

Faculty Morale Survey Summary Report

**Administration of Survey:
Office of Institutional Research**

Analyses and Reporting:

**Vicki L. Wise, Ph.D.
Director of Assessment and Evaluation
College of Education
James Madison University**

Wednesday, March 21, 2007

Executive Summary

Vision

- Faculty agree that the mission statement reflects their vision of JMU.

Administration

- Faculty ratings of administrators vary by administrative position and proximity to administrators. Administrators more directly connected to faculty tend to have higher ratings.
- There were significant differences between faculty who have tenure and those on tenure track in their satisfaction ratings of administrators. In terms of
 - **Commitment to University Mission**, tenured faculty are less satisfied than non-tenured faculty with their Academic Unit Head and the Dean of their College.
 - **Leadership**, tenured faculty are less satisfied than non-tenured faculty with their Academic Unit Head, the Dean of their College, and the Provost.
 - **Interpersonal Skills**, tenured faculty are less satisfied than non-tenured faculty with the Dean of their College.
 - **Professionalism/Judgment**, tenured faculty are less satisfied than non-tenured faculty with their Academic Unit Head and the Dean of their College.
 - **Confidence/Trust in Administrator**, tenured faculty are less satisfied than non-tenured faculty with their Academic Unit Head and the Dean of their College.

Faculty Support/Involvement

- Overall level of satisfaction as a faculty member at JMU is moderate.
- Faculty satisfaction on items related to faculty support and involvement varies, but most items received moderate satisfaction ratings. Faculty satisfaction is highest for academic freedom but lowest for satisfaction with pay.
- Faculty ratings of support and involvement also varies by academic position. In general, overall satisfaction as a faculty member at JMU is highest for instructors (annual terms) and lowest for associate professors.

Library Resources

- Faculty expressed strong satisfaction with Carrier Library resources, but moderate satisfaction with holdings for faculty research.

Committees in your College

- Faculty satisfaction is generally high with the degree to which committees in their college accurately and successfully convey faculty concerns.

General Education Program

- Faculty are moderately satisfied with aspects of the General Education program: quality of teaching, administration of the program, and quality of courses, and structure of the program (i.e., clusters, tiers).
- The main strengths of the General Education Program are course breadth and depth, quality of faculty, structure of the program, GenEd Administration quality, and assessment of learning outcomes.

- The areas in the General Education Program that need improvement are the program structure, courses, GenEd faculty, importance of GenEd, and GenEd administration.
- It is interesting to note that faculty who have been here for fewer years are more positive about the General Education program than faculty who have been here longer.

Agenda Issues

- Agenda issues in order of importance were tuition relief for children of JMU faculty, counting summer school salary towards retirement, and in-state tuition relief for children of new JMU faculty who do not have Virginia residency.

Faculty Club

- Faculty are not satisfied with the opportunities on campus to interact socially with other faculty members.
- And although they are not satisfied, they expressed only moderate interest in a Faculty Club where they would have an inviting location to meet with colleagues and have a meal.
- For those who do support a club, it is important that the club be located on campus for easier access.
- Almost all faculty interested in the Club would visit the Club at least 1-2 times per week.

Grade Inflation

- Faculty vary in their grading orientation. They tend to award the highest grades in their classes based on criterion-referenced performance, but indicate they use both norm-referenced and criterion-referenced depending on the subject matter/course.
- At least one-half of faculty have experienced increased student pressure for higher grades.

Institutional Review Board (IRB)

- About one-third of faculty have interacted with the IRB.
- Faculty who have interacted with IRB expressed moderate satisfaction in doing so.
- Faculty interaction and satisfaction with the IRB committee varies by college and by academic rank.

Textbooks

- Faculty are not very concerned that constraints on textbook selection will impair their ability to do the absolute best job they can for their students.

Childcare Services

- One-quarter of faculty have a current need or expect to have a need in the course of their time at JMU for childcare services.
- At least one-half of faculty would be willing to pay a fee for childcare service that is comparable to that of the private childcare service available in the Harrisonburg/Rockingham County area.

Faculty Senate

- Faculty expressed moderate to low agreement regarding the Faculty Senate charges.
- Faculty report that if the Faculty Senate is to be a strong voice for the faculty, they would

encourage the Senate to put most effort articulating faculty views and interests with administrators.

- Most faculty know who their Faculty Senator is.

Open-ended Questions

What positive experiences at JMU have helped you reach your professional goals?

The main positive experiences that helped faculty to reach their goals are supportive relationships with colleagues and administrators in their area. Professional development opportunities are also key experiences to help faculty reach their goals. Examples they gave were professional development workshops such as those given through the Center for Instructional Technology and Center for Faculty Innovation.

If you have experienced any obstacles in reaching your professional goals at JMU, please tell us about the obstacles.

The greatest obstacle faculty experience is faculty loads that are too much, particularly trying to balance research with heavy teaching loads. Faculty reported they need more professional development opportunities, particularly funding to attend professional conferences. In addition, faculty report that not having paid academic leave for professional development is a problem. Several faculty also reported issues with administration, particularly in terms of the quality of leadership they encounter in their immediate departments.

What are your major concerns about your role as a teacher (for example, grade inflation, honor violations, etc.)?

The main concerns are grade inflation, honor system violations, student expectations for high grades and having a sense of entitlement, faculty load, and class sizes being too large.

As a faculty member, what is the biggest concern you have that has a simple solution that so far appears to be overlooked. Please include both the issue and the solution.

Faculty issues are the most pressing concerns to faculty. In particular, faculty are concerned about faculty shortage, faculty load, and faculty pay. Faculty want their teaching loads reduced, perhaps by hiring new faculty or by redistributing course loads. Faculty also want pay raises, and one way to do this is to reduce spending on campus upgrades. In addition, faculty are concerned about JMU's administration and want them to provide better leadership and vision.

Table of Contents

Representativeness of Sample	6
Analyses	6
Vision	7
Administration	7
Faculty Support/Involvement	8
Library Resources	13
Committees in your College	14
General Education Program	14
Agenda Issues	15
Faculty Club	16
Grade Inflation	16
Institutional Review Board (IRB)	17
Textbooks	17
Childcare Services	17
Faculty Senate	17
Open-ended Questions	18
Demographic Questions	19

Faculty Morale Survey

Institutional Research conducted this Faculty Morale survey in a 15 day period during November 2007. The survey population included 916 faculty classified as either full-time instructional or administrative and professional. Of these, 574 faculty responded to the survey resulting in a response rate of 63%.

Representativeness of Sample

Representativeness of the sample, otherwise called respondents, to the JMU population was explored in terms of gender, race/ethnicity, and distribution across JMU colleges. The respondents are representative of the JMU population at large in terms of gender. JMU faculty consist of 471 (57%) males and 358 (43%) females. Survey respondents are 56% males and 44% females. In terms of race/ethnicity, it is difficult to determine if the respondents are representative of the JMU population, as a large percentage of faculty chose not to report this information. A total of 115 (20%) respondents did not report their race/ethnicity. This is in stark contrast to the Institutional Research reports indicating 1.6% do not report this information. The distribution of respondents across colleges is representative of the JMU population at large.

JMU Colleges/Units	Population N	Population %	Respondent N	Respondent %
Arts and Letters	230	25.1%	145	25.3%
Business	121	13.2%	79	13.8%
Education	52	5.7%	37	6.4%
Integrated Science and Technology	210	22.9%	137	23.9%
Science and Mathematics	134	14.6%	86	15.0%
Visual and Performing Arts	82	9.0%	48	8.4%
Graduate and Professional Programs	3	0.3%	1*	0.2%
Other	75	8.2%	36	6.3%
General Education	9	1.0%	5	0.9%
Total	916	100.0%	574	100.0%

*As only one person responded, this individual's findings are omitted from this report

Analyses

For scaled questions, means and standard deviations are reported. All scaled questions are assigned a value of "1" to indicate a low level of the construct being measured (e.g., satisfaction) and "5" (or "4" in some cases) to indicate a high level of the same construct. In all analyses the "no opinion/no basis to judge" options were removed from analyses. In addition, means and standards deviation are reported when the number of responses was greater than one. However, it is important to interpret means based on a small number of individuals with some trepidation, as these numbers tend to be less stable.

In terms of open-ended questions, responses have been reduced, as appropriate, to main themes. If the overall response rate to an individual open-ended question was fewer than 10%, no themes were extracted and, as a result, are not included in this report.

Vision

Respondents agree that JMU’s mission statement reflects their vision of JMU.

Questions were asked on a 5-point agreement scale (strongly agree=5 to strongly disagree =1).

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
	561	4.35	.838

Administration

Respondents’ satisfaction with each level of academic administration on the characteristics listed varies. The proximity of faculty to each administrator is probably a factor in the ratings.

Questions were asked on a 5-point satisfaction scale (very satisfied=5 to very dissatisfied=1).

		JMU Position				
		Program Coordinator	Academic Unit Head or Director	Dean of College	Provost	President.
Commitment to University Mission	Mean	4.23	4.16	4.21	3.71	3.83
	St. Dev	1.159	1.228	1.147	1.268	1.194
	N	234	529	534	431	474
Leadership	Mean	4.09	4.00	4.01	3.49	3.67
	St. Dev	1.260	1.356	1.267	1.292	1.239
	N	228	532	537	425	461
Interpersonal Skills	Mean	4.19	4.06	4.06	3.53	3.82
	St. Dev	1.212	1.330	1.240	1.302	1.142
	N	222	525	529	365	384
Professionalism/Judgment	Mean	4.23	3.98	4.05	3.53	3.67
	St. Dev	1.177	1.373	1.229	1.270	1.154
	N	223	528	513	369	372
Execution	Mean	4.04	3.88	3.89	3.44	3.59
	St. Dev	1.270	1.338	1.258	1.267	1.174
	N	219	520	501	354	355
Professional Development	Mean	4.13	4.19	4.06	3.67	3.64
	St. Dev	1.220	1.212	1.172	1.249	1.227
	N	213	523	504	365	357

		JMU Position				
		Program Coordinator	Academic Unit Head or Director	Dean of College	Provost	President.
Confidence/Trust in Administrator	Mean	4.18	4.01	4.07	3.54	3.71
	St. Dev	1.246	1.393	1.258	1.298	1.182
	N	223	530	542	433	464

Administration Questions Reported by Faculty Tenure Status

There were significant differences between faculty who have tenure and those on tenure track in their satisfaction ratings of administrators. In terms of

- **Commitment to University Mission**, tenured faculty are less satisfied than non-tenured faculty with their Academic Unit Head and the Dean of their College.
- **Leadership**, tenured faculty are less satisfied than non-tenured faculty with their Academic Unit Head, the Dean of their College, and the Provost.
- **Interpersonal Skills**, tenured faculty are less satisfied than non-tenured faculty with the Dean of their College.
- **Professionalism/Judgment**, tenured faculty are less satisfied than non-tenured faculty with their Academic Unit Head and the Dean of their College.
- **Confidence/Trust in Administrator**, tenured faculty are less satisfied than non-tenured faculty with their Academic Unit Head and the Dean of their College.

Twenty-three percent (130) of respondents provided additional comments regarding **dissatisfaction with an administrator**.

- In the College of Integrated Science and Technology, 32 faculty are dissatisfied with administration.
- In the College of Arts and Letters, 40 faculty are dissatisfied with administration.
- In the College of Business, 12 faculty are dissatisfied with administration.
- In the College of Education, 10 faculty are dissatisfied with administration.
- In the College of Science and Math, 17 faculty are dissatisfied with administration.
- In the College of Visual and Performing Arts, 14 faculty are dissatisfied with administration.

Faculty Support/Involvement

Faculty support and involvement varies by issue. Faculty are most satisfied with their academic freedom but least satisfied with their pay. Faculty used a 5-point satisfaction scale (very satisfied=5 to very dissatisfied=1) to rate their perception of each item.

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Your academic freedom	561	4.35	.917
Overall level of satisfaction as a faculty member at JMU	568	3.78	1.044
Your health benefits	554	3.62	1.160
Faculty involvement in the academic review process, including course	513	3.62	1.203

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
and program creation			
Your retirement benefits	543	3.61	1.123
Research expectations	520	3.51	1.146
Your advising load	444	3.48	1.135
Your service load	530	3.31	1.192
Your teaching load	549	3.25	1.357
Faculty evaluation process	527	3.20	1.240
Opportunity for short-term (one-two years) administrative experience	299	3.15	1.178
Your present salary	572	3.05	1.340
Support for professional development (e.g., funds for attending conferences, taking advanced courses, traveling to research collections, etc.)	552	3.00	1.421
Support for your research	505	2.88	1.324
Merit pay system	519	2.85	1.284
Pay raises (over the last five years)	481	2.63	1.315

Faculty Support/Involvement Questions Reported by Faculty Rank

Faculty support and involvement satisfaction ratings vary by academic rank.

Your academic freedom	Academic rank	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
	Administrative & Professional Faculty	6	4.83	0.408
	Not Specified	13	4.46	0.660
	Instructor (annual terms)	24	4.42	1.139
	Instructor (multi-year term)	39	4.41	0.785
	Full professor	178	4.40	1.005
	Assistant Professor	164	4.33	0.830
	Associate Professor	135	4.27	0.910
	Adjunct	2	3.50	2.121

Your present salary	Academic rank	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
	Administrative & Professional Faculty	7	3.43	0.976
	Instructor (annual terms)	29	3.28	1.386
	Full professor	179	3.18	1.347
	Instructor (multi-year term)	40	3.13	1.343
	Assistant Professor	164	3.02	1.289
	Adjunct	2	3.00	2.828
	Associate Professor	136	2.85	1.371
	Not Specified	15	2.80	1.373

Merit pay system	Academic rank	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
	Instructor (annual terms)	12	3.42	1.084
	Not Specified	13	3.31	1.251
	Instructor (multi-year term)	36	3.19	1.283
	Administrative & Professional Faculty	7	3.14	0.900
	Adjunct	2	3.00	2.828
	Assistant Professor	136	2.94	1.281
	Full professor	179	2.86	1.297
	Associate Professor	134	2.54	1.242

Faculty evaluation process	Academic rank	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
	Instructor (multi-year term)	38	3.39	1.346
	Full professor	178	3.32	1.250
	Administrative & Professional Faculty	4	3.25	0.957
	Assistant Professor	140	3.23	1.159
	Instructor (annual terms)	18	3.17	1.200
	Not Specified	11	3.00	1.549
	Adjunct	2	3.00	2.828
	Associate Professor	136	2.99	1.241

Pay raises (over the last five years)	Academic rank	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
	Instructor (annual terms)	7	3.71	1.604
	Administrative & Professional Faculty	6	3.50	0.837
	Instructor (multi-year term)	32	3.09	1.201
	Not Specified	11	3.00	1.732
	Adjunct	2	3.00	2.828
	Assistant Professor	113	2.70	1.260
	Full professor	176	2.60	1.331
	Associate Professor	134	2.37	1.254

Your teaching load	Academic rank	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
	Administrative & Professional Faculty	3	4.67	0.577
	Instructor (annual terms)	26	4.04	0.958
	Instructor (multi-year term)	40	3.53	1.219
	Full professor	176	3.49	1.283
	Not Specified	10	3.40	1.430
	Associate Professor	133	3.02	1.357
	Adjunct	2	3.00	2.828
	Assistant Professor	159	2.93	1.406

Research expectations	Academic rank	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
	Instructor (annual terms)	15	3.80	1.082
	Full professor	178	3.69	1.025
	Assistant Professor	157	3.45	1.157
	Instructor (multi-year term)	26	3.35	1.129
	Associate Professor	134	3.34	1.251
	Adjunct	2	3.00	2.828
	Administrative & Professional Faculty	0		

Support for your research	Academic rank	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
	Administrative & Professional Faculty	1		
	Instructor (annual terms)	13	3.54	1.330
	Instructor (multi-year term)	24	3.42	1.139
	Not Specified	8	3.25	1.165
	Full professor	173	3.11	1.283
	Adjunct	2	3.00	2.828
	Assistant Professor	152	2.78	1.313
	Associate Professor	132	2.51	1.311

* Ratings omitted due to low response rate (N=1)

Your advising load	Academic rank	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
	Adjunct	1		.
	Administrative & Professional Faculty	2	4.00	0.000
	Instructor (annual terms)	7	3.86	0.690
	Full professor	162	3.71	0.989
	Instructor (multi-year term)	25	3.52	1.085
	Associate Professor	119	3.34	1.209
	Not Specified	9	3.33	1.000
	Assistant Professor	119	3.28	1.241

* Ratings omitted due to low response rate (N=1)

Your service load	Academic rank	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
	Adjunct	1		.
	Instructor (annual terms)	14	4.00	0.877
	Instructor (multi-year term)	38	3.68	1.141
	Full professor	176	3.40	1.132
	Not Specified	11	3.36	0.674
	Assistant Professor	153	3.24	1.203
	Associate Professor	133	3.08	1.271
	Administrative & Professional Faculty	4	3.00	1.414

* Ratings omitted due to low response rate (N=1)

Support for professional development	Academic rank	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
	Instructor (annual terms)	25	3.88	1.166
	Instructor (multi-year term)	34	3.62	1.326
	Administrative & Professional Faculty	7	3.57	1.272
	Not Specified	14	3.36	1.598
	Assistant Professor	158	3.03	1.427
	Adjunct	2	3.00	2.828
	Full professor	177	2.97	1.396
	Associate Professor	135	2.61	1.371

Opportunity for short-term (one-two years) administrative experience	Academic rank	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
	Adjunct	1		
	Not Specified	5	3.80	1.304
	Instructor (annual terms)	8	3.50	1.690
	Instructor (multi-year term)	14	3.43	1.089
	Full professor	119	3.34	1.116
	Assistant Professor	63	2.95	1.084
	Associate Professor	89	2.89	1.220
	Administrative & Professional Faculty	0		

* Ratings omitted due to low response rate (N=1)

Your retirement benefits	Academic rank	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
	Instructor (annual terms)	27	4.37	0.792
	Assistant Professor	154	3.87	0.961
	Administrative & Professional Faculty	7	3.86	1.069
	Full professor	171	3.56	1.169
	Adjunct	2	3.50	2.121
	Instructor (multi-year term)	39	3.49	0.914
	Not Specified	14	3.43	1.505
	Associate Professor	129	3.26	1.176

Your health benefits	Academic rank	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
	Administrative & Professional Faculty	7	4.43	0.535
	Instructor (annual terms)	25	4.24	1.012
	Assistant Professor	162	3.82	1.074
	Full professor	175	3.53	1.203
	Adjunct	2	3.50	2.121

Your health benefits	Academic rank	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
	Instructor (multi-year term)	40	3.45	1.108
	Associate Professor	131	3.37	1.179

Faculty involvement in the academic review process, including course and program creation	Academic rank	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
	Administrative & Professional Faculty	2	4.00	0.000
	Instructor (annual terms)	19	3.84	1.344
	Assistant Professor	137	3.80	1.013
	Instructor (multi-year term)	37	3.70	1.244
	Associate Professor	133	3.54	1.111
	Full professor	174	3.51	1.359
	Not Specified	9	3.33	1.225
	Adjunct	2	3.00	2.828

Overall level of satisfaction as a faculty member at JMU	Academic rank	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
	Instructor (annual terms)	29	4.21	0.774
	Instructor (multi-year term)	40	4.00	0.906
	Administrative & Professional Faculty	7	4.00	0.816
	Assistant Professor	163	3.81	1.003
	Full professor	177	3.79	1.059
	Not Specified	14	3.64	0.929
	Associate Professor	136	3.60	1.131
	Adjunct	2	3.00	2.828

Library Resources

Faculty satisfaction with library resources is generally high, although lower satisfaction is indicated for library holdings related to faculty research. Faculty used a 5-point satisfaction scale (very satisfied=5 to very dissatisfied=1) to rate their perception of each item.

Comments	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Inter-library loan services	465	4.60	.713
Improvement in technological services over the past three years	424	4.40	.793
Technological Support and Instruction	497	4.39	.809
Holdings sufficient for my students' research	496	4.00	1.075
Holdings sufficient for my personal research	499	3.76	1.164

Committees in your College

Faculty satisfaction is generally high with the degree to which committees in their college accurately and successfully convey faculty concerns. Faculty used a 5-point satisfaction scale (very satisfied=5 to very dissatisfied=1) to rate their perception of each committee.

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Budget & Planning	372	4.73	2.493
Personnel	399	4.53	2.210
Curriculum	449	4.26	1.644

General Education Program

Faculty satisfaction with items related JMU's General Education Program is moderate. Faculty used a 5-point satisfaction scale (very satisfied=5 to very dissatisfied=1) to rate their perception of each item.

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Quality of teaching	373	3.55	1.141
Administration of the program	394	3.47	1.284
Quality of courses	392	3.28	1.205
Structure of the program (i.e., clusters, tiers)	434	3.18	1.248

What are the main strengths of the General Education Program?

Twenty-six percent (152) of respondents provided additional comments regarding the **main strengths of the General Education Program**. The main themes that emerged are comments regarding the strength of the GenEd program in terms of course breadth and depth, quality of faculty, structure of the program, GenEd Administration quality, and assessment of learning outcomes.

What are the areas in the General Education Program that need improvement?

Thirty-five percent (199) of respondents provided additional comments regarding the **areas in which the General Education Program needs improvement**. In the previous question about General Education areas of strength, 17 faculty provided comments regarding the program's weaknesses, so they have been added to this list. The main themes that emerged regarding areas where the GenEd Program needs improvements are comments regarding the program structure, courses, GenEd faculty, importance of GenEd, and GenEd administration.

In terms of program structure, faculty proposed changes in the GenEd program, allowing for greater flexibility, reducing the number of courses needed, and in general more consistency across courses and clusters in terms of teaching quality and course expectations. With regard to courses, faculty want courses to be more rigorous and to improve the quality of course offerings. Comments about GenEd faculty mostly focused on the quality of teaching and the objection to using too many adjunct faculty to teach GenEd courses. In regards to the importance of GenEd, faculty generally report that students and faculty alike do not value the program. And finally, faculty reported general dissatisfaction with the GenEd Program administration.

It is interesting to note that faculty who have been here for fewer years are more positive about the General Education program than faculty who have been here longer.

	How many years have you been employed at JMU?											
	0-3 years			4-6 years			7-15 years			15+ years		
	N	Mean	Std. Dev	N	Mean	Std. Dev	N	Mean	Std. Dev	N	Mean	Std. Dev
Administration of the program	79	3.77	1.12	68	3.75	0.983	130	3.45	1.277	115	3.13	1.472
Structure of the program (i.e., clusters, tiers)	89	3.53	1.159	79	3.41	0.981	144	3.04	1.234	119	2.92	1.415
Quality of courses	80	3.71	1.127	71	3.62	1.061	126	3.09	1.173	112	2.98	1.266
Quality of teaching	76	3.91	1.048	70	3.66	1.048	123	3.47	1.133	101	3.32	1.232

Agenda Issues

Agenda issues in order of importance were tuition relief for children of JMU faculty, counting summer school salary towards retirement, and in-state tuition relief for children of new JMU faculty who do not have Virginia residency. Faculty used a 5-point importance scale (very important=5 to very unimportant=1) to rate their perception of each item.

Issues	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Issue 1: Tuition relief for children of JMU faculty/staff (Presently, Virginia law does not allow tuition relief for children of university faculty/staff employees.)	539	4.21	1.227
Issue 2: Counting summer school salary towards retirement (Currently the Virginia Retirement System (VRS) takes an average of the three highest years of salary to calculate retirement income; the present system does not allow for summer teaching income to apply towards retirement-income calculations, but the Faculty Senate of Virginia has made this issue one of its major concerns.)	516	4.10	1.222
Issue 3: In-state tuition rates for children of new JMU faculty who do not have Virginia residency (At present, according to state law, faculty members must be Virginia residents for one year before their children are eligible for in-state tuition.)	500	3.67	1.372

Faculty Club

Faculty are not very satisfied with the opportunities on campus to interact socially with other faculty members. Faculty used a 5-point satisfaction scale (very satisfied=5 to very dissatisfied=1) to rate their perceptions.

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
How satisfied are you with the opportunities on campus to interact socially with other faculty members?	496	2.60	1.209

And although they weren't satisfied with the opportunities on campus to interact socially with other faculty members, they did not express strong interest in a Faculty Club where they would have an inviting location to meet with your colleagues and have a meal. Faculty used a 5-point importance scale (very important=5 to very unimportant=1) to rate their perception of each item.

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
How interested would you be in a Faculty Club where you would have an inviting location to meet with your colleagues and have a meal?	550	3.75	1.168

For faculty who would attend a Faculty Club, the physical proximity of a Club to faculty offices is important in determining how often they would visit. Faculty used a 5-point importance scale (very important=5 to very unimportant=1) to rate their perception of each item.

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
How important would the physical proximity of a Club to your office be in determining how often you would visit?	377	4.23	.829

Ninety-five percent of faculty interested in the Club would visit the Club at least 1-2 times per week.

Grade Inflation

Faculty vary in their grading orientation. They tend to award the highest grades in their classes based on criterion-referenced performance, but indicate they use both norm-referenced and criterion-referenced depending on the subject matter/course.

	Frequency	Valid Percent
The students who do what is asked at a high performance level (criteria-referenced)	263	48.3
The students who clearly outperform their peers in the class (norm-referenced)	44	8.1
Both, depending on the subject matter or course	238	43.7
Total Response	545	100.0

Fifty-four percent of faculty have experienced increased student pressure for higher grades.

Institutional Review Board (IRB)

Thirty-six percent of faculty have you interacted with the IRB.

Faculty who have interacted with IRB expressed moderate satisfaction in doing so. Faculty used a 5-point satisfaction scale (very satisfied=5 to very dissatisfied=1).

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Please rate your level of satisfaction with your interaction with the IRB committee.	200	3.62	1.226

Textbooks

Faculty are not very concerned that constraints on textbook selection will impair their ability to do the absolute best job they can for their students. Faculty used a 4-point scale (very concerned=4 to not concerned=1).

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
How concerned are you that constraints on textbook selection will impair your ability to do the absolute best job you can for your students?	521	2.42	1.166

Childcare Services

Twenty-six percent of faculty have a current need or expect to have a need in the course of their time at JMU for childcare services.

Fifty-seven percent of faculty would be willing to pay a fee for childcare service that is comparable to that of the private childcare service available in the Harrisonburg/Rockingham County area.

Faculty Senate

Faculty expressed moderate to low agreement regarding the Faculty Senate charges. Faculty used a 5-point satisfaction scale (strongly agree=5 to strongly disagree=1) to rate each item.

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
The Faculty Senate listens to and communicates well with its constituents.	447	3.50	1.013
The Faculty Senate is meeting its charge.	416	3.36	1.052

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Faculty views are adequately incorporated into all considerations regarding the academic climate at JMU.	431	3.10	1.215
Faculty views are adequately incorporated into considerations regarding the direction of JMU.	427	2.94	1.235

Faculty report that if the Faculty Senate is to be a strong voice for the faculty, they would encourage the Senate to put most effort articulating faculty views and interests with administrators (63%).

	Frequency	Valid Percent
The Administration	330	62.9
The Board of Visitors	127	24.2
State Government Officials	68	13.0
Total Response	525	100.0
Missing Response	49	
Total	574	

Eighty-seven percent of faculty know who their Faculty Senator is.

Open-ended Questions

What positive experiences at JMU have helped you reach your professional goals?

Fifty-five percent (316) of respondents provided additional comments regarding the positive experiences at JMU that helped them reach their professional goals. The main positive experiences that helped faculty to reach their goals are supportive relationships with colleagues and administrators in their area. Professional development opportunities are also key experiences to help faculty reach their goals. Examples they gave were professional development workshops such as those given through the Center for Instructional Technology and Center for Faculty Innovation.

If you have experienced any obstacles in reaching your professional goals at JMU, please tell us about the obstacles.

Forty-seven percent (268) of respondents provided additional comments regarding the obstacles faculty experience in reaching their professional goals at JMU. The greatest obstacles faculty experience is faculty loads that are too much, particularly trying to balance research with heavy teaching loads.

Faculty reported they need more professional development opportunities, particularly funding to attend professional conferences. In addition, faculty report that not having paid academic leave for professional development is a problem. Several faculty also reported issues with administration, particularly in terms of the quality of leadership they encounter in their immediate departments.

What are your major concerns about your role as a teacher (for example, grade inflation, honor violations, etc.)?

Fifty-seven percent (326) of respondents provided additional comments regarding their major

concerns about their role as a teacher. The main concerns are grade inflation, honor system violations, student expectations for high grades and having a sense of entitlement, faculty load, and class sizes being too large.

As a faculty member, what is the biggest concern you have that has a simple solution that so far appears to be overlooked. Please include both the issue and the solution.

Thirty-nine percent (224) of respondents provided additional comments regarding the biggest concern they have that has a simple solution that so far appears to be overlooked. Not all faculty provided both the issue and the solution. Faculty issues are the most pressing concerns to faculty. In particular, faculty are concerned about faculty shortage, faculty load, and faculty pay. Faculty want their teaching loads reduced, perhaps by hiring new faculty or by redistributing course loads. Faculty also want pay raises, and one way to do this is to reduce spending on campus upgrades. In addition, faculty are concerned about JMU's administration and want them to provide better leadership and vision.

Demographic Questions

Please select your college/unit.

	Frequency	Valid Percent
Arts and Letters	145	25.3
Business	79	13.8
Education	37	6.4
Integrated Science and Technology	137	23.9
Science and Mathematics	86	15.0
Visual and Performing Arts	48	8.4
Graduate and Professional Programs	1	.2
Other	36	6.3
General Education	5	.9
Total	574	100.0

Please indicate what percentage of your responsibilities on average each semester involves teaching (please do not include committee work, personal research, etc., in your calculations).

	Frequency	Valid Percent
0-25%	63	11.2
26-50%	116	20.5
51-75%	238	42.1
76-100%	148	26.2
Total Response	565	100.0
Missing Response	9	
Total	574	

Please indicate your major teaching responsibilities on average each semester.

	Frequency	Valid Percent

	Frequency	Valid Percent
Primarily General Education courses	55	10.8
Approximately 50% General Education courses and 50% Upper-Division (300-400 level) courses in my Discipline	98	19.3
Primarily Lower-Division (100-200 level) courses in my Discipline	85	16.7
Primarily Upper-Division courses in my Discipline	177	34.8
Primarily Graduate-Level courses in my Discipline	51	10.0
Approximately 50% Undergraduate-Level courses and 50% Graduate courses in my Discipline	37	7.3
Primarily Outreach courses in my Discipline	3	.6
Primarily Interdisciplinary courses	2	.4
Total Response	508	100.0
	Missing Response	66
	Total	574

Please indicate your gender (optional).

	Frequency	Valid Percent
Female	239	44.4
Male	299	55.6
Total Response	538	100.0
Missing Response	36	
Total	574	

Please indicate your race or ethnicity (optional).

	Frequency	Valid Percent
Caucasian/White	427	82.3
African American	12	2.3
Asian/Pacific Islander	9	1.7
Hispanic	4	.8
Latino	1	.2
Multiracial	6	1.2
Rather not say	60	11.6
Total Response	519	100.0
Missing Response	55	
Total	574	

How many years have you been employed at JMU?

	Frequency	Valid Percent
0-3 years	148	26.1
4-6 years	105	18.5
7-15 years	173	30.5
15+ years	141	24.9

	Frequency	Valid Percent
Total Response	567	100.0
Missing Response	7	
Total	574	

What is your academic rank?

	Frequency	Valid Percent
Adjunct	2	.4
Instructor (annual terms)	29	5.2
Instructor (multi-year term)	40	7.2
Assistant Professor	165	29.6
Associate Professor	136	24.4
Full professor	179	32.1
Administrative & Professional Faculty	7	1.3
Total Response	558	100.0
Missing Response	16	
Total	574	

Please tell us where you are in terms of tenure.

	Frequency	Valid Percent
I am NOT on the tenure track	123	22.0
I am on the tenure track	152	27.1
I have tenure	285	50.9
Total Response	560	100.0
Missing Response	14	
Total	574	

Do you currently, or have you in the past, held an administrative position at JMU?

	Frequency	Valid Percent
No	419	74.4
Current administer	92	16.3
Not current, but was one in the past	52	9.2
Total Response	563	100.0
Missing Response	11	
Total	574	