

ASSESSMENT REPORT

HERI Faculty Survey
2004-05

October 2005



THE UNIVERSITY OF SCRANTON

PLANNING, ASSESSMENT & INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH OFFICE

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction	3
Executive Summary	4
Respondent Profile.....	6
Table 1: Scranton Respondent Profile.....	6
Background Characteristics.....	7
Table 2: Background Characteristics.....	7
Activities.....	10
Table 3: General Activities.....	10
Table 4: Teaching Activities: Scranton, Peer.....	11
Table 5: Teaching Activities: Scranton Male, Female	12
Table 6: Other Courses Taught.....	13
Table 7: Professional Activities.....	14
Table 8: Publications	15
Time Allocation	16
Table 9: Time Allocation.....	16
Instruction and Evaluation Methods.....	17
Table 10: Instruction Methods	18
Table 11: Evaluation Methods	18
Goals, Expectations, & Opinions	18
Table 12: General Opinions.....	19
Describing the University of Scranton.....	20
Table 13: Issues believed to be of “high” or “highest” priority	20
Table 14: Statements with which faculty “agree” or “agree strongly”	21
Satisfaction & Stress.....	21
Table 15: Very Satisfactory & Satisfactory Job Aspects: Scranton, Peer	22
Locally Developed Questions.....	22
Table 16: Mission and Identity.....	22
Table 17: Governance, Faculty Recognition & Reward System	23
Table 18: Quality Ratings of Several Aspects of University	24
Conclusion	24
Appendix	

INTRODUCTION

During the 2004-05 academic year, the University of Scranton participated in the faculty survey conducted by the Higher Education Research Institute (HERI) at UCLA. This was the fifth time that the University of Scranton has participated in this survey, which is conducted every three years by HERI. A total of 421 colleges and universities nationwide took part in the 2004-05 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.

Surveys were initially distributed to all full-time faculty in October of 2004. In January 2005, a second survey 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 its results, reported in aggregate form, in July 2005.

A complete description of the procedures used in carrying out the 2004-05 national survey and its results is provided by HERI in [The American College Teacher: National Norms for the 2004-05 HERI Faculty Survey](#). A copy of this publication will be available in PAIRO in September 2005.

For this report, selected responses from University of Scranton faculty are compared to those a peer group consisting of seven private schools, all within our Carnegie Classification group of Master's I. The institutions within this peer group are: Santa Clara University, Fairfield University, Valparaiso University, Creighton University, Saint Joseph's University, Villanova University, and Loyola Marymount University. The data for these schools is provided only in aggregate form. Differences of at least five percent (5%) are considered noteworthy in the context of this study, and are indicated by *italicized* font.

In addition, portions of the report identify any noteworthy differences between male and female faculty at Scranton. Detailed results of all survey items from the current or previous HERI faculty surveys are available at PAIRO. Totals for each question represented in tables may not add to 100% due to rounding. All tables in this report use abbreviations for the questionnaire items represented. The reader is encouraged to consult the actual survey form (Appendix) for the complete wording of each item.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This Executive Summary identifies key findings from PAIRO's report of data from the University of Scranton's participation in the 2004-05 HERI Faculty Survey. The findings are grouped with respect to the five characteristics¹ of the institution. These characteristics describe the University as: a Catholic and Jesuit University, a comprehensive University, a University in the liberal arts tradition, a caring community, and a dynamic institution. This summary describes some ways in which faculty perceive and/or are furthering relevant goals of each of these five characteristics.

A Catholic and Jesuit University

- 50% of Scranton faculty respondents agree strongly and 39% agree somewhat that they *understand the Ignatian identity of the University*; 29% agree strongly and 43% agree somewhat that there is *widespread faculty support for the University's Jesuit mission*.
- 34% of respondents agree strongly and 36% agree somewhat that they *understand the developing focus on education for justice at the University*; 34% agree strongly and 39% agree somewhat that *education for justice is of personal importance to [them]*.
- Over the past two-year period, 52% have *advised student groups in service/volunteer work*; 30% have *taught a service learning course*.
- 84% agree strongly or somewhat that a *racially and ethnically diverse student body enhances the intellectual experience of all*; 58% agree or agree strongly that *racial and ethnic diversity should be more strongly reflected in the curriculum*.

A Comprehensive University

- 63% of Scranton faculty respondents agree strongly or somewhat that *western civilization and culture should be the foundation of the undergraduate curriculum*.
- 61% believe it is very important or essential to *prepare students for graduate or advanced education*
- 90% agree strongly or somewhat that *colleges have responsibility to work with surrounding communities to address local issues*; 54% of faculty respondents cite using *their scholarship to address local community needs*.

¹ See: *The University of Scranton Mission, Characteristics, and Goals*. Available at www.scranton.edu/planning

A University in the Liberal Arts Tradition

- 47% of Scranton faculty respondents feel it is a very important or essential to *instill a basic appreciation of the liberal arts* for undergraduates
- 97% believe it is a very important or essential goal for undergraduates to *develop the ability to think critically*.

A Caring Community

- 63% of faculty agree strongly or somewhat that *colleges should be concerned with facilitating undergraduate students' spiritual development*; 21% believe that *the spiritual dimension of faculty members' lives has no place in the academy*.
- 87% agree strongly or somewhat that *faculty are interested in students' personal problems*; 94% agree strongly or somewhat that *faculty are strongly interested in the academic problems of undergraduates*.
- 69% believe *developing a sense of community among students and faculty* is of high or highest priority at the University.
- 30% believe that that *faculty at the institution respect each other*.
- 62% believe there is *adequate support for faculty development*.

A Dynamic Institution

- 50% of faculty respondents agree strongly or somewhat that *faculty are sufficiently involved in campus decision making*; 34% agree strongly and 39% agree somewhat that *involvement with University school/college and department governance* are an important part of their role as a faculty member.
- 46% felt their *relationship with administration* was a satisfactory or very satisfactory aspect of their job; 60% found *institutional procedures and "red tape"* a source of stress during the last two years.
- 43% agree strongly and 39% agree somewhat that *the mission of the University is of personal importance* to them; 29% agree strongly and 43% agree somewhat that *there is widespread faculty support for the University's Jesuit mission*.

RESPONDENT PROFILE

One hundred and thirty (130) University faculty (of 251 surveyed) completed the HERI faculty survey, a response rate of fifty-two percent (52%). This is lower than the University's response rate of sixty-one percent (61%) for the 2001-02 survey. Nationally, 421 colleges and universities completed the survey, with an overall response rate of thirty-eight percent (38%).

The table below describes the University of Scranton's respondents' distribution with regard to age, gender, rank, and tenure as compared to all faculty for fall 2004. The table also compares this data to that of the respondent profile over the last four administrations of the survey. Items in the table with the highest percentage of 2004 respondents for each question are highlighted by gray shading.

Table 1: Scranton Respondent Profile

Age	All 2004 Faculty %	'04 Resp %	'01 Resp %	'98 Resp %	'95 Resp %
<30	2%	1%	1%	1%	1%
30 to 39	11%	14%	11%	14%	15%
40 to 49	26%	21%	29%	44%	46%
50 to 59	38%	41%	38%	28%	24%
60 to 69	21%	21%	17%	9%	11%
70 and over	2%	2%	4%	3%	1%
Sex					
Male	66%	61%	67%	61%	64%
Female	34%	39%	33%	39%	36%
Rank					
Professor	36%	40%	38%	27%	27%
Associate	35%	34%	35%	41%	40%
Assistant	21%	20%	21%	27%	30%
Lecturer	3%	3%	4%	1%	0%
Instructor	5%	3%	2%	4%	4%
Other	-	-	-	-	-
Tenure					
Tenured	77%	76%	73%	67%	66%
Not Tenured	23%	24%	27%	28%	34%
Missing	-	-	-	6%	-

As the table illustrates, the profile of University of Scranton 2004 survey respondents closely mirrors that of the overall full-time faculty population for that year. This profile also depicts the "aging" of our faculty respondents. In 1995, thirty-six percent (36%) of faculty respondents were over the age of fifty. In 1998, this percentage rose to forty percent (40%) and in 2001 to fifty-nine percent (59%). In 2004, the percentage of faculty respondents over the age of fifty reached sixty-four percent (64%); twenty-three percent (23%), nearly one quarter of the

respondents, were over the age of sixty, mirroring actual data for all 2004 University faculty. Also evident are increasing numbers of faculty who are tenured and those who have reached the rank of professor; in 1995, sixty-six percent (66%) of respondents had were tenured, compared with seventy-six percent (76%) in 2004. In 1995, twenty-seven percent (27%) of respondents cited their academic rank as professor; in 2004, the percentage had risen to forty (40%). For each of the survey years represented in this table, there has been a consistently higher percentage of male respondents to the survey. This reflects the overall numbers of male and female faculty members at the University, which has remained generally 2/3 male and 1/3 female during this span.

BACKGROUND CHARACTERISTICS

In addition to the characteristics identified in Table 1, the survey yields respondent and peer data for several other career-related questions. Peer comparison by HERI included all faculty respondents identified as full-time undergraduate faculty². In this analysis, PAIRO has identified noteworthy differences between the University and respondents from the peer group³. Again, differences of at least five percent (5%) are considered noteworthy or of practical significance, and are identified by *italicized* font.

Table 2: Respondent Background Characteristics: Scranton, Peer

	Full-time UG Faculty Respondents	University of Scranton	Peer Group⁴	Difference
Age				
	<30	1%	2%	-1
	30 to 39	13%	21%	-8
	40 to 49	20%	25%	-5
	50 to 59	41%	30%	<i>11</i>
	60 to 69	22%	18%	4
	70 and over	3%	4%	-1
Gender				
	Male	61%	60%	1
	Female	39%	40%	-1
Racial/Ethnic Group				
	White/Caucasian	94%	89%	<i>5</i>

² See PAIRO for more information on HERI determination of respondent type. 124 of the 130 University respondents are considered full-time undergraduate faculty.

³ NOTE: The data presented in the respondent profile and background characteristics is intended to provide 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 University of Scranton faculty.

⁴ For a list of those institutions whose data is included in the peer group, see page 3 of this report.

Academic Rank			
Professor	42%	24%	18
Associate Professor	33%	31%	2
Assistant Professor	20%	33%	-13
Principal Activity			
Teaching	97%	95%	2
Highest Degree Earned			
Master's (M.A., M.S., etc.)	14%	11%	3
Ph.D./Ed.D.	76%	80%	-4
Department of Current Faculty Appt.			
Health Sciences	14%	7%	7
Humanities	14%	16%	-2
Business	10%	12%	-2
Education	13%	4%	9
Social Sciences	10%	10%	0
Physical Sciences	8%	7%	1
Arts & Architecture	.3%	6%	-5.7
Year Appointed at Present Institution			
Before 1986	42%	33%	9
1987 to 1991	19%	12%	7
1992 to 1996	11%	13%	-2
1997 to 2001	11%	25%	-14
2002 to 2004	17%	17%	0
Tenured?			
Yes	77%	61%	16
Salary is Based On			
9/10 month contract	67%	73%	-6
Base Salary for 9/10 Month Contracts			
Less than \$30,000	-	-	-
\$30,000 to 39,999	4%	3%	1
\$40,000 to 49,999	17%	17%	0
\$50,000 to 59,999	10%	17%	-7
\$60,000 to 69,999	16%	17%	-1
\$70,000 to 79,999	26%	13%	13
\$80,000 to 89,999	19%	12%	7
\$90,000 or more	9%	18%	-9

As Table 2 describes, a larger percentage of University of Scranton faculty respondents are over the age of fifty than those in the peer group—sixty-six percent (66%) of Scranton faculty respondents are in this age group, versus fifty-two percent (52%) of peer respondents. The University of Scranton respondent group and the peer respondent group share a similar majority of males, and a vast majority of both groups are of white/Caucasian ethnicity, though slightly more Scranton respondents (94%) cited their race as white/Caucasian than did those in the peer group (89%).

The majority of Scranton faculty respondents hold the academic rank of Professor (42%); thirty-three percent (33%) hold that of Associate Professor, and twenty percent (20%) are assistant professors. For peer group respondents, this order is reversed; twenty-four percent (24%) hold the rank of Professor, thirty-one percent (31%) hold that of Associate Professor, and thirty-three percent (33%) Assistant Professor. For the majority of both groups—seventy-six percent (76%) of Scranton faculty respondents and eighty percent (80%) of peer group respondents—the degree of Ph.D. or Ed.D. is the highest degree earned. A larger percentage of Scranton faculty respondents (77%) are tenured than those within the peer group (61%). Almost all of the faculty in both groups report that their principal activity at their institution is teaching. The largest percentages of Scranton faculty report appointments in the Health Sciences, Humanities, and Education departments. For three academic areas—Health Sciences, Education, and Arts & Architecture—the percentage difference between numbers of faculty within these departments was noteworthy (again, greater than five percent).

For both groups, the majority of faculty respondents were appointed at their present institution before 1986—forty-two percent (42%) of Scranton respondents and thirty-three percent (33%) of peer group respondents. Sixty-seven percent (67%) of Scranton faculty respondents and seventy-seven percent (77%) of peer respondents are on a 9/10 month contract. The peer group reported generally lower earnings than the University of Scranton group, with thirty-seven percent (37%) of their faculty respondents earning between \$30,000 and \$59,999. Seventy percent (70%) of Scranton faculty respondents cite earning \$60,000 or more; sixty percent (60%) of the peer group respondents fall into this earnings bracket.

Seventy-seven percent (77%) of University respondents and seventy-five percent (75%) of peer group respondents are currently married. Sixty-eight percent (68%) of Scranton and sixty-three percent (63%) of peer group respondents have no children under the age of eighteen living at home.

ACTIVITIES

The next series of tables report percentages of faculty engaging in specified activities. For this analysis, these activities have been grouped into three categories: general activities, teaching activities, and professional activities.

GENERAL

General activities are those which relate personal practices or describe respondent characteristics.

**Table 3: General Activities/
Characteristics: Scranton, Peer**

Activity	Scranton	Peer Group	Difference
Commute a long distance to work	19%	21%	-2
Spouse/partner is an academic	23%	28%	-5
Born in the U.S.	92%	87%	4
U.S. Citizen	98%	95%	3
Have been sexually harassed at this institution	7%	4%	3
Feel good about direction life is heading*	68%	67%	1
Engage in self-reflection*	60%	72%	-12
Achieve healthy balance between professional & personal life*	40%	39%	1
Consider self a religious person*	41%	43%	2
Consider self a spiritual person*	50%	53%	-3
Experience close alignment between work and personal values*	58%	63%	-5
Feel that work adds meaning to your life*	68%	73%	-5

* to a great extent

As the table above describes, University of Scranton faculty respondents closely align with the peer group in these areas. A larger percentage of peer group respondents *engage in self-reflection* than those for the University group, and somewhat higher numbers of peer group respondents *find a close alignment between work and personal values* and *feel that work adds meaning to their lives*.

TEACHING

Teaching activities are those that deal only and specifically with time spend in the classroom, in preparation for the classroom, or directly interacting with students. The HERI survey asks faculty to consider these activities over the past two-year period.

Table 4: Teaching Activities: Scranton, Peer

Activity	Scranton	Peer Group	Difference
Have received award for outstanding teaching	44%	42%	2
Taught an honors course	50%	24%	26
Taught an interdisciplinary course	29%	42%	-13
Taught an ethnic studies course	13%	11%	2
Taught a women's studies course	12%	14%	-2
Team-taught a course	28%	37%	-9
Taught a service-learning course	30%	18%	12
Developed a new course	61%	73%	-12
Taught a first-year seminar	29%	22%	7
Worked with undergraduates on research	66%	64%	2
Advised student groups in service/volunteer work	52%	38%	14
Collaborate with local community in teaching/research	50%	38%	12

As the previous table indicates, half of the University of Scranton faculty respondents have taught an honors course during the past two years. Deeper analysis of these data yield differences between male and female participation in these activities at the University. Again, more men than women serve as faculty at the institution, and more respondents to the HERI Faculty survey were men (61%) than women (39%). Of these respondents, ninety-seven percent (97%) of males at the institution and ninety-six percent (96%) of females consider teaching to be their principal activity in their current position at the University. Higher percentages of male faculty respondents have taught honors and ethnic studies courses, while more women have team-taught, taught a service-learning course, placed or collected assignments on the Internet, taught a course exclusively on the internet, advised student groups involved in service/volunteer work, collaborated with local community in research/teaching, developed a new course, or taught a first-year seminar. This data is shown in table 5 on the following page:

**Table 5: Teaching Activities: Scranton
Males, Females**

Activity	Males	Females	Difference
Have received award for outstanding teaching	46%	40%	6
Taught an honors course	56%	41%	15
Taught an interdisciplinary course	28%	30%	-2
Taught an ethnic studies course	15%	10%	5
Taught a women's studies course	4%	23%	-19
Team-taught a course	21%	40%	-19
Taught a service-learning course	23%	42%	-19
Developed a new course	58%	67%	-9
Taught a first-year seminar	27%	33%	-6
Worked with undergraduates on research	63%	70%	-7
Advised student groups in service/volunteer work	47%	60%	-13
Placed or collected assignments on Internet	51%	69%	-18
Taught course exclusively on Internet	3%	14%	-11
Collaborated with local community in research/teaching	44%	60%	-16

General Education Courses

When asked how many of specific types of courses they were teaching in the current term, thirty-seven percent (37%) of University of Scranton faculty respondents indicate teaching no *general education* courses; fifty-one percent (51%) of peer group respondents indicated they were teaching no general education courses. Forty-three percent (43%) of University faculty were teaching one or two general education course in the current term, and twenty percent (20%) were teaching three or more. Within the peer group, thirty-eight percent (38%) were teaching one or two general education courses; twelve percent (12%) were teaching three or more. The table that follows describes other types of courses taught.

**Table 6: Other Courses Taught
This Term**

	Scranton	Peer	Difference
Developmental/remedial			
none	94%	96%	-2
one	6%	3%	3
two	-	1%	-1
three	-	-	-
four or more	-	-	-
Other Undergraduate			
Credit Courses			
none	10%	16%	-6
one	31%	25%	6
two	24%	35%	-11
three	23%	19%	4
four	8%	4%	4
five or more	4%	1%	3
Graduate Courses			
none	65%	64%	1
one	22%	27%	-5
two	10%	7%	3
three or more	3%	2%	1

PROFESSIONAL

Professional activities include those that pertain to the faculty's research and scholarship, as well as characteristics of their professional life and experiences, not including teaching.

The majority of Scranton faculty respondents (56%) report that their interests lie in teaching and research, but lean toward teaching. Eighteen percent (18%) lean toward research, twenty-six percent report their interests lie very heavily in teaching. Peer group response data shows a similar breakdown. Thirty-six percent (36%) of Scranton respondents have held an academic administrative post during their careers; forty-five percent (45%) of peer group respondents have done so. And, twenty-two percent (22%) of both groups feel to a great extent that they have to work harder than their colleagues to be perceived as a legitimate scholar. The following table lists some faculty professional activities during the past two years:

Table 7: Professional Activities: Scranton, Peer

Activity	Scranton	Peer Group	Difference
Participated in a faculty development program ⁵	66%	67%	-1
Use your scholarship to address local community needs	54%	41%	7
Have published op-ed pieces or editorials	27%	21%	6
Taught courses at more than one institution during same term	3%	8%	-5
Engaged in paid consulting outside of institution	32%	36%	-4
Engaged in public service/professional consulting without pay	56%	52%	4
Received funding for work from:			
Foundations	14%	18%	-4
State or Federal Government	17%	18%	-1
Business or Industry	12%	15%	-3
Conducted research or writing focused on:			
International/global issues	33%	28%	5
Racial or Ethnic Minorities	17%	22%	-5
Women and Gender Issues	16%	25%	-9

Other questions in the survey regarded elements of the faculty member’s employment and future employment plans. All Scranton faculty respondents report belonging to a faculty union; only six percent (6%) of peer group respondents are. Eleven percent (11%) of Scranton faculty respondents plan to retire within the next three years; eight percent (8%) of peer group respondents plan to do so. Eighteen percent (18%) of Scranton faculty respondents have considered early retirement during the last two years, while fifteen percent of the peer group has.

Similar numbers of both respondent groups have received at least one firm job offer within the last two years, twenty-seven percent (27%) of Scranton faculty, twenty-six percent (26%) of peer group faculty. Twenty-three percent of Scranton respondents have considered leaving academe for another job in the last two years, though a larger number (28%) of peer group respondents have considered such a move during that span. For both groups, nearly forty-percent have considered leaving their institution for another. However, only nine percent (9%) of Scranton respondents and eight percent (8%) of peer group respondents have changed academic institutions during the past two years.

Another area of faculty professional activity considered in the HERI Faculty survey are numbers of publications. The table that follows depicts this data for the University of Scranton and the peer group. The groups show similar rates of productivity.

⁵ For this question, eighty-seven percent (87%) of female Scranton respondents have engaged in such programs; fifty-two percent (52%) of males have. Sixty-one percent (61%) of males in the peer group respondents responded positively to this question, seventy-six percent (76%) of females did so.

Table 8: Publications

	Scranton	Peer Group	Difference
Articles in academic or professional journals			
none	11%	11%	0
1 - 2	11%	15%	-4
3 - 4	17%	16%	1
5 - 10	28%	24%	4
11 - 20	18%	17%	1
21 - 50	11%	12%	-1
More than 50	5%	5%	0
Chapters in edited volumes			
none	47%	44%	3
1 - 2	32%	29%	3
3 - 4	12%	14%	-2
5 - 10	7%	9%	-2
11 - 20	2%	3%	-1
21 - 50	2%	1%	1
More than 50	-	-	-
Books, manuals, or monographs			
none	57%	54%	3
1 - 2	21%	30%	-7
3 - 4	5%	10%	-5
5 - 10	5%	5%	0
11 - 20	2%	1%	1
21 - 50	-	1%	-1
More than 50	-	-	-
Other, such as computer software products			
none	85%	84%	1
1 - 2	8%	10%	2
3 - 4	4%	3%	1
5 or more	4%	2%	2
Exhibitions or performances in the fine or applied arts presented			
none	89%	85%	4
1 - 2	3%	4%	-1
3 - 4	3%	2%	1
5 or more	4%	9%	-5
Professional writings published or accepted for publication in <u>last two years</u>			
none	29%	26%	-3
1 - 2	34%	36%	-2
3 - 4	24%	25%	-1
5 - 10	11%	12%	-1
11 or more	2%	2%	0

TIME ALLOCATION

How faculty allocate their time among various responsibilities is reported in Table 9.

A considerable portion of both the University of Scranton respondent and those of the peer group spend between 9 – 12 hours per week on scheduled teaching: sixty percent (60%) of Scranton faculty, and forty-eight percent (48%) of those in the peer group. Roughly two-thirds of both groups spend between one and four hours of their time per week advising/counseling students; most spend less than four hours per week on committee work and meetings or other administration duties. University of Scranton faculty respondents spend generally more time engaged in community/public service than the peer group, with sixty-five percent (65%) spending between 1 – 4 hours per week, while half of the peer group respondents spent this amount of time. Thirty-nine percent (39%) of the peer group cited spending no hours during their week engaged in this kind of service.

Table 9: Time Allocation

HOURS PER WEEK SPENT:	Scranton	Peer Group	Difference
Scheduled Teaching			
0 to 4	3%	4%	-1
5 to 8	21%	38%	-17
9 to 12	60%	48%	12
13 to 16	9%	6%	3
17 or more	7%	3%	4
Preparing for Teaching			
0 to 4	11%	10%	1
5 to 8	23%	23%	0
9 to 12	16%	25%	-9
13 to 16	16%	16%	0
17 to 20	17%	16%	1
21 or more	17%	26%	-9
Advising/Counseling of Students			
none	3%	4%	-1
1 to 4	65%	64%	0
5 to 8	25%	25%	0
9 or more	7%	7%	0
Committee Work & Meetings			
none	4%	8%	-4
1 to 4	74%	66%	8
5 to 8	13%	21%	-8
9 or more	9%	5%	4
Other Administration			
none	40%	39%	1
1 to 4	37%	40%	-3
5 to 8	17%	12%	5
9 to 12	4%	5%	-1
13 or more	2%	4%	-2

HOURS PER WEEK SPENT, <i>cont'd</i>	Scranton	Peer Group	Difference
Research and Scholarly Writing			
none	9%	12%	-3
1 to 4	35%	31%	4
5 to 8	29%	26%	3
9 to 12	15%	17%	-2
13 or more	12%	15%	-3
Creative Products/Performances			
none	74%	65%	9
1 to 4	23%	23%	0
5 or more	4%	12%	-8
Community or Public Service			
none	19%	39%	-20
1 to 4	65%	50%	15
5 to 8	11%	9%	2
9 or more	5%	2%	3
Outside Consulting/Freelance Work			
none	79%	70%	9
1 to 4	16%	23%	-7
5 or more	5%	7%	-2
Household/Childcare Duties			
none	12%	10%	2
1 to 8	33%	42%	-9
9 to 16	29%	24%	5
17 or more	26%	24%	2

INSTRUCTION AND EVALUATION METHODS

Tables 10 and 11 show responses to questions about the types of instructional and evaluation methods used by faculty in undergraduate courses.

The types of instruction methods used by most University of Scranton respondents are class discussion (78%) and extensive lecturing (60%). The predominant method of evaluation is essay mid-term and/or final exams (56%). These same methods are used by similar numbers of peer group respondents, though slightly more of the peer group use methods such as cooperative learning (47%), group projects (37%), and student presentations (47%) for instruction, and term/research papers (41%) for evaluation. Within these responses, more women than men in both groups use class discussion or student presentations, and more men than women use extensive lecturing. At the University, twenty-seven percent (27%) of female faculty respondents rely on community service as part of coursework in “most” or “all” of the courses they teach, versus five percent (5%) of male faculty respondents.

Table 10: Instruction Methods Used in “All” or “Most” Courses Taught

Method	Scranton	Peer	Difference
Class discussion	78%	81%	-3
Extensive lecturing	58%	54%	4
Cooperative learning (small groups)	40%	47%	-7
Student Presentations	36%	47%	-11
Group projects	26%	37%	-11
Multiple drafts of written work	19%	28%	-9
Community service as part of coursework	14%	5%	9

Table 11 captures responses to questions regarding evaluation methods used by faculty in undergraduate courses.

Table 11: Evaluation Methods Used in “All” or “Most” Courses Taught

Method	Scranton	Peer	Difference
Essay mid-term and/or final exams	56%	62%	-6
Multiple choice mid-term an/or final exams	34%	26%	8
Short answer mid-term and/or final exams	36%	37%	-1
Term/research papers	32%	41%	-9
Student evaluations of their own work	13%	19%	-6
Student evaluation of each other’s work	6%	18%	-12

GOALS, EXPECTATIONS, AND OPINIONS

This section describes items which address faculty’s professional and personal goals, their goals and expectations of 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 “very important” or “essential.”

Goals for Undergraduates

More than half of Scranton faculty identify the following as “very important” or “essential” goals for undergraduates:

<u>Goal</u>	<u>Scranton Percentage</u>
Develop ability to think critically	97%
Help master knowledge in a discipline	91%
Promote ability to write effectively	85%
Prepare students for employment after college	66%
Prepare students for graduate or advanced education	61%
Develop moral character	53%

Most peer group faculty identified these same items as being “essential” or “very important”. However, for other goals within the selection, the number of goals rated as being “essential” or “very important” by more than fifty percent of peer faculty was greater than that for Scranton

faculty; for every item within this question, a higher percentage of the peer group found the item as “essential” or “very important” than did the Scranton faculty group. Some of these items include: *Develop creative capacities* (64% of peer group; 35% of Scranton group), *instill a basic appreciation of the liberal arts* (63% of peer group; 47% of Scranton group), *prepare students for responsible citizenship* (63% of peer group; 48% of Scranton group), *help students develop personal values* (62% of peer group, 47% of Scranton group), *enhance students’ self-understanding* (62% of peer group, 45% of Scranton group), and *enhance students’ knowledge of and appreciation for other racial/ethnic groups* (61% peer group, 44% of Scranton group).

Personal Goals

More than half of Scranton faculty identify the following as “very important” or “essential” personal goals:

<u>Goal</u>	<u>Scranton Percentage</u>
Being a good teacher	99%
Being a good colleague	92%
Serving as a role model to students	84%
Raising a family	73%
Developing a meaningful philosophy of life	67%
Helping others who are in difficulty	61%
Achieving congruence between my own values and institutional values	57%
Becoming an authority in my field	51%

Faculty from the peer group share similar aspirations. Items in addition to the ones above which more than half the peer group rate as “very important” or “essential” are *helping to promote racial understanding* (58%) and *integrating spirituality into my life* (56%). Faculty were also asked to share their opinions on several general subjects. The table below describes items with which faculty “agree strongly” or “somewhat”:

Table 12: General Opinions Noted as Agrees Strongly or Somewhat

Item	Scranton	Peer	Difference
College should encourage students to be involved in community service activities	98%	91%	7
Colleges have responsibility to work with surrounding communities to address local issues	90%	84%	6
A racially/ethnically diverse student body enhances educational experience of all	84%	92%	-8
Tenure is essential to attract the best minds in academe	68%	67%	1
Colleges should be actively involved in solving social problems	63%	72%	-9
College should be concerned with facilitating undergrads spiritual development	63%	60%	3
Western civilization & culture should be foundation of undergrad curriculum	63%	61%	2

DESCRIBING THE UNIVERSITY OF SCRANTON

This section of the survey asks respondents to describe their home institution. When asked to indicate how well each of a selection of attributes describes their college or university, more than half of both Scranton and peer group faculty respondents believe that it *is easy for students to see faculty outside of regular office hours* (68% Scranton, 71% peer group). More than half of the peer group feel that faculty at their institution *respect each other* (56%), while only thirty percent (30%) of Scranton faculty believe that this is the case.

Less than one-quarter of Scranton faculty believe that there *is respect for the expression of diverse values and beliefs* (22%), *faculty are rewarded for being good teachers* (10%), *social activities are overemphasized* (7%), and *faculty are rewarded for their efforts to work with underprepared students* (0%). Over one-quarter of Scranton faculty (29%) feel that the statement *faculty are typically at odds with campus administration* is “very descriptive” of their institution, while twelve percent (12%) of the peer group believe it describes their home institution.

Table 13 below lists issues faculty believe to be of “high” or “highest” priority at their institution.

Table 13: Issues believed to be of “high” or “highest” priority at faculty’s institution

	Item	Scranton	Peer	Difference
	To promote intellectual development of students	88%	91%	-3
	To develop community among students and faculty	69%	73%	-4
	To increase or maintain institutional prestige	65%	73%	-8
	To enhance the institution’s national image	63%	78%	-15
	To develop leadership ability among students	58%	64%	-6

Another survey question asked respondents to indicate their level of agreement with statements about their college or university. Table 14 describes items which more than half of Scranton respondents “agreed” or “agreed strongly” were true about the University. Peer responses regarding their home institution are included for comparison.

Table 14: Statements with which faculty “agree” or “agree strongly”

Statement	Scranton	Peer	Difference
Faculty are strongly interested in academic problems of undergraduates	94%	88%	6
Faculty are interested in students’ personal problems	87%	89%	-2
There is adequate support for integrating technology into teaching	86%	83%	3
My teaching is valued by faculty in my department	82%	88%	-6
My values are congruent with dominant institutional values	76%	76%	0
Most students are strongly committed to community service	72%	72%	0
Criteria for advancement & promotion decisions are clear	72%	70%	2
My research is valued by faculty in my department	68%	75%	-8
My department does a good job of mentoring new faculty	64%	69%	-5
There is adequate support for faculty development	62%	63%	-1
Institution takes responsibility for educating underprepared students	61%	52%	9
Racial and ethnic diversity should be more strongly reflected in the curriculum	58%	63%	-5
Faculty feel that most students are well-prepared academically	50%	65%	-15

SATISFACTION & STRESS

This portion of the report captures faculty’s identification of aspects of their job which are most satisfactory, and those which have been a source of personal stress.

The greatest sources of satisfaction for both Scranton and peer group faculty are *autonomy and independence* (90% Scranton, 89% peer), *overall job satisfaction* (82% Scranton, 81% peer), *opportunity to develop new ideas* (81% Scranton, 79% peer), and *office/lab space* (73% Scranton, 75% peer). In many areas, Scranton faculty satisfaction with certain elements of their job are quite similar to those for the peer group. However, several areas are highlighted by significant differences of opinion, as indicated in table 15:

Table 15: Very satisfactory or satisfactory job aspects: Scranton, Peer Differences

Item	Scranton	Peer	Difference
Professional relationships with other faculty	66%	82%	-16
Competency of colleagues	69%	81%	-12
Social relationships with other faculty	51%	70%	-19
Relationship with administration	46%	63%	-17
Availability of childcare at institution	10%	30%	-20

Factors noted as a source of stress for faculty during the last two years for Scranton and peer group faculty respondents are: *self-imposed high expectations* (72% Scranton, 79% peer), *lack of personal time* (72% Scranton, 72% peer), *managing household responsibilities* (69% Scranton, 73% peer), and *teaching load* (66% Scranton, 62% peer). More Scranton faculty (48%) found *working with under prepared students* to be a source of stress than the peer group (38%), while higher percentages of peer group respondents were stressed by *job security* (28% peer, 17% Scranton) and the *review/promotion process* (50% peer, 40% Scranton). When asked if, were they to begin their career again, would they still wish to be a college professor, ninety-four percent (94%) of Scranton faculty indicated they definitely or probably would; eighty-six percent (86%) of peer group faculty felt this way.

LOCALLY DEVELOPED QUESTIONS

The final part of the survey consisted of twenty questions developed locally. The questions were in two sections. The first asked respondents to indicate their level of agreement with thirteen statements that relate to the University’s Jesuit identity and mission, and the roles, work, and reward structure of faculty at the institution. In the second section, respondents were asked to rank the quality of various aspects of the University.

Table 16 below describes Scranton faculty respondents’ level of agreement with statements related to the University’s Jesuit identity and mission. These questions are identical to those asked in the 2001 administration of the HERI faculty survey. Within this group of questions, longitudinal analysis comparing responses from 2001 to those from 2004 are included.

Table 16: Mission and Identity

A = Agree Strongly, B = Agree Somewhat, C = Disagree Somewhat, D = Disagree Strongly

A	B	C	D	Question #	
50%	39%	8%	3%	38	I understand the Ignatian Identity of the University.
29%	43%	21%	7%	39	There is widespread faculty support for the University’s Jesuit mission.
43%	39%	14%	4%	40	The mission of the University is of personal importance to me.
51%	31%	13%	4%	41	I consider being involved with student learning outside of the classroom an important part of my role as a faculty member.
34%	36%	17%	12%	42	I understand the developing focus on education for justice at the University.
34%	39%	19%	7%	43	Education for justice is of personal importance to me.

As the statistics in the preceding chart show, nearly one-third of faculty responding to the 2004 survey **agree strongly** that *there is widespread faculty support for the University's Jesuit mission*; this compares to fifteen percent (15%) of faculty in 2001 who believed this is the case. In that year, fifty-six percent (56%) of faculty **agreed somewhat** with this statement. A larger number of faculty respondents in both years **agree strongly** with the statement that *the mission of the university is of personal importance to me* (43% in 2004; 42% in 2001).

Table 17 below describes faculty responses to questions regarding governance and the faculty work and reward structure:

Table 17: Governance, Faculty Recognition & Reward System

A = Agree Strongly, B = Agree Somewhat, C = Disagree Somewhat, D = Disagree Strongly					
A	B	C	D	Question #	
34%	39%	23%	3%	44	I consider involvement with University school/college and department governance an important part of my role as a faculty member
34%	34%	23%	8%	45	I understand the role of Faculty Senate in University governance
16%	46%	28%	11%	46	I am aware of the overall model for faculty development at the University
9%	31%	28%	29%	47	I believe that the faculty recognition and reward system properly addresses the accomplishments of individual faculty
54%	30%	9%	7%	48	I am involved in research/scholarship and the publication/dissemination of my findings
58%	31%	5%	6%	49	I value research/scholarship and the publication/dissemination of my findings
22%	31%	32%	12%	50	I believe that service is a highly valued faculty responsibility

Since 2001, significantly more Scranton faculty **agree strongly** that *involvement with University governance* is an important part of their *role as a faculty member*; in 2001, eleven percent (11%) of respondents felt this way, as compared with thirty-four percent (34%) in 2004. Most faculty **agree strongly** or **somewhat** that they *understand the role of the faculty senate in the University's governance structure*. A considerable percentage (39%) **disagree somewhat** or **disagree strongly** with the statement *I am aware of the overall faculty development model at the University*; an even higher percentage **disagree somewhat** or **disagree strongly** (57%) that *the faculty recognition and reward system properly addresses the accomplishments of individual faculty*. Forty-four percent (44%) **disagree somewhat** or **disagree strongly** that *service is a highly valued faculty responsibility*.

The final bank of questions on the 2004 HERI faculty survey asked respondents to rank, on a scale of lowest to highest, the quality of several aspects of the University. Table 18 presents their responses:

Table 18: Quality Ratings for Aspects of The University of Scranton

A = Lowest E = Highest					Aspect of the University
A	B	C	D	E	
6%	16%	34%	31%	15%	Student Advising Centers
5%	12%	38%	34%	12%	Faculty Advising/Mentoring
5%	7%	22%	36%	30%	Library
13%	22%	35%	24%	7%	Center for Teaching and Learning Excellence
2%	18%	39%	35%	6%	Undergraduate Student Body
23%	23%	36%	14%	5%	Administrative Effectiveness
9%	20%	36%	29%	6%	Classroom/Lab Space

As this table indicates, most faculty rate most aspects surveyed in the report as somewhat mediocre in quality. The aspect of the University recognized as **highest** in quality by the most faculty members was the *Library*; the aspect recognized as **lowest** in quality of the choices was *administrative effectiveness*.

CONCLUSION

The 2004-05 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. We encourage and support further discussion and analysis of these results by the faculty and administration of the University.

Appendix:

HERI Faculty Survey Instrument, 2004