programs and services (71%)
  - Instructional technology support from LRC (70%)

- Computers, printers, and software for faculty offices (68%)
- At 50% plus:
  - HR processes for providing clerical, service, and technical candidates (63%)
  - Equipment request and delivery services from LRC (62%)
  - Services from the Registrar's Office (62%)
  - Instructional technology permanently placed in classrooms (61%)
  - EAP program (57%)
  - Process for obtaining IPFW summer grants (55%)
- Less than 50% satisfaction:
  - Non-financial support for research (43%)
  - User support for WebCT (38%)

**Overall Aspects of Job (IPFW v. national averages, from highest to lowest)**

- Autonomy and independence (93% v. 86%)
- Opportunity to develop new ideas (79% v. 75%)
- Overall job satisfaction (78% v. 74%)
- Professional relationships with other faculty (78% v. 76%)
- Job security (77% v. 77%)
- Competency of colleagues (74% v. 71%)
- Office/lab space (69% v. 59%)
- Social relationships with other faculty (66% v. 63%)
- Relationships with administration (65% v. 58%)
- Opportunity for scholarly pursuits (64% v. 56%)
- Teaching load (62% v. 52%)
- Availability of child care (59% v. 35%)
- Visibility for jobs at other institutions/organizations (47% v. 40%)
- Salary and fringe benefits (40% v. 46%)

## Conclusions

- IPFW faculty have a somewhat more traditional and technical view of the role and content of higher education than faculty at other 4-year institutions.
- Generally, IPFW faculty are as satisfied as their national peers with their job and with the institution.

## Areas for further attention (VCAA)

- Continued efforts to improve faculty salaries/fringe benefits.
- Integration of more active learning methods.
- Expansion of service learning.
- Encouragement of more faculty involvement in collaborative curriculum development and delivery.
- Support for/development of methods to build community among faculty and students.
- Improvement of non-financial research support (already under way).
- Improvement of WebCT training and support (note shift to Vista).
- Better alignment between curriculum and university mission, especially in areas of diversity and community engagement.

Prepared by SB Hannah

February 5, 2003

[Top of the Report](#)

[Previous Page](#)