

## CSUSB Faculty Survey - Spring 2002

Office of Institutional Research  
Ross Moran, Director  
Muriel Lopez-Wagner, Assistant Director  
August 20, 2002

In Spring 2002 all CSUSB faculty teaching courses were surveyed via campus mail. Unlike earlier faculty surveys, individuals were identified through the class schedule rather than Academic Personnel. As a result, this survey was the first to extensively query temporary faculty. Surveys were initially sent to 908 individuals and additional reminders and requests to respond were sent to the Campus electronic list-server by the Chair of the Faculty Senate and the Office of Institutional Research. Responses were received from 284 for a 31.3% response rate.

### Item Sources:

The items on the survey were drawn from several sources. Thirteen of the first 23 non-demographic questions were previously asked in the 1997 *Faculty Senate Survey* and as local questions in the 1998 *Higher Education Research Institute (HERI) Faculty Survey*. An additional four of the satisfaction items came from the HERI survey proper, but the response scale was slightly different. The specific items selected were based on a factor analysis of the 1998 HERI local item responses and reviews of items by the Associate Provost for Academic Programs and a Faculty Senate committee.

An additional set of items paralleled some of the questions asked of students in the *National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE)* administered to an extensive sample of CSUSB "First-Year" and "Senior" students in Winter/Spring 2002. Students would be reporting on their experiences as learners while faculty would be responding as teachers and a comparison of their relative perspectives would be possible. Accordingly, faculty respondents were to answer each of these questions in the context of the division in which they taught classes: Lower, Upper and Graduate. The NSSE Survey findings will be available in a separate report.

An additional item on the impact of changes in average class size was derived from a similar question used at the University of Northern Florida.

### Highlights of Findings:

Three types of comparative ratings are reported. The first looks at responses of tenure track faculty over three points in time. The second compares the responses of tenure track with temporary faculty. While the third looks at differences among the respondent's College of discipline.

The results are presented in a straightforward fashion in the pages that follow. However, the following generalizations may be made:

- Among tenure track faculty, virtually all ratings have improved over time.
- For the historical items, temporary faculty gave higher ratings than tenure track faculty with the exception of Item 4 on "The fairness of decisions made concerning retention, promotion, and tenure (RPT)."
- Responses to the NSSE-based items on self-reported instructional activities suggest that at the undergraduate level, temporary faculty are more engaged with students than tenure track faculty. Temporary faculty do spend less time working with students on activities other than coursework, however, they are more likely to communicate with students electronically.
- Temporary faculty report more frequent assessment of student learning than do tenure track faculty and, at the undergraduate level, are seemingly more likely to require higher order critical thinking of students. Temporary faculty were also more likely to agree with the statement that "CSUSB expects students to spend significant amounts of time studying and on academic work." and correspondingly they report higher levels of satisfaction with student academic performance.

The somewhat low response rate together with the deliberate efforts to insure respondent anonymity preclude many additional analyses of interest. For example, how valid are the ratings and self-reported activities of faculty? Given the current controversy about the use of part-time faculty, it is noteworthy that undergraduate students appear to be well- (and perhaps better-) served by temporary faculty. Might that help explain why Temporary faculty receive higher SETE ratings?

The electronic dataset is available from the Office of Institutional in Excel and SPSS format for other campus researchers who may wish to explore these survey responses further.

### Respondent Demographics:

To help insure anonymity the demographic questions were minimized. Three questions at the beginning pertained to position, tenure status and administrative appointment, while a question at the end asked for the College of the respondent's academic discipline.

Faculty Category	Frequency	Percent
Temporary - primary employment CSUSB	60	22.5
Temporary - primary employment elsewhere	51	19.1
Tenure Track - probationary	39	14.6
Tenure Track - tenured	112	41.9
Tenure Track - tenured, on FERP	5	1.9
Total (excluding Omits)	267	100.0
Omitted	17	

According to the Spring 2002 Faculty Assignment by Department Report (FAD) 57% of CSUSB instructors were in non-tenure track positions compared with the 41.6% of survey respondents. It is noteworthy that 54% of the so-called "part-time" faculty (23% of all) reported that CSUSB was their primary source of employment. It is probable that the "true" part-time faculty were less likely to have responded to this survey since they would have had to have, and regularly check their campus mailbox to have received it.

Among those indicating that they were tenure track faculty, ranks were as follows:

Tenure Track Rank	Pct.	(FAD %)
Assistant Professor	24.5	(30.1)
Associate Professor	20.1	(20.1)
Professor	55.3	(48.1)

Some form of administrative appointment was reported by 9.9%.

College of Discipline/Department Respondents and (Spring 2002 FAD Faculty Headcount) Percentages

Arts & Letters	24.3 (20.4)
Business & PA	14.3 (12.3)
Education	19.6 (24.6)
Natural Sciences	23.2 (23.5)
Social Sciences	18.6 (19.1)

Position / College	A&L	BPA	Educ	NSci	SBS	Total
Temporary (Primary Elsewhere)	15.6	23.1	33.3	16.4	10.4	19.4
Temporary (CSUSB Primary)	26.6	17.9	23.5	23.0	18.8	22.4
Tenure Track	57.8	59.0	43.1	60.7	70.8	58.2
Number (excluding Omits)	64	39	51	61	48	263
Omitted Number	4	1	4	4	4	17

There is a difference in the type of Temporary faculty based on College. In Education and Business, 80% of the Temporary faculty have their primary employment elsewhere while for the other three colleges, over 60% of so-called "part-time" faculty have CSUSB as their primary employer.

Please indicate your level of satisfaction with each question using the following scale (Omit question if you have "No Opinion"):

#### 4. The fairness of decisions made concerning retention, promotion, and tenure (RPT)?

Group	1997	1998	TTrk	Temp	Total	A&L	BPA	Educ	NSci	SBS
Mean	3.62	3.31	3.57	3.15	3.44	3.33	3.24	3.52	3.59	3.48
N	211	208	162	68	231	55	33	42	54	44
S.D.	1.25	1.22	1.19	1.08	1.17	1.25	1.12	1.17	1.14	1.17
Very Satisfied % - 5	30	18	25	13	22	22	12	24	24	23
Satisfied % - 4	28	30	31	19	28	22	33	29	31	27
Neutral % - 3	24	26	26	44	31	35	27	31	31	32
Dissatisfied % - 2	9	15	9	16	11	11	21	10	6	11
Very Dissatisfied % - 1	9	10	8	7	8	11	6	7	7	7

#### 5. The faculty's role in budgeting and planning for the University?

Group	1997	1998	TTrk	Temp	Total	A&L	BPA	Educ	NSci	SBS
Mean			2.59	2.87	2.67	2.36	2.39	3.00	2.81	2.69
N			160	60	221	50	33	39	54	42
S.D.			1.05	1.13	1.07	1.06	1.12	1.17	1.08	0.84
Very Satisfied % - 5			2	12	5	2	3	13	6	0
Satisfied % - 4			18	12	16	12	12	18	20	17
Neutral % - 3			36	38	36	32	33	36	37	43
Dissatisfied % - 2			26	28	26	28	24	23	24	33
Very Dissatisfied % - 1			19	10	16	26	27	10	13	7

#### 6. The Faculty Senate's effectiveness in shared governance of the University?

Group	1997	1998	TTrk	Temp	Total	A&L	BPA	Educ	NSci	SBS
Mean	2.71	2.75	3.05	3.07	3.05	3.14	2.77	2.97	3.25	2.95
N	191	208	154	60	215	49	30	39	51	43
S.D.	1.13	1.12	1.11	0.92	1.06	1.15	0.97	1.04	1.09	0.90
Very Satisfied % - 5	7	6	8	10	8	10	3	8	14	2
Satisfied % - 4	15	25	30	13	25	33	17	21	27	26
Neutral % - 3	36	35	32	52	37	29	43	41	35	42
Dissatisfied % - 2	26	19	20	23	21	18	27	23	18	26
Very Dissatisfied % - 1	16	6	10	2	8	10	10	8	6	5

#### 7. Laboratory facilities?

Group	1997	1998	TTrk	Temp	Total	A&L	BPA	Educ	NSci	SBS
Mean	2.63	2.64	2.89	3.42	3.05	3.00	3.13	2.97	3.06	3.10
N	147	199	138	57	195	34	31	36	49	41
S.D.	1.34	1.01	1.04	0.86	1.02	0.85	1.18	1.11	1.11	0.89
Very Satisfied % - 5	10	5	6	9	7	6	6	8	8	5
Satisfied % - 4	21	12	22	37	26	12	39	22	31	27
Neutral % - 3	19	39	38	46	41	65	32	39	29	44
Dissatisfied % - 2	23	32	24	5	18	12	6	19	24	22
Very Dissatisfied % - 1	27	13	10	4	8	6	16	11	8	2

### 8. The Library's book and journal holdings?

	1997		1998		TTrk	Temp	Total	A&L	BPA	Educ	NSci	SBS
Group Mean	2.21	2.21	2.28	3.19	2.61	2.47	2.76	3.20	2.47	2.36	2.36	2.36
N			165	89	255	64	33	46	59	50		
S.D.			1.08	0.95	1.13	1.13	1.06	1.17	1.13	0.98		
Very Satisfied % - 5	5	2	3	8	5	5	3	13	3	2		
Satisfied % - 4	7	15	12	30	18	13	24	28	19	12		
Neutral % - 3	20	21	24	37	28	31	30	35	22	24		
Dissatisfied % - 2	31	26	35	22	30	28	30	13	34	44		
Very Dissatisfied % - 1	36	36	27	2	19	23	12	11	22	18		

Note: This is a double barreled question. In 1997, "book" Mean=2.39, "journal" Mean=2.03. In 1998, "book" Mean=2.39, "journal" Mean=2.02. The means and percentages reported here are the averages of the two items.

### 9. Technical support for computer and teaching-related work?

	1997		1998		TTrk	Temp	Total	A&L	BPA	Educ	NSci	SBS
Group Mean	2.67	2.64	3.28	3.61	3.38	3.27	2.91	3.64	3.31	3.74		
N	203	208	167	84	252	62	34	44	59	50		
S.D.	1.22	1.20	1.23	1.02	1.17	1.10	1.26	1.06	1.25	1.05		
Very Satisfied % - 5	7	7	16	21	18	15	6	23	19	24		
Satisfied % - 4	21	19	35	32	34	26	32	36	31	44		
Neutral % - 3	25	27	23	36	27	40	32	25	24	16		
Dissatisfied % - 2	27	27	16	7	13	11	6	14	17	14		
Very Dissatisfied % - 1	21	21	11	4	9	8	24	2	10	2		

### 10. Teaching load? (for 1998 HERI Survey comparison, use % Satisfied + Very Satisfied)

	1998		TTrk	Temp	Total	A&L	BPA	Educ	NSci	SBS
Group Mean	3.06	2.35	3.56	2.79	2.48	3.03	3.17	2.90	2.55	
N	214	170	93	265	66	37	48	62	49	
S.D.		1.21	1.12	1.31	1.39	1.46	1.24	1.26	1.06	
Very Satisfied % - 5	5	6	22	11	9	19	15	13	4	
Satisfied % - 4	31	14	37	22	21	30	29	19	16	
(Marginal) Neutral % - 3	29	19	23	21	14	5	27	29	24	
(Not Satis.) Dissat % - 2	36	31	15	25	21	27	17	23	41	
Very Dissatisfied % - 1		30	4	21	35	19	13	16	14	

### 11. Academic preparation of entering students?

	TTrk	Temp	Total	A&L	BPA	Educ	NSci	SBS
Group Mean	2.11	2.81	2.37	2.36	2.05	3.00	2.38	2.00
N	170	103	275	66	40	51	65	49
S.D.	0.93	1.06	1.04	0.91	1.11	1.15	1.01	0.76
Very Satisfied % - 5	1	6	3	0	3	10	2	0
Satisfied % - 4	8	20	12	12	10	25	12	4
Neutral % - 3	22	32	26	29	18	29	31	16
Dissatisfied % - 2	41	32	37	42	30	25	34	55
Very Dissatisfied % - 1	29	10	22	17	40	10	22	24

**12. Academic performance of typical students?**

		TTrk	Temp	Total	A&L	BPA	Educ	NSci	SBS
	5								
	4								
	3								
	2								
	1								
Group	Mean	2.72	3.19	2.91	2.86	2.82	3.32	2.89	2.65
	N	170	109	281	69	39	53	65	51
	S.D.	0.92	0.88	0.93	0.84	1.00	0.94	1.00	0.74
Very Satisfied %	- 5	1	6	3	1	3	8	2	0
Satisfied %	- 4	21	30	24	19	23	38	31	12
Neutral %	- 3	38	45	41	49	38	38	32	45
Dissatisfied %	- 2	31	17	25	25	26	13	26	39
Very Dissatisfied %	- 1	9	3	7	6	10	4	9	4

**13. Interactions with students?**

		TTrk	Temp	Total	A&L	BPA	Educ	NSci	SBS
	5								
	4								
	3								
	2								
	1								
Group	Mean	3.92	4.16	4.02	4.07	4.00	4.25	4.02	3.81
	N	169	110	281	67	40	55	63	52
	S.D.	0.83	0.76	0.81	0.80	0.85	0.73	0.73	0.89
Very Satisfied %	- 5	25	36	29	33	33	40	25	21
Satisfied %	- 4	47	45	47	45	38	47	52	46
Neutral %	- 3	23	16	20	19	28	11	21	27
Dissatisfied %	- 2	4	2	3	3	3	2	2	4
Very Dissatisfied %	- 1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

**14. Professional relations with other faculty? (for 1998 HERI Survey comparison, use % Satisfied + Very Sat.)**

		1998	TTrk	Temp	Total	A&L	BPA	Educ	NSci	SBS
	5									
	4									
	3									
	2									
	1									
Group	Mean	3.82	3.70	3.92	3.79	3.88	3.49	3.90	3.86	3.71
	N	222	169	104	274	68	37	52	63	51
	S.D.		1.10	0.95	1.05	0.84	1.04	1.11	1.13	1.12
Very Satisfied %	- 5	22	27	30	28	25	14	38	35	25
Satisfied %	- 4	45	34	41	37	43	43	27	33	39
(Marginal) Neutral %	- 3	25	24	23	24	28	27	25	19	22
(Not Satis.) Dissat %	- 2	8	10	3	7	4	11	6	8	8
Very Dissatisfied %	- 1		4	3	4	0	5	4	5	6

**15. Social relations with other faculty? (for 1998 HERI Survey comparison, use % Satisfied + Very Satisfied)**

		1998	TTrk	Temp	Total	A&L	BPA	Educ	NSci	SBS
	5									
	4									
	3									
	2									
	1									
Group	Mean	3.55	3.24	3.52	3.34	3.43	3.19	3.40	3.41	3.22
	N	211	166	91	258	65	36	45	59	50
	S.D.		1.08	1.03	1.07	1.12	1.09	1.14	0.97	1.07
Very Satisfied %	- 5	13	11	21	15	20	11	20	12	12
Satisfied %	- 4	44	31	26	30	29	25	24	36	28
(Marginal) Neutral %	- 3	29	34	38	36	28	47	38	37	36
(Not Satis.) Dissat %	- 2	14	16	12	14	20	6	11	12	18
Very Dissatisfied %	- 1		7	2	5	3	11	7	3	6

**16. Relationships with administration?** (for 1998 HERI Survey comparison, use % Satisfied + Very Satisfied)

		1998	TTrk	Temp	Total	A&L	BPA	Educ	NSci	SBS
Group										
Mean		3.50	3.20	3.57	3.33	3.27	3.03	3.63	3.47	3.18
N		223	167	95	262	64	36	49	60	50
S.D.			1.21	1.25	1.24	1.29	1.25	1.27	1.14	1.22
Very Satisfied % - 5		13	14	31	20	19	8	33	22	16
Satisfied % - 4		40	33	25	30	31	36	27	30	26
(Marginal) Neutral % - 3		29	23	20	22	19	22	18	25	28
(Not Satis.) Dissat % - 2		17	19	19	19	20	17	16	20	20
Very Dissatisfied % - 1			11	5	9	11	17	6	3	10

Please indicate your level of agreement with each statement (Omit if you have "No Opinion"):

**17. I am satisfied with my decision to teach at CSUSB.**

		1997	1998	TTrk	Temp	Total	A&L	BPA	Educ	NSci	SBS
Group											
Mean		3.83	3.67	3.92	4.40	4.12	4.00	4.05	4.43	4.23	3.96
N		223	211	171	112	285	69	41	54	65	52
S.D.		1.05	1.22	1.08	0.90	1.03	0.97	1.12	1.00	0.95	1.05
Strong Agree % - 5		31	31	37	62	47	39	46	69	49	37
Agree % - 4		34	30	33	22	29	29	27	15	32	37
Neutral % - 3		25	22	18	12	16	25	15	9	12	15
Disagree % - 2		7	10	10	4	7	7	10	6	5	10
Strong Disagree % - 1		3	7	2	1	2	0	2	2	2	2

**18. I am excited about the use of technologies for multimedia instruction and distance education.**

		1997	1998	TTrk	Temp	Total	A&L	BPA	Educ	NSci	SBS
Group											
Mean		2.93	2.88	2.97	3.81	3.27	3.26	3.08	4.07	3.19	2.82
N		218	211	170	91	263	65	37	45	62	51
S.D.		1.43	1.30	1.29	1.17	1.31	1.34	1.34	1.12	1.29	1.21
Strong Agree % - 5		19	13	16	36	23	23	16	49	21	10
Agree % - 4		17	20	16	26	20	18	24	22	16	18
Neutral % - 3		22	30	36	26	33	37	30	18	39	35
Disagree % - 2		18	16	14	4	11	5	11	9	10	20
Strong Disagree % - 1		23	21	18	7	14	17	19	2	15	18

**19. With its museums, plays, public lecture, concerts, sports, and special events, the University provides a valuable cultural resource for the community.**

		1997	1998	TTrk	Temp	Total	A&L	BPA	Educ	NSci	SBS
Group											
Mean		3.72	3.54	3.69	3.90	3.76	3.97	3.64	3.87	3.70	3.56
N		217	211	167	94	262	68	36	46	61	48
S.D.		1.08	1.11	1.09	0.97	1.05	1.12	1.05	1.09	1.07	0.87
Strong Agree % - 5		28	20	28	32	30	46	19	33	28	15
Agree % - 4		34	36	31	37	33	21	44	37	33	38
Neutral % - 3		26	28	24	20	23	19	19	20	21	38
Disagree % - 2		8	10	15	11	13	15	14	7	18	10
Strong Disagree % - 1		4	6	2	0	1	0	3	4	0	0

**20. The campus offers a good array of places to sit and converse informally with students and colleagues.**

	1997		1998		TTrk	Temp	Total	A&L	BPA	Educ	NSci	SBS
Group	1997	1998	TTrk	Temp	Total	A&L	BPA	Educ	NSci	SBS		
Mean	2.62	2.45	2.66	3.39	2.93	2.86	3.21	3.15	2.90	2.76		
N	218	210	168	102	271	69	39	47	62	50		
S.D.	1.23	1.15	1.17	1.12	1.20	1.23	1.22	1.16	1.20	1.19		
Strong Agree % - 5	8	3	8	18	11	10	15	15	13	6		
Agree % - 4	16	15	17	31	22	23	28	21	16	26		
Neutral % - 3	29	22	27	28	27	23	28	36	31	22		
Disagree % - 2	24	35	32	18	26	29	18	19	29	30		
Strong Disagree % - 1	23	23	17	5	13	14	10	9	11	16		

**21. CSUSB is doing well in providing support for faculty who are involved in community activities.**

	1997		1998		TTrk	Temp	Total	A&L	BPA	Educ	NSci	SBS
Group	1997	1998	TTrk	Temp	Total	A&L	BPA	Educ	NSci	SBS		
Mean	2.42	2.54	2.81	3.16	2.90	3.02	2.41	3.21	2.85	2.94		
N	183	203	159	62	221	47	32	39	52	48		
S.D.	1.14	1.04	1.08	1.03	1.07	1.09	1.07	1.24	0.92	1.00		
Strong Agree % - 5	5	5	6	13	8	9	3	18	4	6		
Agree % - 4	10	10	18	18	18	21	13	21	15	19		
Neutral % - 3	31	37	42	47	43	47	28	38	50	46		
Disagree % - 2	27	32	20	18	19	11	34	10	23	21		
Strong Disagree % - 1	26	17	14	5	12	13	22	13	8	8		

**22. CSUSB is doing well in providing support for faculty who are involved in research projects.**

	1997		1998		TTrk	Temp	Total	A&L	BPA	Educ	NSci	SBS
Group	1997	1998	TTrk	Temp	Total	A&L	BPA	Educ	NSci	SBS		
Mean	2.83	3.30	2.96	2.77	2.77	3.41	3.04	2.91				
N	169	64	233	57	35	37	54	47				
S.D.	1.12	1.16	1.15	1.09	1.21	1.14	1.08	1.18				
Strong Agree % - 5	3	19	7	2	9	22	6	4				
Agree % - 4	31	22	28	26	23	22	33	34				
Neutral % - 3	28	38	31	37	20	38	30	28				
Disagree % - 2	22	14	20	18	34	14	22	17				
Strong Disagree % - 1	15	8	13	18	14	5	9	17				

**23. CSUSB is doing well in encouraging people who have been historically underrepresented to become more involved in University activities and programs.**

	1997		1998		TTrk	Temp	Total	A&L	BPA	Educ	NSci	SBS
Group	1997	1998	TTrk	Temp	Total	A&L	BPA	Educ	NSci	SBS		
Mean	3.71	3.59	3.60	3.77	3.66	3.64	3.59	3.95	3.84	3.29		
N	191	205	159	79	239	58	32	42	56	48		
S.D.	1.04	1.04	1.08	0.88	1.02	1.04	1.04	1.03	0.78	1.13		
Strong Agree % - 5	23	20	21	20	21	21	19	33	21	10		
Agree % - 4	42	38	38	44	40	38	38	40	43	42		
Neutral % - 3	24	30	29	29	29	31	34	19	34	23		
Disagree % - 2	7	9	6	5	6	5	3	2	2	17		
Strong Disagree % - 1	5	4	6	1	5	5	6	5	0	8		

**24. CSUSB generally provides the support that students need to succeed academically.**

		TTrk	Temp	Total	A&L	BPA	Educ	NSci	SBS
Group									
Mean		3.52	3.80	3.63	3.67	3.21	3.92	3.79	3.44
N		168	100	270	66	38	48	63	52
S.D.		0.94	0.89	0.93	0.88	1.07	0.92	0.88	0.83
Strong Agree% - 5		14	20	16	20	11	25	21	6
Agree % - 4		39	49	43	35	32	52	46	46
Neutral % - 3		33	24	30	38	32	15	27	37
Disagree % - 2		12	5	9	8	21	6	5	10
Strong Disagree % - 1		2	2	2	0	5	2	2	2

**25. CSUSB generally provides the support that faculty need to succeed professionally.**

		TTrk	Temp	Total	A&L	BPA	Educ	NSci	SBS
Group									
Mean		2.86	3.26	3.01	2.71	2.87	3.47	3.23	2.73
N		169	97	268	66	39	49	61	49
S.D.		1.17	1.02	1.14	1.09	1.03	1.12	1.12	1.13
Strong Agree% - 5		8	10	9	3	5	18	13	4
Agree % - 4		24	32	27	21	21	37	31	24
Neutral % - 3		28	36	31	38	41	22	26	29
Disagree % - 2		25	16	22	20	23	18	25	27
Strong Disagree % - 1		14	5	11	18	10	4	5	16


**26. CSUSB expects students to spend significant amounts of time studying and on academic work.**

		TTrk	Temp	Total	A&L	BPA	Educ	NSci	SBS
Group									
Mean		2.93	3.59	3.19	2.97	3.05	3.68	3.31	3.00
N		168	105	275	67	40	53	61	51
S.D.		1.11	0.97	1.11	1.06	1.01	1.22	1.01	1.06
Strong Agree% - 5		8	17	12	6	10	28	10	8
Agree % - 4		22	39	29	27	18	36	36	24
Neutral % - 3		35	32	34	34	45	21	34	37
Disagree % - 2		24	9	18	24	23	6	15	24
Strong Disagree % - 1		11	3	8	9	5	9	5	8

**27. The overall sense of well being of faculty at CSUSB is very high.**

	1997	1998	TTrk	Temp	Total	A&L	BPA	Educ	NSci	SBS
Group										
Mean	2.26	2.32	2.83	3.19	2.97	2.83	2.58	3.22	3.18	2.92
N	211	210	167	93	261	65	38	45	62	48
S.D.	0.96	1.06	1.06	1.05	1.07	1.04	1.15	1.20	0.98	0.92
Strong Agree% - 5	1	4	5	9	6	2	5	16	6	4
Agree % - 4	10	9	22	34	27	31	16	29	32	19
Neutral % - 3	28	27	37	30	35	28	32	27	40	48
Disagree % - 2	38	35	23	22	23	29	26	20	15	23
Strong Disagree % - 1	24	25	13	5	10	11	21	9	6	6

**28. Overall, the faculty feel that the administration at the University level is doing a good job.**



Group	1997	1998	TTrk	Temp	Total	A&L	BPA	Educ	NSci	SBS
Mean	2.14	2.74	2.98	3.18	3.04	2.98	2.55	3.45	3.24	2.87
N	214	210	167	83	251	62	38	44	59	45
S.D.	0.95	1.17	1.16	1.18	1.17	1.19	1.22	1.19	1.07	1.08
Strong Agree % - 5	1	5	7	14	10	6	5	20	12	4
Agree % - 4	7	24	31	29	30	34	18	34	32	29
Neutral % - 3	22	29	28	24	26	27	29	23	27	24
Disagree % - 2	36	23	21	25	22	16	21	16	25	33
Strong Disagree % - 1	27	19	13	7	11	16	26	7	3	9

For each Division in which you have taught courses over the past two years, please indicate the instructional activities that you used. (Omit item if not applicable).

**29. I taught courses at this divisional level in the last two years.**

Group	TTrk	Temp	Total	A&L	BPA	Educ	NSci	SBS
Number of Faculty	171	113	284	69	41	55	65	52
Lower Div. Yes%	49	48	49	68	24	9	71	54
Upper Div. Yes%	82	54	71	87	83	25	72	85
Graduate Div. Yes%	58	35	49	30	63	84	31	46

**30. Most of the courses I taught at this level were activity-based or labs.**


Group	TTrk	Temp	Total	A&L	BPA	Educ	NSci	SBS
Lower Div. Yes%	16	18	17	19	12	5	29	8
Upper Div. Yes%	27	14	22	20	24	13	29	19
Graduate Div. Yes%	13	13	13	1	2	44	8	10

**31. My primary workload was for supervision of field placements.**

Group	TTrk	Temp	Total	A&L	BPA	Educ	NSci	SBS
Lower Div. Yes%	1	2	1	1	0	2	3	0
Upper Div. Yes%	4	1	2	3	2	4	2	2
Graduate Div. Yes%	4	3	4	0	2	7	3	6


**Frequency of Selected Course Activities and Requirements:**

**32. Required students to make class presentations?**



Group	TT-LD	Tem-LD	Tot-LD	TT-UD	Tem-UD	Tot-UD	TT-GD	Tem-GD	Tot-GD	NSSE
Mean	1.92	2.57	2.18	2.61	3.12	2.77	3.31	3.40	3.33	2.67
N	78	51	130	137	59	197	98	43	142	448
S.D.	1.14	1.19	1.19	0.99	0.93	1.00	0.95	0.85	0.91	
Very Often % - 4	17	31	22	23	44	30	56	58	57	15
Often % - 3	10	20	14	28	29	29	27	28	27	43
Sometimes % - 2	22	24	22	34	22	31	9	9	9	38
Never % - 1	51	25	41	14	5	11	8	5	7	6

**33. Had students work on a paper or project that required integrating ideas or information from different sources?**



Group	TT-LD	Tem-LD	Tot-LD	TT-UD	Tem-UD	Tot-UD	TT-GD	Tem-GD	Tot-GD	NSSE
Mean	2.63	3.20	2.85	3.35	3.51	3.40	3.69	3.55	3.65	3.25
N	80	50	131	136	57	194	101	42	144	448
S.D.	1.15	1.18	1.19	0.85	0.73	0.82	0.66	0.74	0.68	
Very Often % - 4	35	64	46	55	63	58	78	67	75	42
Often % - 3	11	8	10	29	26	28	15	24	17	42
Sometimes % - 2	35	12	26	11	9	10	5	7	6	15
Never % - 1	19	16	18	4	2	4	2	2	2	1

**34. Used e-mail or on-line chat to communicate with students?**

	TT-LD			Tem-UD			Tot-UD			TT-GD			Tem-GD			Tot-GD			NSSE
Group Mean	2.80	3.11	2.93	2.91	3.36	3.04	3.06	3.43	3.15	2.63									
N	82	54	137	140	56	197	101	40	142	448									
S.D.	1.09	1.11	1.11	0.99	0.88	0.98	0.99	0.84	0.96										
Very Often% - 4	39	52	44	39	57	44	47	65	52	22									
Often % - 3	15	22	18	17	27	20	18	13	16	30									
Sometimes % - 2	34	11	25	39	11	31	31	23	28	38									
Never % - 1	12	15	13	5	5	5	5	0	4	11									

**35. Discussed ideas from the class with students outside of class?**

	TT-LD			Tem-LD			Tot-LD			TT-UD			Tem-UD			Tot-UD			NSSE
Group Mean	2.91	3.00	2.95	3.11	2.98	3.08	3.32	3.10	3.24	1.79									
N	80	53	134	140	56	197	99	41	141	448									
S.D.	0.97	0.94	0.95	0.89	0.86	0.88	0.91	0.97	0.95										
Very Often% - 4	36	38	37	42	29	38	59	44	54	5									
Often % - 3	25	30	27	31	48	36	19	29	22	13									
Sometimes % - 2	33	26	30	24	16	21	18	20	19	38									
Never % - 1	6	6	6	4	7	5	4	7	5	44									

**36. Worked with students on activities other than course work?**

	TT-LD			Tem-LD			Tot-LD			TT-UD			Tem-UD			Tot-UD			NSSE
Group Mean	2.11	2.00	2.07	2.58	2.12	2.44	2.85	2.44	2.72	1.47									
N	82	54	137	137	58	196	94	39	134	447									
S.D.	1.03	0.93	0.99	1.01	1.11	1.06	1.05	1.02	1.06										
Very Often% - 4	15	9	13	25	19	23	37	21	32	5									
Often % - 3	15	15	15	22	10	18	21	21	21	6									
Sometimes % - 2	38	43	40	39	34	38	31	41	34	20									
Never % - 1	33	33	33	14	36	21	11	18	13	69									

**37. Required written papers or reports of 5 or more pages?**

	TT-LD			Tem-LD			Tot-LD			TT-UD			Tem-UD			Tot-UD			NSSE
Group Mean	2.09	2.48	2.26	3.11	3.16	3.13	3.59	3.13	3.45	2.52									
N	79	54	134	137	57	195	99	39	139	446									
S.D.	1.30	1.37	1.34	1.10	1.05	1.08	0.85	0.98	0.91										
Very Often% - 4	27	41	32	52	54	53	76	46	67	9									
Often % - 3	9	6	8	21	16	20	13	28	17	22									
Sometimes % - 2	11	15	13	13	21	15	5	18	9	56									
Never % - 1	53	39	47	14	9	12	6	8	7	13									

**38. Provided prompt feedback to students on their academic performance?**

	TT-LD			Tem-LD			Tot-LD			TT-UD			Tem-UD			Tot-UD			NSSE
Group Mean	3.62	3.69	3.65	3.68	3.70	3.69	3.80	3.69	3.77	2.66									
N	81	51	133	137	56	194	101	45	147	448									
S.D.	0.62	0.51	0.58	0.55	0.66	0.58	0.47	0.67	0.54										
Very Often% - 4	68	71	69	72	79	74	82	78	81	16									
Often % - 3	27	27	27	26	14	22	17	16	16	41									
Sometimes % - 2	4	2	3	2	5	3	0	4	1	36									
Never % - 1	1	0	1	1	2	1	1	2	1	7									

**39. Taught courses where increases in student enrollment has had a significant negative impact on the quality of instruction?**

	TT-LD	Tem-LD	Tot-LD	TT-UD	Tem-UD	Tot-UD	TT-GD	Tem-GD	Tot-GD
Group Mean	2.69	2.12	2.45	2.49	2.11	2.38	2.13	2.08	2.11
N	80	52	133	138	55	194	91	36	128
S.D.	1.18	1.13	1.19	1.22	1.23	1.23	1.18	1.16	1.17
Very Often% - 4	35	15	27	32	24	30	20	19	20
Often % - 3	21	23	22	15	9	13	16	11	15
Sometimes % - 2	21	19	20	23	22	23	21	28	23
Never % - 1	23	42	30	30	45	34	43	42	43

**40. Would you have been described by your students as available, helpful, and sympathetic?**

	TT-LD	Tem-LD	Tot-LD	TT-UD	Tem-UD	Tot-UD	TT-GD	Tem-GD	Tot-GD
Group Mean	3.43	3.55	3.48	3.57	3.63	3.59	3.67	3.40	3.59
N	81	51	133	136	59	196	98	43	142
S.D.	0.72	0.58	0.67	0.59	0.58	0.59	0.55	0.69	0.61
Very Often% - 4	57	59	58	62	68	64	71	49	65
Often % - 3	30	37	33	33	27	31	24	44	30
Sometimes % - 2	14	4	10	5	5	5	4	5	4
Never % - 1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1

In the respective division's courses, to what extent did you assessments of student learning focus on performance in each of the following areas:

**41. Memorizing facts, ideas, or methods covered in course presentations and readings in pretty much the same form.**

	TT-LD	Tem-LD	Tot-LD	TT-UD	Tem-UD	Tot-UD	TT-GD	Tem-GD	Tot-GD	NSSE
Group Mean	2.37	2.24	2.30	2.36	2.10	2.28	2.02	1.74	1.94	2.93
N	82	55	138	137	59	197	93	35	129	447
S.D.	0.96	1.07	1.01	0.99	0.98	0.99	1.00	0.78	0.95	
Very Often% - 4	15	15	15	16	10	14	11	3	9	29
Often % - 3	27	27	27	26	22	24	18	11	16	40
Sometimes % - 2	39	25	34	37	36	37	33	43	36	27
Never % - 1	20	33	25	21	32	24	38	43	39	5

**42. Analyzing the basic elements of an idea, experience, or theory, such as examining a particular case or situation in depth and considering its components.**

	TT-LD	Tem-LD	Tot-LD	TT-UD	Tem-UD	Tot-UD	TT-GD	Tem-GD	Tot-GD	NSSE
Group Mean	3.07	3.32	3.16	3.36	3.56	3.41	3.57	3.49	3.54	3.19
N	81	50	132	138	59	198	97	41	139	447
S.D.	0.85	0.84	0.85	0.77	0.62	0.74	0.68	0.64	0.66	
Very Often% - 4	37	54	44	52	63	55	66	56	63	39
Often % - 3	36	26	32	34	31	33	26	37	29	43
Sometimes % - 2	25	18	22	12	7	10	7	7	7	17
Never % - 1	2	2	2	2	0	2	1	0	1	2

**43. Synthesizing and organizing ideas, information, or experiences into new, more complex interpretations and relationships.**

	TT-LD	Tem-LD	Tot-LD	TT-UD	Tem-UD	Tot-UD	TT-GD	Tem-GD	Tot-GD	NSSE
Group Mean	2.91	3.26	3.05	3.41	3.54	3.45	3.66	3.44	3.59	2.92
N	80	50	131	137	59	197	97	41	139	446
S.D.	1.03	0.88	0.99	0.75	0.68	0.73	0.58	0.84	0.67	
Very Often % - 4	39	50	43	56	64	59	71	63	69	30
Often % - 3	24	30	26	29	25	28	24	20	22	37
Sometimes % - 2	28	16	23	14	10	13	5	15	8	29
Never % - 1	10	4	8	1	0	1	0	2	1	4

**44. Making judgments about the value of information, arguments or methods such as examining how others gathered and interpreted data and assessing the soundness of their conclusions.**

	TT-LD	Tem-LD	Tot-LD	TT-UD	Tem-UD	Tot-UD	TT-GD	Tem-GD	Tot-GD	NSSE
Group Mean	2.56	2.92	2.70	3.07	3.09	3.08	3.56	3.45	3.53	2.92
N	80	49	130	135	55	191	96	40	137	446
S.D.	1.09	0.98	1.05	0.88	0.87	0.87	0.63	0.78	0.68	
Very Often % - 4	28	35	30	36	38	37	64	58	62	27
Often % - 3	20	31	24	41	36	39	29	35	31	43
Sometimes % - 2	34	27	31	17	22	18	7	3	6	25
Never % - 1	19	8	15	6	4	5	0	5	1	6

**45. Applying theories or concepts to practical problems or in new situations.**

	TT-LD	Tem-LD	Tot-LD	TT-UD	Tem-UD	Tot-UD	TT-GD	Tem-GD	Tot-GD	NSSE
Group Mean	2.88	3.13	2.97	3.36	3.41	3.37	3.65	3.58	3.63	2.97
N	81	48	130	137	58	196	99	43	143	447
S.D.	0.94	0.96	0.95	0.79	0.77	0.78	0.63	0.66	0.64	
Very Often % - 4	32	46	37	53	57	54	73	65	70	31
Often % - 3	30	27	29	31	29	31	19	30	23	38
Sometimes % - 2	32	21	28	13	12	13	8	2	6	27
Never % - 1	6	6	6	2	2	2	0	2	1	4