



## **2001-02 HERI Faculty Survey**

**Assessment & Institutional Research Office  
September 2002**

# THE 2001-02 HERI SURVEY OF FACULTY AT THE UNIVERSITY OF SCRANTON

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Respondent Profile.....	1
Table 1: Respondent Profile.....	2
Background Characteristics .....	3
Table 2: Background Characteristics .....	4
Activities .....	5
Table 3: Activities.....	6
Time Allocation .....	6
Table 4: Time Allocation .....	8
Scholarship & Courses.....	9
Table 5: Types of Scholarship & Courses .....	10
Evaluation & Instructional Methods.....	11
Table 6: Evaluation & Instructional Methods.....	12
Goals, Expectations, & Opinions.....	12
Table 7: Goals Expectations, & Opinions.....	14
Describing the University of Scranton.....	14
Table 9: Describing the University of Scranton .....	17
Satisfaction & Stress .....	18
Table 10: Satisfaction & Stress.....	19
Locally Developed Questions .....	20
Table 11: Mission & Identity, Faculty Roles & Rewards.....	21
Table 12: Quality Ratings for Aspects of the University.....	22
Summary of Key Findings .....	23
Conclusion .....	25
Appendix	

## **THE 2001-02 HERI SURVEY OF FACULTY AT THE UNIVERSITY OF SCRANTON**

During the 2001-02 academic year, the University of Scranton participated in the faculty survey conducted by the Higher Education Research Institute (HERI) at UCLA. This was the fourth time that the University of Scranton has participated in this survey which is conducted every three years by HERI. A total of 416 two-year colleges, four-year colleges and universities nationwide took part in the 2001-02 survey.

As in previous years, the purpose of our participation in the survey was to gauge the opinions and attitudes of faculty at the University of Scranton on a variety of issues related to higher education. The survey focuses on issues such as how faculty members spend their time, how they interact with students, their preferred methods of teaching, their perceptions of institutional climate, and their primary sources of stress and satisfaction. We added 20 locally developed questions that asked faculty about their responsibilities, their perceptions of the University's Jesuit mission, and their opinions about the quality of various aspects of the University of Scranton. A copy of the instrument, including the additional questions, is provided as an appendix to this report.

Questionnaires were initially distributed in November of 2001. In January 2002, a second questionnaire was sent to those who had not responded to the first mailing. Completed questionnaires were returned directly to HERI by the respondents. The University of Scranton received our results, reported in aggregate form, in June 2002. A complete description of the procedures used in carrying out the 2001-02 national survey and its results is provided by HERI in The American College Teacher: National Norms for the 2001-02 HERI Faculty Survey. A copy of this publication will be available in AIRO after September 2002.

### **RESPONDENT PROFILE**

A total of 150 University of Scranton faculty (out of 247) completed the 2001-02 survey, yielding a response rate of sixty-one percent (61%). Nationally, there were 54,549 respondents and an overall participation rate of forty-one percent (41%) for all institutions.

The profile of University of Scranton respondents indicates that the sample is fairly representative of the faculty as a whole in terms of demographic characteristics. Table 1 shows how the sample of respondents is distributed with regard to age, sex, rank, and tenure compared to all University of Scranton faculty for 2001.

**Table 1: Respondent Profile**

Age	All 2001 Faculty %	'01 Resp %	'98 Resp %	'95 Resp %	'92 Resp %
<30	0.4%	1%	1%	1%	2%
30 to 39	13%	11%	14%	15%	23%
40 to 49	35%	29%	44%	46%	39%
50 to 59	33%	38%	28%	24%	26%
60 to 69	16%	17%	9%	11%	10%
70 and over	3%	4%	3%	1%	0%
<b>Sex</b>					
Male	69%	67%	61%	64%	70%
Female	31%	33%	39%	36%	30%
<b>Rank</b>					
Professor	32%	38%	27%	27%	21%
Associate	41%	35%	41%	40%	31%
Assistant	19%	21%	27%	30%	42%
Lecturer	5%	4%	1%	0%	2%
Instructor	3%	2%	4%	4%	2%
Other					1%
<b>Tenure</b>					
Tenured	77%	73%	67%	66%	58%
Not Tenured	23%	27%	28%	34%	42%
Missing			6%		

Table 1 also shows the changes in our respondent profile over the last four administrations of this survey which span 10 years. This profile shows the “aging” of our faculty respondents. In 1992, 1995, and 1998, the largest percentage of respondents were from the 40 to 49 year age category. This group has now moved to the 50 to 59 year age category. In 1992, 64% of our faculty were under 50 years of age, now almost 60% are 50 years of age or older. We have consistently had a larger percentage of male respondents in past survey administrations as well, which reflects our actual profile of 2/3 male and 1/3 female faculty. Corresponding with the age of our faculty, there has been a shift in the percentage of respondents with an academic rank of Assistant Professor at 42% in 1992 to a rank of full professor at 38% in 2001. While the majority of our faculty respondents have been tenured, the percent with tenure has increased from 58% in 1992 to 73% in 2001.

In this report, selected responses from University of Scranton faculty are compared to a peer group consisting of seven private schools, all with our Carnegie Classification of Master’s I. The specific schools included are Butler University, Creighton University, Loyola Marymount University, Rollins College, Santa Clara University, University of Richmond, and Valparaiso University. The data for these schools is provided to us only in aggregate form for the group. In addition, any noteworthy changes in University of Scranton faculty responses over time are also reported. We treat differences of at least 5 percent as noteworthy or of practical significance. Detailed results of all survey items from the current or previous HERI faculty surveys, are available from the Assessment and Institutional Research Office (AIRO).

All tables in this report use abbreviations for the questionnaire items. The reader is encouraged to consult the actual survey form for complete wording of the items (see appendix).

## BACKGROUND CHARACTERISTICS

Responses, in terms of percentage of faculty, to questions on background characteristics are presented in Table 2.

The faculty respondents from the University of Scranton are slightly older than those from the peer group. Almost 60% of our faculty are 50 years of age or older; while almost 50% of faculty in the Master's I Private schools were 50 years of age or older, due to a larger group of faculty in their thirties. The University of Scranton faculty are similar to the peer group in their racial/ethnic background — both are predominantly white/Caucasian. The racial composition of our respondents has remained the same since the 1992 survey. Our faculty differ from this peer group in terms of gender, where we have a larger number of male respondents (67%).

The majority of faculty at the University of Scranton (83%) and in the comparison group (81%) have earned a doctoral degree. The percentage of our faculty respondents who have earned a Ph.D. or Ed.D has increased from 75% in 1992. A larger percentage of our faculty (38%) hold the rank of professor compared to those in the Master's I Private (28%) and more of our faculty (by 15%) are tenured. Almost all of the faculty in both groups reported that their principal activity is teaching.

About one-third of the faculty in both groups were appointed at their present institution before 1984; however, a larger percentage of our faculty were appointed at the University before 1984 (38%) compared to the peer group. The Master's I Private schools have appointed more of their faculty within the last decade. Forty-one percent (41%) of the Master's I faculty were appointed between 1994 and 2001, while only 27% of our faculty were appointed in that time period. The largest percentages of our faculty are located in health-related, humanities, business, education, or social sciences departments. The peer group has less faculty in the health-related and education departments and more faculty in the fine arts and physical sciences departments.

One-half (53%) of our faculty reported earnings in the \$50,000 to \$69,000 salary range for a 9/10 month contract. The Master's I Private group reported lower earnings with 43% of their faculty falling in the \$40,000 to \$59,000 salary range for a 9/10 month contract. Overall, 65% of the University of Scranton respondents reported earning \$60,000 or more compared to 45% of the peer group respondents.

Note: The data presented in the respondent profile and background characteristics is intended to provide a context for the remaining portions of the survey discussed in this report. Data from our own internal sources should be used to analyze trends in the demographic characteristics or employment of our faculty. For example, although only 78% of our faculty respondents reported having a 9/10 month contract, in fact all of our faculty have a 9/10 month contract.

**Table 2: Background Characteristics**

University of Scranton Full-time UG Faculty			
	University of Scranton	Master's I Private	Difference
<b>Age as of December 31, 2001</b>			
<30	1%	2%	-1
30 to 39	11	21	-10
40 to 49	29	29	0
50 to 59	38	33	5
60 to 69	17	13	4
70 and over	4	3	1
<b>Gender</b>			
male	67	60	7
female	33	40	-7
<b>Racial/Ethnic Group</b>			
white/caucasian	93	89	4
<b>Academic Rank</b>			
professor	38	28	10
associate professor	35	31	4
assistant professor	21	30	-9
<b>Principal Activity</b>			
teaching	99	94	5
<b>Highest Degree Earned</b>			
Master's (M.A., M.S., etc.)	14	10	4
Ph.D./Ed.D.	83	81	2
<b>Department of Current Faculty Appt.</b>			
health related	17	8	9
humanities	16	15	1
business	12	8	4
education	11	5	6
social sciences	10	12	-2
physical sciences	3	8	-5
fine arts	1	11	-10
<b>Year Appointed at Present Institution</b>			
Before 1984	38	31	7
1984 to 1988	16	12	4
1989 to 1993	20	16	4
1994 to 1998	15	20	-5
1999 to 2001	12	21	-9
<b>Tenured?</b>			
yes	73	58	15
<b>Salary is Based On</b>			
9/10 months	78	71	7
<b>Base Salary for 9/10 Month Contracts</b>			
Less than \$30,000	1	4	-3
\$30,000 to 39,999	4	10	-6
\$40,000 to 49,999	10	23	-13
\$50,000 to 59,999	22	20	2
\$60,000 to 69,999	31	16	15
\$70,000 to 79,999	18	11	7
\$80,000 to 89,999	11	8	3
\$90,000 or more	5	10	-5

## ACTIVITIES

In Table 3, the percentage of faculty having engaged in various activities is reported. There are three categories of activities: (1) general, (2) teaching, and (3) reform efforts. Involvement in reform efforts at your institution is a new item in the 2001-02 HERI survey.

Substantially more University of Scranton faculty (98%) belong to a faculty union than do faculty in the Master's I Private group (2%). Compared to this peer group, fewer University of Scranton faculty reported having

- received an award for outstanding teaching
- held an academic administrative position
- focused research or writing on racial or ethnic minorities
- developed a new course (in the last two years)
- considered leaving academe (in the last two years)
- received one job offer (in the last two years)

In terms of their teaching activities in the last two years, more University of Scranton faculty reported that they had taught an honors course (39%) or taught a service learning course (31%) than the faculty in the Master's I Private group.

While fewer of our faculty reported that they:

- taught an interdisciplinary course
- put/collected assignments on the Internet
- participated in a teaching enhancement workshop
- used intra- or extramural funds for research
- team-taught a course

One-half or more of the faculty respondents from the University and the Master's I Private group reported being involved in reform efforts related to the curriculum, general education, mission/purpose, faculty roles/rewards, or governance at their institution in the last two years. The largest percent of faculty at the University (83%) and in the peer group (80%) have been involved in reform efforts related to the curriculum. More of our faculty reported involvement in reform efforts related to governance, faculty/roles rewards, mission/purpose, and general education than their counterparts from the Master's I Private schools.

### *Scranton Trends*

Presented below are the five top rated teaching activities in the last two years for our faculty respondents from 1992 and 2001:

<u>1992</u>	<u>2001</u>
1. worked w/students on research proj. (66%)	worked w/undergrads on research proj. (64%)
2. teaching enhancement workshop (52%)	teaching enhancement workshop (52%)
3. used funds for research (49%)	used funds for research (44%)
4. served as a paid consultant (37%)	put/collect assignment on Internet (42%)
5. taught honors course (29%)	taught honors course (39%)

**Table 3: Activities**

	University of Scranton	Master's I Private	Difference
<b>General Activities</b>			
member of a faculty union*	98%	2%	<b>96</b>
plan to work beyond age 70	37	37	<b>0</b>
held academic admin position	35	46	<b>-11</b>
award for outstanding teaching	34	46	<b>-12</b>
research/writing on women	29	33	<b>-4</b>
research/writing on race/ethnicity	24	29	<b>-5</b>
<b>In the Last Two Years</b>			
developed a new course	67	78	<b>-11</b>
served as a paid consultant	36	35	<b>1</b>
considered early retirement	22	26	<b>-4</b>
considered leaving academe	21	33	<b>-12</b>
received one job offer	21	28	<b>-7</b>
<b>Teaching Activities in the Last Two Years</b>			
worked w/undergrads on research proj.	64	68	<b>-4</b>
in teaching enhancement workshop	52	66	<b>-14</b>
used funds for research	44	56	<b>-12</b>
put/collected assign on Internet	42	57	<b>-15</b>
taught honors course	39	21	<b>18</b>
taught a service learning course	31	20	<b>11</b>
taught interdisciplinary course	30	46	<b>-16</b>
team-taught a course	30	37	<b>-7</b>
<b>Involved in Reform Efforts in the Last Two Years (Very/Minimally)*</b>			
curriculum	83	80	<b>3</b>
general education	73	68	<b>5</b>
overall mission, purpose	63	57	<b>6</b>
faculty roles/rewards	62	54	<b>8</b>
governance	58	48	<b>10</b>

\* This item asked for the first time in 2001.

## TIME ALLOCATION

How faculty allocate their time among various responsibilities is reported in Table 4.

Almost two-thirds (61%) of University of Scranton faculty report spending 9 to 12 hours per week teaching, the equivalent of three or four three-credit courses. More of our faculty report teaching 9 to 12 hours per week than those in the comparison group (45%). About one-third (36%) of the faculty in the Master's I Private schools spend only 5 to 8 hours per week teaching.

University of Scranton faculty reported spending the largest amounts of time on preparing to teach, where one-third of our faculty reported spending 17 or more hours per week, and on household/childcare duties were one-third also reported spending 17 or more hours per week. Their least amount of time was spent on outside consulting (77% spent 0 hours), creative products/performances (65% spent 0 hours), and other administration (43% spent 0 hours).

Our faculty spent similar amounts of time as the faculty in the Master's I Private Group on the following activities:

- preparing for teaching (¼ spend 9 to 12 hours per week)
- research and scholarly writing (1 to 8 hours per week)
- committee work and meetings (1 to 4 hours per week)

Compared to this peer group, University of Scranton faculty report spending

More Time

- scheduled teaching
- advising/counseling of students
- community or public service
- household /childcare duties

Less Time

- other administration
- creative products/performances
- outside consulting/freelance work

*Scranton Trends*

Compared to our faculty respondents from 1992, the University of Scranton faculty in 2001 are spending their time in relatively the same ways. A comparison of the time allocated to the activities listed in the survey show that the modal response to each item has remained the same; however there have been some shifts in the percentage of respondents.

<u>Activity</u>	<u>Mode hours per week</u>	<u>1992</u>	<u>2001</u>
scheduled teaching	9 to 12 hrs	61%	61%
preparing for teaching	9 to 12 hrs	23%	23%
household/childcare	1 to 8 hrs	43%	39%
advising/counseling students	1 to 4 hrs	54%	62%
committee work & meetings	1 to 4 hrs	71%	66%
research & scholarly writing	1 to 4 hrs	34%	40%
community or public service	1 to 4 hrs	67%	62%
other administration	none	40%	43%
creative products/performance	none	84%	65%
outside consulting/freelance	none	76%	77%

The most amounts of time continue to be spent on scheduled teaching, preparing to teach, and household/childcare. An increase in the amount of time spent on household/childcare was reported from 1992, where 23% were spending 17 or more hours per week, to 2001, where 33% are spending 17 or more hours per week. More time is also being spent on committee work and meetings, with an increase in the faculty reporting spending 5 to 8 hours per week from 14% in 1992 to 22% in 2001. More faculty are also reporting spending time on creative products/performances.

Less time is reported being spent on advising/counseling students, where 13% of faculty reported spending 9 or more hours per week in 1992 compared to 6% of faculty who currently report spending that same amount of time. Similarly, the percent of faculty who report spending 9 or more hours per week on research and scholarly writing has dropped from 30% in 1992 to 23% in 2001.

**Table 4: Time Allocation**

<b>HOURS PER WEEK SPENT:</b>			
	<b>University of Scranton</b>	<b>Master's I Private</b>	<b>Difference</b>
<b>Scheduled Teaching</b>			
0 to 4	2%	6%	-4
5 to 8	22	36	-14
9 to 12	61	45	16
13 to 16	10	9	1
17 or more	5	6	-1
<b>Preparing for Teaching</b>			
0 to 4	8	7	1
5 to 8	18	21	-3
9 to 12	23	24	-1
13 to 16	18	19	-1
17 to 20	19	15	4
21 or more	15	14	1
<b>Advising/Counseling of Students</b>			
none	2	5	-3
1 to 4	62	63	-1
5 to 8	30	24	6
9 or more	6	8	-2
<b>Committee Work &amp; Meetings</b>			
none	3	6	-3
1 to 4	66	68	-2
5 to 8	22	21	1
9 or more	8	6	2
<b>Other Administration</b>			
none	43	35	8
1 to 4	35	41	-6
5 to 8	10	11	-1
9 to 12	6	6	0
13 or more	6	6	0
<b>Research and Scholarly Writing</b>			
none	15	14	1
1 to 4	40	36	4
5 to 8	23	26	-3
9 to 12	13	13	0
13 or more	10	11	-1
<b>Creative Products/Performances</b>			
none	65	65	0
1 to 4	28	23	5
5 or more	7	12	-5
<b>Community or Public Service</b>			
none	14	35	-21
1 to 4	62	53	9
5 to 8	15	8	7
9 or more	8	3	5
<b>Outside Consulting/Freelance Work</b>			
none	77	69	8
1 to 4	18	24	-6
5 or more	5	7	-2
<b>Household/Childcare Duties</b>			
none	7	12	-5
1 to 8	39	38	1
9 to 16	21	29	-8
17 or more	33	22	11

## TYPES OF SCHOLARSHIP AND COURSES

Table 5 summarizes responses to two sets of questionnaire items: (1) items concerning the production of various types of scholarship and (2) items concerning types of courses taught.

The largest percentage (58%) of University of Scranton faculty reported that their primary interests lie in both research and teaching, but leaning toward teaching. This is a larger percentage (by 11%) of faculty than in the comparison group, where more faculty indicated that their primary interest was leaning toward research.

The University of Scranton faculty have been more active in the production of articles in academic or professional journals and slightly less active in their production of chapters in edited volumes and books, manuals, monographs than the faculty in the Master's I Private group. Sixty-seven percent (67%) of our faculty reported having had a professional writing published or accepted for publication in the last two years while 72% of faculty from the comparison group had their writing published or accepted for publication.

In terms of the types of courses taught this term, more University of Scranton faculty reported teaching general education classes than the faculty in the comparison group. More of our faculty (43%) also reported teaching more than one general education class than the faculty from the Master's I Private schools (29%). The majority of our faculty (79%) report teaching 1 to 3 "other BA or BS undergraduate credit courses." Eighty-four percent (84%) of the faculty in the Master's I Private group report teaching 1 to 3 "other BA or BS undergraduate credit courses;" however, more of these faculty (by 13%) report teaching only two courses. About one-third of faculty at the University of Scranton (33%) and in the comparison group (30%) report teaching one or more graduate courses.

### *Scranton Trends*

More of our 2001 faculty respondents (86%) indicated that their primary interest is either in teaching or leaning toward teaching than the 1992 respondents (79%). During this same time period, our faculty report an increase in their production of articles in academic or professional journals (from 80% in 1992 to 94% in 2001) and chapters in edited volumes (from 25% in 1992 to 49% in 2001). Sixty-seven percent (67%) of 2001 faculty report having their professional writing published or accepted for publication in the last two years, compared with 62% of 1992 faculty.

More of our 2001 faculty respondents (61%) report teaching a general education course this term than the 1992 respondents (54%). Roughly the same percent of faculty respondents report teaching undergraduate credit courses and graduate courses in 2001 as in 1992.

**Table 5: Types of Scholarship and Courses**

<b>NUMBER OF:</b>			
<b>Articles in Academic or Professional Journals</b>			
	<b>University of Scranton</b>	<b>Master's I Private</b>	<b>Difference</b>
none	7%	13%	-6
1 to 2	18	17	1
3 to 4	13	16	-3
5 to 10	30	24	6
11 to 20	22	17	5
21+	11	13	-2
<b>Chapters in Edited Volumes</b>			
none	51	45	6
1 to 2	32	30	2
3 to 4	9	14	-5
5+	8	11	-3
<b>Books, Manuals, Monographs</b>			
none	60%	55	5
1 to 2	26	29	-3
3 to 4	9	9	0
5+	5	8	-3
<b>Professional Writings Published or Accepted for Publication in the Last Two Years</b>			
none	33	28	5
1 to 2	38	38	0
3 to 4	17	22	-5
5 to 10	9	11	-2
11+	3	1	2
<b>COURSES TAUGHT THIS TERM:</b>			
<b>General Education</b>			
none	39	46	-7
one	18	25	-7
two	23	20	3
three	16	7	9
four or more	4	2	2
<b>Other BA or BS Undergraduate Credit Courses</b>			
none	13	9	4
one	26	23	3
two	23	36	-13
three	30	25	5
four	6	4	2
five or more	2	2	0
<b>Graduate Courses</b>			
none	67	70	-3
one	20	25	-5
two	12	3	9
three or more	1	1	0
<b>Primary Interest</b>			
very heavily in teaching	28	25	3
leaning toward teaching	58	47	11
leaning toward research	14	26	-12
very heavily in research	1	2	-1

## EVALUATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL METHODS

Table 6 shows responses to questions about the types of evaluation and instructional methods used by faculty in undergraduate courses.

The instructional methods that are used most frequently by the faculty in both respondent groups are class discussions, lecturing, and cooperative (small group) learning. The actual distribution of responses shows that our faculty differ from the faculty in the Master's I Private group in terms of their use of various instructional methods. Our faculty use extensive lecturing (50%) and community service as part of coursework (13%) more frequently than faculty in the comparison group. Instructional methods that are used less frequently by our faculty than by faculty in the Master's I Private group are:

- independent projects
- cooperative learning (small groups)
- group projects
- readings on racial/ethnic issues
- readings on women/gender issues
- experiential learning/field studies
- multiple drafts of written work

There are also differences in the evaluation methods used most often by University of Scranton faculty and those used most often by the faculty in the Master's I Private group. The evaluation methods that were used most often by the two groups are:

### University of Scranton Faculty

essay mid-terms/finals  
multiple choice mid-terms/finals  
quizzes

### Master's I Private Group

essay mid-terms/finals  
competency-based grading  
term/research papers

### *Scranton Trends*

Four of the five most frequently used instructional methods reported by our faculty have remained the same since 1992; however the extent of their use has shifted with less lecturing and independent projects and more cooperative learning used in 2001. The use of computer/machine aided instruction replaced the use of group projects and multiple drafts of written work among the top five in 2001.

#### 1992

1. class discussions (70%)
2. extensive lecturing (62%)
3. independent projects (38%)
4. cooperative learning (28%)
5. group projects & multiple drafts of writing (20%)

#### 2001

- class discussions (72%)
- extensive lecturing (50%)
- cooperative learning (34%)
- computer/machine aided (25%)
- independent projects (23%)

Four of the five most frequently used evaluation methods reported by our faculty have remained the same since 1992. The use of competency-based grading has decreased while the use of

essays or multiple choice on mid-terms/finals and quizzes have remained relatively unchanged. The use of student presentations replaced term/research papers among the top five.

- 1992
1. competency-based grading (48%)
  2. essay mid-term/finals (42%)
  3. short answer mid-term/finals (41%)
  4. term/research papers (39%)
  5. multiple choice mid-term/finals & quizzes (37%)

- 2001
- essay mid-terms/finals (46%)
  - multiple choice mid-terms/finals (42%)
  - quizzes (41%)
  - competency-based grading (38%)
  - student presentations (37%)

**Table 6: Evaluation and Instructional Methods**

<b>Evaluation Methods Used in Most or all Undergraduate Classes</b>	<b>University of Scranton</b>	<b>Master's I Private</b>	<b>Difference</b>
essay mid-terms/finals	46%	54%	-8
multiple-choice mid-terms/finals	42	25	17
quizzes	41	37	4
competency-based grading	38	52	-14
student presentations	37	40	-3
short-answer mid-terms/finals	34	41	-7
term/research papers	34	42	-8
grading on a curve	23	17	6
weekly essay assignments	12	22	-10
student evals of each others' work	9	17	-8
<b>Instructional Methods Used in Most/All Undergraduate Classes</b>			
class discussions	72	74	-2
extensive lecturing	50	39	11
cooperative learning (small groups)	34	45	-11
computer/machine-aided instruct	25	27	-2
independent projects	23	35	-12
group projects	19	30	-11
multiple drafts of written work	18	24	-6
readings on racial/ethnic issues	15	24	-9
readings on women/gender issues	15	23	-8
experiential learning/field studies	14	22	-8
community service part of coursewk	13	5	8

## GOALS, EXPECTATIONS, & OPINIONS

In Table 7, responses are summarized for items in the survey that ask about faculty's professional and personal goals, their goals and expectations for undergraduate students, and their opinions on a variety of current issues in academe. The items presented are those where fifty percent or more of the faculty responded that they were in agreement with the specific goal or issue or that they consider it as important or essential.

Faculty at the University of Scranton and in the Master's I Private group share their top three personal goals of

- 1) being a good teacher
- 2) being a good colleague
- 3) developing a meaningful philosophy of life.

Beyond these, more of our faculty had personal goals of raising a family (75%), integrating spirituality in their life (63%), and achieving congruence with institutional values (67%) than the faculty in the comparison group. More faculty (by 11%) from the Master's I Private group had a personal goal of helping to promote racial understanding.

Intellectual challenge was the number one reason selected for pursuing an academic career by faculty at the University of Scranton and in the Master's I Private group. There were no notable differences among the reasons chosen by our faculty for pursuing an academic career and those in the comparison group.

Similarly, our faculty (98%) share the opinion of their counterparts in the Master's I Private group (99%) that developing the ability to think clearly is the most important goal for undergraduates. University of Scranton faculty (67%) rated preparing for employment as a very important or essential goal for undergraduates more frequently than the faculty in the Master's I Private group (61%). Our faculty rated the following goals for undergraduates as very important or essential less frequently than the faculty in the comparison group:

- prepare students for responsible citizenship
- enhance students' self-understanding
- enhance students' knowledge/appreciation of other race/ethnic groups
- help students develop personal values

The majority of our faculty and those in the comparison group agreed strongly or somewhat with the ideas that (1) colleges should encourage students to be involved in community service activities, and (2) a racially/ethnically diverse student body enhances the educational experience of all students.

### *Scranton Trends*

Our faculty's top personal/professional goals are the same today as in 1992: (1) be a good teacher (99%), (2) be a good colleague (84%), and (3) develop a philosophy of life (80%).

In 1992, fifty percent or more of our faculty rated the following goals for undergraduates as very important or essential:

- develop ability to think clearly (98%)
- increase self-directed learning (87%)
- prepare for employment (63%)
- prepare for graduate education (57%)
- develop moral character (56%)
- enhance self-understanding (56%)
- help develop personal values (55%)

The notable change in this list of goals for undergraduates is the movement of "develop moral character" from 56% in 1992 to 66% in 2001. The other goals remain largely unchanged in terms of percent responses or position in the list. The item "increase self-directed learning" was no longer included on the survey instrument in 2001.

**Table 7: Goals, Expectations, & Opinions**

<b>Personal Goals Noted as Very Important or Essential</b>	<b>University of Scranton</b>	<b>Master's I Private</b>	<b>Difference</b>
being a good teacher	98%	98%	0
being a good colleague	90	91	-1
developing a philosophy of life	79	79	0
raising a family	75	69	6
achieving congruence with institut'l values*	67	60	7
integrating spirituality into my life	63	55	8
helping others in difficulty	63	66	-3
helping to promote racial understanding	51	62	-11
<b>Reasons Noted as Very Important for Pursuing an Academic Career</b>			
intellectual challenge	86	87	-1
intellectual freedom	75	76	-1
freedom to pursue interests	75	77	-2
autonomy	72	73	-1
opportunities for teaching	71	71	0
flexible schedule	66	67	-1
<b>Goals for Undergraduates Noted as Very Important or Essential</b>			
develop ability to think clearly	98	99	-1
prepare for employment	67	61	6
develop moral character	66	66	0
prepare for graduate education	61	60	1
help develop personal values	59	65	-6
enhance self-understanding	56	65	-9
enhance knowledge/appreciation of other race/ethnic groups	53	60	-7
prepare for responsible citizenship	52	65	-13
<b>General Opinions Noted as Agrees Strongly or Somewhat</b>			
encourage students to do community service	92	89	3
diverse student body enhances educational experience for all students	90	92	-2
college should help solve social problems	68	68	0
tenure essential to attract best to academe	63	62	1
western civ./culture should be foundation of undergraduate curriculum	62	60	2
community service should get weight in admissions decisions	60	65	-5
external pressures prevent researchers from being objective in their work*	57	60	-3

\* This item asked for the first time in 2001.

## DESCRIBING THE UNIVERSITY OF SCRANTON

A number of items on the survey ask faculty to describe their home institution. These results are presented in Table 9. A section that was newly added this year deals with the factors that were important in their decision to work at the University. The responses to this section are also included here. As in previous HERI faculty surveys, there are some noteworthy differences between our responses and those of the comparison group to these questions.

The most important factor in the decision to work at their college or university was the same for both faculty groups, the institutional emphasis on teaching. This was followed by geographic

*The 2001-02 HERI Survey of Faculty at The University of Scranton* Page 14

location and colleagues as the second and third factors in their decision. University of Scranton faculty (21%) rated salary and benefits as very important in their decision more than the faculty in the Master's I Private group (14%). Our faculty rated geographic location, colleagues, and other personal considerations as less important in their decision than the faculty in the comparison group.

More than  $\frac{3}{4}$  of our faculty perceive the following issues to be of high institutional priority:

1. promote the intellectual development of students
2. promote the religious/spiritual development of students
3. help students examine and understand their personal values
4. facilitate student involvement in community service
5. enhance the institution's national image
6. develop a sense of community among students and faculty

Although the comparison group faculty share many of the same perceptions of the priorities at their institutions, our emphasis on students' spiritual development, community service, and developing community among students and faculty were noted as high priorities more often by our faculty than by the Master's I Private group.

When asked about attributes that describe their institution, more than  $\frac{1}{2}$  of our faculty noted the following as very descriptive of the University:

- it is easy for students to see faculty outside of regular office hours
- there is a great deal of conformity among the students

Less than  $\frac{1}{4}$  of our faculty indicated that the statement "faculty here respect each other" is very descriptive of the University. Twenty percent (20%) more faculty in the peer group chose "faculty here respect each other" as an attribute that is very descriptive of their institution. Faculty in the Master's I Private group also selected "it is easy for students to see faculty outside of regular office hours" and "faculty are rewarded for good teaching" as very descriptive of their institution more frequently (by 11% each) than our faculty. Less faculty in the comparison group (by 10%) describe their institution as having a great deal of conformity among the students.

The majority of faculty (about 90%) in both groups agree that (1) faculty are committed to the welfare of this institution, and (2) faculty here are strongly interested in the academic problems of undergraduates. Compared to the Master's I Private group, more University of Scranton faculty agree that

- many courses involve students in community service
- most students are strongly committed to community service

and less University of Scranton faculty agree that

- this institution should hire more faculty of color
- faculty feel that most students are well-prepared academically
- this institution should hire more women faculty
- student affairs staff have the support and respect of faculty
- my research is valued by faculty in my department
- many courses include feminist perspectives

### *Scranton Trends*

Faculty respondents perceived the following issues to be of high institutional priority in 1992:

1. promote the intellectual development of students (86%)
2. increase or maintain institutional prestige (82%)
3. help students examine and understand their personal values (72%)
4. enhance the institution's national image (72%)
5. develop a sense of community among students and faculty (63%)
6. facilitate student involvement in community service (59%)

The faculties' perceptions of institutional priorities in 2001 are largely unchanged from the list above. Five of the six priorities listed remain the same in 2001. Only "increase or maintain institutional prestige" has been replaced among the top priorities by "promote the religious/spiritual development of students" which was a new item on the 2001 survey. The percent of faculty who indicated that involving students in community service, developing a sense of community among students and faculty, and helping students examine and understand their personal values were high institutional priorities increased substantially in 2001.

When asked to select from among a series of attributes those that are very descriptive of the University of Scranton, faculty in 1992 and 2001 both indicated

- it is easy for students to see faculty outside of regular office hours (50% in 1992)
- there is a great deal of conformity among the students (53% in 1992)

more than any other attributes. The same percentage (23%) of faculty respondents in 1992 and 2001 selected "faculty respect each other" as an attribute that is very descriptive of the University. This rating placed our faculty well below the comparison groups' selection of "faculty respect each other" as very descriptive of their institutions in 1992 and again in 2001.

In 1992, fifty percent (50%) or more of our faculty respondents agreed strongly or somewhat with the following statements:

- faculty of color are treated fairly here (85%)\*
- faculty are committed to the welfare of the institution (82%)\*
- faculty here are interested in the academic problems of undergraduates (82%)\*
- faculty are interested in students personal problems (79%)\*
- women faculty are treated fairly here (76%)\*
- administrators act in good faith (71%)
- student affairs staff have the support and respect of faculty (66%)\*
- faculty are sensitive to minority issues (59%)
- unionization enhances teaching (59%)

The six asterisked(\*) statements above continue to receive support from our faculty in 2001. The three remaining statements were not asked on the survey instrument in 2001. Of the six statements that were common to both the 1992 and 2001 faculty, five received the same or an increased level of support from the 2001 respondents; one statement, "student affairs staff have the support and respect of faculty" received less support (61%) from the 2001 faculty respondents.

**Table 9: Describing The University of Scranton**

<b>Factors Noted as Very Important in</b>	<b>University of Scranton</b>	<b>Master's I Private</b>	<b>Difference</b>
<b>Decision to Work at <u>This</u> College/Univ*</b>			
institutional emphasis on teaching	66%	64%	2
geographic location	36	49	-13
colleagues	25	42	-17
salary/benefits	21	14	7
other personal/family considerations	21	28	-7
<b>Agrees Strongly or Somewhat</b>			
faculty committed to welfare of inst	94	89	5
fac interested in students' acad probs	90	92	-2
faculty of color are treated fairly here	86	87	-1
fac interested in students' pers probs	84	88	-4
my teaching valued by my dept.*	84	88	-4
women faculty are treated fairly here	84	83	1
many courses involve comm service	71	61	10
most students committed to cmtv svc	66	56	10
my research valued by my dept	66	73	-7
gay/lesbian faculty treated fairly here*	65	69	-4
inst should hire more faculty of color*	61	78	-17
stdnt affairs staff supported by faculty	61	68	-7
diversity should be more strongly reflected in curriculum	60	63	-3
inst should hire more women faculty*	52	64	-12
most students well prep academically	46	59	-13
many courses incl feminist perspect	36	42	-6
<b>Issues Noted as Being of High or Highest Priority</b>			
promote intellectual devlp. of students	84	89	-5
promote stud relig/spiritual dvlpmt*	80	62	18
help students understand their values	79	79	0
student involvement in comm. service	76	65	11
enhance institution's national image	76	77	-1
dev community among students/fac	76	66	10
increase/maintain institutional prestige	71	71	0
dev leadership ability in students	60	60	0
recruit more minority students	52	54	-2
mentor new faculty*	51	40	11
create multi-cultural environment	44	59	-15
help students learn to bring change in society	37	39	-2
<b>Attributes Noted as Being VERY Descriptive of the Institution</b>			
easy to see faculty outside office hour	57	68	-11
great conformity among students	53	43	10
faculty respect each other	23	43	-20
faculty rewarded for good teaching	14	25	-11

\* This item asked for the first time in 2001.

## SATISFACTION AND STRESS

Table 10 summarizes responses to questions dealing with faculty satisfaction with various aspects of their jobs and sources of stress.

The aspects of their job that are the greatest sources of satisfaction to both the University of Scranton faculty and those in the Master's I Private group are:

1. autonomy and independence
2. job security
3. opportunity to develop new ideas
4. overall job satisfaction

Among the other aspects of their job noted in the survey, University of Scranton faculty were more satisfied with their salary and fringe benefits and their opportunity for scholarly pursuits than the faculty in the Master's I Private group. Our faculty were less satisfied with (1) the availability of child care at this institution, (2) quality of students, (3) competency of colleagues, (4) professional relations with other faculty, and (5) social relations with other faculty than those faculty in the peer group.

The greatest sources of stress for faculty at the University of Scranton and in the Master's I Private group are:

1. time pressures
2. managing household responsibilities
3. keeping up with information technology
4. lack of personal time

Compared to the faculty in the Master's I Private group, our faculty found the following to be

### More Stressful

- care of an elderly parent
- institutional procedures & "red tape"
- child care
- colleagues

### Less Stressful

- lack of personal time
- personal finances
- review/promotion process
- teaching load
- time pressures

### *Scranton Trends*

In 1992, seventy-five percent (75%) or more of our faculty responded that they were satisfied/very satisfied with the following aspects of their job:

- autonomy and independence (87%)
- undergraduate course assignments (83%)
- job security (77%)
- overall job satisfaction (77%)
- graduate course assignments (76%)

Autonomy, job security, and overall job satisfaction remain among their top sources of satisfaction in 2001. Questions about course assignments were not included in the 2001 survey. The top five sources of stress reported by our faculty:

1992

1. time pressures (83%)
2. lack of personal life (76%)
3. research or publishing demands (69%)
4. institutional procedures & “red tape” (69%)
5. colleagues & teaching load (63%)

2001

1. time pressures (80%)
2. managing household responsibilities (70%)
3. keeping up with information tech. (70%)
4. lack of personal time (69%)
5. institutional procedures & “red tape” (68%)

Time pressures, lack of personal life/time, institutional procedures and “red tape” remain among the top sources of stress for our faculty. The stresses of research or publishing demands, colleagues, and teaching load have been replaced among the top sources of stress by managing household responsibilities and keeping up with information technology.

**Table 10: Satisfaction and Stress**

<b>Aspects of Job Noted as Very Satisfactory or Satisfactory</b>	<b>University of Scranton</b>	<b>Master’s I Private</b>	<b>Difference</b>
autonomy and independence	91%	92%	-1
job security	84	82	2
opportunity to develop new ideas	82	82	0
overall job satisfaction	81	81	0
office/lab space	77	75	2
opportunity for scholarly pursuits	75	65	10
professional relations w/other faculty	73	78	-5
competency of colleagues	72	78	-6
relationships with administration	71	67	4
salary and fringe benefits	66	52	14
teaching load	66	62	4
social relations w/other faculty	62	67	-5
quality of students	56	67	-11
visibility for jobs at other inst.	47	45	2
availability of child care at this inst.	11	29	-18
<b>Still Want to Be a College Professor?</b>			
Definitely/probably yes	87	84	3
<b>Sources of Stress (last 2 years)</b>			
time pressures	80	86	-6
managing household responsibilities	70	74	-4
keeping up with info technology	70	67	3
lack of personal time	69	80	-11
inst procedures & “red tape”	68	62	6
colleagues	63	58	5
research or publishing demands	59	63	-4
students	58	56	2
committee work	56	57	-1
teaching load	56	66	-10
faculty meetings	53	51	2
personal finances	49	60	-11
my physical health	47	48	-1
care of elderly parent	41	30	11
child care	39	33	6
review/promotion process	37	48	-11
subtle discrimination	23	25	-2

## LOCALLY DEVELOPED QUESTIONS

The final part of the survey consisted of twenty questions developed locally. In the first section, faculty were asked to indicate their level of agreement with thirteen statements that relate to the University's Jesuit identity and mission and the roles and reward structure of faculty here. Responses for these items are presented in Table 11. In the second section, faculty were asked to rate the quality of various aspects of the University. Of the seven aspects considered, all were repeated from earlier faculty surveys. These results are reported in Table 12.

Five items were related to the University's mission and Jesuit identity. The majority of faculty indicate (agree) that they understand the University's Ignatian Identity (94%), that the mission is of personal importance to them (90%), and that there is widespread faculty support for the mission (71%). These levels of support are similar or higher than the ratings these items received on the 1998 faculty survey. Two new items related to education for justice received strong support from the faculty, with more than two-thirds of the respondents indicating (agree) that they understand the developing focus on education for justice (69%) and that education for justice is of personal importance to them (71%).

Eight items related to faculty roles and rewards at the University of Scranton. In terms of their roles, the majority of faculty (84%) agree that being involved with student learning outside of the classroom is an important faculty role, while only one-half (48%) agree that involvement with University governance is an important faculty role. Sixty-one percent (61%) report that they have not been involved (strongly disagree) with the University Senate in the past three years and forty-four percent (44%) responded similarly when asked about the Faculty Senate. Two-thirds (67%) disagree with the statement that there is no appropriate structure to facilitate individual faculty development at the University.

In terms of the current faculty reward structure, almost two-thirds (63%) disagree that our reward system properly addresses the accomplishments of individual faculty. A slight majority (57%) indicate agreement that service is a highly valued faculty responsibility here. The faculty respondents are equally divided (48% agree, 49% disagree) in their opinion as to whether the weights assigned to the three categories of faculty responsibility are adhered to in the evaluation of faculty for promotion and tenure. This is an improvement from the 1998 faculty survey where only 41% of the respondents agreed that the assigned weights were actually adhered to in our evaluation practices.

**Table 11: The University of Scranton Mission and Identity, Faculty Roles and Rewards**

Please indicate your agreement with the following statements about the University of Scranton.					
A = Agree Strongly, B = Agree Somewhat, C = Disagree Somewhat, D = Disagree Strongly					
A	B	C	D	Question	
60%	34%	5%	2%	<b>38</b>	I understand the Ignatian Identity of the University.
15	56	22	6	<b>39</b>	There is widespread faculty support for the University's Jesuit mission.
42	48	7	3	<b>40</b>	The mission of the University is of personal importance to me.
47	37	12	3	<b>41</b>	I consider being involved with student learning outside of the classroom an important part of my role as a faculty member.
29	40	19	12	<b>42</b>	I understand the developing focus on education for justice at the University.
36	35	15	12	<b>43</b>	Education for justice is of personal importance to me.
11	37	33	15	<b>44</b>	I consider involvement with University governance an important part of my role as a faculty member.
22	11	16	44	<b>45</b>	I have been involved in the activities of the Faculty Senate over the course of the past three years.
13	5	12	61	<b>46</b>	I have been involved in the activities of the University Senate over the course of the past three years.
9	21	33	34	<b>47</b>	There is no appropriate structure to facilitate individual faculty development at the University of Scranton.
8	25	36	27	<b>48</b>	I believe that the faculty reward system properly addresses the accomplishments of individual faculty.
10	38	21	28	<b>49</b>	The weights assigned to the three categories of faculty responsibility (teaching ½, scholarship ¼, community service ¼) are adhered to in the evaluation of faculty for promotion and tenure.
12	45	28	12	<b>50</b>	I believe that service is a highly valued faculty responsibility.

Faculty were asked to rate seven aspects of the University on a five-point scale of outstanding, good, adequate, poor, inadequate. All seven aspects were rated as outstanding or good by more than one-half of the faculty respondents in 2001. Their rank order by the percent rated outstanding or good is:

- library (83%)
- faculty quality (80%)
- instructional technology (79%)
- student quality (65%)
- quality of student advising (64%)
- administrative quality (62%)
- classroom space (54%)

The same question was asked in 1992. Listed below is a rank order of the 1992 respondents ratings of outstanding or good.

- faculty quality (64%)
- computers (55%)
- student quality (53%)
- library (50%)
- administrative quality (43%)
- classroom space (24%)

Faculty ratings of these areas of the University have improved since 1992, when more respondents gave ratings of “good” or “adequate” than “outstanding.” The item on quality of student advising was not added to the survey until 1998, at that time its rating as outstanding or good was 41%.

**Table 12: Quality Ratings for Aspects of The University of Scranton**

<b>Please rate the following areas of the University.</b>					
<b>A = Outstanding, B = Good, C= Adequate, D = Poor, E = Inadequate</b>					
<b>A</b>	<b>B</b>	<b>C</b>	<b>D</b>	<b>E</b>	<b>Aspect of UofS</b>
9%	55%	27%	8%	2%	Quality of Student Advising
17	37	31	13	3	Classroom Space
40	43	13	2	3	Library
33	46	17	3	1	Instructional Technology
9	56	31	5	0	Student Quality
11	69	17	3	0	Faculty Quality
8	54	23	11	3	Administrative Quality

## SUMMARY OF KEY FINDINGS

The following summary highlights key differences between the faculty respondents from the University of Scranton and the selected peer group of Master's I Private schools found throughout this report.

### **Background Characteristics/General Activities**

More University of Scranton faculty respondents:

- are 50 years of age or older
- hold the rank of professor
- are tenured
- earn \$60,000 or more for a 9/10 month contract
- are in a health-related department
- are a member of a faculty union

### **Teaching Activities (in the last two years)**

The majority of faculty from both the University (64%) and the peer group (68%) have worked with undergraduates on a research project in the last two years. More University of Scranton faculty report that they have taught an honors course or service learning course than those in the peer group. More faculty in the peer group have:

- developed a new course
- participated in a teaching enhancement workshop
- used intra- or extra-mural funds for research
- placed or collected assignments on the Internet
- taught an interdisciplinary course
- team-taught a course

### **Time Allocation**

University of Scranton faculty reported spending more time each week on scheduled teaching, community or public service, and household/childcare duties.

### **Scholarship & Courses**

More University of Scranton faculty (86%) reported that their primary interest is in teaching than the peer group faculty (72%).

### **Evaluation & Instructional Methods**

Our faculty respondents differed widely from the peer group faculty in their use of instructional and evaluation methods. The largest percentage of faculty from both the University (72%) and the peer group (74%) report using class discussions in most or all of their undergraduate classes. The instructional methods used more frequently by the faculty from each group in most or all undergraduate classes are:

#### University of Scranton

- extensive lecturing
- community service as coursework

#### Peer Group

- cooperative learning (small groups)
- independent projects
- group projects
- readings on racial & gender issues
- experiential learning/field studies

The evaluation methods used more frequently in most or all undergraduate classes are:

University of Scranton

- multiple choice mid-terms/finals

Peer Group

- competency-based grading
- weekly essay assignments
- essay mid-terms/finals
- term/research papers
- student evaluation of each others' work

### **Goals for Undergraduates**

Both groups of faculty respondents rated “developing the ability to think clearly” as their highest very important or essential goal for undergraduates. More University of Scranton faculty selected “preparing for employment” as a very important or essential goal for undergraduates. More faculty in the peer group selected the following as very important or essential goals for undergraduates:

- preparing for responsible citizenship
- enhancing self-understanding
- enhancing knowledge or appreciation of other racial/ethnic groups
- helping develop personal values.

### **Institutional Priorities & Attributes**

The majority (75% or more) of the faculty in both groups indicated that the following issues are of high or highest priority for their institutions:

- promote the intellectual development of students
- help students examine and understand their personal values
- enhance the institution's national image

More of University of Scranton faculty selected

- promoting student religious/spiritual development
- student involvement in community service
- developing community among students and faculty
- mentoring new faculty

to be among the University's high or highest priorities. More of the peer group faculty indicated that creating a multi-cultural environment is among their institution's high or highest priorities.

When asked to indicate how descriptive various attributes were of their own institution, more of our faculty selected the attribute “there is a great deal of conformity among the students” as very descriptive of the University of Scranton. More of the faculty in the peer group selected the following attributes as very descriptive of their institutions:

- faculty respect each other
- it is easy for students to see faculty outside of regular office hours
- faculty are rewarded for being good teachers

## **Satisfaction & Stress**

The aspects of their job that are the greatest sources of satisfaction for both groups of faculty are:

- autonomy and independence
- job security
- opportunity to develop new ideas
- overall job satisfaction

University of Scranton faculty respondents are more satisfied with their salary and fringe benefits and with the opportunity for scholarly pursuits as aspects of their job. The peer group faculty are more satisfied with the availability of child care and the quality of students at their institution.

Common sources of stress (during the last two years) for both groups of faculty are:

- time pressures
- managing household responsibilities
- keeping up with information technology

More of our faculty indicated that the care of an elderly parent was a source of stress for them in the last two years. More peer group faculty reported the following sources of stress in the last two years:

- lack of personal time
- personal finances
- review/promotion process
- teaching load

## **CONCLUSION**

The 2001-02 HERI faculty survey has provided data about the professional practices of faculty at the University of Scranton as well as on their opinions and attitudes on a variety of issues related to their work. Comparing the current results with those of the faculty from a peer group of Master's I Private schools provides us with an initial indication of areas in which we may need further development. Comparing the current results to our own previous HERI surveys gives us an indication of how much our practices and perceptions have changed in the last decade. We encourage and support further discussion and analysis of these results by the faculty and administration of the University.

# **APPENDIX**

2001 Faculty Survey  
Higher Education Research Institute, UCLA

Additional Questions