

**Faculty Survey 2010-11
Higher Education Research Institute (HERI)
Overall Report**

Administered November 2010 to March 2011



**INDIANA UNIVERSITY
SOUTHEAST**

**OFFICE OF INSTITUTIONAL
RESEARCH AND ASSESSMENT**

Ronald E. Severtis, Jr.

Table of Contents

Survey Background and Summary 5

How Representative is our Sample?..... 6

 Full-time and part-time faculty 6

 Gender 6

 Job-related Respondent Characteristics..... 7

Professional Practice: Teaching, Scholarship and Service..... 11

 Professional Practice by Tenure Status, Academic Rank & Full-Time Status..... 11

 Tenure Status..... 11

 Academic Rank..... 12

 Full-Time Status 12

Students and Teaching..... 13

 Encouraging Undergraduates 13

 Education Goals for Undergraduates..... 14

 Evaluation Methods and Instructional Techniques/Methods 15

Institutional Perception..... 18

 Institutional Descriptions 18

 Institutional Climate..... 19

 Institutional Priorities 20

Being a Faculty Member 21

 Affect 21

 Work and Personal Objectives..... 22

 Hours Spent per Week..... 23

 Recent Activities 24

 Restarting a Career 25

 Stress..... 25

 Job Satisfaction 26

 Institutional Viewpoints..... 27

Focus on Part-Time Faculty 29

Peer Group Differences..... 31

 Professional Practice- Teaching..... 31

 Professional Practice- Scholarship..... 31

 Professional Practice- Service..... 32

HERI 2010-11: Overall Report

Institutional Support and Resources	32
Goals for Undergraduate Education	32
Personal Development	32
Civic Minded Values.....	32
Other Education Goals	32
Diversity	33
Commitment to Diversity.....	33
Social Agency	33
Other Diversity.....	33
Satisfaction	34
Compensation.....	34
Workplace	34
Other Satisfaction	34
Institutional Priorities	34
Civic Engagement.....	34
Civic Minded Values.....	35
Commitment to Diversity.....	35
Increase Prestige.....	35
Other Institutional Priorities	35
Interactions with Students	35
Habits of Mind.....	36
Health and Wellness.....	36
Career Related Stress	36
Other Health and Wellness	36
Other Sources of Stress	36
Relationship with Administration.....	36
HERI Constructs	37
Faculty Work & Job Satisfaction.....	37
Job Satisfaction: Compensation	37
Career Related Stress	37
Scholarly Productivity	37
Social Agency	37
Educational Goals & Mission	38
Civic Minded Values.....	38

HERI 2010-11: Overall Report

Undergraduate Education Goal: Personal Development.....	38
Institutional Priorities.....	38
Civic Engagement.....	38
Commitment to Diversity.....	38
Increase Prestige.....	38
Appendix A.....	39
Appendix B: Constructs	47
Faculty Work & Job Satisfaction.....	47
Educational Goals & Mission	48
Institutional Priorities.....	48

Survey Background and Summary

The Academic Assessment Committee at Indiana University Southeast provides faculty input to strategic planning. At their October 14, 2010, meeting, the committee approved without dissent a motion to utilize the 2010-11 Higher Education Research Initiative (HERI) Faculty Survey to serve as a guide in informing the strategic planning process.

Since 1989, more than 1200 institutions have participated in the HERI Faculty Survey, offered by the Cooperative Institutional Research Program (CIRP) triennially. IU Southeast previously participated in 1989, 1992, 1995 and 1998. The HERI is nationally normed and provides, along with on-line data analysis, reports that can be customized to include comparisons with peer and aspirational peer institutions that participate in the same survey cycle, thus guiding the strategic planning process and helping to inform institutional priorities.

The [faculty instrument](#) itself is administered entirely web-based, includes specific sections intended for part-time faculty, and collects data on demographics, faculty activities inside and outside the classroom; and perception of student learning and goals, stress and job satisfaction, institutional goals and priorities. In addition, items from the Faculty Survey can map to HLC-NCA Criteria and aid in accreditation.

A list of 546 full- and part-time faculty was obtained from IU Southeast Human Resources. Six faculty were dropped from the survey because a valid email address for them could not be located. An invitation email was sent to all remaining faculty on February 8, 2011, but ten addresses could not be delivered. The survey closed on March 8, 2011.

Overall, 530 invitations to participate were sent. Five respondents opted out, leaving a population size of 525. There were 206 full surveys submitted and an additional 75 partial responses that are included in the analysis, leaving a total response rate of 53.5%.

Because of the unique link sent with each survey request, each faculty respondent could only log one response. Individual question response rate varies, as all survey questions were voluntary and some respondents chose not to answer certain questions. We have chosen to include partial responses in the data report.

Results were originally delayed due to CIRP error in calculations relating to the peer group analyses in the data. Complete, accurate reports were received and downloaded on September 12, 2012, and data analysis continued.

OIRA recommends that the Academic Assessment Committee make overall data results of this report available to the faculty population on the OIRA website. In addition, requests for school-specific reports should be reviewed and made available if possible. Lastly, an email should be sent to the entire original distribution list with a link to the OIRA report. These steps support the institution's mission of transparency and encourage faculty to take future assessments.

How Representative is our Sample?

Full-time and part-time faculty

Self-reported full-time faculty responded to the survey in a greater proportion than self-reported part-time faculty (57% to 43%), despite part-time faculty outnumbering full-time faculty 60% to 40% in the overall population.

Table 1

Work Status	N	%
Full-Time (≥9 months/yr)	159	56.6%
Part-Time	122	43.4%
Total	281	100.0%

A chi-square goodness of fit test was calculated comparing the sample distribution across full-time status with the campus population. A significant deviation from the expected values was found ($X^2=30.685$, $p<.001$, $d.f.=1$). The sample distribution is overrepresented by full-time faculty.

This may be due to many factors, including how often faculty check their email, how faculty respond to requests from Academic Affairs administration, or if part-time faculty feel their opinion is valued. Of course, this is speculation, but most of the logical reasons why part-time faculty chose not to respond to the survey involve issues of connection and integration to the institution. The HERI instrument includes a section specifically for part-time employees. That data is located later in this report.

Regardless, because of the significant difference between the sample and population means, there are two implications. First, overall results should be interpreted with care, since full-time faculty despite being a smaller proportion of campus faculty have a greater-than-expected voice in the overall survey results. Second, because of the significant differences, many data results are broken down throughout this report into “all respondents” and self-reported “part-time respondents”.

Gender

Nearly 55% of respondents to the survey were female, while 45% were male.

Table 2

Gender	%
Female	54.9%
Male	45.1%

A chi-square goodness of fit test was calculated comparing the sample distribution across gender with the campus faculty characteristics (52.8% female: 47.2% male) in the email list. No significant deviation from the expected values were found ($X^2=.356$, $p>.05$, $d.f.=1$). Thus, we can conclude that the sample distribution accurately represents the gender make-

up of the campus faculty. The implication is that significant results by gender should be considered reliable.

Job-related Respondent Characteristics

To get an idea of the make-up of the faculty sample, below are ten brief tables showing data related to principal activity, administrative position, academic rank, tenure status, degree characteristics, and academic appointment area.

Table 3 indicates that almost all respondents primarily identify with a teaching activity, while nearly 5% holds primary administrative duties. About 1 in every 5 respondents holds an administrative position (many concurrently with a teaching assignment), primarily as department chairs (or program coordinators), as shown in Table 4.

Table 3

Principal Activity	N	%
Teaching	260	92.5%
Administration	13	4.6%
Research	2	0.7%
Services to clients/patients	2	0.7%
Other	4	1.4%
Grand Total	281	100.0%

Table 4

Administrative Positions	%
Department Chair	7.8%
Dean	2.5%
Other	10.3%
Total Administrative	20.6%

Table 5 indicates that nearly 1 in every 3 respondents holds instructor rank, and 1 in 4 holds lecturer rank, meaning that a majority of the sample is not on tenure track. In fact, as shown in Table 6, only about 2 in every 5 respondents are tenured or on tenure track.

Table 5

Present Academic Rank	N	%
Instructor	89	31.8%
Lecturer	68	24.3%
Professor	48	17.1%
Asst Professor	41	14.6%
Assoc Professor	34	12.1%
Grand Total	280	100.0%

Table 6

Tenure Status	N	%
Not on tenure track	168	60.4%
Tenured	77	27.7%
On tenure track, not tenured	33	11.9%
Grand Total	278	100.0%

Table 7 compares respondents' academic rank to tenure status and Table 8 compares academic rank to full-time employee status. In both cases, tenure status and full-time status are highly correlated with academic rank, which is expected based on both the job descriptions and requirements.

HERI 2010-11: Overall Report

Table 7

Tenure Status	Present Academic Rank				
	Professor	Assoc Professor	Asst Professor	Lecturer	Instructor
Tenured	91.5%	97.1%	2.4%	0.0%	0.0%
On tenure track, not tenured	0.0%	2.9%	75.6%	1.5%	0.0%
Not on tenure track	8.5%	0.0%	22.0%	98.5%	100.0%
Grand Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table 8

Full-Time (≥9 months/yr)	Present Academic Rank				
	Professor	Assoc Professor	Asst Professor	Lecturer	Instructor
Yes	87.5%	100.0%	90.2%	60.3%	5.6%
No	12.5%	0.0%	9.8%	39.7%	94.4%
Grand Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table 9 indicates that nearly half of the sample has a Master's as their highest degree earned while another 44% have earned a PhD. Table 10 shows that 14% of respondents are working on earning another degree, primarily the PhD.

Table 9

Highest Degree Earned	%
Master's	48.2%
PhD	44.2%
EdD	3.6%
Bachelor's	1.8%
LLB, JD	1.8%
Other	0.4%
Grand Total	100.0%

Table 10

Degree Currently Working On	%
PhD	8.7%
Master's	1.3%
Bachelor's, EdD, other beyond BA	1.3%
Other	2.6%
Grand Total	14.0%

Respondents represent a wide range of academic disciplines on campus, as suggested in Table 11. Nearly three-quarters of the sample comprises faculty whose cumulative current academic appointments are in Education, Business, English, the Arts, History, Social Sciences, Biological Sciences and Physical Sciences.

HERI 2010-11: Overall Report

Table 11

Current Appointment Dept	N	%
Education	30	14.6%
Business/Management	24	11.7%
English	21	10.2%
Arts	19	9.3%
Social Sci & History (non-Psych)	18	8.8%
Psychology	13	6.3%
Biological Sciences	12	5.9%
Physical Sciences	12	5.9%
Communication/Journalism	8	3.9%
Health/Clinical Science	8	3.9%
Mathematics/Statistics	7	3.4%
Computer/Information Sciences	6	2.9%
Philosophy/Religion	6	2.9%
Foreign Language	4	2.0%
Library Sciences	3	1.5%
Fitness Studies	2	1.0%
Multidisciplinary	2	1.0%
Other	10	4.9%
Grand Total	205	100.0%

Sixty-nine percent of respondents could be placed into their respective IU Southeast Schools (or, in the case of Library Sciences faculty, their respective service) in Table 12. About three of every ten faculty respondents hold appointments in the Arts & Letters, while one in every five is a Natural Science faculty.

Table 12

Distribution by School/Service	N	%
Arts & Letters	57	29.2%
Natural Sciences	38	19.5%
Social Sciences	33	16.9%
Education	31	15.9%
Business	24	12.3%
Nursing	8	4.1%
Library Sciences	3	1.5%
General Studies	1	0.5%
Grand Total	195	100.0%

HERI 2010-11: Overall Report

Due to missing data on over a quarter of respondents on current academic appointment, we were unable to run tests determining if the sample respondents differed significantly from the population in terms of academic school. As such, results should be interpreted cautiously, as certain schools may be under- or over-represented by sample respondents. Nonetheless, results by school are available on request from OIRA; however, these results will not be compared to other IU Southeast schools, and raw data by peer institutions was not included in the analysis from the CIRP. Schools will be able to compare their results to overall IU Southeast results.

Professional Practice: Teaching, Scholarship and Service

Respondents were asked to rate the importance of teaching, scholarship (or research) and service. These results are presented in Table 13 below.

Table 13

Importance of	Essential	Very important	Somewhat important	Not important	Grand Total
Teaching	77.9%	18.8%	1.8%	0.0%	100.0%
Research	30.1%	35.9%	22.5%	11.6%	100.0%
Service	22.5%	46.0%	29.0%	2.5%	100.0%

Teaching is seen as the most essential aspect of the three practices, with nearly 97% of respondents indicating it as essential or very important, and none rating it as not important. About two of every three respondents indicated that research (66%) and service (68.5%) were essential or very important. Research was seen as not important by about one in every ten respondents.

Professional Practice by Tenure Status, Academic Rank & Full-Time Status

Because academic rank is so highly correlated with tenure status and full-time status (see Tables 7 and 8 above), and because chief activities such as teaching, research and service intuitively vary by academic rank (based on job requirements, etc.), it is further expected that the importance of teaching, research and service would also vary by academic rank as well. Those variations are summarized below (and presented in tables A1 through A9 in Appendix A).

Tenure Status

The self-rated importance of teaching does not vary significantly by tenure status. For example, 98.7% of tenured faculty responded that teaching is essential or very important to them personally, while this sentiment was shared by 98.2% of non-tenured faculty and 96.9% of non-tenured but on-tenure track faculty.

Regarding research, roughly 85% of both tenured and non-tenured but on-tenure track faculty reported that research is essentially or very important to them personally, while only 54% of non-tenured faculty agreed on importance.

Lastly, 74% of non-tenured faculty indicated that service is essential or very important to them personally, while only 64% of tenured faculty and 60% of non-tenured but on-tenure track faculty concurred.

Academic Rank

The importance of teaching does not vary much by academic rank. 100% of instructors and Associate Professors, 98% of Assistant Professors, 97% of lecturers and 96% of Professors reported that teaching was personally essential or very important.

The importance of research is essential or very important to 89% of Professors and 83% of Assistant Professors, compared to 74% of Associate Professors, and just 53% of instructors and 52% of lecturers.

Consistent with tenure comparisons, service was also seen as essential or very important to 75% of instructors. 71% of Associate Professors and 70% of lecturers also rated service as essential or very important compared to 60% of Assistant Professors and Professors.

Full-Time Status

Full-time and part-time (less than 9 months per academic year) faculty did not differ in the personal importance they place on teaching. 99% of full-time and 98% of part-time faculty indicated that teaching was essential or very important to them personally.

The percentage of full-time faculty that indicated that research was essential or very important was 74% compared to 55% of part-time faculty.

Finally, 75% of part-time faculty responded that service was essential or very important to them personally, compared to 64% of full-time faculty.

Students and Teaching

Encouraging Undergraduates

Respondents were given a series of questions asking how often they encourage a number of undergraduate habits. Their responses are broken down below, as all respondents and as part-time respondents.

Table 14

	All Respondents			Part-time Respondents		
	Frequently	Occasionally	Not at all	Frequently	Occasionally	Not at all
Ask questions in class	95.8%	2.7%	1.5%	96.4%	2.7%	0.9%
Integrate skills & knowledge from different sources and experiences	83.0%	13.5%	3.5%	88.2%	10.9%	0.9%
Accept mistakes as part of the learning process	81.9%	16.2%	1.9%	84.5%	13.6%	1.8%
Support their opinions with a logical argument	80.4%	16.9%	2.7%	82.7%	16.4%	0.9%
Seek solutions to problems & explain to other	78.5%	19.2%	2.3%	79.3%	19.8%	0.9%
Seek feedback on their academic work	76.0%	21.3%	2.7%	82.7%	16.4%	0.9%
Seek alternative solutions to problem	73.0%	23.6%	3.5%	76.4%	22.7%	0.9%
Evaluate quality or reliability of information they receive	71.5%	25.0%	3.5%	77.5%	18.9%	3.6%
Revise papers to improve writing	58.5%	28.8%	12.7%	62.2%	27.0%	10.8%
Explore topics on their own, even though not required for class	52.1%	40.5%	7.3%	57.3%	37.3%	5.5%
Look up scientific research articles and resources	51.0%	32.8%	16.2%	48.2%	32.7%	19.1%
Take risks for potential gains	43.0%	42.2%	14.7%	49.5%	38.5%	11.9%

Almost all faculty respondents frequently encourage their students to ask questions in class. At least four of every five respondents frequently encourage integration of skills and knowledge from different sources and experiences, acceptance of mistakes as part of the learning process, and supporting opinions with logical arguments. Less than half of all respondents encourage students to take risks for potential gains.

Aside from looking up scientific research articles and resources, part-time respondents more frequently encourage all of the listed habits in their undergraduates compared to all respondents.

At least four of every five part-time respondents frequently encourage students to seek feedback on their academic work, while only three of every four of all faculty respondents frequently encourage that behavior.

Education Goals for Undergraduates

Respondents were asked to indicate the importance of eighteen education goals for undergraduate students. The goals seen as most essential for all respondents are below, while the full table appears as Table A10 in Appendix A.

Table 15

	All Respondents			Part-time Respondents		
	Essential	Very or somewhat	Not important	Essential	Very or somewhat	Not important
Develop ability to think critically	87.9%	12.1%	0.0%	90.7%	9.3%	0.0%
Help students evaluate the quality and reliability of information	65.7%	34.3%	0.0%	66.0%	34.0%	0.0%
Help master knowledge in a discipline	63.2%	36.8%	0.0%	59.8%	40.2%	0.0%
Prepare students for employment after college	57.3%	41.4%	1.3%	63.9%	35.1%	1.0%
Promote ability to write effectively	56.9%	41.4%	1.7%	67.0%	30.9%	2.1%
Teach students tolerance and respect for different beliefs	54.4%	43.1%	2.5%	59.8%	38.1%	2.1%

Nearly nine out of every ten faculty respondents indicate it essential that students develop critical thinking abilities. Almost two-thirds of all respondents also rate it essential that they help undergraduates evaluate the quality and reliability of information (66%) and help them master knowledge in a discipline (63%). Also, nearly one-third (29%) of all respondents rate as unimportant the teaching of classic works of Western civilization. Also ranking as least important among all respondents are encouraging students to become agents of social change (15%), instilling a commitment to community service (12%), and engaging students in civil discourse around controversial issues (11%).

Nearly all of these education goals are more often essential to part-time respondents compared to all respondents. The goals that are not more essential to part-time respondents are helping master knowledge in a discipline and engaging students in civil discourse around controversial issues.

Part-time faculty indicate similar importance for a number of education goals. Ninety-one percent of part-time faculty respondents indicate it is essential that students develop

HERI 2010-11: Overall Report

critical thinking abilities, while two-thirds of part-time respondents also rate it essential that they promote the ability to write effectively (67%), help undergraduates evaluate the quality and reliability of information (66%) and prepare students for employment after college (64%). Over half of part-time respondents also rate essential that they help students master knowledge in a discipline, teach students tolerance and respect for different beliefs, and enhance students' self-understanding.

Additionally, an independent-samples *t* test comparing the highest-scoring category (essential) of full-time and part-time faculty found a significant difference between the scores of the two groups on the following three goals: developing moral character ($t(190) = -3.15, p < .01$), providing for students' emotional development ($t(174) = -2.97, p < .01$), and promoting the ability to write effectively ($t(214) = -2.66, p < .01$). In each case, the score of part-time faculty was significantly higher than the score of full-time faculty. Thus, compared to full-time faculty, part-time faculty believe these education goals significantly more essential for undergraduate students.

Evaluation Methods and Instructional Techniques/Methods

Respondents were also asked in how many of the courses that they teach do they use the evaluation methods and instructional techniques or methods below.

Table 16

	All Respondents			Part-time Respondents		
	All	Most or Some	None	All	Most or Some	None
Competency-based grading	34.5%	41.7%	23.8%	35.2%	41.0%	23.8%
Student presentations	30.3%	52.0%	17.7%	35.5%	42.1%	22.4%
Multiple-choice exams	27.0%	41.0%	32.0%	33.0%	33.9%	33.0%
Short-Answer exams	25.1%	50.2%	24.7%	25.9%	43.5%	30.6%
Quizzes	25.0%	52.0%	23.0%	23.9%	46.8%	29.4%
Term/research papers	22.0%	47.6%	30.3%	28.0%	41.1%	30.8%
Essay exams	21.1%	44.9%	34.0%	22.0%	33.9%	44.0%
Student evaluations of each others' work	14.9%	46.7%	38.4%	16.7%	38.9%	44.4%
Weekly essay assignments	13.4%	31.6%	54.9%	14.0%	26.2%	59.8%
Grading on a curve	4.7%	21.3%	74.0%	7.5%	25.2%	67.3%

For all respondents, about one in every three reported using competency-based grading and student presentations in all of their courses. About one in every four indicated using multiple-choice exams, short-answer exams and quizzes in all of their courses. Nearly three-quarters of all respondents do not grade on a curve and over half do not use weekly essay assignments.

About one in every three part-time respondents report the use of student presentations, competency-based grading and multiple-choice exams as evaluation methods in all of their courses. Around one in every four part-time respondents use term or research papers and

HERI 2010-11: Overall Report

short-answer exams in all of their courses. About two-thirds never grade on a curve (8% do so in all of their classes) or give weekly essay assignments (14% do in all of their classes).

Compared to all respondents, part-time faculty are more likely to use all evaluation methods above in all of their courses except for quizzes. These results may indicate the types of courses that part-time faculty teach in relation to full-time faculty or the evaluation methods that their individual departments prefer.

With regards to instructional techniques, nearly three-quarters of all respondents use class discussions in all of their courses. About half of all respondents use small groups learning and real-life problems in all of their courses. Nine out of ten respondents do not use teaching assistants in any of their courses and three-quarters of respondents indicate the absence of electronic quizzes with immediate feedback and community service as part of coursework in their courses. Half of all respondents do not use recitals or demonstrations or reflective writing in their courses.

Table 17

	All Respondents			Part-time Respondents		
	All	Most or Some	None	All	Most or Some	None
Class discussions	74.7%	23.7%	1.6%	77.6%	20.6%	1.9%
Cooperative learning (small groups)	53.0%	35.6%	11.5%	46.7%	36.4%	16.8%
Using real-life problems	45.6%	47.2%	7.1%	51.4%	40.2%	8.4%
Using student inquiry to drive learning	32.1%	55.6%	12.3%	43.9%	43.9%	12.1%
Extensive lecturing	20.2%	58.7%	21.0%	26.2%	51.4%	22.4%
Group projects	19.8%	54.9%	25.3%	20.6%	43.0%	36.4%
Experiential learning/Field studies	19.4%	43.5%	37.2%	21.5%	37.4%	41.1%
Multiple drafts of written work	19.0%	43.9%	37.2%	22.4%	36.4%	41.1%
Student-selected topics for course content	15.1%	44.4%	40.5%	23.4%	30.8%	45.8%
Recitals/Demonstrations	14.6%	33.2%	52.2%	18.7%	30.8%	50.5%
Reflective writing/journaling	14.6%	35.2%	50.2%	16.8%	32.7%	50.5%
Electronic quizzes with immediate feedback in class	4.4%	20.6%	75.0%	3.7%	17.8%	78.5%
Community service as part of coursework	3.6%	22.5%	73.9%	4.7%	11.2%	84.1%
Teaching assistants	0.8%	8.8%	90.4%	0.9%	7.5%	91.5%

Three-quarters of part-time respondents use class discussions in all of their courses, and about half of part-time respondents report the use of real-life problems, small groups learning and using student inquiry to drive learning in all of their courses. About nine of every ten part-time respondents do not use teaching assistants or community service as part of coursework, while three-quarters do not use electronic quizzes with immediate feedback. Lastly, about half of part-time respondents report the absence of the following instructional techniques in the courses they teach: recitals or demonstrations, reflective writing, and student-selected topics for course content.

HERI 2010-11: Overall Report

Part-time respondents are more likely than all respondents to report the use of all instructional techniques listed in all of their courses except for small groups learning and electronic quizzes with immediate feedback in class. This may be influenced by the type of courses taught, class size, or perceived availability and training of course technology.

An independent-samples *t* test comparing the highest-scoring category (all) of full-time and part-time faculty found a significant difference between the scores of the two groups on the following two instructional techniques: student-selected topics for course content ($t(175) = -3.03, p < .01$) and using student inquiry to drive learning ($t(206) = -3.43, p < .001$). In each case, the score of part-time faculty was significantly higher than the score of full-time faculty. Thus, compared to full-time faculty, part-time faculty use these instructional techniques in significantly more courses.

Institutional Perception

Faculty were asked to reflect on descriptions of IU Southeast, the institutional climate, and institutional priorities. Again, responses are broken down by all respondents and part-time respondents.

Institutional Descriptions

Faculty were asked how well a set of statements describes IU Southeast. All respondents and part-time respondents agree with the ease with which students can see faculty, that faculty respect for each other, that students are not treated like numbers in a book, and the respect for the expression of diverse values and beliefs.

Table 18

	Respondents	Very descriptive	Somewhat descriptive	Not descriptive
Easy for students to see faculty outside of regular office hours	All	50.2%	46.0%	3.8%
	Part-time	38.9%	56.8%	4.2%
Faculty here respect each other	All	47.7%	47.7%	4.7%
	Part-time	52.6%	41.1%	6.3%
There is respect for the expression of diverse values and beliefs	All	44.5%	51.3%	4.2%
	Part-time	53.1%	43.8%	3.1%
The administration is open about its policies	All	26.5%	56.0%	17.5%
	Part-time	42.6%	47.9%	9.6%
Faculty are rewarded for being good teachers	All	20.9%	60.0%	19.1%
	Part-time	18.9%	63.2%	17.9%
Faculty are rewarded for their efforts to use instructional technology	All	17.1%	56.4%	26.5%
	Part-time	19.1%	56.4%	24.5%
Administrators consider faculty concerns when making policy	All	13.2%	66.0%	20.9%
	Part-time	16.8%	69.5%	13.7%
Faculty are typically at odds with campus administration	All	8.2%	45.7%	46.1%
	Part-time	2.2%	23.9%	73.9%
Most students are treated like "numbers in a book"	All	2.1%	10.2%	87.7%
	Part-time	4.2%	10.4%	85.4%

All respondents and part-time respondents differ in their institutional descriptions of IU Southeast on a number of traits. All respondents are more likely than part-time respondents to label the ease of students to see faculty outside of regular office hours as very descriptive, and less likely to label the respect for the expression of diverse values and beliefs as very descriptive.

An independent-samples *t* test comparing full-time and part-time faculty found a significant difference between the scores of the two groups on the following institutional descriptions: the faculty are typically at odds with campus administration ($t(230) = -7.68$, $p < .001$), administrators consider faculty concerns when making policy ($t(228) = 2.35$, $p < .05$), and the administration is open about its policies ($t(159) = -4.49$, $p < .001$). Compared

to full-time faculty, part-time faculty are significantly less likely to describe faculty at odds with administration yet less likely to describe administration as open about its policies, and significantly more likely to describe administrators as considering faculty concerns when making policy.

Institutional Climate

Faculty were asked their level of agreement on a number of campus traits that pertain to the climate of the institution. The traits agreed to most strongly by all respondents are below, while the full table appears as Table A11 in Appendix A.

Table 19

	Respondents	Agree strongly	Agree	Disagree somewhat	Disagree strongly
Faculty of color are treated fairly here	All	55.5%	40.4%	2.8%	1.4%
	Part-time	58.8%	37.6%	1.2%	2.4%
Women faculty are treated fairly here	All	51.6%	43.0%	4.5%	0.9%
	Part-time	63.2%	31.0%	4.6%	1.1%
Gay and lesbian faculty are treated fairly here	All	50.2%	44.7%	4.6%	0.5%
	Part-time	59.0%	36.1%	3.6%	1.2%
My teaching is valued by faculty in my department	All	46.6%	43.9%	8.1%	1.4%
	Part-time	45.5%	48.9%	4.5%	1.1%
Faculty are committed to the welfare of this institution	All	44.3%	48.9%	5.4%	1.4%
	Part-time	47.1%	46.0%	5.7%	1.1%

All respondents and part-time respondents strongly agree that women, faculty of color and gay and lesbian faculty are treated fairly here, that their teaching is valued in their department, that faculty are committed to the welfare of the institution and that faculty are strongly interested in the academic problems of undergraduates. Both sets of respondents also strongly disagree that there is a lot of racial conflict on campus.

An independent-samples *t* test comparing the highest-scoring category (agree strongly) of full-time and part-time faculty found a significant difference between the scores of the two groups on the following institutional climate opinions: the institution should hire more faculty of color ($t(216) = -2.60, p < .01$), women faculty are treated fairly here ($t(187) = 2.84, p < .01$), gay and lesbian faculty are treated fairly here ($t(215) = 2.05, p < .05$), faculty are sufficiently involved in campus decision making ($t(140) = 2.48, p < .05$), and the institution takes responsibility for educating underprepared students ($t(155) = 2.15, p < .05$). Thus, compared to full-time faculty, part-time faculty significantly agree that women faculty and gay and lesbian faculty are treated fairly here, that faculty are sufficiently involved in campus decision making, and that the institution takes responsibility for educating underprepared students. In addition, full-time faculty are significantly more likely to agree that the institution should hire more faculty of color.

Institutional Priorities

Faculty were asked how important a number of institutional priorities are at IU Southeast. The highest priorities for all respondents are below, while the full table appears as Table A12 in Appendix A.

Table 20

	Respondents	Highest priority	High priority	Medium priority	Low priority
To promote the intellectual development of students	All	58.6%	27.9%	10.2%	3.3%
	Part-time	67.5%	25.3%	6.0%	1.2%
To create a diverse multi-cultural campus environment	All	21.0%	36.0%	36.0%	7.0%
	Part-time	24.4%	41.5%	25.6%	8.5%
To increase or maintain institutional prestige	All	20.6%	43.5%	29.9%	6.1%
	Part-time	22.0%	43.9%	26.8%	7.3%
To develop an appreciation for multiculturalism	All	19.7%	38.5%	37.0%	4.8%
	Part-time	23.7%	40.8%	30.3%	5.3%
To develop a sense of community among students and faculty	All	19.5%	49.8%	26.0%	4.7%
	Part-time	27.7%	48.2%	22.9%	1.2%

Both all respondents and part-time respondents agree that some of the highest priorities are to promote the intellectual development of students, to develop a sense of community among students and faculty, and to increase or maintain institutional prestige. Further, part-time respondents also listed as their highest institutional priorities to develop leadership ability among students, to promote gender equity among faculty, to create a diverse multi-cultural campus environment, to create and sustain partnerships with surrounding communities, and to develop an appreciation for multiculturalism.

There were a number of priorities that all respondents and part-time faculty perceive differently. For instance, 57% of part-time respondents list to provide resources for faculty to engage in community-based teaching or research as either a high or the highest priority at IU Southeast, compared to just 38% of all respondents. Also, 69% of part-time respondents list the promotion of gender equity among faculty as a high or the highest priority, compared to 52% of all respondents. Other large gaps between part-time and all respondents in high priority perception are seen in strengthening links with the for-profit, corporate sector (53% for part-time respondents and 36% for all respondents), increasing the representation of women in the faculty and administration (53% to 38%), and developing leadership ability among students (71% to 59%).

All respondents and part-time respondents agree that hiring faculty “stars” is a low priority (80.6% cumulatively). Other cumulative items of low priority include strengthening links with the for-profit, corporate sector (37%), pursuing extramural funding (34%) and providing resources for faculty to engage in community-based teaching or research. The largest gaps between part-time and all respondents in low priority perception include increasing the representation of women in the faculty and administration (8% of part-time and 17% of all respondents) and hiring faculty stars (36% of part-time and 45% of all respondents).

Being a Faculty Member

Faculty were asked various job-specific questions related to affect, work and personal objectives, hours spent, recent activities, restarting a career, sources of stress, job satisfaction, and institutional viewpoints.

Affect

Faculty were asked the extent to which they experience a number of items.

Table 21

	Respondents	To a great extent	To some extent	Not at all
Experience close alignment between your work and personal values	All	73.0%	24.3%	2.7%
	Part-time	80.4%	19.6%	0.0%
Graduate school training prepared you well for role as faculty member	All	51.3%	43.3%	5.4%
	Part-time	52.7%	40.9%	6.4%
Achieve a healthy balance between personal and professional life	All	49.6%	42.4%	8.0%
	Part-time	61.3%	36.0%	2.7%
Feel you have to work harder than your colleagues to be perceived as a legitimate scholar	All	23.8%	39.1%	37.2%
	Part-time	18.2%	39.1%	42.7%
Mentor new faculty	All	16.7%	41.8%	41.4%
	Part-time	4.5%	27.7%	67.9%

All respondents (73%) and part-time respondents (80%) agree that they experience close alignment between their work and personal values to a great extent. In addition, 51% of all respondents feel to a great extent that graduate school training prepared them well for their role as faculty, and 50% also feel to a great extent that they achieve a healthy balance between personal and professional life, compared to 53% and 61% of part-time respondents, respectively.

Sixty-eight percent of part-time respondents report that they do not mentor new faculty at all, compared to 41% of all respondents, while 43% of part-time faculty do not feel they have to work harder than colleagues to be perceived as a legitimate scholar, compared to 37% of all respondents. The largest variation on affect between these two groups is in mentoring: 59% of all respondents feel to some or a great extent that they mentor new faculty, compared to 32% of part-time respondents.

An independent-samples *t* test comparing the highest-scoring category (to a great extent) of full-time and part-time faculty found a significant difference between the scores of the two groups on the following experiences: achieve a healthy balance between personal and professional life ($t(260) = 3.29, p < .001$), experience close alignment between your work and personal values ($t(256) = 2.39, p < .05$), and mentor new faculty ($t(226) = -5.24, p < .001$). Thus, part-time faculty experience a healthier balance between personal and professional life and closer alignment between work and personal values to a significantly greater extent compared to full-time faculty. Additionally, full-time faculty mentor new faculty to a significantly greater extent than part-time faculty.

Work and Personal Objectives

Faculty were asked to indicate the personal importance of a number of work-related and personal objectives.

Table 22

	Respondents	Essential	Very or somewhat important	Not important
Developing a meaningful philosophy of life	All	53.3%	43.5%	3.3%
	Part-time	56.9%	41.2%	2.0%
Raising a family	All	46.3%	35.4%	18.3%
	Part-time	52.9%	30.4%	16.7%
Helping to promote racial understanding	All	45.3%	51.0%	3.7%
	Part-time	52.5%	43.6%	4.0%
Becoming an authority in my field	All	38.1%	53.4%	8.5%
	Part-time	39.8%	50.5%	9.7%
Mentoring the next generation of scholars	All	36.1%	61.5%	2.5%
	Part-time	38.0%	60.0%	2.0%
Integrating spirituality into my life	All	34.7%	49.0%	16.3%
	Part-time	39.6%	45.5%	14.9%
Helping others who are in difficulty	All	29.7%	69.9%	0.4%
	Part-time	36.3%	63.7%	0.0%
Keeping up to date with political affairs	All	25.0%	70.5%	4.5%
	Part-time	29.7%	67.3%	3.0%
Adopting 'green' practices to protect the environment	All	19.1%	74.4%	6.5%
	Part-time	23.5%	70.6%	5.9%
Influencing social values	All	17.1%	67.9%	15.0%
	Part-time	20.6%	68.6%	10.8%
Participating in a community action program	All	9.0%	65.7%	25.3%
	Part-time	12.9%	66.3%	20.8%
Becoming very well off financially	All	6.9%	77.1%	15.9%
	Part-time	7.9%	72.3%	19.8%
Making a theoretical contribution to science	All	6.9%	48.6%	44.5%
	Part-time	8.9%	41.6%	49.5%
Becoming a community leader	All	6.1%	61.2%	32.7%
	Part-time	9.9%	63.4%	26.7%
Influencing the political structure	All	4.9%	58.1%	37.0%
	Part-time	8.8%	60.8%	30.4%

All respondents and part-time respondents cumulatively agree that developing a meaningful philosophy of life (53% & 57%, respectively), raising a family (46% & 53%) and helping to promote racial understanding (45% & 53%) are most essential personally. Despite that cumulative agreement, the difference in agreement between the two groups on even these objectives is about 7% each. Additionally, 36% of part-time respondents

HERI 2010-11: Overall Report

report that helping others who are in difficulty is essential, compared to 30% of all respondents.

All respondents and part-time respondents cumulatively agree that making a theoretical contribution to science is not important (45% & 50%, respectively). A similar agreement (though with a similar 6%-7% difference between groups) is seen as 37% of all respondents and 30% of part-time respondents indicate that influencing the political structure is not important, and 33% of all respondents and 27% of part-time respondents report that becoming a community leader is not important.

Hours Spent per Week

Faculty also indicated the average number of hours spent on a number of activities.

Table 23

	Respondents	None	1-4	5-8	9-12	13-16	17+
Consultation with clients/ patients	All	73.7%	13.6%	3.8%	2.1%	2.1%	4.6%
	Part-time	67.7%	16.7%	2.1%	2.1%	2.1%	9.3%
Outside consulting/ freelance work	All	69.2%	20.1%	5.1%	2.6%	0.9%	2.1%
	Part-time	58.9%	23.2%	7.4%	5.3%	1.1%	4.3%
Other employment outside of academia	All	68.5%	8.1%	2.1%	1.7%	1.3%	18.3%
	Part-time	37.5%	10.4%	3.1%	4.2%	2.1%	42.8%
Other administration	All	50.6%	28.3%	8.9%	5.1%	3.0%	4.2%
	Part-time	77.3%	19.6%	1.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.1%
Other creative products/ performances	All	48.5%	34.0%	6.4%	3.0%	1.7%	6.4%
	Part-time	46.9%	28.1%	8.3%	3.1%	3.1%	10.4%
Community or public service	All	36.9%	49.6%	7.6%	3.8%	0.4%	1.6%
	Part-time	43.8%	40.6%	7.3%	5.2%	1.0%	2.1%
Committee work & meetings	All	36.3%	37.1%	16.9%	6.3%	2.1%	1.2%
	Part-time	83.5%	13.4%	3.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Research & scholarly writing	All	36.0%	29.7%	16.9%	6.4%	4.7%	6.4%
	Part-time	59.4%	25.0%	7.3%	3.1%	2.1%	3.1%
Advising/counseling	All	15.2%	61.6%	17.7%	3.8%	0.0%	1.7%
	Part-time	28.9%	66.0%	4.1%	1.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Household/childcare duties	All	6.4%	20.1%	23.5%	17.5%	7.3%	25.2%
	Part-time	7.4%	14.7%	28.4%	16.8%	6.3%	26.4%
Actual scheduled teaching	All	5.1%	17.7%	34.6%	31.2%	7.2%	4.2%
	Part-time	3.1%	35.1%	35.1%	18.6%	4.1%	4.0%
Commuting to campus	All	3.8%	68.8%	21.9%	5.1%	0.4%	0.0%
	Part-time	3.1%	80.4%	14.4%	2.1%	0.0%	0.0%
Teaching prep (including reading & grading)	All	3.8%	19.4%	25.3%	16.0%	15.2%	20.3%
	Part-time	2.1%	36.1%	27.8%	8.2%	11.3%	14.4%

HERI 2010-11: Overall Report

Not surprisingly, there are striking differences in how part-time respondents spend their time compared to all respondents, especially involving work. For instance, part-time respondents generally spend less time per week teaching (73% teach 0 to 8 hours per week compared to 57% of full-time faculty), teaching preparation (66% prep 0 to 8 hours versus 49%), advising and counseling, in committee work, meetings and other administration, doing research and scholarly writing, and commuting to campus.

As expected, part-time respondents typically spend more time than all respondents in other creative products and performances, consultation with clients or patients, doing outside consulting and freelance work, and other employment outside of academia.

Recent Activities

Faculty were asked if they had done any of the following activities over the past two years:

Table 24

	Respondents	Yes	No
Engaged in public service/professional consulting without pay	All	55.7%	44.3%
	Part-time	52.6%	47.4%
Considered leaving this institution for another	All	36.4%	63.6%
	Part-time	30.2%	69.8%
Considered leaving academe for another job	All	33.1%	66.9%
	Part-time	33.3%	66.7%
Engaged in paid consulting outside institution	All	27.2%	72.8%
	Part-time	26.3%	73.7%
Received at least one firm job offer	All	25.5%	74.5%
	Part-time	27.4%	72.6%
Considered early retirement	All	21.6%	78.4%
	Part-time	22.9%	77.1%
Changed academic institutions	All	19.1%	80.9%
	Part-time	22.9%	77.1%
Requested/sought an early promotion	All	8.1%	91.9%
	Part-time	8.4%	91.6%

There was general agreement across both all respondents and part-time respondents in regards to these activities. Most common, 56% of all respondents and 53% of part-time respondents engaged in public service or professional consulting without pay. Least common, 8% of each group requested or sought an early promotion. Interestingly, the biggest percentage discrepancy between the groups came in regards to leaving IU Southeast, as 36% of all respondents considered leaving for another institution compared to 30% of part-time respondents.

Restarting a Career

Faculty were asked two questions with regards to beginning their careers again: would they still come back to IU Southeast and would they still want to be a college professor.

Table 25

	Respondents	Definitely yes	Probably yes	Not sure	Probably no	Definitely no
Still want to come to this institution	All	44.5%	35.2%	11.9%	5.5%	3.0%
	Part-time	58.3%	32.3%	6.3%	0.0%	3.1%
Still want to be a college professor	All	65.3%	24.6%	6.8%	1.7%	1.7%
	Part-time	63.5%	24.0%	8.3%	2.1%	2.1%

Ninety-one percent of part-time respondents would definitely or probably come to IU Southeast if beginning their careers again, compared to 80% of all respondents. Nearly nine in ten of both groups would still want to be college professors.

Stress

Faculty were asked to identify sources of stress during the last two years. The most extensive sources of stress for all respondents are below, while the remainder appear as Table A13 in Appendix A.

Table 26

	Respondents	Extensive	Somewhat	Not at all
Self-imposed high expectations	All	23.4%	55.4%	21.2%
	Part-time	21.3%	52.1%	26.6%
Personal finances	All	22.0%	46.6%	31.4%
	Part-time	33.0%	42.9%	24.2%
Working with underprepared students	All	21.4%	60.7%	17.9%
	Part-time	21.5%	58.1%	20.4%
Lack of personal time	All	20.5%	59.0%	20.5%
	Part-time	18.3%	57.0%	24.7%
Managing household responsibilities	All	19.2%	52.0%	28.8%
	Part-time	17.9%	51.6%	30.5%

All respondents and part-time respondents agree cumulatively that their most extensive source of stress over the last two years is personal finances (22% for all respondents and 33% for part-time respondents), followed by self-imposed high expectations (23% & 21%, respectively) and working with underprepared students (21% & 22%). In addition, 21% of all respondents indicated that lack of personal time was an extensive source of stress.

The source of least stress, cumulatively indicated by all and part-time respondents, is subtle discrimination (76% of all respondents and 87% of part-time respondents). Other cumulative sources of stress- and particularly for part-time respondents- include faculty meetings (49% of all respondents and 93% of part-time respondents), committee work (49% and 90%, respectively), colleagues (54% & 84%), health of spouse or partner (66% &

HERI 2010-11: Overall Report

70%), and teaching load (60% & 75%). In addition, part-time respondents report little stress concerning research or publishing demands (83%), review and promotion process (78%), and institutional procedures and “red tape” (71%). Lastly, seventy percent of all respondents indicate that friction with spouse or partner is not a source of stress over the last two years.

An independent-samples *t* test comparing the highest-scoring category (extensive) of full-time and part-time faculty found a significant difference between the scores of the two groups on the following stressors: review/promotion process ($t(173) = -2.17, p < .05$), personal finances ($t(156) = 3.19, p < .01$), and job security ($t(125) = 3.16, p < .01$). Thus, full-time faculty experience significantly greater stress over the review and promotion process compared to part-time faculty, while part-time faculty experience significantly greater stress over personal finances and job security relative to full-time faculty.

Job Satisfaction

Faculty were asked how satisfied they were on a number of job characteristics. Those characteristics of most satisfaction for all respondents are below, while the full table appears as Table A14 in Appendix A. Note that the rows do not add up to 100% because of the choice of a not applicable category.

Table 27

	Respondents	Very satisfied	Marginally satisfied	Not satisfied
Freedom to determine course content	All	55.9%	7.2%	2.3%
	Part-time	51.7%	7.9%	2.2%
Autonomy and independence	All	38.2%	6.6%	3.1%
	Part-time	37.4%	4.4%	1.1%
Course assignments	All	36.3%	8.8%	1.8%
	Part-time	41.3%	8.7%	1.1%
Professional relationships with other faculty	All	31.9%	14.0%	6.1%
	Part-time	35.9%	15.2%	4.3%
Departmental leadership	All	31.8%	18.4%	9.4%
	Part-time	47.7%	13.6%	3.4%
Competency of colleagues	All	31.8%	11.7%	2.2%
	Part-time	42.5%	6.9%	2.3%
Clerical/administrative support	All	31.4%	15.9%	9.5%
	Part-time	44.0%	8.3%	4.8%

Fifty-six percent of all respondents and 52% of part-time respondents cumulatively are very satisfied with the freedom to determine course content. Other areas of high satisfaction for both groups are in autonomy and independence (38% of all respondents and 37% of part-time respondents), course assignments (36% & 41%, respectively), and competency of colleagues (32% & 43%). Part-time faculty are very satisfied with departmental leadership (48%), clerical and administrative support (44%) and competency of colleagues (43%).

HERI 2010-11: Overall Report

The greatest levels of cumulative dissatisfaction for both groups is found in health benefits (81% of part-time to just 20% of all respondents), retirement benefits (73% to 19%), and tuition remission for children or dependents (67% to 20%). These three characteristics are also the ones with the greatest level of variation between the two groups.

An independent-samples *t* test comparing the highest-scoring category (vary satisfied) of full-time and part-time faculty found a significant difference between the scores of the two groups on the following characteristics: health benefits ($t(135) = -7.50, p < .001$), retirement benefits ($t(158) = -5.35, p < .001$), opportunity for scholarly pursuits ($t(162) = -3.00, p < .01$), and office/lab space ($t(197) = -2.17, p < .05$). Thus, full-time faculty are significantly more satisfied with health and retirement benefits, opportunities for scholarly pursuits and office or lab space compared to part-time faculty.

Institutional Viewpoints

Faculty were asked their level of agreement with a handful of institutional viewpoints.

Table 28

	Respondents	Agree strongly	Agree somewhat	Disagree somewhat	Disagree strongly
A racially/ethnically diverse student body enhances the educational experience of all students	All	60.3%	34.9%	3.3%	1.4%
	Part-time	59.0%	37.2%	3.8%	0.0%
Colleges should prohibit racist/sexist speech on campus	All	38.0%	26.3%	22.9%	12.7%
	Part-time	38.5%	32.1%	17.9%	11.5%
Colleges should encourage students to be involved in community service activities	All	27.1%	62.9%	7.6%	2.4%
	Part-time	27.8%	63.3%	3.8%	5.1%
Colleges have a responsibility to work with their surrounding communities to address local issues	All	23.7%	62.1%	11.8%	2.4%
	Part-time	18.8%	67.5%	11.3%	2.5%
Colleges should be actively involved in solving social problems	All	14.8%	53.3%	26.7%	5.2%
	Part-time	16.3%	48.8%	28.8%	6.3%
The chief benefit of a college education is that it increases one's earning power	All	12.9%	49.0%	27.1%	11.0%
	Part-time	15.0%	51.3%	22.5%	11.3%
Private funding sources often prevent researchers from being completely objective in the conduct of their work	All	11.8%	42.9%	36.0%	9.4%
	Part-time	13.3%	44.0%	34.7%	8.0%
Promoting diversity leads to the admission of too many underprepared students	All	4.8%	18.3%	39.9%	37.0%
	Part-time	5.1%	17.9%	43.6%	33.3%
This institution should not offer remedial/developmental education	All	3.8%	16.2%	41.4%	38.6%
	Part-time	2.5%	8.9%	34.2%	54.4%
Colleges should be concerned with facilitating undergraduate students' spiritual development	All	1.9%	24.8%	35.2%	38.1%
	Part-time	0.0%	27.5%	33.8%	38.8%
Realistically, an individual can do little to bring about changes in society	All	1.0%	14.8%	38.6%	45.7%
	Part-time	1.3%	15.0%	36.3%	47.5%

HERI 2010-11: Overall Report

The viewpoint receiving the strongest level of agreement from both all respondents and part-time respondents is that a racially/ethnically diverse student body enhances the educational experience of all students (60% & 59%, respectively). In addition, 38% of all respondents and 39% of part-time respondents strongly agree that colleges should prohibit racist or sexist speech on campus.

Combining both “agree” categories, cumulatively for both respondent groups, large levels of agreement are found in the above statements and in the following: colleges should encourage students to be involved in community service activities (90% all respondents and 91% part-time respondents) and colleges have a responsibility to work with their surrounding communities to address local issues (85% apiece).

The largest level of disagreement for both groups is found in the statement: this institution should not offer remedial/developmental education. Thirty-nine percent of all respondents and 54% of part-time respondents strongly disagree. In addition, 37% of part-time respondents disagree strongly that promoting diversity leads to the admission of too many underprepared students, combined with 33% of all respondents.

Focus on Part-Time Faculty

Part-time faculty were asked a series of questions to better understand their goals, choices and opinions. In data shown in Appendix Tables A15 through A17, if given the choice, 59% of part-time respondents would prefer to work full-time at IU Southeast. In addition, 45% of part-time respondents have sought a full-time position at IU Southeast or another institution and 32% of part-time respondents have a full-time professional career outside academia. Additionally, part-time respondents were asked a series of questions regarding their reasons for teaching part-time at IU Southeast.

Table 29

	Agree Strongly	Agree Somewhat	Disagree Somewhat	Disagree Strongly
My expertise in my chosen profession is relevant to the course(s) I teach	81.8%	16.5%	1.7%	0.0%
My part-time position is an important source of income for me	47.9%	27.3%	19.8%	5.0%
Teaching part-time fits my current lifestyle	47.1%	37.2%	9.9%	5.8%
Full-time positions were not available	40.2%	31.6%	10.3%	17.9%
Part-time teaching is a stepping-stone to a full-time position	20.8%	36.7%	24.2%	18.3%
Compensation is not a major consideration in my decision to teach part-time	13.2%	33.1%	32.2%	21.5%
My part-time position provides benefits (e.g. health insurance, retirement, etc.) that I need	0.0%	1.7%	5.8%	92.6%

Ninety-eight percent of part-time respondents agree that their expertise in their professions is relevant to their courses, while 84% agree that teaching part-time fits their current lifestyle. Three-quarters agree that their part-time position is an important source of their income, and 72% agree that full-time positions were not available. Additionally, nearly all respondents disagree that their part-time position provides needed benefits.

Lastly, part-time faculty were asked a variety of questions regarding part-time instructors at IU Southeast.

Table 30

	Agree Strongly	Agree Somewhat	Disagree Somewhat	Disagree Strongly
Receive respect from students	62.0%	34.7%	1.7%	1.7%
Have no guarantee of employment security	54.5%	36.4%	6.6%	2.5%
Have good working relationships with the administration	48.8%	37.2%	10.7%	3.3%
Have access to support services	43.8%	38.0%	12.4%	5.8%
Are respected by full-time faculty	40.8%	47.5%	5.0%	6.7%
Are primarily responsible for introductory classes	37.2%	38.0%	16.5%	8.3%
Rarely get hired into full-time positions	23.1%	39.3%	29.9%	7.7%
Are given specific training before teaching	12.4%	33.1%	31.4%	23.1%
Are required to attend meetings	4.2%	21.7%	44.2%	30.0%
Are compensated for advising/counseling students	3.4%	10.2%	41.5%	44.9%

HERI 2010-11: Overall Report

Nearly all part-time respondents agree that fellow part-time faculty receive respect from students, while 88% agree that part-time faculty are respected by full-time faculty. Eighty-six percent of the part-time sample agree that part-time faculty have good working relationships with the administration. About eight out of every ten agree that part-time faculty have access to support services, but nine out of ten agree that part-time faculty have no guarantee of employment security. About 86% of the part-time sample disagree that part-time faculty are compensated for advising or counseling students, while about three-quarters disagree that part-time faculty are required to attend meetings.

Peer Group Differences

The HERI data from our campus was also compared to nationally normed data for three types of schools: a peer group of our choice (of participating HERI schools), public 4-year colleges, and a combination of public/private universities with public 4-year colleges. Only significant differences of summarized means (combining the strongest 2 Likert categories such as 'all' and 'most', for instance) or their equivalent (combining the top numerical categories, such as '5 or more hours') are presented below.

Organized by HERI theme, this section explores significant differences between IU Southeast full-time respondents and their **HERI peers** (schools identified as either IU Southeast peers or aspirational peers, listed in Appendix Table A18), **public 4-year faculty peers** (ninety-eight HERI-participating schools categorized as 4-year public colleges, such as IU Southeast: list available upon request), and a combination of both HERI and public 4-year groups. Differences are also examined by gender between the three sets of peer groups listed above.

While statistical significance indicates a difference of means expected by more than just chance, effect size indicates the practical difference in magnitude between the two means. Roughly speaking, HERI effect size of .2 indicates a small effect, .5 a medium effect and .8 a large effect. Subheadings in these sections below indicate questions that make up the HERI constructs that are analyzed at the end of the report.

Professional Practice- Teaching

Both our full-time IU Southeast respondents ($p < .05$, .23) and our male sample ($p < .01$, .42) use multiple-choice exams in significantly more of their courses than their respective peers at public 4-year schools. Additionally, our full-time faculty ($p < .05$, .19) and our male sample ($p < .05$, .27) use quizzes in more of their courses than full-time faculty at public 4-year schools. Our full-time respondents use term or research papers in fewer courses than their HERI peers ($p < .05$, -.20) and public 4-year faculty ($p < .01$, -.26), while our female sample uses term or research papers in less courses than their respective public 4-year faculty ($p < .05$, -.27).

Small groups (or cooperative learning) are used in significantly more courses by IU Southeast full-time faculty ($p < .001$, .40 & $p < .001$, .36), our male sample ($p < .01$, .46 & $p < .05$, .36) and our female sample ($p < .05$, .33 & $p < .05$, .31) compared to their respective faculty at HERI peer schools and at public 4-year schools. Also, our full-time sample ($p < .05$, .24) and our female sample ($p < .05$, .28) use real-life problems in more courses than public 4-year faculty, while our full-time faculty ($p < .01$, -.25 & $p < .01$, -.28) and male sample ($p < .05$, -.33 & $p < .05$, -.34) report less usage of teaching assistants in their courses compared to their HERI peers and their public 4-year peers, respectively.

Professional Practice- Scholarship

Compared to HERI peers ($p < .01$, .39) and public 4-year school ($p < .05$, .29) faculty, male IU Southeast full-time faculty publish articles in academic or professional journals at a significantly higher rate. In addition, our male sample ($p < .01$, .42) have had greater

numbers of professional writings accepted for publication in the last two years compared to their HERI peers. Lastly, both our full sample ($p < .001$, .37 & $p < .05$, .19) and male sample ($p < .001$, .75 & $p < .001$, .55) spend significantly more time per week on research and scholarly writing compared to both their HERI peers and faculty at public 4-year schools.

Professional Practice- Service

Compared to 4-year public faculty, our full sample spends significantly less time per week advising and counseling students ($p < .05$, -.19). Our male sample, compared to their HERI peers, spends less time per week on 'other' administration ($p < .05$, -.31).

Institutional Support and Resources

IU Southeast faculty ($p < .01$, .26) and the female sample ($p < .05$, .28) were more likely to agree, compared to their public 4-year peers, that there is significantly more support for faculty development.

Goals for Undergraduate Education

Personal Development

IU Southeast full-time faculty and our female sample impart, compared to their HERI peers ($p < .01$, -.30 & $p < .001$, -.63) and 4-year public faculty ($p < .01$, -.24 & $p < .01$, -.37), significantly less importance in developing moral character in undergraduates and less importance in helping students develop personal values (FT: $p < .05$, -.24 & $p < .05$, -.20) (Fem: $p < .001$, -.53 & $p < .05$, -.29). Female faculty also impart less importance to providing for students' emotional development ($p < .01$, -.36) compared to their HERI peers.

Civic Minded Values

Our full-time faculty ($p < .05$, -.26) and our female sample ($p < .001$, -.53) indicate less importance in instilling in students a commitment to community service compared to HERI peers.

Other Education Goals

IU Southeast full-time male faculty assign significantly greater importance to helping undergraduates master knowledge in a discipline compared to both their HERI peers ($p < .05$, .31) and public 4-year faculty ($p < .05$, .35), a sentiment echoed to a lesser extent by the full sample compared to public 4-year respondents ($p < .05$, .21). The full sample places less importance on promoting the ability to write effectively compared to both HERI peers ($p < .05$, -.23) and public 4-year faculty ($p < .01$, -.27), while this effect is larger in the female sample compared to the HERI peers ($p < .001$, -.54) and public 4-year faculty ($p < .001$, -.50). The female sample believes the instillation of a basic appreciation of the liberal arts is less important than their HERI peers ($p < .01$, -.38) and 4-year public faculty ($p < .01$, -.40), an opinion similarly shared by the full sample when compared to 4-year public faculty ($p < .01$, -.27).

The full sample indicates greater importance placed on preparing students for employment after college compared to their public 4-year faculty peers ($p < .05$, .23), while the female

sample places less importance on preparing students for graduate or advanced education relative to their HERI peers ($p < .05$, $-.34$). Additionally, the full sample ($p < .05$, $-.26$ & $p < .05$, $-.20$) and the female sample ($p < .001$, $-.57$ & $p < .01$, $-.34$) assign less importance to encouraging students to become agents of social change compared to both HERI peers and public 4-year faculty.

Both the full IU Southeast full-time sample ($p < .01$, $-.29$) and the female sample ($p < .05$, $-.34$) significantly disagree that the institution takes responsibility for educating underprepared students compared to their HERI peers. Lastly, compared to both their HERI peers and public 4-year faculty, the full sample ($p < .001$, $-.51$ & $p < .001$, $-.38$), the male sample ($p < .001$, $-.50$ & $p < .001$, $-.50$) and the female sample ($p < .001$, $-.56$ & $p < .05$, $-.28$) express significantly stronger disagreement that colleges should be concerned with facilitating undergraduate students' spiritual development.

Diversity

Commitment to Diversity

Full-time IU Southeast faculty and the male sample both rate increasing the representation of minorities in the faculty and administration as significantly higher institutional priorities than their HERI peers ($p < .05$, $.25$ & $p < .05$, $.37$) and public 4-year faculty ($p < .05$, $.24$ & $p < .05$, $.28$). In addition, compared to their HERI peers, our male sample rates the recruitment of more minority students as a significantly higher priority ($p < .05$, $.32$), a sentiment echoed in the full sample relative to public 4-year faculty ($p < .05$, $.21$).

Social Agency

Our male sample responded that helping to promote racial understanding was significantly more important to them personally compared to their HERI peers ($p < .05$, $.30$).

Other Diversity

The full IU Southeast sample ($p < .01$, $.28$), the male sample ($p < .05$, $.30$) and the female sample ($p < .05$, $.28$) significantly disagree relative to HERI peers that the institution should offer remedial or developmental education. Also, the full sample ($p < .01$, $-.29$) and the female sample ($p < .05$, $-.34$) significantly disagree with HERI peers that the institution takes responsibility for educating underprepared students. The female sample disagrees with HERI peers that promoting diversity leads to the admission of too many underprepared students ($p < .05$, $-.30$).

Our full-time respondents ($p < .001$, $-.37$), male sample ($p < .05$, $-.31$) and female sample ($p < .001$, $-.47$) all disagree significantly compared with public 4-year faculty that there is a lot of campus racial conflict. The full sample also agrees that racial and ethnic diversity should be more strongly reflected in the curriculum compared to HERI peers ($p < .05$, $.24$).

The female sample at IU Southeast indicates that the promotion of gender equity among faculty is not a high priority compared to responses from their HERI peers ($p < .01$, $-.40$). Finally, compared with public 4-year faculty, our full sample significantly agrees that gay and lesbian faculty are treated fairly here ($p < .05$, $.20$).

Satisfaction

Compensation

As shown in Table 31, compared to HERI peers and public 4-year faculty, IU Southeast faculty are significantly more satisfied with their compensation: opportunities for scholarly pursuits, teaching load and retirement benefits.

Table 31

IU Southeast Sample	Full-time		Male		Female	
	Sig level	Effect size	Sig level	Effect size	Sig level	Effect size
Opportunities for Scholarly Pursuits						
HERI peers	p<.001	.53	p<.001	.51	p<.001	.52
Public 4-yr faculty	p<.001	.54	p<.01	.44	p<.001	.64
Teaching Load						
HERI peers	p<.001	.53	p<.001	.51	p<.001	.52
Public 4-yr faculty	p<.001	.54	p<.01	.44	p<.001	.64
Retirement Benefits						
HERI peers	p<.001	.43	p<.01	.49	p<.01	.38
Public 4-yr faculty	p<.001	.34	p<.05	.34	p<.01	.33

Workplace

Relative to public 4-year faculty, the full IU Southeast sample is significantly less satisfied with departmental leadership (p<.05, -.19).

Other Satisfaction

Full-time faculty express significantly greater satisfaction with the availability of institutional child care than both their HERI peers (p<.05, .54) and public 4-year faculty (p<.01, .54), as do our female full-time respondents (p<.05, .65 & p<.05, .65, respectively). The full sample also is significantly more satisfied than their HERI peers (p<.001, .48) and public 4-year faculty (p<.001, .35) in terms of health benefits. Both the male sample (p<.05, .38 & p<.05, .28) and female sample (p<.001, .54 & p<.01, .40) share this satisfaction compared to both HERI and public 4-year peers, respectively. Lastly, the IU Southeast full sample (p<.05, -.36) and female sample (p<.01, -.64) are significantly less satisfied than their HERI peers with tuition remission for children or dependents.

Institutional Priorities

Civic Engagement

IU Southeast full-time faculty (p<.001, -.47 & p<.001, -.29) and the female sample (p<.001, -.72 & p<.01, -.39) rate the facilitation of student involvement in community service as a significantly lower institutional priority than their HERI peers and public 4-year faculty, respectively. Compared to HERI peers, the full sample (p<.05, -.22) and the female sample (p<.05, -.28) rate the creation and sustainment of partnerships with surrounding communities as a lower institutional priority. However, our full sample perceives these

partnerships as a significantly *higher* priority compared to all public 4-year faculty ($p < .05$, .20). Finally, the female sample rates providing resources for faculty to engage in community-based teaching or research as a lower priority compared to their HERI peers ($p < .05$, -.30).

Civic Minded Values

The IU Southeast female sample significantly disagrees that colleges should be actively involved in solving social problems ($p < .05$, -.32) and that colleges have a responsibility to work with their surrounding communities to address local issues ($p < .05$, -.29) when compared to HERI peers.

Commitment to Diversity

The IU Southeast male sample indicates that increasing the representation of women in the faculty and administration is a significantly higher institutional priority compared to both their HERI ($p < .05$, .33) and public 4-year faculty ($p < .05$, .30).

Increase Prestige

Enhancing the institution's national image was rated as a significantly lower institutional priority by the full sample ($p < .001$, -.37 & $p < .001$, -.41) and female sample ($p < .01$, -.43 & $p < .001$, -.44) compared to HERI peers and public, 4-year faculty, respectively, and by the male sample ($p < .01$, -.38) compared to public 4-year faculty.

Other Institutional Priorities

Compared to both HERI peers and public 4-year faculty, the full-time IU Southeast faculty ($p < .01$, -.29 & $p < .05$, -.21) and the female sample ($p < .001$, -.44 & $p < .05$, -.26) both rate helping students to learn how to bring about societal change as a significantly lower institutional priority and rate the pursuit of extramural funding as a lower institutional priority (FT: $p < .01$, -.28 & $p < .01$, -.24) (Fem: $p < .01$, -.42 & $p < .01$, -.36). The full sample ($p < .01$, -.28) and male sample ($p < .05$, -.33) both rate strengthening links with the for-profit, corporate sector as a significantly lower institutional priority than their HERI peers. Lastly, the full sample ($p < .001$, -.51 & $p < .001$, -.38), male sample ($p < .001$, -.50 & $p < .001$, -.50) and female sample ($p < .001$, -.56 & $p < .05$, -.28) significantly disagree with both their HERI peers and public 4-year faculty that colleges should be concerned with facilitating undergraduate students' spiritual development.

Interactions with Students

The IU Southeast full sample compared to HERI peers ($p < .05$, -.22), and the male sample relative to public 4-year faculty ($p < .05$, -.30) significantly disagree that most students are well-prepared academically. The full sample also describes that most students are not treated like "numbers in a book", compared to public 4-year faculty ($p < .05$, -.20). Lastly, the full sample also significantly disagrees with HERI peers that it is easy for students to see faculty outside of regular office hours ($p < .05$, -.21).

Habits of Mind

The IU Southeast female sample encourages undergraduates to revise their papers to improve their writing significantly more often than both their HERI peers ($p < .05$, $-.36$) and public 4-year faculty ($p < .05$, $-.27$). Our female sample encourages undergraduates to explore topics on their own, even though not required for class, significantly less often than public 4-year faculty ($p < .05$, $-.26$).

Health and Wellness

Career Related Stress

IU Southeast full-time faculty report significantly less stress regarding teaching load during the last two years than both HERI peers ($p < .001$, $-.41$) and public 4-year faculty ($p < .001$, $-.44$). This effect is also seen in both the male ($p < .01$, $-.39$ & $p < .01$, $-.39$) and female ($p < .01$, $-.43$ & $p < .001$, $-.50$) sample. The full sample reports that lack of personal time provides significantly less stress compared to public 4-year faculty ($p < .05$, $-.20$), while our female full-time faculty differ significantly compared to both the HERI peers ($p < .01$, $-.44$) and the public 4-year faculty ($p < .01$, $-.40$).

Other Health and Wellness

IU Southeast full-time respondents indicated a significantly higher achievement of a healthy balance between their personal and professional lives compared to their HERI peers ($p < .01$, $.29$) and public 4-year school ($p < .05$, $.23$) respondents. A similar but greater effect is seen in our female full-time faculty, who indicated greater balance compared to their HERI ($p < .001$, $.51$) and public 4-year school ($p < .001$, $.50$) peers.

Other Sources of Stress

The full sample ($p < .05$, $-.21$ & $p < .01$, $-.29$) and male sample ($p < .05$, $-.30$ & $p < .01$, $-.36$) report significantly less stress during the last two years over job security compared to their HERI peers and public 4-year faculty, respectively. The full sample ($p < .01$, $-.30$) and female sample ($p < .05$, $-.33$) report less stress over keeping up with information technology than their HERI peers. The male sample indicates more stress than their HERI peers ($p < .05$, $.35$) and public 4-year faculty ($p < .05$, $.30$) over subtle discrimination (e.g., prejudice, racism, sexism). Lastly, the female sample reports significantly greater stress over institutional budget cuts compared to their HERI peers ($p < .05$, $.29$).

Relationship with Administration

Compared to public 4-year peers, our full sample ($p < .01$, $.26$) and male sample ($p < .05$, $.28$) agree significantly more that Student Affairs staff have the support and respect of faculty.

HERI Constructs

The CIRP uses Item Response Theory (IRT) to combine survey questions into constructs, weighting individual questions that better measure an array of broad concepts. Results can indicate how the faculty experience at IU Southeast differs for our comparison groups. As above, only significant differences are presented. The questions that create each construct are listed in Appendix B.

Faculty Work & Job Satisfaction

Job Satisfaction: Compensation

This is a unified measure of the extent to which faculty are satisfied with their compensation packages. Overall, IU Southeast faculty are more satisfied with their compensation packages compared to both their HERI peers and public 4-year faculty. The full-time sample ($p < .001$, .38 & $p < .001$, .34), the male sample ($p < .01$, .45 & $p < .05$, .35) and the female sample ($p < .05$, .33 & $p < .01$, .37) all have larger and significantly different means compared to both comparison groups, respectively.

In addition to the significant differences by construct mean, CIRP reports comparative information and tests for significance by the percentage of respondents who score in the “high” score group on each construct relative to their peers. The only construct that IU Southeast faculty differ significantly on based on a proportional difference test of high scoring respondents is on this construct of job compensation. Specifically, male full-time faculty at IU Southeast that showed the highest satisfaction on job compensation differed significantly than their HERI male peers who showed the highest satisfaction on job compensation ($p < .05$, 46.2% to 24.4%).

Career Related Stress

This construct measures the amount of stress faculty experience related to their career. The IU Southeast full sample reports significantly less career related stress compared to both their HERI peers ($p < .01$, -.20) and public 4-year faculty ($p < .01$, -.20). This effect is greater for the female sample, who also report less stress compared with their HERI peers ($p < .05$, -.32) and public 4-year faculty ($p < .01$, -.34).

Scholarly Productivity

This construct is a unified measure of the scholarly activity of faculty. Compared to their HERI peers, the IU Southeast male sample reports significantly higher productivity ($p < .01$, .40).

Social Agency

This construct measures the extent to which faculty value political and social involvement as a personal goal. Compared to their HERI peers, the IU Southeast female sample indicates significantly less value placed on this personal goal ($p < .05$, -.34).

Educational Goals & Mission

Civic Minded Values

This is a unified measure of the extent to which faculty believe civic engagement is a central part of the college mission. IU Southeast full-time female respondents believe civic engagement is significantly less a central part of the college mission compared to both their HERI peers ($p < .001$, $-.57$) and public 4-year faculty ($p < .01$, $-.33$). This sentiment is shared by the full IU Southeast sample ($p < .01$, $-.30$ & $p < .05$, $-.23$, respectively).

Undergraduate Education Goal: Personal Development

This construct measures the extent to which faculty believe that personal development is a central goal for undergraduate education. Our female sample believes personal development is significantly less a central undergraduate education goal compared to both their HERI peers ($p < .001$, $-.52$) and public 4-year faculty ($p < .05$, $-.27$). Additionally, the full sample echoes this effect compared to their HERI peers ($p < .05$, $-.23$).

Institutional Priorities

Civic Engagement

This construct measures the extent to which faculty believe IU Southeast is committed to facilitating civic engagement among students and faculty. Compared to their HERI peers, both the full sample ($p < .05$, $-.25$) and the female sample ($p < .01$, $-.41$) believes to a significantly lesser degree that IU Southeast is committed to facilitating civic engagement.

Commitment to Diversity

This construct measures the extent to which faculty believe IU Southeast is committed to creating a diverse multicultural campus environment. Compared to their HERI peers, the male sample believes to a significantly higher degree that IU Southeast is committed to creating a diverse campus environment ($p < .05$, $.30$). In addition, compared to public 4-year faculty, the full sample also shares this positive commitment ($p < .05$, $.21$).

Increase Prestige

This construct measures the extent to which faculty believe IU Southeast is committed to increasing its prestige. Compared to public 4-year faculty, the full IU Southeast sample believes to a significantly lesser degree that the campus is committed to increasing its prestige ($p < .05$, $-.18$).

Appendix A

Tables A1 through A9: Professional Practice by Tenure Status, Academic Rank and Full-Time Status

Table A1

Importance of teaching	Essential	Very important	Somewhat important	Not important	Grand Total
Tenured	79.2%	19.5%	1.3%	0.0%	100.0%
On tenure track, not tenured	78.1%	18.8%	3.1%	0.0%	100.0%
Not on tenure track	79.4%	18.8%	1.8%	0.0%	100.0%

Table A2

Importance of research	Essential	Very important	Somewhat important	Not important	Grand Total
Tenured	40.3%	44.2%	13.0%	2.6%	100.0%
On tenure track, not tenured	40.6%	43.8%	12.5%	3.1%	100.0%
Not on tenure track	23.0%	30.9%	29.1%	17.0%	100.0%

Table A3

Importance of service	Essential	Very important	Somewhat important	Not important	Grand Total
Tenured	20.8%	42.9%	31.2%	5.2%	100.0%
On tenure track, not tenured	12.5%	46.9%	37.5%	3.1%	100.0%
Not on tenure track	25.5%	47.9%	25.5%	1.2%	100.0%

Table A4

Importance of teaching	Essential	Very important	Somewhat important	Not important	Grand Total
Instructor	75.0%	25.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%
Lecturer	88.1%	9.0%	3.0%	0.0%	100.0%
Asst Professor	77.5%	20.0%	2.5%	0.0%	100.0%
Assoc Professor	76.5%	23.5%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%
Professor	78.7%	17.0%	4.3%	0.0%	100.0%

Table A5

Importance of research	Essential	Very important	Somewhat important	Not important	Grand Total
Instructor	22.7%	30.7%	30.7%	15.9%	100.0%
Lecturer	20.9%	31.3%	28.4%	19.4%	100.0%
Asst Professor	40.0%	42.5%	12.5%	5.0%	100.0%
Assoc Professor	41.2%	32.4%	23.5%	2.9%	100.0%
Professor	40.4%	48.9%	6.4%	4.3%	100.0%

HERI 2010-11: Overall Report

Table A6

Importance of service	Essential	Very important	Somewhat important	Not important	Grand Total
Instructor	25.0%	50.0%	23.9%	1.1%	100.0%
Lecturer	22.4%	47.8%	29.9%	0.0%	100.0%
Asst Professor	20.0%	40.0%	35.0%	5.0%	100.0%
Assoc Professor	23.5%	47.1%	26.5%	2.9%	100.0%
Professor	19.1%	40.4%	34.0%	6.4%	100.0%

Table A7

Importance of teaching	Essential	Very important	Somewhat important	Not important	Grand Total
Full-time 9 months+	83.5%	15.2%	1.3%	0.0%	100.0%
Not full-time	73.7%	23.7%	2.5%	0.0%	100.0%

Table A8

Importance of research	Essential	Very important	Somewhat important	Not important	Grand Total
Full-time 9 months+	36.7%	37.3%	17.1%	8.9%	100.0%
Not full-time	21.2%	33.9%	29.7%	15.3%	100.0%

Table A9

Importance of service	Essential	Very important	Somewhat important	Not important	Grand Total
Full-time 9 months+	20.9%	43.0%	32.3%	3.8%	100.0%
Not full-time	24.6%	50.0%	24.6%	0.8%	100.0%

HERI 2010-11: Overall Report

Table A10- Education Goals for Undergraduates

Importance-->	All Respondents			Part-time Respondents		
	Essential	Very or somewhat	Not important	Essential	Very or somewhat	Not important
Develop ability to think critically	87.9%	12.1%	0.0%	90.7%	9.3%	0.0%
Prepare students for employment after college	57.3%	41.4%	1.3%	63.9%	35.1%	1.0%
Prepare students for graduate or advanced education	34.5%	64.7%	0.8%	46.9%	51.0%	2.1%
Develop moral character	35.6%	60.7%	3.8%	47.4%	49.5%	3.1%
Provide for students' emotional development	23.8%	70.3%	5.9%	34.0%	61.9%	4.1%
Teach students the classic works of Western civilization	11.3%	59.4%	29.3%	14.4%	56.7%	28.9%
Help students develop personal values	29.7%	66.1%	4.2%	37.1%	59.8%	3.1%
Enhance students' self-understanding	41.8%	54.0%	4.2%	51.5%	45.4%	3.1%
Instill in students a commitment to community service	16.7%	71.1%	12.1%	18.6%	71.1%	10.3%
Enhance students' knowledge of and appreciation for other racial/ethnic groups	43.7%	51.3%	5.0%	49.0%	44.8%	6.3%
Help master knowledge in a discipline	63.2%	36.8%	0.0%	59.8%	40.2%	0.0%
Develop creative capacities	40.6%	56.9%	2.5%	45.4%	54.6%	0.0%
Instill a basic appreciation of the liberal arts	32.6%	58.2%	9.2%	35.1%	59.8%	5.2%
Promote ability to write effectively	56.9%	41.4%	1.7%	67.0%	30.9%	2.1%
Help students evaluate the quality and reliability of information	65.7%	34.3%	0.0%	66.0%	34.0%	0.0%
Engage students in civil discourse around controversial issues	31.4%	57.7%	10.9%	30.9%	55.7%	13.4%
Teach students tolerance and respect for different beliefs	54.4%	43.1%	2.5%	59.8%	38.1%	2.1%
Encourage students to become agents of social change	25.6%	59.7%	14.7%	33.0%	52.6%	14.4%

HERI 2010-11: Overall Report

Table A11- Institutional Climate

	Respondents	Agree strongly	Agree	Disagree somewhat	Disagree strongly
Faculty of color are treated fairly here	All	55.5%	40.4%	2.8%	1.4%
	Part-time	58.8%	37.6%	1.2%	2.4%
Women faculty are treated fairly here	All	51.6%	43.0%	4.5%	0.9%
	Part-time	63.2%	31.0%	4.6%	1.1%
Gay and lesbian faculty are treated fairly here	All	50.2%	44.7%	4.6%	0.5%
	Part-time	59.0%	36.1%	3.6%	1.2%
My teaching is valued by faculty in my department	All	46.6%	43.9%	8.1%	1.4%
	Part-time	45.5%	48.9%	4.5%	1.1%
Faculty are committed to the welfare of this institution	All	44.3%	48.9%	5.4%	1.4%
	Part-time	47.1%	46.0%	5.7%	1.1%
Faculty here are strongly interested in the academic problems of undergraduates	All	42.7%	50.0%	6.8%	0.5%
	Part-time	40.7%	55.8%	3.5%	0.0%
My values are congruent with the dominant institutional values	All	28.6%	56.7%	11.5%	3.2%
	Part-time	36.9%	52.4%	9.5%	1.2%
Faculty are interested in students' personal problems	All	23.8%	65.5%	9.4%	1.3%
	Part-time	25.8%	58.4%	13.5%	2.2%
There is adequate support for faculty development	All	21.5%	56.2%	17.4%	5.0%
	Part-time	20.0%	62.4%	12.9%	4.7%
This institution takes responsibility for educating underprepared students	All	21.4%	54.1%	20.9%	3.6%
	Part-time	29.1%	51.2%	17.4%	2.3%
Student Affairs staff have the support and respect of faculty	All	20.1%	67.8%	10.7%	1.4%
	Part-time	17.3%	77.8%	4.9%	0.0%
Racial and ethnic diversity should be more strongly reflected in the curriculum	All	19.5%	39.5%	32.7%	8.2%
	Part-time	16.3%	27.9%	44.2%	11.6%
My research is valued by faculty in my department	All	19.0%	49.0%	21.9%	10.0%
	Part-time	12.5%	51.3%	22.5%	13.8%
Faculty are sufficiently involved in campus decision making	All	18.9%	51.2%	23.5%	6.5%
	Part-time	27.7%	57.8%	8.4%	6.0%
The criteria for advancement and promotion decisions are clear	All	18.2%	50.5%	22.9%	8.4%
	Part-time	13.6%	46.9%	32.1%	7.4%
This institution should hire more faculty of color	All	18.1%	42.5%	32.1%	7.2%
	Part-time	10.3%	40.2%	41.4%	8.0%
Most of the students I teach lack the basic skills for college level work	All	11.3%	33.5%	45.2%	10.0%
	Part-time	9.2%	31.0%	49.4%	10.3%
This institution should hire more women faculty	All	9.5%	41.2%	39.4%	10.0%
	Part-time	11.5%	34.5%	41.4%	12.6%
Faculty feel that most students are well-prepared academically	All	0.9%	33.3%	51.8%	14.0%
	Part-time	2.3%	42.0%	43.2%	12.5%
There is a lot of campus racial conflict here	All	0.5%	3.2%	25.5%	70.9%
	Part-time	1.1%	3.4%	23.9%	71.6%

HERI 2010-11: Overall Report

Table A12- Institutional Priorities

	Respondents	Highest priority	High priority	Medium priority	Low priority
To promote the intellectual development of students	All	58.6%	27.9%	10.2%	3.3%
	Part-time	67.5%	25.3%	6.0%	1.2%
To create a diverse multi-cultural campus environment	All	21.0%	36.0%	36.0%	7.0%
	Part-time	24.4%	41.5%	25.6%	8.5%
To increase or maintain institutional prestige	All	20.6%	43.5%	29.9%	6.1%
	Part-time	22.0%	43.9%	26.8%	7.3%
To develop an appreciation for multiculturalism	All	19.7%	38.5%	37.0%	4.8%
	Part-time	23.7%	40.8%	30.3%	5.3%
To develop a sense of community among students and faculty	All	19.5%	49.8%	26.0%	4.7%
	Part-time	27.7%	48.2%	22.9%	1.2%
To develop leadership ability among students	All	15.8%	43.1%	38.3%	2.9%
	Part-time	26.9%	43.6%	29.5%	0.0%
To create and sustain partnerships with surrounding communities	All	15.6%	41.7%	35.1%	7.6%
	Part-time	21.5%	43.0%	30.4%	5.1%
To promote gender equity among faculty	All	14.3%	37.6%	34.8%	13.3%
	Part-time	21.8%	47.4%	24.4%	6.4%
To increase the representation of minorities in the faculty and administration	All	14.1%	33.5%	42.7%	9.7%
	Part-time	16.0%	37.3%	38.7%	8.0%
To recruit more minority students	All	13.7%	39.6%	38.7%	8.0%
	Part-time	13.6%	39.5%	38.3%	8.6%
To enhance the institution's national image	All	12.1%	33.5%	36.7%	17.7%
	Part-time	16.9%	33.7%	37.3%	12.0%
To increase the representation of women in the faculty and administration	All	10.1%	28.0%	44.4%	17.4%
	Part-time	13.3%	40.0%	38.7%	8.0%
To strengthen links with the for-profit, corporate sector	All	9.8%	26.5%	43.1%	20.6%
	Part-time	13.7%	39.7%	30.1%	16.4%
To pursue extramural funding	All	9.2%	29.1%	42.2%	19.4%
	Part-time	12.0%	36.0%	37.3%	14.7%
To provide resources for faculty to engage in community-based teaching or research	All	8.7%	29.3%	44.2%	17.8%
	Part-time	13.2%	43.4%	28.9%	14.5%
To help students learn how to bring about change in society	All	8.4%	27.6%	47.2%	16.8%
	Part-time	15.9%	30.5%	41.5%	12.2%
To facilitate student involvement in community service	All	7.9%	35.5%	44.9%	11.7%
	Part-time	15.9%	34.1%	40.2%	9.8%
To hire faculty "stars"	All	2.8%	16.0%	36.3%	44.8%
	Part-time	6.2%	19.8%	38.3%	35.8%

HERI 2010-11: Overall Report

Table A13- Stress

	Respondents	Extensive	Somewhat	Not at all
Review/promotion process	All	17.6%	28.3%	54.0%
	Part-time	10.3%	11.8%	77.9%
Child care	All	16.2%	36.0%	47.8%
	Part-time	19.0%	32.8%	48.3%
Care of elderly parent	All	14.8%	32.7%	52.5%
	Part-time	8.7%	37.7%	53.6%
Institutional budget cuts	All	13.6%	48.6%	37.9%
	Part-time	10.1%	32.9%	57.0%
Committee work	All	12.2%	38.8%	48.9%
	Part-time	0.0%	10.3%	89.7%
Institutional procedures and 'red tape'	All	11.9%	41.1%	47.0%
	Part-time	7.2%	21.7%	71.1%
Change in work responsibilities	All	11.8%	37.4%	50.7%
	Part-time	9.6%	37.3%	53.0%
Being part of a dual career couple	All	11.3%	32.8%	55.9%
	Part-time	12.2%	32.4%	55.4%
Job security	All	10.3%	29.0%	60.7%
	Part-time	18.7%	36.3%	45.1%
Colleagues	All	9.5%	36.8%	53.6%
	Part-time	0.0%	16.5%	83.5%
Research or publishing demands	All	8.6%	39.5%	51.9%
	Part-time	1.5%	15.4%	83.1%
Friction with spouse/partner	All	7.6%	22.7%	69.7%
	Part-time	7.8%	27.3%	64.9%
Children's problems	All	7.3%	33.1%	59.6%
	Part-time	10.6%	28.8%	60.6%
Faculty meetings	All	6.7%	36.9%	56.4%
	Part-time	0.0%	6.7%	93.3%
Subtle discrimination (prejudice, racism, sexism)	All	6.5%	17.5%	76.0%
	Part-time	3.6%	9.6%	86.7%
My physical health	All	6.3%	41.5%	52.2%
	Part-time	7.5%	37.6%	54.8%
Students	All	5.7%	52.0%	42.3%
	Part-time	1.1%	45.7%	53.3%
Teaching load	All	5.4%	34.2%	60.4%
	Part-time	3.4%	21.6%	75.0%
Keeping up with information technology	All	5.3%	42.7%	52.0%
	Part-time	5.6%	37.1%	57.3%
Health of spouse/partner	All	4.3%	30.1%	65.6%
	Part-time	3.8%	26.3%	70.0%

HERI 2010-11: Overall Report

Table A14- Job Satisfaction

	Respondents	Very satisfied	Marginally satisfied	Not satisfied
Freedom to determine course content	All	55.9%	7.2%	2.3%
	Part-time	51.7%	7.9%	2.2%
Autonomy and independence	All	38.2%	6.6%	3.1%
	Part-time	37.4%	4.4%	1.1%
Course assignments	All	36.3%	8.8%	1.8%
	Part-time	41.3%	8.7%	1.1%
Professional relationships with other faculty	All	31.9%	14.0%	6.1%
	Part-time	35.9%	15.2%	4.3%
Departmental leadership	All	31.8%	18.4%	9.4%
	Part-time	47.7%	13.6%	3.4%
Competency of colleagues	All	31.8%	11.7%	2.2%
	Part-time	42.5%	6.9%	2.3%
Clerical/administrative support	All	31.4%	15.9%	9.5%
	Part-time	44.0%	8.3%	4.8%
Overall job satisfaction	All	24.0%	17.9%	3.9%
	Part-time	30.4%	16.3%	5.4%
Job security	All	23.6%	21.3%	13.0%
	Part-time	8.6%	35.8%	23.5%
Health benefits	All	23.1%	10.4%	19.7%
	Part-time	0.0%	5.4%	81.1%
Retirement benefits	All	22.5%	17.3%	18.5%
	Part-time	2.7%	13.5%	73.0%
Social relationships with other faculty	All	21.5%	19.5%	7.8%
	Part-time	23.7%	21.1%	6.6%
Tuition remission for your children/dependents	All	18.6%	21.4%	20.0%
	Part-time	8.3%	8.3%	66.7%
Office/lab space	All	15.6%	19.0%	19.4%
	Part-time	9.1%	35.1%	27.3%
Teaching load	All	15.4%	19.3%	8.3%
	Part-time	13.2%	24.2%	11.0%
Opportunity for scholarly pursuits	All	13.4%	26.3%	16.8%
	Part-time	4.0%	26.0%	34.0%
Availability of child care at this institution	All	9.5%	19.0%	26.2%
	Part-time	6.7%	13.3%	33.3%
Prospects for career advancement	All	7.9%	30.2%	25.4%
	Part-time	6.2%	32.3%	43.1%
Salary	All	4.4%	31.7%	23.8%
	Part-time	3.3%	32.2%	24.4%
Quality of students	All	3.9%	34.9%	12.2%
	Part-time	3.3%	31.5%	12.0%

HERI 2010-11: Overall Report

Table A15- If given the choice, would prefer to work at IU Southeast

	N	%
Yes	72	59.0%
No	50	41.0%

Table A16- Have ever sought a full-time teaching position at IU Southeast or elsewhere

	N	%
Yes	55	45.1%
No	67	54.9%

Table A17- Full-time professional career is outside academia

	N	%
Yes	37	31.6%
No	80	68.4%

Table A18- HERI peers, 2010-2011: HERI Faculty Survey

HERI Peer Group, 2010-2011	Full-time Faculty (N)	All Respondents (N)
Indiana University Southeast	159	281
Indiana University- Purdue University- Fort Wayne	132	195
Fort Hays State University	136	158
Aurora University	61	157
University of Indianapolis	90	119
Lewis University	82	98

Appendix B: Constructs

Constructs are sets of related survey items that measure an underlying trait of the faculty experience, weighted according to how effective they are in “tapping into” the trait. Constructs from IU Southeast data that differ significantly from either HERI peers or public 4-year peers are presented below. Note that numbers in parentheses below indicates the weights of each question in creating the construct.

Faculty Work & Job Satisfaction

Job satisfaction: compensation- How satisfied are you with the following aspects of your job?

- * Opportunity for scholarly pursuits (2.18)
- * Retirement benefits (1.48)
- * Salary (1.40)
- * Teaching load (1.27)
- * Job security (1.26)
- * Prospects for career advancement (1.25)

Career related stress- Please indicate the extent to which each of the following has been a source of stress for you during the last two years:

- * Lack of personal time (1.52)
- * Teaching load (1.38)
- * Committee work (1.25)
- * Institutional procedures/red tape (1.17)
- * Colleagues (1.14)
- * Research or publishing demands (1.13)
- * Self-imposed high expectations (1.09)
- * Students (1.08)

Scholarly productivity- How many of the following have you published?

- * Articles in academic and professional journals (3.09)
- * How many of your professional writings have been published or accepted for publication in the last two years (2.53)
- * Chapters in edited volumes (2.11)

Social agency- Indicate the importance to you personally of each of the following:

- * Participating in a community action program (2.32)
- * Becoming a community leader (1.84)
- * Influencing social values (1.49)
- * Helping to promote racial understanding (1.40)
- * Keeping up to date with political affairs (1.06)

Educational Goals & Mission

Civic minded values

- * Encourage students to become agents of social change (2.37)
- * Colleges should encourage students to be involved in community service activities (2.22)
- * Instill in students a commitment to community service (2.15)
- * Colleges should be actively involved in solving social problems (1.75)
- * Colleges have a responsibility to work with their surrounding communities to address local issues (1.64)
- * Influencing social values (1.31)

Undergraduate education goal: personal development- Indicate the importance to you of each of the following education goals for undergraduate students:

- * Help students develop personal values (4.92)
- * Provide for students' emotional development (2.91)
- * Develop moral character (2.87)
- * Enhance students' self-understanding (2.65)

Institutional Priorities

Institutional priority: civic engagement- Indicate how important you believe each priority listed below is at your college or university:

- * To provide resources for faculty to engage in community-based teaching or research (4.27)
- * To create and sustain partnerships with surrounding communities (2.50)
- * To facilitate student involvement in community service (1.29)

Institutional priority: commitment to diversity- Indicate how important you believe each priority listed below is at your college or university:

- * To create a diverse multi-cultural campus environment (3.21)
- * To increase the representation of minorities in the faculty and administration (3.05)
- * To develop an appreciation for multiculturalism (2.79)
- * To recruit more minority students (2.41)
- * To increase the representation of women in the faculty and administration (1.76)

Institutional priority: increase prestige- Indicate how important you believe each priority listed below is at your college or university:

- * To increase or maintain institutional prestige (3.54)
- * To enhance the institution's national image (3.43)
- * To hire faculty "stars" (1.47)