### ULM Faculty Senate Survey—Spring 2006

#### Number of responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College</th>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arts &amp; Sciences</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>51.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Sciences</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>14.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Administration</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pharmacy</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>12.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education &amp; Human Development</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing Data (College not identified)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>233</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: These responses represent approximately 55% of the faculty.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tenured</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>51.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Tenured</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>27.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-t-track</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>19.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing data (status not identified)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>233</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Part 1. Setting Priorities

Please place a check mark next to five items on the following list, and only five, that you believe are the most important issues facing faculty and/or the University.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Description</th>
<th>Not Checked</th>
<th>Checked</th>
<th>NR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Resources to do my job. <em>(Resjob)</em></td>
<td>106</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department/program staffing. <em>(DeptStaf)</em></td>
<td>122</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recruiting and retaining faculty. <em>(Recruit)</em></td>
<td>127</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognizing and rewarding existing faculty. <em>(Recogniz)</em></td>
<td>109</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment security. <em>(EmplSec)</em></td>
<td>177</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workplace safety. <em>(WorkSafe)</em></td>
<td>224</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freedom of expression on campus. <em>(FreeExpr)</em></td>
<td>182</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Esprit des corps’ and general morale among faculty. <em>(Esprit)</em></td>
<td>113</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion, tenure, and post-tenure review policies. <em>(P&amp;T)</em></td>
<td>168</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication between administration and faculty. <em>(Comm)</em></td>
<td>103</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty development. <em>(FacDevlp)</em></td>
<td>154</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching loads. <em>(TchLoad)</em></td>
<td>152</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of classrooms and labs. <em>(QualRoom)</em></td>
<td>166</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security of teaching resources on campus. <em>(EquipSec)</em></td>
<td>209</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Part 2. Identifying Concerns

Please indicate whether you agree or disagree with the following statements.

1. The University is moving in a positive direction. (PosMOve) 
   SA  A  U  D  SD  NR
   47  85  33  45  17  6

2. The physical appearance of the ULM campus is improving. (PhysApp)
   132 97  1  0  0  3

3. The academic environment of ULM is conducive to teaching and learning. (AcEnvCon)
   14 103 46  56 10  4

4. The academic environment of ULM is improving. (AcEnvImp)
   17  80 51  55 24  6

5. Evaluation policies for faculty are well-defined. (EvalDef)
   3  43 49  89 46  3

6. Criteria for evaluation are communicated effectively. (EvalComm)
   3  42 47  91 45  5

7. Merit evaluation policies for faculty are well-defined. (MeritDef)
   3  34 41  97 55  3

8. The equipment on campus works to my satisfaction. (EqipGood)
   9  99 39  67 15  4

9. My workload is manageable. (WrkLdOk)
   10 121 16  60 24  2

10. My workload allows adequate interaction with my students. (WrkLdInt)
    16 120 22  54 18  3

11. Levels of staffing facilitate effective interaction with my students. (StaffInt)
    7  75 39  74 33  4

12. Class size is appropriate to the subject matter I teach. (ClassSize)
    25 137 17  36 15  3

13. Classroom size is appropriate to the subject matter I teach. (RoomSize)
    24 148 22  27  9  3

14. Shared governance is important in determining the direction of the university. (ShrGvImp)
    118 78 18  10  7  2

15. Faculty have adequate opportunity to participate in the governance of the university. (ShrGvOpp)
    7  44 63  62 55  2

16. The faculty fully participates in the governance of the university. (FullPart)
    4  10 62  78 77  2

17. Faculty participation in governance is encouraged by the administration. (ShrGvEnc)
    8  41 72  50 59  3

18. The role of the ULM Faculty Senate is clear. (Fsrole)
    8  31 67  81 43  3

19. The goals of the ULM Faculty Senate are clear. (Fsgoals)
    9  26 77  74 44  3

20. The ULM Faculty Senate is effectively representing the interests of the ULM faculty. (FSeffect)
    9  32 104 46 39  3
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Part 3. Relationship to University

Please answer the following questions to provide some information about you, the respondent. All answers are anonymous.

1. Have you recently considered seeking employment opportunities elsewhere?
   - Yes: 153
   - No: 76
   - NR: 4

   If so, rank the factors influencing your job search (where #1 =’s most important):
   - Salary: rank 1
   - Work environment: rank 2
   - Tenure considerations: rank 3
   - Personal considerations: rank 4
   - Job security: rank 5

2. Have you recently applied for employment elsewhere?
   - Yes: 68
   - No: 158
   - NR: 7

   If so, rank the factors influencing your application for alternative employment (where #1 =’s most important):
   - Salary: rank 1
   - Work environment: rank 2
   - Tenure considerations: rank 3
   - Personal considerations: rank 4
   - Job security: rank 5

3. Is your department/program adequately staffed?
   - Yes: 35
   - No: 182
   - Don’t know: 13

   If not, is this due to: (check all that apply)
   - Budget appropriation: 48
   - Inability to attract applicants: 111
   - ULM’s offered salary: 101
   - Administrative decisions: 62
   - Program decline: 156
   - Don’t know: 162

4. In which College are you a faculty member?
   - Arts and Sciences: 121
   - Health Sciences: 33
   - Business Administration: 25
   - Pharmacy: 30
   - Education and Human Development: 20

5. Are you tenured?
   - Yes: 121
   - No: 64
   - Not tenure track: 45
   - NR: 3
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6. Identify who/what you credit with the positive elements of your job (Select all that apply):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Not Checked</th>
<th>Checked</th>
<th>NR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>president (PresPos)</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>provost (ProvPos)</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dean of college (DeanPos)</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>department head (DHpos)</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>colleagues (ClgsPos)</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>students (StuPos)</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other (OtherPos)</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. Identify who/what you credit with the negative elements of your job (Select all that apply):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Not Checked</th>
<th>Checked</th>
<th>NR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>president (PresNeg)</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>provost (ProvNeg)</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dean of college (DeanNeg)</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>department head (DHneg)</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>colleagues (ClgsNeg)</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>students (StuNeg)</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other (OtherNeg)</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Many thanks to all faculty who participated in the survey. You are greatly appreciated. It’s a busy time of year, and if you did not participate, know that this kind of internal review will be part of every Spring.

Of the 233 questionnaires returned (~55% of the faculty responded), 83 questionnaires (37% of the responding population) were returned with written comments in Part IV of the survey. Some comments were very brief, others devoted pages to the opportunity to express concerns, issues and priorities. Silence can be read in many ways: as expressing satisfaction, as feeling that such input is futile, that writing is yet another time consuming task among other more pressing priorities. As one respondent put it, “Is this business as usual, or something different?” Opinion research recognizes that for every opinion written and shared with a governance (committee/body/congress), the thinking of several who did not take the time to write, or were not certain of what might be said, become represented Noelle-Neumann, 1981; Glynn & McLeod, 1984). So while the subjective reports of 83 people are not everyone’s thoughts, the range of thinking among the entire faculty responding to this survey is represented, in the emergent themes of the discourse under analysis. These comments were grouped around themes to facilitate analysis. These comments, as raw transcripts and unedited thematized report, at present are available for supervised reading by Faculty and Administrators (with university identification); please contact the President of the Faculty Senate (John Rettenmayer until June 30, Dorothy Schween starting July 1).

The written comment fell into patterns or categories that move from 1) Perceptions of the Faculty Senate, to 2) Faculty Workload, to 3) Faculty Development, to 4) Recruiting and Retaining Faculty, and to 5) Managerial Style. The final three themes present 6) Perceived Losses, 7) Perceived Gains, and 8) Possible Improvements. Of course, such thematic boundaries are never fixed, as one informs another, which informs the whole. Some issues are reiterated but a full spectrum of positive and negative observations were presented, reflecting cynicism and pessimism to hope that positive steps will strengthen our institutional functioning. As the sociologist Arthur Frank notes, “Any analysis is always left gazing at what remains in excess of the analyzable. What is testified to remains the really real, and in the end what counts as duties toward it.”

What follows is a compression of the feedback evident in the themes.

1) Faculty Senate received praise and critique of the survey itself; questions about what would be done with the results of the survey; qualifiers about how the questions were interpreted and understood by the respondent; semantic clarifications; suggestions for future questions, other variations on questions. The range of views regarding the work, functioning, and role of the
faculty senate display appreciation and chastisement: appreciation for the invisible, thankless, and unrecognized contributions of an active senate; chastisement for private agendas, poor communication with constituents, lack of orderly meetings. The Faculty Senate is seen as barely existing; left out or bypassed in the shared governance it aspires to; allowing the administration to claim shared governance; as comprised of faculty near the end of their careers seeking promotion, security, and self-aggrandizement.

2) **Faculty Workload:** Faculty expressed concern over teaching loads and class sizes, limited support services and resources to do their jobs. There are expectations of teaching, research and service which are standard to any faculty position. However the additional clerical workload on faculty compromises abilities to focus on the expectations by which faculty are traditionally evaluated. New(er) faculty felt mentors would be helpful for orientation to the department, colleges, and institution; for learning policies and procedures, and for preparing for tenure review.

3) **Faculty Development:** Again, new(er) faculty note that familiarity with procedures is assumed, rather than effectively communicated, and that mentoring program(s) would be helpful. Other requests from faculty focused on money to travel to conferences and workshops; stronger support from colleagues in the form of collegiality, less competitive undermining, less complaining if unaccompanied by solution-oriented thinking. The stress level of faculty was observed to impact abilities to support one another, and to create fears of raising issues.

4) **Recruiting and Retaining Faculty:** To recruit, departments need early authorization to advertise new positions: we seem to wait until the last minute. Salaries are too low to be competitive. We continue to lose faculty. Salaries and other factors make replacement difficult and/or unsupported.

5) **Managerial Style:** Administration was applauded, criticized, and suggestions for improvement were made. They were applauded for having stopped an institutional downward spiral 4 years ago; as having initially been willing to listen, willing to seek out alternative points of view, and for changing the “face” of ULM. Programs strengthened or supported by administrative changes evince and perceive a sense of security, well-being, and encouragement. Managerial style is criticized as being “dictatorial,” evidencing a general lack of respect for faculty, having and producing a “siege mentality.” Decisions seemingly are made with little or no faculty involvement. There is too much administrative “micromanaging” in academic decision making, a “general lack of respect for faculty and Deans,” and diminishing autonomy of staff, faculty, departments, and colleges. Departmental identity through loss of office staff and reorganization. Another issue raised frequently is administrative hiring and firing of faculty without consultation with Deans, department heads or faculty. Communication issues are central in the critique of managerial styles: too little communication between faculty and administration; the communication between the levels of administration being inconsistent and contradictory; the lack of internal communication about ULM to ULM, as many are surprised to hear news first through local media. Suggestions included so-called 360 degree evaluation of administrators (just as faculty are evaluated), the use of consistent and factual information to make decisions; to improve communication, to reprioritize morale, and to train administrators on all levels regarding the management of faculty. Administration has only recently voiced desire to “re-evaluate” but has no way or proposed way of monitoring effectiveness of the changes.
There are conflicting perceptions of what “student centered” means and while the level, number, quality and visibility of student activities have increased, questions revolve around the educational soundness of “student-centeredness.” Increasing class size is a quality of education issue that may unfairly be reflected in learning outcomes and student evaluations.

6) **Perceived Losses**: faculty, cohesiveness, bonding, diversity, fairness, equity, faculty visibility and availability, access, morale, loyalty, faculty/student relations.

7) **Perceived Gains**: Great copy center and satellites; improved appearance of the campus; more student activities, improved recruitment, support divisions like the bookstore, signs, admissions office; forward movement.

8) **Possible Improvements?** One office that controls all classroom technology; departments that willingly share instructional technology; a plan for equipment updates; equipment security; money, secretaries, and other resources enabling faculty to do their jobs; better library resources.

We have a wonderful opportunity to do something with this information about faculty perceptions of the state of the university and problems that need to be addressed. We, like all human institutions, are trying to work out our own changed and changing identity, and part of that is learning what we think. The hope of such work is that the voicings of concerns, issues and priorities are valued, are allowed into the community that is ULM, and incorporated into our history and future decisions, as we progress toward the kind of place we collectively want to be.