

**Montana State University Accreditation Self-Study
Report on Faculty Survey
January 23, 2009**

Introduction

In November, 2008, a random sample of MSU faculty were sent email invitations to participate in an online survey about a host of issues to be addressed in our self-study document in preparation for NWCCU accreditation. We sampled 700 faculty of all appointment types, adjunct, research, and tenure-track. Deans and other administrators were excluded from the sample, though department heads were eligible for selection. We received 361 responses, for a response rate of 51.6%.

Respondents had about two weeks to complete the survey. In addition to the initial email invitation, sent over Senior Vice Provost Joseph Fedock's signature, we sent two reminder emails. We offered no incentives for participation, so the strong response rate is a nice reflection of faculty interest in giving their input to the self-study process.

The survey was quite long and detailed, with sections on teaching, academic planning and advising, academic programs. Research and creative activity, service, faculty workloads, employment and hiring practices, annual reviews, promotion and tenure, governance, finance, and planning, students and student services, facilities, institutional integrity, salaries and benefits, as well as a series of free-text responses in which respondents could address other issues. We also included a few demographic items to use in analyzing the survey.

Respondents

The table below shows the percent of respondents in each of the demographic categories included in the survey. Our respondents over-represent tenure-track faculty and under-represent adjuncts. Research faculty responded in proportion to their numbers on campus. Tenured faculty are also over-represented. Men responded in greater numbers than their proportion on campus. The colleges are in rough proportion to their populations. It is important to take the overall results with a grain of salt, as the responding sample does not perfectly reflect the population. Responses for subgroups are reported where they differ statistically from each other (and from the overall results), so any biases in the sample can be minimized in the analysis by focusing on subgroups.

1. What is your faculty appointment type?	
Adjunct	24.2%
Research	4.9%
Tenure-track	70.9%
2. What is your rank?	
Instructor	14.1%
Assistant Professor	30.0%
Associate Professor	27.2%
Professor	26.9%
No rank	1.8%
3. Do you have tenure?	
Yes	50.3%
No	47.3%
Under review this year (combined with No for all analyses)	2.4%

4. In which college/agency is your primary appointment?	
Agriculture	12.6%
AES	0.9%
Arts and Architecture	9.2%
Business	6.2%
Education, Health, and Human Development	6.5%
Engineering	13.2%
Extension	8.3%
Letters and Sciences	34.5%
Libraries	1.5%
Nursing	5.5%
University	1.5%
5. What is your gender?	
Female	37.0%
Male	63.0%
6. How many years have you been on the faculty at MSU (please enter a whole number)?	
Mean Response	11.4 years

Analysis

In each section of the survey, faculty were asked to respond to a series of Likert items, where a statement was presented and respondents chose whether they strongly agree (assigned a value of 1), agree (2), neither agree nor disagree (3), disagree (4), or strongly disagree (5) with the statement. Averages above three indicate disagreement, an average right around three suggests neutrality, and averages below three indicate agreement. A few other question formats appear in the survey where appropriate. The valid percentages of the survey respondents in each category appear below, along with the mean response value.

Statistically significant differences in the mean responses ($p < .1$) are described for a variety of subgroups. Adjuncts and research faculty are each compared to tenure-track faculty. Tenure status (for tenure-track only) and length of service at MSU (more or less than ten years) are also reported where differences emerge. These two variables often move together, as most of the long term faculty have tenure. Gender differences are reported where they are statistically significant.

Finally, a summary of the comments on each topic appears in each section. Comments may contain multiple topics, so each comment has been coded to reflect as many distinct subjects as were mentioned. Most individuals who wrote in a comment mentioned one to three topics. The number of codes recorded, then, will be greater than the number of people who made comments. Popular comment topics are shown for each area.

Teaching

1. Please mark whether you agree or disagree with the following statements about support for teaching within your department.

	Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Mean Response (1=Strongly agree, 5= Strongly disagree)
My department's teaching expectations are what I understood they would be.	39.3	45.2	7.6	6.2	1.7	1.86
The assignment of teaching loads is equitable within my department.	24.7	39.5	16.2	13.4	6.2	2.37
My department encourages innovative teaching.	30.4	40.3	18.8	7.4	3.1	2.12
My department rewards excellence in teaching.	15.3	39.2	24.4	15.9	5.1	2.56
Given my other duties, I have adequate time to devote to teaching.	13.9	42.9	19.9	18.8	4.5	2.57

Overall, faculty tend to agree with the statements on departmental teaching. The statement on expectations garners the greatest level of agreement, while rewards for teaching and adequate time for teaching are the most likely to generate some disagreement, though faculty still agree with these items overwhelmingly.

Adjuncts and tenure-track differ on having adequate time for teaching, with the average tenure-track response (2.67) closer to the middle of the scale, and adjuncts (2.27) more likely to lean toward "agree" or "strongly agree."

Tenure status and longevity do not affect responses to these statements.

Gender does have an impact on agreement with the statement about equitable teaching assignments. While both men and women average a response between "agree" and the neutral response category, women are closer to neutral at 2.53 and men are closer to "agree" at 2.29.

2. Please mark whether you agree or disagree with the following statements about support for teaching at MSU.

	Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Mean Response (1=Strongly agree, 5= Strongly disagree)
MSU demonstrates a commitment to quality teaching.	16.0	51.0	19.1	12.3	1.7	2.33
MSU's expectations for teaching are appropriate.	13.7	54.0	22.0	8.9	1.4	2.30
MSU's support for the improvement of teaching (e.g. sabbaticals, BEST, seminars, Short Term Faculty Leave, etc.) is appropriate.	11.2	38.7	32.1	14.3	3.7	2.61
MSU's rewards for teaching are consistent with the institution's expectations.	8.0	32.4	34.7	20.1	4.9	2.81
MSU encourages interdisciplinary collaboration in teaching.	5.7	31.2	39.5	18.8	4.8	2.86

Faculty agree with the items on MSU's support for teaching as well, though this block of items averages slightly higher – closer to the center – than the prior block. MSU's commitment to teaching is the most agreeable statement, while faculty are more willing to disagree with the consistency of MSU's rewards and expectations for teaching and with MSU's encouragement of interdisciplinary teaching.

Adjuncts and tenure-track differ on support for improvement of teaching, with adjuncts expressing less agreement on average (2.86) than tenure-track faculty (2.50). Adjuncts and tenure-track differ on rewards for teaching with adjuncts (2.99) centered on the scale and tenure-track (2.75) slightly to the "agree" side of the scale.

There are no significant differences on these statements according to tenure status.

Faculty with ten years of service or more (2.49) are less likely to agree that MSU demonstrates a commitment to quality teaching than are those with less than ten years (2.19). They are also less likely to agree that the expectations for teaching are appropriate (2.42 versus 2.20).

There are no significant differences according to gender on these statements.

3. Please mark whether you agree or disagree with the following statements about teaching evaluations at MSU.

	Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Mean Response (1=Strongly agree, 5= Strongly disagree)
The instrument used by students to evaluate my teaching is effective.	3.7	26.5	27.9	29.6	12.3	3.20
Assessment of teaching is performed in a clearly articulated manner.	4.5	32.3	32.3	23.2	7.6	2.97
Assessment of teaching is performed in a fair manner.	6	38.5	35	17.1	3.4	2.74

Faculty opinion on the evaluation and assessment of teaching averages in the middle of the scale. Faculty are not enthused about the student evaluation forms, with over 40% expressing disagreement and more than one in ten expressing strong disagreement with the effectiveness of the instrument.

There are no statistically significant differences between adjunct, research, and tenure-track faculty on these items. Tenure status and longevity at MSU also do not affect responses.

Women (3.49) are more likely to disagree that the teaching evaluation instrument is effective compared to men, who are neutral on average (3.04).

4. How much support for teaching does MSU provide in the following areas?

	too little	about the right amount	too much	Mean Response (-1=Too little, 1=Too much)
Financial support	64.5	35.3	0.3	-0.64
Physical facilities (including space)	54.9	44.5	0.6	-0.54
Administrative support	31.5	65.3	3.2	-0.28
Information technology	25.6	74.4	0	-0.26

A majority of faculty respondents think there is too little financial and physical support for teaching. Administrative and IT support are seen as "about right" by most faculty. Few faculty believe there is too much support for teaching.

There are no statistically significant differences between adjunct, research, and tenure-track faculty on these items.

Looking only at faculty on the tenure-track, post-tenure faculty rate physical facilities more negatively (-.61) than pre-tenure faculty (-.46).

Longevity at MSU does not have an impact on responses to these items.

Gender affects responses to the items on financial support and space. Both men and women believe there is too little of each, but women average lower scores at -.69 for financial support and -.66 for space versus men's averages of -.59 and -.47.

Comments on Teaching

Of the 361 respondents, 113 made comments on teaching, containing up to three separate topics. The most popular topic centers on a perception that teaching is undervalued at MSU. Close behind in number of mentions is the quality of the instrument or method used to evaluate teaching. A third popular topic is a sense of imbalance in

the teaching/research tradeoff, with research winning. The first and third topics are closely related, but the first topic contained no reference to research.

Comment Topic	# Mentions
Teaching is undervalued	21
Need better evaluation tool/method	20
Research/teaching imbalance	19
Space concerns	10
Facilities, no further specification	10
General positive comment about teaching at MSU	9
Instructional technology needs	8
Lack of support for adjuncts	7
Lack of resources, no further specification	7
Uneven/ambiguous standards for teaching	6
Negative comment about "administration" or specific administrators	6
Interdisciplinary teaching is undervalued	5

Advising and Academic Planning

1. Please mark whether you agree or disagree with the following statements about advising at MSU.

	Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Mean Response (1=Strongly agree, 5= Strongly disagree)
I understand the University and department degree requirements well enough to advise students well.	22.8	47	25.1	4.5	0.6	2.13
Given my other duties, I have adequate time to advise the students assigned to me.	9.4	42.0	31.4	14.5	2.7	2.59
Academic advising at MSU is effective.	4.8	44.7	38.7	8.5	3.3	2.61
MSU's rewards for advising are consistent with the institution's expectations.	2.1	11.8	53.2	24.8	8.2	3.25

Faculty skew toward agreement with three of the advising statements. One exception is the statement on rewards and expectations for advising, where one third disagrees and over half are in the middle. Adequate time for advising appears to be an issue for 17% of the faculty.

Adjunct faculty and research faculty differ from tenure-track faculty on understanding degree requirements sufficiently for advising, with the average tenure-track faculty agreeing (2.00) and the average adjunct (2.37) and research (2.45) faculty less likely to agree. Adjuncts (3.11) and tenure-track (3.31) differ on rewards for advising, with both groups on the disagree side of center.

Pre-tenure faculty (2.15) express less agreement with the statement about understanding degree requirements than do post-tenure faculty (1.94), perhaps reflecting less time with the requirements.

Those with longer experience are more apt to agree that they understand the requirements well enough to advise students and that they have time to advise. While faculty on average tend to disagree that MSU's rewards and expectations for advising are in alignment, those who have been here ten years or more are even more likely to disagree.

Gender does not have a statistically significant impact on these responses.

2. Please mark whether you agree or disagree with the following statements about academic planning at MSU.

	Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Mean Response (1=Strongly agree, 5= Strongly disagree)
Faculty have ample opportunity to give substantive input into the academic policy-making process.	7.2	34.3	34.9	17.9	5.7	2.81
Curriculum development and review at MSU is effective.	7.5	39.4	38.5	10.7	3.9	2.64
Academic program assessment at MSU is effective.	4.2	33.1	46.4	11.4	4.8	2.80

Faculty overall average on the "agree" side of center on academic program and policy-making. However, more than a fifth disagree that faculty have ample input into academic policy making and nearly half neither agree nor disagree that program assessment is effective.

Adjuncts (2.61) and tenure-track (2.84) differ on faculty input into academic policy-making, with adjuncts agreeing more than tenure-track faculty.

There are no statistically significant differences according to tenure status, longevity, or gender on these items.

3. In the last 5 years, I have participated in

	Never	Occasionally	Regularly	Mean Response (1=Never, 3=Regularly)
Academic planning in my department or program	17.2	33.5	49.3	2.32
Academic planning in the university (e.g. CORE 2.0, Undergraduate Studies Committee, etc.)	70.1	19.2	10.7	1.41
Academic program assessment	45.4	36.2	18.4	1.73
Academic advising	24.9	19.3	55.8	2.31
Teaching CORE 2.0 courses	63.7	11.3	25.0	2.00

Participation in academic planning, program review, and advising activities is fairly strong, averaging between occasional and regular participation. Department level academic planning and academic advising are the most frequent of these activities, with about half the faculty reporting regular participation over the past five years.

Adjuncts and research faculty are significantly less likely to participate in any of these activities, with one exception. Adjuncts and tenure-track faculty do not differ on teaching CORE 2.0 courses. Adjuncts average occasional participation in academic planning in the department (2.08) and never at the university level (1.23), while tenure-track average between occasional and regular departmental participation (2.51) and between "never" and "occasional" at the university level (1.51). Adjuncts (1.59) and tenure-track (1.85) differ on participation in program assessment. Adjuncts and tenure-track also differ on participation in advising, with adjuncts advising on average close to "occasional" (1.87), and tenure-track averaging between "occasional" and "regularly" (2.53).

Pre-tenure faculty average lower participation than post-tenure faculty in academic planning in the department (2.37 versus 2.58), academic planning at the university level (1.38 versus 1.57), program assessment activities (1.68 versus 1.93), and academic advising (2.36 versus 2.61).

Longer service leads to more participation in all of these activities except CORE teaching, where the two groups do not differ significantly.

There are no significant differences in participation according to gender.

Comments on Advising and Academic Planning

52 faculty commented on advising and academic planning, with two-thirds of the topics mentioned reflecting advising and one-third academic planning. The most popular comment topics appear below. As with teaching, a fair number of faculty mentioned that advising is not properly valued at MSU. There were comments about both advising and academic planning varying significantly across the university.

Comment Topic	# Mentions
Advising is undervalued	13
Advising quality uneven	8
Academic planning quality uneven	5
Negative comment about CORE 2.0	4
Advising should be done by faculty	4

Academic Programs

1. Please mark whether you agree or disagree with the following statements about academic programs at MSU.

	Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Mean Response (1=Strongly agree, 5= Strongly disagree)
University seminars (e.g. CLS 101, Bus 101, US 101) provide a valuable first-year experience.	16.3	33.5	44.4	5.1	0.6	2.40
Capstone courses provide a valuable senior experience.	35.3	39.5	20.1	4.5	0.6	1.96
Having the opportunity to participate in an international education program is important for MSU students.	35.8	43.0	20	0.6	0.6	1.87
Faculty development programs (e.g. Teaching/Learning Committee offerings) offer valuable on campus resources for faculty.	15.7	41.0	37.7	5.4	0.3	2.64
The Honors Program provides challenging coursework for qualified students.	17.2	35.6	43.5	2.4	1.2	2.35
Summer course offerings should be expanded.	23.1	32.3	36.5	7.2	0.9	2.31
MSU demonstrates a commitment to the integration of research and learning.	18.1	47.8	23.4	8.9	1.8	2.28

Academic programs at MSU garner generally positive results. The average faculty member agrees that capstone experiences provide value and that international experiences are important. Other statements about academic programs average between "agree" and the center of the scale. None of these items generate much strong disagreement.

Adjuncts (2.13) and tenure-track (2.35) differ on expanding summer course offerings, though both average near "agree." Research faculty differ from tenure-track on assessment of the Honors Program, with research faculty (1.92) agreeing more strongly with the statement than tenure-track (2.34).

Pre-tenure and post-tenure faculty differ in their evaluations of university seminars, with tenured faculty agreeing more strongly (2.34) compared to pre-tenured faculty (2.55).

Longer serving faculty are more interested in expanding summer session than are shorter term faculty.

Men (1.94) are less likely to agree strongly with the importance of an international experience than are women (1.76), though the average for both groups is quite low (more agreeing). Men are also less sanguine about faculty development programs, averaging 2.41 versus women's 2.22.

2. Please mark whether you agree or disagree with the following questions about general education (i.e. CORE 2.0) at MSU.

	Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Mean Response (1=Strongly agree, 5= Strongly disagree)
I am familiar with the goals and structure of CORE 2.0.	17.5	45.2	19.6	13.9	3.9	2.42
The value of CORE 2.0 is adequately communicated to students.	4.6	28.0	54.4	11.6	1.5	2.78
General education is crucial to the education of majors in my department.	28.0	44.7	22.8	4.0	0.6	2.05
MSU demonstrates a commitment to teaching CORE 2.0 courses.	13.4	46.3	35.1	4.9	0.3	2.32

Statements on CORE 2.0, the general education program at MSU, generate very little strong disagreement. Half of the faculty respondents neither agreed nor disagreed that the value of CORE is communicated to the students. Pluralities agreed with statements on familiarity with CORE, the importance of general education, and MSU's commitment to teaching CORE courses.

Adjuncts (2.54) and tenure-track (2.29) differ on familiarity with goals and structure of CORE. Research faculty (3.33) are much less familiar with CORE goals than tenure-track faculty. Adjuncts and tenure-track differ on the criticality of general education for students in their departments, with adjuncts (1.88) more likely to strongly agree than tenure track faculty (2.08).

Faculty who have not yet been here ten years are less familiar with the goals and structure of CORE than are longer serving faculty.

Women on average (1.91) agree more strongly with the criticality of general education in their departments than do men (2.13).

3. The number of required courses in CORE 2.0 should

Be decreased (please suggest changes)	Not change	Be increased (please suggest changes)	Mean Response (1=Be decreased, 3=Be increased)
6.6	84.4	9.0	2.02

Most faculty are content with the number of CORE courses required. There are no significant differences by faculty type, tenure status, longevity, or gender.

Comments about CORE 2.0

Faculty were encouraged to specify the changes to CORE 2.0 they recommend if they marked that the number of required courses in the CORE should be increased or decreased. Several faculty commented on CORE without marking one of those options. Their responses were coded along with the others. Forty-eight respondents made comments about the CORE, with small clusters on topics like resources, specific requirements to add, and general comments on CORE quality.

Comment Topic	# Mentions
Need more funding	6
Add writing requirements/curricula	5
Add liberal arts requirements	4
Add R opportunities	3
Add basic skills requirements/curricula	3
Drop CORE altogether	3
CORE quality is uneven	3

Comments about Academic Programs

Faculty were also provided an opportunity to comment on academic programs more generally. Just 40 made comments, and no single topic generates much interest. Specific programs like CORE and the Honors Program appeared in the comments, with negative and positive mentions.

Comment Topic	# Mentions
General positive comment about academic program quality	4
Lack of resources	4
Negative comment about CORE	3
Lack of communication skills among students	3
Positive comment about the Honors Program	3

Research and Creative Activity

1. Please mark whether you agree or disagree with the following statements about support for research and creative activity at MSU.

	Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Mean Response (1=Strongly agree, 5= Strongly disagree)
MSU demonstrates a commitment to faculty research and creative activity.	27.9	53.4	12.3	4.7	1.8	1.99
MSU’s rewards for research and creative activity are consistent with the institution’s expectations.	16.8	41.8	27.1	12.6	1.8	2.41
MSU provides adequate sabbatical leave opportunities for renewal of my research and creative activities.	6.8	23.5	42.3	18.8	8.6	2.99
Faculty are allowed academic freedom to pursue research and creative activity in a manner consistent with the institution’s mission and goals.	26.8	51.5	17.4	3.8	0.6	2.00
Given my other duties, I have adequate time to conduct my research/creative activities.	6.8	35.8	19.8	29.0	8.6	2.97

Large majorities agree that MSU demonstrates commitment to research and creativity and that faculty are allowed sufficient academic freedom. A smaller majority agrees that MSU's rewards and expectations are in line with each other. Two-fifths neither agree nor disagree with the statement on adequate sabbatical leave. Sabbatical leave and adequate time for research generate the most disagreement and the most strong disagreement.

Adjuncts and tenure-track differ on MSU's commitment to research and creativity, with tenure-track faculty more likely to agree or strongly agree, averaging 1.87 compared to adjuncts' 2.31. Adjuncts (2.64) and researchers (2.75) differ from tenure-track (2.29) on MSU's rewards for research and creativity. Adjuncts and tenure-track differ on academic freedom, with tenure-track faculty more likely to agree or strongly agree, averaging 1.86 compared to adjuncts' 2.35. Research faculty are more likely to agree that they have adequate time for research and creative activity, averaging 2.31 compared to tenure-track faculty's neutral 2.98.

Tenured faculty agree more strongly (1.78) that MSU demonstrates a commitment to research and creativity than do pre-tenure faculty (2.07). They are less likely to agree with the adequacy of sabbatical leaves (3.10 versus 2.79).

Faculty who have been here less than ten years average higher (more disagreeing) scores on MSU's commitment to research and creativity and the alignment of rewards and expectations for such activity (2.10 and 2.52) compared to their longer serving colleagues (1.88 and 2.28).

The average female respondent disagrees (3.24) with having adequate time for research and creativity, while the average male respondent agrees with similar magnitude (2.83).

2. Please mark whether you agree or disagree with the following statements about policy on research and creative activity at MSU.

	Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Mean Response (1=Strongly agree, 5= Strongly disagree)
MSU's expectations for faculty research and creative activity are clear.	14.5	47.5	25.5	9.8	2.7	2.39
MSU clearly articulates its policies and procedures concerning the conduct of research and creative activity.	13.1	46.6	33.2	5.0	2.1	2.36
Ethical considerations are included in MSU's policies and procedures for the conduct of research, and creative activities.	18.9	44.0	34.4	2.1	0.6	2.22
Faculty have ample opportunity to give substantive input into the research/creativity policy-making process at the University level.	4.2	23.0	46.0	19.7	7.2	3.03
Externally funded research, whether from grants, contracts or gifts, is consistent with the institution's mission and goals.	27.8	39.7	24.8	5.1	2.7	2.15

Faculty generally agree with the statements on policy about research and creative activity at MSU. The exception is faculty input into policy making at the University level, where nearly half are neutral and more than one quarter disagree.

Adjunct (2.69), research (2.75), and tenure-track (2.26) faculty differ on the clarity of MSU's research expectations, with tenure-track reporting more clarity. Adjuncts (2.67) and tenure-track (2.26) differ on the clarity of MSU's policies and procedures. Adjuncts (2.42) and tenure-track (2.15) differ on the level of consideration for ethics in policies and procedures on research and creativity. Adjuncts (2.56) and tenure-track (2.02) differ on the consonance of externally funded research and the university's mission, with tenure-track seeing greater congruity.

Post-tenure faculty agree more than do pre-tenure faculty with the statements that research and creativity expectations are clear (2.15 versus 2.54) and that MSU clearly articulates its policies and procedures on research and creative activity (2.17 versus 2.49).

Longer serving faculty agree more, on average, than do shorter term faculty with the statements about clarity of expectations and clearly articulated policies.

There are no gender differences on these items.

3. How much support for research and creative activity does MSU provide in the following areas?

	too little	about the right amount	too much	Mean Response (-1=Too little, 1=Too much)
Financial support	60.1	38.7	1.3	-0.59
Physical facilities (including space)	47.3	50.2	2.5	-0.45
Administrative support	29.7	64.7	5.7	-0.24
Information technology	25.1	74.3	0.6	-0.24

Most faculty believe MSU does not have enough financial support for research and creativity. Just over half think the facilities are adequate, and larger majorities think the administrative and IT support are about right. Very few faculty members think there is too much support for research and creative activity.

Adjuncts and research faculty differ from tenure-track on financial support for research and creativity. Research faculty are the most likely to report inadequate financial support, averaging -.87, followed by tenure-track faculty at -.62, and adjuncts at -.45. Research faculty report higher administrative support than tenure-track, with a positive average response (.13) compared to a negative response for tenure-track faculty (-.29).

Tenured faculty differ from their junior colleagues on the level of IT support for research and creative activity. While neither group believes the support is sufficient, tenured faculty are closer to that rating, with an average rating of -.20 versus -.31.

There is no difference between long-term and shorter-term faculty nor between men and women on these items.

Comments on Research and Creative Activity

Seventy-one faculty made comments about this topic. As with nearly every subject in the survey, a lack of resources emerged as a popular theme among those who commented. The research/teaching balance issue appeared in this section, reflecting responses in the teaching section. A specific policy decision shows up in the top comments in this section, the decision to use some indirect cost recovery for central priorities. Some faculty commented on the process, while others commented on the decision and its ramifications for future research.

Comment Topic	# Mentions
Lack of resources	11
Need balance between research and teaching	9
Negative comment about decision to centralize IDCs	9
General positive comment	8
Departmental support for research is uneven	7
MSU is too grant-focused/driven by research funding	7
Need space for research/creativity	6
Need more faculty input into decisions about research policy	6

Service

1. Please mark whether you agree or disagree with the following statements about service at MSU.

	Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Mean Response (1=Strongly agree, 5= Strongly disagree)
MSU's faculty are engaged in service in a manner consistent with the mission of the university.	18.8	57.9	16.1	5.7	1.5	2.13
MSU's expectations for faculty service are clear.	10.7	40.1	28.8	17.8	2.7	2.62
My department rewards excellence in service.	7.4	31.1	27.8	23.4	10.4	2.98
Departmental service loads are equitable.	3.8	33.1	27.5	24.0	11.5	3.06
College or university service loads are equitable.	2.1	27.7	44.3	18.7	7.2	3.01

Nearly one-fifth strongly agrees that MSU faculty's engagement in service is consistent with the mission of the University. Few faculty respondents disagree with this statement. One-third of the faculty thinks their departments do not reward service, and more than one-third thinks departmental service loads are inequitable. Almost half are neutral on the equity of university service loads, perhaps reflecting the lower participation rates in university service.

There are no statistically significant differences between adjuncts and tenure-track faculty on these items, despite different service expectations for the two faculty types. Research faculty had a less agreeable average score (2.46) than tenure-track (2.06) on faculty's engagement in service consistent with the institution's mission.

Tenure status does not affect responses on these items.

Newer faculty average more positive responses to faculty engagement in service, rewards for service, and equitable service loads than do their longer serving colleagues.

Women and men differ on the clarity of MSU's service expectations. Women (2.48) agree more on average than do men (2.70).

Comments on Service

Fifty faculty made comments about service, and responses here clustered more than on most topics. The most popular response involves the lack of external motivation for faculty to do service. As a result perhaps, service work is done unevenly or inconsistently.

Comment Topic	# Mentions
No incentives for service	17
Service load is uneven across the university	14
Service criteria/expectations are undefined	11
MSU is not doing enough outreach	5

Workload

1. Please mark whether you agree or disagree with the following statements about faculty workloads at MSU.

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Mean Response (1=Strongly agree, 5= Strongly disagree)
There are enough faculty in my department to meet its obligations, consistent with the university’s mission and goals.	3.3	23.2	15.4	38.6	19.6	3.48
Faculty assignments reflect the talents and competencies of the faculty.	10.4	57.4	17.9	10.1	4.2	2.40
Faculty assignments reflect the mission and goals of the institution.	8.7	56.0	24.4	9.9	0.9	2.38
Faculty workloads allow time and support for professional growth and renewal.	4.5	31.7	22.5	29.3	12.0	3.13

A majority of faculty think there are not enough faculty to carry the departmental workload. This statement generates the third highest (most disagreeing) average in the survey. Large majorities, on the other hand, agree that faculty are appropriately assigned and that the assignments reflect the mission and goals of the institution. Forty percent of faculty disagree with the statement on sufficient time for professional growth and renewal.

Adjuncts and tenure-track differ on the sufficiency of faculty in the department. Neither group agrees on average with the statement, but tenure-track faculty (3.56) disagree more than adjuncts (3.27). Research faculty (2.73) differ from tenure-track (2.31) on whether faculty assignments reflect the institution's mission.

Length of service at MSU and gender do not impact responses on workload items.

Comments on Faculty Workloads

Forty-seven faculty commented on workloads, with two dominant themes: a lack of people to fill the needs, and uneven loads people in different departments, or even within a department, bear.

Comment Topic	# mentions
Need more people for the amount of work	17
Workloads are uneven across people and departments	16
Lack of resources	6
General positive comment about workloads	4
Adjuncts filling the need (positive and negative connotations)	4

Employment and Hiring Practices

1. Please mark whether you agree or disagree with the following statements about faculty employment and hiring practices at MSU.

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Mean Response (1=Strongly agree, 5= Strongly disagree)
MSU has an effective process for the recruitment and appointment of high-quality tenure-track faculty.	9.7	45.1	22.7	17.7	4.7	2.63
MSU has an effective process for the recruitment and appointment of high-quality adjunct faculty.	4.7	26.0	40.7	23.6	5.0	2.98
Tenure-track faculty are qualified for the positions they hold.	22.5	59.8	12.7	3.6	1.5	2.02
Part-time faculty and adjuncts are qualified for the positions they hold.	15	51.3	27.7	5.6	0.3	2.25
I have access to the policies that affect the conditions of my employment.	21.8	48.8	19.7	8.5	1.2	2.19

Employment practices in general garner agreement from the majority of faculty. The exception is the statement on recruiting quality adjuncts, where a plurality expressed neutrality, and slightly more faculty agree than disagree. None of the annual review statements generate much strong disagreement.

Adjunct, research, and tenure-track faculty differ on the effectiveness of MSU's recruitment and appointment of adjunct faculty, with adjuncts (2.77) reporting more agreement with the statement of effectiveness and tenure-track (3.01) squarely in the middle of the scale on average, and research (3.69) near "disagree" on average. Research faculty differ from tenure-track on this item as well.

Adjuncts and tenure-track differ on the qualification of both tenure-track and part-time or adjunct faculty. Adjuncts are more likely to agree that adjuncts are qualified (1.97) and average slightly less agreeing on tenure-track qualifications (2.29), while the converse is true for tenure-track faculty (2.30 on adjunct qualifications and 1.89 on tenure-track qualifications). Both groups average close to "agree" on both statements, however. Research faculty average 2.59 on tenure-track faculty qualifications and 2.71 on adjunct qualifications, significantly less agreeable than the tenure-track averages. Research faculty (2.80) also differ from tenure-track (2.15) on access to employment policies, expressing less agreement with having access.

Tenure status does not affect opinions on employment practices.

Longevity does impact opinions on the practices for hiring quality faculty. Those with ten or more years of service agree more with the practices for hiring tenure-track faculty and agree less with the adjunct hiring practices compared to faculty with shorter tenures at MSU. They also report greater access to employment policies.

Gender does not have a statistically detectable influence on opinions about hiring and employment practices.

2. Please mark your response.

	too low	about right	too high	Mean Response (1=Too low, 3=Too high)
In light of the mission and goals of MSU, the level of reliance on adjuncts is	4.3	55.0	40.7	2.36

A majority of faculty believe the reliance on adjuncts is about right for MSU's mission and goals. A large minority, however, believes the level of reliance is too high. Few faculty believe it is too low.

Adjuncts and tenure-track differ on this item, with adjuncts' (2.13) average response close to "about right" and tenure-track faculty's (2.42) average response higher.

Tenure status, longevity, and gender do not affect responses to this question.

Comments on Employment and Hiring Practices

Sixty faculty offered comments on this topic. Thirteen chose to follow up on the immediately preceding question and comment on being over-reliant on adjuncts. A dozen noted that low salaries relative to peers harm our recruitment of high quality faculty. Another set commented on the high workload and/or exclusion of adjuncts from decision-making. A distinct set mentioned low pay for adjuncts.

Comment Topic	# Mentions
MSU is too reliant on adjuncts	13
Low salaries harm recruiting	12
Adjuncts are mistreated	11
Adjunct compensation is inadequate	6
Uneven hiring practices across departments	5

Annual Reviews

1. Please mark whether you agree or disagree with the following statements about annual reviews at MSU.

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Mean Response (1=Strongly agree, 5= Strongly disagree)
I have been reviewed annually in my position as a faculty member.	50.0	34.2	10.7	3.6	1.5	1.72
The procedures and criteria by which I am evaluated are clearly communicated.	26.3	39.1	18.9	12.1	3.6	2.28
Faculty members in my department were involved in the establishment of review procedures and criteria.	21.9	31.4	29.9	13.8	3.0	2.45
The departmental annual review process is fair.	21.2	40.0	27.5	7.5	3.9	2.33

Nearly 85% of faculty agree that they have been reviewed annually. Most faculty agree that the evaluation criteria are clearly communicated and that the department's annual review process is fair. Slightly less than one-third of the faculty respondents are neutral on faculty involvement in establishing review criteria. None of the annual review statements generate much strong disagreement.

Adjuncts and tenure-track differ on each item in this section. Adjuncts' average response is right between "agree" and the center position on each item, while tenure-track faculty averages hover right above and below agree. The greatest difference between the two faculty types is on the item concerning annual reviews, where they differ by nearly a full point. Research faculty also report less agreement with having annual reviews and with faculty input into review criteria, differing from tenure-track faculty by half a point on each item.

Tenured faculty (1.36) express stronger agreement with the statement on having annual reviews than pre-tenured faculty (1.60), though both groups indicate they have regularly been reviewed. Review criteria appear to be more clearly articulated to tenured (2.06) than pre-tenured (2.41) faculty.

Longer tenured-faculty express stronger agreement with being reviewed annually (1.57) and with the clear communication of review criteria (2.14) than do shorter-tenured faculty (1.85 and 2.39), however both groups agree on average.

Men express stronger agreement with being reviewed annually, averaging 1.64 compared to women's 1.86.

2. How much do evaluations of the following activities matter in annual reviews?

	too little				too much	Mean Response (1=too little, 5=too much)
Teaching	8.9	17.4	62.7	8.3	2.8	2.79
Research or creative activity	4.3	5.8	64.6	18.8	6.5	3.17
Service to institution, discipline, or community	15.7	17.6	59.3	6.8	0.6	2.59

A majority of faculty believe that each of the activities above are given the appropriate weight in annual reviews. The average responses reveal small differences between the perceived weights of each activity, with service getting the least attention and research slightly over-weighted.

Adjuncts (2.97) and tenure-track (3.23) differ on the amount research and creativity matters in annual reviews. Research (3.21) and tenure-track (2.54) faculty differ on the amount that service matters.

Both faculty with ten or more years at MSU and those with less than ten years see research as slightly to the "too much" end of the scale in annual reviews, while teaching and service are slightly to the "too little" end. Shorter-term faculty perceive research is further to the "too much" end and teaching and service are closer to the "too little end."

There are no differences according to gender on these items.

3. How much DO evaluations by each of the following groups matter in annual reviews?

	very little				very much	Mean Response (1=very little, 5=very much)
Students	8.6	15.7	34.9	22.2	18.5	3.26
Peers	18.1	19.0	36.8	17.2	8.9	2.80
Administrators	7.7	5.2	36.3	25.5	25.2	3.55

This and the next question show the difference between what faculty perceive and what they prefer for about the weight of evaluations by students, peers, and administrators in annual reviews. The average faculty respondent thinks that evaluations by administrators matter the most, followed by student evaluations and then peers.

Adjunct, research, and tenure-track faculty differ on students. While adjunct and tenure-track faculty are to the "very much" side of center, adjuncts (3.63) are further to the right on this continuum than tenure-track faculty (3.17). Research faculty on average report student evaluations matter much less (2.42).

Both faculty with ten or more years at MSU and those with less than ten years see evaluations by students and by administrators as slightly to the "very much" end of the scale in annual reviews, while evaluations by peers are slightly to the "very little" end. Shorter-term faculty perceive student evaluations are closer to the "very much" end, while they see peer and administrator evaluations closer to the center of the scale than their longer-serving colleagues.

Women report that student evaluations matter more than men report. Women's average of 3.50 compares to men's average of 3.14.

4. How much SHOULD evaluations by each of the following groups matter in annual reviews?

	very little		very much		Mean Response (1=very little, 5=very much)	
Students	5.2	15.5	38.6	29.5	11.2	3.26
Peers	3.6	5.5	38.8	37.6	14.5	3.54
Administrators	7.0	10.9	47.1	27.1	7.9	3.18

The average faculty respondent believes that evaluations by peers should matter most, followed by students, and then by administrators. The largest gap between this and the last question rests on the evaluations by peers, where faculty perceive they matter least and should matter most.

Adjuncts and tenure-track differ on administrators, with adjuncts (3.49) expressing greater support for administration evaluations than tenure-track faculty (3.09).

Length of service affects responses only on how much student evaluations should matter. The responses for long- and short-term faculty almost exactly correspond to their responses on how much they do matter, so shorter-term faculty think student evaluations should matter a bit more than do longer-term faculty. As the overall results suggest, faculty think the student evaluations are weighted appropriately in annual reviews.

Women (3.35) think evaluations by administrators should matter more in annual reviews, compared to men's prescription for their importance (3.06).

Comments on Annual Reviews

A slightly larger group, sixty-seven, commented on annual reviews. The most popular topic involves the evaluation of teaching in annual reviews, with 21 faculty suggesting new methods for evaluating instruction or general discontent with the student evaluation forms. Other answers with smaller clusters of responses are the importance of a good manager as department head in this process, the ambiguity of some evaluation criteria, and a small group who notes they have not yet been reviewed and feel they cannot give much input.

Comment Topic	# Mentions
Need a better teaching evaluation process/tool	21
Dept head role is critical in annual reviews	8
Criteria for review are undefined	7
Have not been reviewed yet	7
Annual reviews have been unfair	6
Positive comment about own department	6

Promotion and Tenure

1. Please mark whether you agree or disagree with the following statements about promotion and tenure at MSU.

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Mean Response (1=Strongly agree, 5= Strongly disagree)
Promotion and tenure expectations were clearly communicated to me upon hire.	19.9	37.2	20.8	16.9	5.1	2.50
Promotion and tenure expectations have been clearly communicated to me since hire.	22.2	39.2	24.3	9.9	4.5	2.35
The promotion and tenure process at MSU-Bozeman is fair.	16.3	37.2	34.7	10.0	1.8	2.44

Promotion and tenure statements average quite similarly to the annual review statements. A majority of respondents agrees with each statement. One-third is neutral on the fairness of the process, and meaningful minorities disagree with all three statements.

Adjunct, research, and tenure-track faculty differ on articulation of P&T expectations on hire and since, with research faculty at 3.08 and 2.73 respectively, adjuncts at 2.72 and 2.76, and tenure-track faculty most likely to agree at 2.41 and 2.20. Adjuncts (2.87) and tenure-track (2.28) differ on the fairness of the process.

Tenured faculty members indicate greater agreement with the expectations upon hire and since hire statements than do their junior peers. Faculty who have been granted tenure (2.17) are more likely to see the process as fair than those who have not yet (2.51).

As tenure status affected these responses, so too does longevity. Longer-serving faculty express greater agreement on average with the clear communication of tenure expectations on hire and since. There is no difference, however, on the fairness of the process.

Gender does not have a statistically significant impact on agreement with these statements.

2. How much DO evaluations by each of the following groups matter in Promotion and Tenure reviews?

	very little				very much	Mean Response (1=very little, 5=very much)
Students	11.0	19.8	33.6	22.0	13.5	3.07
Peers	2.8	7.2	37.4	32.1	20.6	3.60
Administrators	3.4	6.3	37	29.2	24.1	3.64
External Reviewers	2.8	6.0	36.8	28.0	26.4	3.69

As with annual reviews, faculty are able to show the difference between their perceptions and their preferences on the weight of evaluations by different audiences. The average respondent thinks that external reviewers matter most, followed closely by administrators and peers. Student evaluations are weighted least, but the perceived weight placed on student evaluations averages right in the middle of the scale.

Adjuncts and tenure-track differ on peers, administrators, and external reviewers, with adjuncts expressing less weight from each group than tenure-track faculty express. Both are between 3 and 4 on the scale. Research faculty perceive less weight on student and external evaluations than tenure-track.

Tenured faculty perceive evaluations by administrators and external reviewers as more important than do junior faculty, averaging close to 4 on both items, while junior faculty are between 3 and 4.

Longer-term faculty see student evaluations right in the middle of the scale, while short-term faculty see student evaluations as mattering more.

Men and women do not differ statistically on their perceptions of the weight each evaluation carries in promotion and tenure review.

3. How much SHOULD evaluations by each of the following groups matter in Promotion and Tenure reviews?

	very little				very much	Mean Response (1=very little, 5=very much)
Students	4.9	17.9	37.0	29.6	10.5	3.23
Peers	0.9	3.1	28.3	46.5	21.2	3.84
Administrators	7.1	9.0	41.0	31.5	11.4	3.31
External reviewers	0.9	6.2	35.6	33.8	23.4	3.72

Faculty prefer that peer evaluations matter the most, followed by external reviewers, then administrators and students. All should matter more than not, however, as all average above 3 on the five-point scale. The biggest difference between what faculty think is happening and what they think should happen is for administrators, whose evaluations should matter less than they seem to.

Adjuncts and tenure-track differ on peers, administrators, and external reviewers. As with annual reviews, adjuncts express greater support for evaluations by administrators than do tenure-track faculty, while tenure-track faculty are more likely to consider the evaluations of peers and external reviewers. The highest mean rating for both groups of faculty was peer evaluations. Not surprisingly, research faculty think student evaluations should matter significantly less than tenure-track do.

Post-tenure faculty believe evaluations by external reviewers should matter slightly more than they do, and significantly more than junior faculty think they should.

There are no statistically significant differences in these responses according to length of service at MSU.

Women (3.35) think evaluations by administrators should matter more in annual reviews, compared to men's prescription for their importance (3.06).

Comments on Promotion and Tenure

Forty-eight faculty, most of them tenure-track, commented on the promotion and tenure section. No topic generates a large cluster of responses, but there are six general positive comments about the process at MSU being fair. Five faculty note that tenure should be harder to get than it is at MSU, and another five offer comments on a perceived imbalance between research and teaching in the P&T evaluation.

Comment Topic	# Mentions
General positive comment about P&T	6
Tenure is too easy to achieve	5
Imbalance between weights of research and teaching	5
Need a better teaching evaluation process/tool	4
We need better mentors/mentorship program	4
P&T criteria are undefined	4

Governance, Planning, and Budgeting

1. Please mark whether you agree or disagree with the following statements about governance, planning, and budgeting.

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Mean Response (1=Strongly agree, 5= Strongly disagree)
Faculty Senate represents the interests of faculty.	5.3	33.0	43.3	12.5	5.9	2.81
Faculty have adequate representation in long-range planning and university goal-setting.	2.2	22.7	43.6	22.4	9.0	3.13
Faculty have adequate opportunity for input into the budgeting process.	1.2	10.3	37.1	34.6	16.8	3.55
Faculty participation in MSU governance is effective.	0.9	15.0	50.8	22.7	10.6	3.27
Decision-making is guided by the Five Year Vision document.	1.3	11.6	73.0	10.7	3.5	3.03
MSU's budget and planning processes are integrated.	0.6	11.4	63.0	18.7	6.3	3.19
MSU's budgeting process is an open process.	1.3	10.4	49.1	24.5	14.8	3.41

As a group, there is more neutrality on the statements about governance, planning, and budgeting, than on any other block of questions. Majorities are neutral on the statements about the five-year vision document, the integration of planning and budgeting, and the transparency of the budgeting process. Pluralities are neutral on Faculty Senate's effectiveness, and faculty representation in planning and budgeting. More faculty disagree than agree with every statement except Faculty Senate's representativeness, where 38% believe the Senate represents the faculty's interests. The second highest (most disagreeing) average in the survey is on the statement about faculty input into budget decisions.

Adjuncts and tenure-track differ on whether faculty have input into the budgeting process. Both groups average on the disagree side of center, but tenure-track faculty (3.59) disagree more than adjuncts (3.38).

Neither tenured nor pre-tenured faculty agree on average that faculty have a say in planning and goal setting, but tenured faculty are closer to neutral at 3.08 versus 3.31 for pre-tenured faculty.

Longevity at MSU does not affect responses to these items on governance.

Women on average are neutral (2.98) on the faculty's input into long range planning and goal-setting, while men (3.20) disagree with the statement on average. Women agree slightly on average (2.90) that decision making is guided by the vision document, while men disagree by about the same amount (3.11). Both groups disagree that faculty have input into budgeting, that faculty participation in governance is effective, and that the planning and budgeting processes are integrated. Men disagree more strongly on all three.

2. In the last 5 years, I have participated in

	Never	Occasionally	Regularly	Mean Response (1=Never, 3=Regularly)
Faculty Senate and/or its standing committees	70.2	20.3	9.5	1.39
Other college or university committees.	23.9	33.0	43.1	2.19

Participation in Faculty Senate and its committees is infrequent, with most faculty never participating in the last five years. Other college and university committees generate more participation, with a plurality regularly engaged.

Adjuncts and tenure-track differ on participation on committees, with adjuncts close to "never" (1.08) for Faculty Senate and between "never" and "occasionally" (1.68) for other college university committees. Tenure-track faculty report more involvement, halfway between "never" and "occasionally" for Faculty Senate (1.50) and between "occasionally" and "regularly" for college and university committees (2.40). Research faculty (1.71) are significantly less likely to have participated regularly in college or university committees.

Post-tenure faculty have been more regularly active in Faculty Senate activities and in other college or university committees than their junior colleagues.

Longer-serving faculty are more likely to have participated in Faculty Senate and other university or college committees.

There are no statistically significant differences across genders on reported participation in Faculty Senate or other committees.

3. Please mark the level of information you have access to about governance and administration at MSU.

	Too little	About as much as I want	Too much	Mean Response (1=Too little, 3=Too much)
Information about faculty input into university decisions	49.2	50.5	0.3	1.51
Information about major decisions in your college	43.1	56.6	0.3	1.57
Information about major decisions at MSU	54.8	45.2	0.0	1.45
Information about the Commissioner's Office and the Board of Regents	48.1	50.9	0.9	1.53

Slight majorities of faculty get about as much information as they want on faculty input into decisions, decisions within the college, and information about the Commissioner and Board of Regents. A similar majority does not receive enough information about major decisions at MSU. Virtually no one receives too much information. There are no significant differences between faculty types, tenure status, or gender on these items.

Shorter-term faculty are more likely to say they get too little information about faculty input into university decisions and the Commissioner's Office or the Regents. There are no other statistically significant differences across subgroups.

Comments on Governance, Planning, and Budgeting

Only 42 faculty commented on the topics of governance, planning, and budgets. One theme is apparent among the group of commenters, a perception that decision-making is driven by administrators at the top of the structure, with little interest for faculty opinions. Small groups note concerns about Faculty Senate and the faculty who serve in it or on its committees. Specific decisions also show up in the comments, including a funding allocation model within Academic Affairs.

Comment Topic	# Mentions
Decision-making is too top down	12
Faculty Senate is ineffective	6
Weaknesses in faculty representatives	4
Negative comments about Provost's allocation model	4

Students and Student Services

1. Please mark whether you agree or disagree with the following statements about students at MSU.

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Mean Response (1=Strongly agree, 5= Strongly disagree)
Entering undergraduate students are adequately prepared for college-level coursework.	0.9	22.4	34.8	36.0	5.9	3.24
Entering graduate students are adequately prepared for graduate-level coursework.	4.1	37.9	42.6	14.4	0.9	2.70
Student recruitment policies are appropriate for this campus.	2.2	36.8	38.1	18.3	4.6	2.86
Efforts to retain qualified students are effective.	2.8	34.9	42.6	17.0	2.8	2.82
Sufficient advising opportunities are provided for students.	8.0	51.7	28.2	10.5	1.5	2.46

Faculty are more likely to disagree than agree that undergraduate students are prepared when they arrive at MSU. They are more likely to agree that graduate students are prepared, though a plurality is neutral on that statement. Pluralities are also neutral on student recruitment and retention. Sixty percent agree that sufficient advising opportunities are provided. There are no significant differences between faculty types, tenure status, or longevity on these items.

Women (3.35) disagreed more on average than did men (3.16) that entering undergraduates are prepared for college coursework.

2. Please mark your level of satisfaction with the following student services at MSU.

	Very satisfied	Satisfied	Dissatisfied	Very dissatisfied	Don't know or not applicable	Mean Response (1=Very satisfied, 4=Very dissatisfied, don't know excluded)
Admissions	5.0	49.4	4.7	2.5	38.4	2.08
Career and Internship Services	6.3	42.7	7.0	1.9	42.1	2.08
Counseling Center	4.7	37.9	2.8	0.3	54.3	1.97
Dean of Students	9.5	37.9	6.9	1.9	43.8	2.02
Disability, Re-entry and Veterans Services	5.7	35.2	3.2	1.0	54.9	1.99
First Year Initiative	2.8	26.2	4.1	1.3	65.6	2.11
Financial Aid	2.8	33.2	10.1	2.2	51.6	2.24
Math Learning Center	5.4	28.2	3.5	1.6	61.4	2.03
Office of Community Involvement	3.8	23.7	0.0	1.9	70.7	1.94
Registrar	8.8	53.3	5.4	1.3	31.2	1.99
Student Health Services	7.6	34.8	2.5	0.9	54.1	1.93
TRiO	3.8	18.2	2.5	0.6	74.8	2.00
Writing Center	11.3	34.0	8.2	1.9	44.7	2.01

Most faculty expressed no opinion on most of the student service offices. Among those expressing opinions, Student Health Services and the Office of Community Involvement garnered the highest mean ratings, and Financial Aid received the lowest.

Adjuncts and tenure-track differ on TRiO, with adjuncts less satisfied (2.17) than tenure-track (1.86).

Financial Aid garners less satisfaction from post-tenure (2.07) faculty than from pre-tenure (2.31). TRiO follows the same pattern, with tenured faculty rating it 2.14, or slightly worse than "satisfied," while pre-tenure faculty rated TRiO better than "satisfied" at 1.76.

TRiO also generates different satisfaction levels among shorter- and longer-term faculty, with newer faculty more satisfied at 1.86 versus 2.17 for longer-term faculty.

Gender influenced satisfaction with Admissions and the Registrar, with men expressing lower levels of satisfaction on average with both offices.

Comments on Students and Student Services

The number of comments on students and student services was quite low at 38. Survey fatigue may play a greater role in this than actually feelings about the topic. No large clusters of responses are apparent. A few people mention writing skills in particular and a few more mention students being ill-prepared in general.

Comment Topic	# Mentions
Students unprepared for college level coursework	8
Inadequate writing skills	4
Positive comment about student services	3

Facilities

1. Please mark whether you agree or disagree with the following statements about classrooms at MSU.

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Mean Response (1=Strongly agree, 5= Strongly disagree)
There are adequate choices of classrooms to fit my teaching style.	2.2	26.3	19.0	33.9	18.7	3.41
The classrooms in which I teach have sufficient internet connectivity for instruction.	6.3	45.8	14.7	24.5	8.8	2.84
I have access to sufficient A/V equipment.	5.7	48.1	17.7	20.9	7.6	2.77
In general, the seating capacity in the classrooms in which I teach is appropriate for the number of students enrolled in the course.	6.9	51.7	17.2	16.6	7.5	2.66
Acoustics in the classrooms in which I teach are adequate.	6.0	46.9	21.7	17.9	7.5	2.74
Seating in the classrooms in which I teach is in acceptable condition.	5.6	46.1	18.5	19.7	10.0	2.82
Writing surfaces in the classrooms in which I teach are in acceptable condition.	6.3	52.2	20.8	13.5	7.2	2.63

Faculty appear to be dissatisfied with classroom choices, with one of the highest (most disagreeing) average scores in the survey and a majority who disagreed. Small majorities agree with statements on sufficient internet connectivity, sufficient A/V equipment, appropriate seating capacity in acceptable condition, adequate acoustics, and writing surfaces in acceptable condition. However, one-third disagree that there is sufficient internet access in the classrooms.

There are no significant differences between faculty types, tenure status, or longevity on the classroom questions.

While all faculty averaged disagreement on classroom choices, women had a higher average (more disagreeing) than men, with a high 3.69 versus men's 3.23. Women average close to neutral on seating capacity and seating condition, while men tended to agree with those statements.

2. Please mark whether you agree or disagree with the following statements about labs and studios at MSU.
(Please skip if you do not use lab or studio space.)

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Mean Response (1=Strongly agree, 5= Strongly disagree)
There are adequate choices of labs/studios to fit my teaching style.	6.6	32.0	29.9	19.9	11.6	2.98
My lab/studio is adequate to accommodate my research.	8.9	33.1	41.9	10.2	5.9	2.71
Equipment in the instructional labs/studios in which I teach is adequate.	7.5	33.3	35.8	15.8	7.5	2.82
Equipment in the research labs/studios in which I work is adequate.	7.6	33.8	40.9	11.0	6.8	2.76
Cabinetry in the instructional labs/studios in which I teach is adequate.	6.4	36.2	40.0	10.2	7.2	2.76
Cabinetry in the research lab/studio in which I work is adequate.	8.5	33.2	43.0	9.4	6.0	2.71

Among faculty who use lab and studio space, pluralities either agree or express neutrality on the sufficiency of space and equipment.

Adjuncts and tenure-track differ on equipment in labs/studios in which they work, with adjuncts squarely in the middle (3.00) and tenure-track slightly more agreeable (2.69).

There are no differences between pre- and post-tenure or length of service on lab or studio space and equipment.

Continuing the differences noted on the classroom statements, women disagree with the adequacy of lab/studio choices for teaching, while men agree on average. Women are less likely to agree that equipment in research labs/studios is adequate than are men.

3. Please mark whether you agree or disagree with the following statements about facilities services at MSU.

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Mean Response (1=Strongly agree, 5= Strongly disagree)
Custodial Services keeps my office adequately clean.	13.8	38.8	15.6	20.6	11.2	2.77
Custodial Services keeps my classrooms adequately clean.	12.9	47.0	19.1	13.2	7.8	2.56
Furnishings/equipment in my office are adequately maintained.	10.3	41.1	24.1	16.3	8.2	2.71
Furnishings/equipment in my classrooms are adequately maintained.	8.5	40.8	25.4	18.2	7.2	2.75
Required maintenance for furnishings/equipment in my department is performed in a timely manner.	6.7	37.5	29.2	18.4	8.3	2.84

Custodial Services garner overall agreement for their work in offices and classrooms, though almost one-third disagree with the statement on clean offices. Pluralities to slight majorities agree with statements about maintenance of furnishings and equipment.

Adjuncts and tenure-track differ on custodial services in the classrooms, with adjuncts (2.38) slightly more likely to agree than tenure-track (2.63). Research (2.21) and tenure-track (2.85) faculty differ on custodial services in the office.

Neither tenure status, longevity, nor gender significantly affect responses to items on Facilities Services.

Comments on Facilities

A larger group is willing to make comments on facilities at MSU, with 68 offering some sort of response. One theme generates significant interest, the inadequacy of classroom space to suit needs and schedules. A smaller group offers a related comment on the inadequacy of the process for assigning classrooms or other instructional space. Custodial services in general get attention, and specific mentions of infrequent garbage removal, vacuuming and dusting (not shown in this table) also appear. Several faculty also note the facilities – buildings, equipment, furnishings – are outdated.

Comment Topic	# Mentions
Classroom space inadequate	13
Custodial services inadequate	9
Facilities are outdated	8
Allocation process for space/classrooms is inadequate	8
Trash not emptied frequently enough	8
Off campus – comments on non-Bozeman specifics or unable to comment	7
Need more IT (equipment, support) in classrooms	7
Equipment/furniture financed by grant, department, self	7

Institutional Integrity

1. Please mark whether you agree or disagree with the following statements about institutional integrity at MSU.

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Mean Response (1=Strongly agree, 5= Strongly disagree)
Intellectual property rights policies are appropriate for this campus.	6.9	49.4	38.1	5.0	0.6	2.43
MSU appropriately supports ethnic and gender diversity on this campus.	15.0	48.1	23.8	10.6	2.5	2.38
MSU acts appropriately when fraud is reported or discovered.	7.8	33.2	53.9	3.4	1.6	2.58
MSU acts appropriately when sexual harassment is reported or discovered.	9.7	31.7	53.0	4.1	1.6	2.56
MSU acts appropriately when discrimination is reported or discovered.	8.2	29.4	58.2	3.2	0.9	2.59

Most faculty agree that MSU's intellectual property rights policies and support for ethnic and gender diversity are appropriate. Majorities are neutral on MSU's responses to fraud, harassment, and discrimination charges. Few faculty disagree strongly with any of the statements, though 12% disagree with the statement on support for diversity.

Faculty type, tenure status, longevity, and gender have no impact on responses to statements on institutional integrity.

Comments on Institutional Integrity

This topic garners the fewest comments in the survey, with just 24 faculty offering one, and the most common response being no experience with the issues raised.

Comment Topic	# Mentions
No experience with issues	7
General positive comment about institutional integrity	3
Specific sexual harassment incident was overblown	3

Salaries and Benefits

1. Please mark whether you agree or disagree with the following statements about benefits at MSU.

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Mean Response (1=Strongly agree, 5= Strongly disagree)
I am satisfied with my health insurance coverage.	7.0	39.9	14.9	29.3	8.8	2.93
The out-of-pocket costs for my health insurance are reasonable.	5.8	40.9	16.5	26.5	10.4	2.95
The TIAA/CREF retirement package is adequate for my needs (leave blank if TRS).	4.2	35.6	20.1	27.5	12.7	3.09
The TRS retirement package is adequate for my needs (leave blank if TIAA/CREF).	6.1	43.9	25.6	18.3	6.1	2.74

Faculty are only slightly more likely to agree than disagree that they are satisfied with their health insurance coverage. Out-of-pocket costs are seen as reasonable by a plurality of respondents, but more than one-third disagree. Perhaps not surprising given the market climate, faculty on TIAA/CREF are evenly split, while TRS faculty are more likely to agree with its adequacy. All of these items generated a noticeable group of strong disagree-ers.

Adjuncts and tenure-track differ on health insurance coverage and out-of-pocket costs. Tenure-track average right in the middle on these items (3.01 and 3.00), while adjuncts respond slightly more positively (2.58 and 2.64). Adjuncts and tenure-track differ on TIAA/CREF. Adjuncts average on the agree side of the scale (2.70), while tenure-track average on the disagree side (3.22).

Pre-tenured faculty average a neutral response on TIAA/CREF's adequacy. Post-tenure faculty average a more disagreeing 3.33. Similarly, faculty with less than ten years of service have a neutral average on this item while longer-serving faculty are more negative at 3.25.

Women tend to agree (2.72) that they are satisfied with health insurance coverage, while men are just to the "disagree" side of the scale (3.06). The same pattern with nearly the same numbers persists on the item on out-of-pocket costs. There was a half-point difference between men and women on TRS, with women (2.44) agreeing and men close to neutral (2.94).

2. Please mark whether you agree or disagree with the following statements about salaries at MSU.

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Mean Response (1=Strongly agree, 5= Strongly disagree)
Given the funding constraints MSU faces, my base AY salary is appropriate as compared to faculty with the same rank, experience, and time in service in my department.	2.4	45.9	16.2	22.9	12.5	2.97
Given the funding constraints MSU faces, my base AY salary is appropriate as compared to faculty with the same rank, experience, and time in service, in my discipline at similar institutions.	0.3	7.7	11.1	43.1	37.8	4.10
Annual increases in my salary have been fairly determined by my department and college.	7.1	34.9	26.2	17.9	13.9	2.97

The single highest (most disagreeing) score on the survey is in response to the item on external salary comparisons. Faculty overwhelmingly disagree that their salaries are appropriate when compared to similarly situated faculty elsewhere. A plurality agrees with the internal comparison statement, though with a substantial minority opposing the statement. Finally, annual increases are seen as fairly determined by just over forty percent, but thirty percent disagree.

Adjuncts and tenure-track differ on internal equity, with adjuncts averaging on the "disagree" side of the scale (3.21) and tenure-track on the "agree" side (2.90). Adjuncts and tenure-track differ on the fairness of annual raises, following the same pattern (3.20 versus 2.89).

Post-tenure and pre-tenure also faculty differ internal equity, with senior faculty neutral (2.99) and junior faculty slightly closer to "agree" (2.72).

There are no significant differences according to gender.

Comments on Salaries and Benefits

Despite its location as the last topic on the survey, this section did generate 80 comments. The single most popular theme is the insufficiency of salaries at MSU, with 27 comments on that theme. Another set of seven faculty mention the "quality of life tax," the price of the view, or the lifestyle/salary trade-offs – theories sometimes used to explain how MSU is able to hire and retain employees at lower salaries than our peers.

There are several clusters of comments around raises. One group notes insufficient annual raises. A distinct set of comments centers on the insufficient cost-of-living (COLA) portion of the annual raise or notes that the entire raise does not match inflation in some years. A third set comments negatively on the central holdback of a portion of the raise pool, yielding smaller raises for those who do not get special merit or equity raises from that holdback.

Finally, there are nine negative comments about retirement benefits or the state's contribution to retirement. A smaller group (four faculty, not shown here) makes related comments on a portion of TIAA/CREF contributions going into TRS.

Comment Topic	# Mentions
Insufficient salaries	27
Negative comment about retirement benefits	9
"Quality of life tax"	7
Process for setting salaries/raises is not transparent	6
Insufficient COLAs	6
Comment on central holdback from the raise pool	6
Insufficient raises	6

Overall Comments

Finally, faculty were asked to comment on what they like most about working at MSU, what they like least, and any other topic they wished to bring up.

Like Most

Though respondents had been through a very long survey by this point, 223 faculty made comments on what they liked best. Comments follow four dominant themes, though there were nearly 50 distinct topics brought up. Topics receiving ten or more mentions appear below.

The most popular element about MSU for faculty are the bright, engaged, talented colleagues, with 87 mentions. Slightly fewer, 73, mention the quality of the students with whom they work. Sixty-eight mention Bozeman, the region, or some other location benefit. A much smaller group mentions the collegiality or positive atmosphere in their specific department.

Comment Topic	# Mentions
Colleagues	87
Students	73
Location	68
Department	23
Academic freedom	17
Commitment to teaching	15
Commitment to research	14
Collaboration	14
Faculty-student interaction	14
Size	13
"Friendly"	12
"Atmosphere"	10
"People"	10

Like Least

229 faculty offered what they like least about working at MSU. Topics with more than ten mentions appear below. Unlike the "like most" question, few themes emerged from the responses, with one exception, salaries.

Comment Topic	# Mentions
Salaries	49
Funding	19
Administration (no further specifics)	13
Lack of transparency in decision-making	12
Facilities	12
Lack of state support (financial and intangible)	12

Other Comments

Only 55 faculty took advantage of the final comment opportunity, which was a free-response item inviting any other comments. Almost half of those commenting offered a positive comment about MSU or working at MSU.

Comment Topic	# Mentions
Positive	23
Questions don't pertain to my position	7
Specific suggestion for improving MSU	5
Salaries are too low to retain quality faculty	4