

Report on Faculty  
Morale and Satisfaction  
Kansas State University

Prepared by the Faculty Affairs Committee  
on Faculty Morale and Satisfaction  
of the Faculty Senate at  
Kansas State University

AUGUST 1994

MEMBERS OF THE FACULTY MORALE AND SATISFACTION STANDING COMMITTEE

1993-1994

|                                |  |
|--------------------------------|--|
| Cheri L. Becker                | Hotel, Restaurant, Inst. Mgt & Dietetics |
| Brenda Fergen                  | Institutional Research & Analysis        |
| Harry D. Knostman <sup>1</sup> | Arch. Eng. & Construction Science        |
| Cynthia S. McCahon             | Management                               |
| Brian P. Niehoff               | Management                               |
| Janice C. Swanson              | Animal Sciences & Industry               |
| James R. Underwood             | Geology                                  |

<sup>1</sup> Chair

The report was accepted by the Faculty Senate on \_\_\_\_\_, 1994. Following Senate acceptance, it was transmitted to the President and Provost. Copies are available from the Office of the Faculty Senate, Leasure Hall 3, Kansas State University, Manhattan, KS 66506 (913-532-5738) and a copy has been placed in the KSU Library.

## Executive Summary

In the Fall of 1989, the Faculty Senate appointed an Ad-Hoc Committee to study faculty satisfaction and morale. A questionnaire was developed to assess faculty attitudes, opinions, and perceptions concerning general and specific issues surrounding their work at KSU. The survey was administered to a sample of faculty in the Fall of 1990, 1991, Spring of 1993 and, most recently, Spring 1994. This report details the findings of the fourth administration of the survey administered in the Spring 1994. The report includes an analysis of the most recent results broken down by college/unit and faculty position, as well as comparisons of the 1994 results with the results from 1992 and 1993. In addition, this year's report also provides analysis of survey responses by gender.

The results of the 1994 Faculty Morale and Satisfaction Survey were quite similar to those from 1991 and 1993. Respondents tended to be more satisfied with issues at the departmental level than with those associated with university leadership and levels of support (e.g., salary, library resources). However, satisfaction at the departmental level also appears to be declining. Respondents continued to report that too little emphasis was placed on teaching, extension, and service activities, too much emphasis was placed on research and creative work, too many resources were going to administration, and that faculty work loads were too heavy. Analysis by faculty gender indicates that on those issues in which men and women's opinions differ significantly, female faculty tend to be less satisfied than their male counterparts.

With regard to some of the special issues covered in this survey, respondents supported implementing admission standards for new students, allowing departmental faculty to decide whether they are to be governed by heads or chairs, adoption of a pay-by-the-credit-hour tuition plan, and investigating network linkages to access library journals.

## Report on Faculty Morale and Satisfaction Kansas State University

In the Fall of 1989, the Faculty Senate appointed an Ad-Hoc Committee to develop and administer a survey to study faculty satisfaction and morale. The survey was developed in the Spring of 1990 and was administered to the faculty in the Fall of 1990, 1991, Spring of 1993, and, most recently, Spring of 1994. This year's analysis of the data provides the following:

- (1) a comparison of the 1994 survey results by college/unit;
- (2) a comparison of the 1994 survey results by faculty position;
- (3) a comparison of the 1994 survey results by faculty gender; and
- (3) a comparison of the 1994 survey results with the results from 1991 and 1993.

For a detailed discussion of the development of the questionnaire and the sample, individuals are advised to read the 1991 Report on Faculty Satisfaction and Morale or the 1992 Report on Faculty Satisfaction and Morale. In general, the questionnaire was developed with three major sections:

- PART I.** This section requests basic background information on the respondents.
- PART II.** This section contains questions on general attitudes and issues, and remains the same each year.
- PART III.** This section deals with special issues and questions, and varies from year to year.

The questionnaire is reviewed each year and altered if necessary. Changes to Parts I and II are kept to a minimum, however, to allow for assessment of changes in responses over time. A copy of the questionnaire for the 1994 administration is in Appendix A, and a copy of the letters sent to faculty and the return form are shown in Appendix B.

For purposes of the administration of the survey, faculty were defined as all unclassified personnel who had been employed by the University for more than 2 years in a row. Graduate teaching and research assistants were excluded, but part-time and temporary unclassified individuals were included. Individuals in administrative positions were included but local agency personnel (Student Publications, Athletics, and KSU Foundation) were

excluded. From this population, a random sample was selected and asked to participate.

For the initial administration of the survey in the Fall 1990, 345 faculty were sampled of which 207 responded (60%). Each year new respondents are added to the sample to replace faculty who have dropped out of the survey (i.e., have left the university or have requested that they no longer be included in the sample).

### 1994 Survey Results

#### SAMPLE

In the spring of 1994, the survey sample included 270 faculty. A response rate of 78% (210 respondents) was achieved. One change to this year's study is the inclusion of KSU faculty at Salina in the sample.

#### ANALYSIS OF BACKGROUND INFORMATION (PART I)

Table 1 provides demographic information for respondents to the Spring 1994 administration of the survey. In comparing the information in Table 1 to the same information from prior years, the following differences were found:

- (1) Prior samples consisted of a larger percentage of full professors. Although the percentage of full professors increased from 18% in 1993 to 20% in 1994, it is still 9% lower in 1994 than it was in 1991.
- (2) The percentage of respondents reporting that their principal activity was administration decreased from 18% in 1993 to 10% in 1994. In contrast, more respondents indicate that their principal activity is teaching (41% 1993 vs. 52% in 1994).
- (3) Reported efforts toward Extension activities continue to decline (14% in the current sample compared to 15% in 1993 and 21% in 1991).
- (4) The percentage of respondents who indicated that their appointment time was 12 months declined from 61% in 1993 to 55% in 1994.

**Table 1**  
**Background Information on Survey Sample Spring 1994**

|                                    |                               |
|------------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| <u>Principal Activity (N=217):</u> | <u>Present Title (N=217):</u> |
| 10.1% - Administration             | 19.8% - Professor             |
| 52.1% - Teaching                   | 27.6% - Associate Professor   |
| 14.7% - Research                   | 22.1% - Assistant Professor   |
| 15.2% - Extension                  | 17.1% - Instructor            |
| 7.8% - Other                       | 4.1% - Res. Asso./Assist.     |
|                                    | 9.2% - Other                  |

|                                 |                         |
|---------------------------------|-------------------------|
| <u>Tenths Employed (N=216):</u> | <u>Gender (N=216):</u>  |
| Mean = 9.73 (90% ten tenths)    | 66.7% Male 33.3% Female |

|                                |                                     |
|--------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| <u>Highest Degree (N=214):</u> | <u>Years worked at KSU (N=216):</u> |
| 6.1% - BA/BS                   | Mean = 12.2 S.D. = 8.0              |
| 32.7% - Master's               |                                     |
| 61.2% - PhD (or equivalent)    |                                     |

|  |                                       |
|--|---------------------------------------|
|  | <u>Current Annual Salary (N=216):</u> |
|  | Mean = \$43,347 S.D. = \$13,997       |

|                             |                                     |
|-----------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| <u>Average Age (N=214):</u> | <u>Year Degree Granted (N=211):</u> |
| Mean = 45.5 S.D. = 9.3      | 41.2% - Prior to 1980               |
|                             | 58.8% - Since 1980                  |

|                                  |                              |
|----------------------------------|------------------------------|
| <u>Appointment Type (N=213):</u> | <u>Tenure Status (N=214)</u> |
| 45.1% - 9 months                 | 52.8% - Tenured              |
| 54.9% - 12 months                | 17.3 - Tenure Track          |
|                                  | 29.9% - Non-Tenure Track     |

|                               |  |
|-------------------------------|--|
| <u>Employed in a (N=213):</u> |  |
| 86.9% - Permanent position    |  |
| 13.1% - Temporary position    |  |

Average (Mean) Percent of Effort Devoted to (N=217):

|      |   |
|------|---|
| 34.7 | INSTRUCTION -- Teaching, advising, course dev., etc.  |
| 21.4 | CREATIVE WORK -- Scholarship, Research, Art, etc.     |
| 15.9 | SERVICE -- Departmental and Professional service.     |
| 14.5 | EXTENSION -- Ag./Human Eco. Efforts, Con. Ed., Etc.   |
| 10.2 | ADMINISTRATION -- Formal Management Responsibilities. |

|                                      |                           |             |             |            |
|--------------------------------------|---------------------------|-------------|-------------|------------|
| <u>Changes Wanted in Activities:</u> | <u>Percent Responding</u> |             |             |            |
|                                      | <u>More</u>               | <u>Same</u> | <u>Less</u> | <u>(N)</u> |
| INSTRUCTION.....                     | 24.1                      | 58.5        | 17.4        | 195        |
| CREATIVE WORK.....                   | 47.8                      | 41.9        | 10.2        | 186        |
| SERVICE.....                         | 11.5                      | 65.6        | 22.9        | 192        |
| EXTENSION.....                       | 8.8                       | 74.4        | 16.8        | 125        |
| ADMINISTRATION.....                  | 17.6                      | 62.5        | 19.9        | 136        |

Self Reported College/Administrative Unit (N=216):

|                              |                             |
|------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| 19% - Agriculture            | 9% - Human Ecology          |
| 3% - Architecture and Design | 9% - Veterinary Medicine    |
| 21% - Arts and Sciences      | 1% - Extension              |
| 8% - Business Administration | 7% - Other (Administrative) |
| 10% - Education              | 3% - Salina                 |
| 9% - Engineering             |                             |

Average hours (per week) consulting activities N=(166):

|                      |                           |
|----------------------|---------------------------|
| 79.7% - Zero hours   | 1.4% - More than 10 hours |
| 18.8 - 1 to 10 hours |                           |

## ANALYSIS OF ATTITUDES & OPINIONS (PART II)

This section of the report provides tables and a discussion of faculty responses to questions from PART II of the survey. These questions generally remain the same each year, and can be divided into three categories: General Satisfaction, Turnover, and KSU Issues. This year additional analysis was performed to determine whether general satisfaction varied by faculty gender. Using these three categories, differences in 1994 responses will be presented by college/unit, rank, and faculty gender. Please note that the Extension category is not included in the tables this year due to the low response rate for this unit and corresponding issues of confidentiality.

### General Satisfaction Questions

Differences by College/Unit. The results of a comparison of means for all items across the eleven colleges/units indicate that responses to some items did vary significantly by college. Table 2 displays the means for those General Satisfaction items for which significant differences were found. Analysis of the 1994 data identifies 17 items, an increase from 1993, for which significant differences existed. A Scheffe test was used to determine whether the means reported by the 11 colleges/units were significantly different. Statistically significant differences were determined at the  $p < .05$  level. Satisfaction scores for colleges whose means were significantly higher or lower than others are shown in **bold and underlined**.

Analysis of the statistical comparisons between colleges/units revealed that respondents from Architecture, Veterinary Medicine, and the Salina campus expressed lower satisfaction with the leadership quality of their college/unit than other units. Respondents from Architecture, for the second year in a row, and Arts & Sciences reported lower levels of satisfaction with the quality of classroom/lab facilities than other colleges/units. In addition, participants from Arts & Sciences, Business Administration, Education, and Human Ecology indicated significantly lower levels of satisfaction with adequacy of library resources. Although the data showed significant variance among colleges/units for the remaining 14 items, the variance was not great enough to pinpoint specific college/unit(s) that differed from the others.

Differences by Rank. Analysis of General Satisfaction items across the various ranks of the participants indicated that responses to some items did vary significantly by rank. Means for all General Satisfaction items for which significant differences were found by rank are displayed in Table 3.

Similar to 1993 results, respondents at the associate and full professor ranks reported higher levels of satisfaction with job security than other ranks in the sample. In addition, research associates reported less satisfaction with promotion policies in the department than did other ranks in the sample.

**Table 2**  
**Mean College Differences in General Satisfaction**  
 (Means listed only for items showing significant differences)

|                     | AGRICULTURE | ARCHITECTURE | ARTS & SCIENCES | BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION | EDUCATION  | ENGINEERING | HUMAN ECOLOGY | VETERINARY MEDICINE | OTHER | SALINA     |
|---------------------|-------------|--------------|-----------------|-------------------------|------------|-------------|---------------|---------------------|-------|------------|
| 1. Mix Teach/Res    | 3.3         | 2.3          | 2.9             | 3.1                     | 3.1        | 3.2         | 2.6           | 2.7                 | 2.7   | 2.9        |
| 2. KSU Reputation   | 3.3         | 3.0          | 2.8             | 2.7                     | 3.0        | 3.0         | 3.0           | 2.7                 | 2.8   | 3.7        |
| 3. KSU Mission      | 3.1         | 3.0          | 2.7             | 2.6                     | 2.9        | 3.0         | 2.6           | 2.8                 | 2.5   | 3.3        |
| 4. Dep. Lead Qual   | 3.1         | 3.3          | 3.0             | 2.5                     | 2.5        | 2.6         | 2.6           | 2.3                 | 2.3   | 2.4        |
| 5. Col.Lead.Qual.   | 3.0         | <u>1.7</u>   | 2.9             | 2.5                     | 3.4        | 3.2         | 2.6           | <u>2.1</u>          | 2.5   | <u>1.7</u> |
| 6. Colleag Qual.    | 3.5         | 3.1          | 3.2             | 3.0                     | 2.9        | 3.0         | 3.3           | 3.1                 | 2.7   | 3.3        |
| 7. Admin-Fac Rel.   | 2.8         | 2.6          | 2.3             | 2.3                     | 2.6        | 2.6         | 2.4           | 2.4                 | 2.4   | 1.6        |
| 8. Grad. Quality    | 3.3         | 2.6          | 2.6             | 2.8                     | 3.1        | 2.5         | 3.0           | 2.7                 | 3.0   | 3.0        |
| 9. Res. Assist.     | 2.8         | 1.5          | 2.3             | 1.5                     | 2.4        | 2.6         | 2.4           | 2.4                 | 1.3   | 3.0        |
| 10. Off. Sp. Qual.  | 2.9         | 3.0          | 2.4             | 2.8                     | 2.5        | 3.2         | 3.2           | 3.5                 | 2.4   | 3.1        |
| 11. Class/Lab Qual. | 3.0         | <u>1.6</u>   | <u>2.1</u>      | 2.5                     | 2.5        | 2.9         | 2.4           | 3.4                 | 2.3   | 3.1        |
| 12. Travel Support  | 2.7         | 1.7          | 1.8             | 2.9                     | 2.1        | 2.2         | 2.0           | 2.2                 | 1.9   | 2.3        |
| 13. Lib. Res. Qual. | 2.8         | 1.9          | <u>1.7</u>      | <u>1.8</u>              | <u>1.8</u> | 2.5         | <u>1.9</u>    | 2.7                 | 1.8   | 3.4        |
| 14. Comput. Resou.  | 3.0         | 1.8          | 2.4             | 2.6                     | 2.8        | 2.6         | 2.5           | 2.9                 | 2.1   | 3.0        |
| 15. Prof.Trav.Supp. | 2.7         | 1.6          | 1.9             | 2.9                     | 2.1        | 2.0         | 2.1           | 2.2                 | 1.8   | 2.4        |
| 16. Gen. Comp.Supp. | 2.9         | 2.3          | 2.3             | 2.9                     | 3.0        | 2.2         | 2.3           | 2.8                 | 2.0   | 2.4        |
| 17. Unclass. Sal.   | 2.4         | 1.7          | 1.7             | 2.3                     | 2.3        | 2.1         | 2.1           | 1.9                 | 1.7   | 2.1        |

NOTE: Agriculture includes research and extension in the academic departments. Other includes all other individuals, except Extension. Underlined numbers indicate means for units that tended to be significantly lower or higher than others. The scale ranged from 1 (Very Dissatisfied) to 4 (Very Satisfied).

**Table 3**  
**Mean Rank Differences in General Satisfaction**  
 (Means listed only for items showing significant differences)

| <u>Item</u>           | <u>FULL</u> | <u>ASSOC</u> | <u>ASST</u> | <u>INSTR</u> | <u>RES ASSO</u> | <u>OTHER</u> |
|-----------------------|-------------|--------------|-------------|--------------|-----------------|--------------|
| 1. Job Security       | 3.6         | 3.7          | <u>2.8</u>  | <u>2.8</u>   | <u>2.6</u>      | 3.0          |
| 2. Overall KSU Rep    | 2.9         | 2.8          | 3.1         | 3.3          | 3.1             | 3.1          |
| 3. Colleagues Qual.   | 3.1         | 3.1          | 3.0         | 3.5          | 3.6             | 3.4          |
| 4. Teach. Assist.     | 2.6         | 2.3          | 2.4         | 2.6          | 3.0             | 3.6          |
| 5. Travel Support     | 2.0         | 2.2          | 2.1         | 2.6          | 2.0             | 2.8          |
| 6. Promotion Policy   | 2.9         | 2.5          | 2.5         | 2.3          | <u>1.3</u>      | 2.2          |
| 7. Prof. Travel Supp. | 2.0         | 2.1          | 2.2         | 2.6          | 2.3             | 2.6          |

NOTE: Other includes individuals in administrative units or other groups. The scale ranged from: 1 = Very Dissatisfied, 2 = Dissatisfied, 3 = Satisfied, 4 = Very Satisfied. Underlined numbers indicate means for ranks that tended to be significantly lower or higher than others.

Differences by Gender. Table 4 displays three items for which significant gender differences existed after controlling for the effects of salary, college, and rank. In each case, mean satisfaction scores were higher among male respondents. Men were more likely to indicate that they were "somewhat satisfied" with their work load and the adequacy of computer resources, while women reported being "somewhat dissatisfied" in both of these areas. With regard to the quality of library resources, mean scores for both men and women participants fell in the "somewhat dissatisfied range". Please note that data collected by this survey instrument does not provide explanations for why male and female perceptions and opinions differ. The results of the gender analysis may need to be further explored to determine why these differences exist.

**Table 4**  
**Mean Gender Difference in General Satisfaction**  
 (Means listed only for items showing significant differences)

| <u>Item</u>                 | <u>Male</u> | <u>Female</u> |
|-----------------------------|-------------|---------------|
| 1. Work Load                | 2.9         | 2.3           |
| 2. Library Resource Quality | 2.4         | 1.9           |
| 3. Computer Resources       | 2.8         | 2.3           |

Note: The scale ranged from 1 (Very Dissatisfied) to 4 (Very Satisfied).



Turnover Questions

Three items on the survey asked respondents about the likelihood that they would leave KSU to "seek a job in higher education", "seek a job in industry", or "retire". Response categories were "not at all", "somewhat", and "very". These questions were also analyzed to determine if any significant differences existed in responses by college/unit.

Analysis revealed that over 61% of those responding were either somewhat or very likely to seek another job in higher education. No significant differences by college/unit or rank of participant were found for this item. About 43% of participants noted that they were somewhat or very likely to seek a job in industry; a slight increase from last year. Comparisons of responses to this question indicate significant differences by college/unit, rank, and faculty gender. As displayed in Table 5, individuals in Arts & Sciences were least likely to report that they planned to seek another job in industry.

**Table 5**  
**Mean College/Unit Differences in Potential Turnover**  
**(Means listed only for items showing significant differences)**

---

|                      | AGRICULTURE | ARCHITECTURE & DESIGN | ARTS & SCIENCES | BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION | EDUCATION | ENGINEERING | HUMAN ECOLOGY | VETERINARY MEDICINE | OTHER | SALINA |
|----------------------|-------------|-----------------------|-----------------|-------------------------|-----------|-------------|---------------|---------------------|-------|--------|
| 1. Seek Job in Indst | 1.6         | 1.3                   | <u>1.2</u>      | 1.7                     | 1.2       | 1.9         | 2.1           | 1.6                 | 1.6   | 2.1    |

---

NOTE: Agriculture includes research and extension in the academic departments. Other includes all other individuals, except Extension. Underlined numbers indicate means for units that tended to be significantly lower or higher than others. The scale ranged from 1 (Not At All) to 3 (Very Likely).

Table 6 shows that Full and Associate professors were least likely to indicate that they planned to seek another job in industry. Nearly 14% of participants indicated that they would likely retire in the next 3 years. Full professors were more likely to indicate plans to retire than individuals in other ranks.

Differences in the likelihood of male and female respondents seeking another job or retiring was also analyzed. Table 7 displays the one item, seek another job in industry, in which there were significant differences by gender after controlling for salary, college, and rank. Scores for male participants indicated that they were more likely to fall

into the range of "somewhat likely" to seek another job in industry, while women were more likely to report that they were "not at all" likely to take this action.

**Table 6**  
**Mean Rank Differences in Potential Turnover**  
 (Means listed only for items showing significant differences)

| <u>Item</u>             | <u>FULL</u> | <u>ASSOC</u> | <u>ASST</u> | <u>INSTR</u> | <u>RES ASSO</u> | <u>OTHER</u> |
|-------------------------|-------------|--------------|-------------|--------------|-----------------|--------------|
| 1. Seek Job in Industry | <u>1.4</u>  | <u>1.4</u>   | 1.6         | 1.7          | 2.4             | 1.6          |
| 2. Retire               | <u>1.4</u>  | 1.3          | 1.0         | 1.2          | 1.0             | 1.2          |

NOTE: Underlined numbers indicate means for units that tended to be significantly lower or higher than others. The scale ranged from 1 (Not At All) to 3 (Very Likely).

**Table 7**  
**Mean Gender Difference in Turnover**  
 (Means listed only for items showing significant differences)

| <u>Item</u>             | <u>Male</u> | <u>Female</u> |
|-------------------------|-------------|---------------|
| 1. Seek Job in Industry | 1.7         | 1.4           |

NOTE: The scale ranged from 1 (Not At All) to 3 (Very Likely).

### KSU Issues Questions

Eighteen items were grouped under "KSU Issues" and addressed how respondents felt about the emphasis that KSU places on certain issues. In 1993, this section included two new items -- "emphasis on retention of women faculty" and "emphasis on retention of minority faculty". Response categories were: 1 = "way too little"; 2 = "too little"; 3 = "about right"; 4 = "too much"; and 5 = "way too much".

Differences by College/Unit. The mean responses to questions regarding KSU issues were analyzed for significant differences by college/unit. Table 8 reports the findings for those items where significant differences were found. This year statistical differences were identified for five items, a slight decrease from 1993. Despite the significant variation among responses, significantly higher or lower means for specific colleges/units were not identified for any of these questions.

Table 8  
 Mean College Differences in KSU Issues  
 (Means listed only for items showing significant differences)

|                     | AGRICULTURE | ARCHITECTURE | ARTS & SCIENCES | BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION | EDUCATION | ENGINEERING | HUMAN ECOLOGY | VETERINARY MEDICINE | OTHER | SALINA |
|---------------------|-------------|--------------|-----------------|-------------------------|-----------|-------------|---------------|---------------------|-------|--------|
| 1. Part in Govern.  | 2.9         | 2.6          | 2.4             | 2.8                     | 2.9       | 3.0         | 2.4           | 3.0                 | 2.7   | 2.6    |
| 2. Reward extension | 2.1         | 3.0          | 2.8             | 2.7                     | 2.5       | 2.9         | 2.2           | 2.2                 | 2.5   | 3.0    |
| 3. Part in Tenure   | 2.9         | 3.0          | 2.7             | 2.3                     | 2.9       | 2.8         | 2.6           | 2.7                 | 2.9   | 2.3    |
| 3. Part in Promotn  | 2.8         | 3.0          | 2.7             | 2.3                     | 3.0       | 2.7         | 2.5           | 2.7                 | 3.0   | 2.3    |
| 4. Retain Women Fac | 3.0         | 3.0          | 2.5             | 2.7                     | 2.4       | 2.8         | 2.5           | 2.6                 | 1.7   | 3.0    |
| 5. Retain Minor.    | 3.2         | 3.0          | 2.5             | 2.9                     | 2.4       | 2.9         | 2.8           | 2.6                 | 1.9   | 3.3    |

NOTE: Agriculture includes research and extension in the academic departments. Other includes all other individuals, except Extension. The responses ranged from 1 (Way Too Little) to 5 (Way Too Much).

Differences by Rank. Questions regarding KSU issues were also analyzed for significant differences by rank. As presented in Table 9, significant differences in means were identified for only one item. None of the ranks were significantly higher or lower than the others.

Table 9  
 Mean Rank Differences in KSU Issues  
 (Means listed only for items showing significant differences)

| Item                  | FULL | ASSOC | ASST | INSTR | RES ASSO | OTHER |
|-----------------------|------|-------|------|-------|----------|-------|
| 1. Reward for Extensn | 2.8  | 2.5   | 2.5  | 2.5   | 2.1      | 2.1   |

NOTE: Other includes all other individuals. The responses ranged from 1 (Way Too Little) to 5 (Way Too Much).

Differences by Gender. Table 10 presents a comparison of KSU issues by gender. After controlling for salary, college and rank, men and women's opinions differed significantly for five items; work load, recruitment of women and minority faculty, and retention of women and minority faculty.

With regard to the issue of faculty work load, women indicated that it was "too much". In contrast, men reported that faculty work load was more in the range of "about right".

Male faculty were also more likely to say that the recruitment of minority and female faculty was "about right", while women indicated "too little" emphasis in this area. Similarly, men indicated that the emphasis placed on retaining women faculty was about right and that the importance placed on retaining minority faculty was nearing too much. Mean scores for women suggest that the emphasis on retention of women and minority faculty was closer to "way too little". This divergence in perceptions regarding recruiting and retaining female and minority faculty may be related to the fact that, among faculty, men outnumber women 5 to 1. As numerical minorities, female respondents may be more attuned to these issues.

**Table 10**  
**Mean Gender Difference in General Issues**  
**(Means listed only for items showing significant differences)**

| <u>Item</u>                    | <u>Male</u> | <u>Female</u> |
|--------------------------------|-------------|---------------|
| 1. Work Load                   | 3.3         | 4.0           |
| 2. Recruiting Women Faculty    | 3.3         | 1.8           |
| 3. Recruiting Minority Faculty | 3.4         | 1.9           |
| 4. Retaining Women Faculty     | 3.4         | 1.2           |
| 5. Retaining Minority Faculty  | 3.5         | 1.4           |

Note: The responses ranged from 1 (Way Too Little) to 5 (Way Too Much).

### ANALYSIS OF SPECIAL QUESTIONS (PART III)

The questions in this section represent issues that are of special interest during the specific year the survey is administered. In 1994 the committee incorporated twelve statements representing a number of diverse issues into the 1994 questionnaire. Participants were asked to indicate the extent to which they agreed or disagreed (i.e., 1 definitely disagree, 2 somewhat disagree, 3 somewhat agree, 4 definitely agree) with each statement. Responses are summarized in Table 11.

During 1994 there was much legislative debate about whether Washburn University should be admitted into the Regents System. In December of 1993 Governor Finney's proposal to the legislature linked salary increases for regents faculty to the inclusion of Washburn into the regents system. President Wefald supported this proposal because it would accomplish one of his highest priorities, increasing faculty salaries (Janney, 1994). However, an overwhelming percentage (83%) of the survey respondents disagreed with this proposal. Sixty percent of the participants indicated that they "definitely disagreed".

Another issue which has been debated by the Kansas legislature in recent years is that of admissions standards for students who want to attend state institutions of higher education. Although the legislature has continued to support the current policy of open admission to all residents of

Kansas, 80% of the sample agreed that admissions standards should be implemented for new KSU students. Nearly half of the respondents "definitely agreed" with this proposal.

In a related question, survey participants were asked whether they agreed or disagreed that the quality of students at K-State is improving. In response to this question, approximately 53% of the sample disagreed and 47% agreed. Respondents appeared to feel less strongly about this issue than others, indicating "somewhat agree/disagree" much more often than "definitely agree/disagree".

The fourth question addressed the need for a collective bargaining unit at KSU. Participant answers to this question were more evenly split among the four response categories. However, over half of the sample (56%) disagreed that a collective bargaining unit should be created, with nearly 30% saying they "definitely disagreed".

Another concern for a number of departments on campus has been whether departmental faculty should be allowed to decide whether they are governed by heads or chairs. The two positions are differentiated by a Faculty Senate Resolution as follows: "chairs serve the faculty with the concurrence of the Dean, and heads serve the Dean with the concurrence of the faculty (Kansas State University Faculty Senate Minutes, 1993). In February 1994 Faculty Senate voted to establish the following amended policy: "By a 2/3 vote of its faculty, a unit, with the concurrence of the Dean of the College and the Provost, and within the mission of the College, may adopt specific policies concerning such matters as the selection, retention, evaluation, and job description of the Unit Administrator" (Kansas State University Faculty Senate Minutes, 1994). Nearly 78% of the survey respondents indicated that they agreed that faculty should have a choice in this matter.

Over the past two years both faculty and students have been debating whether KSU should adopt a plus/minus grading system. In May 1993 Faculty Senate approved a proposal which would have instituted a plus/minus grading system beginning Fall 1994. Students' opposition to the proposed grading system resulted in a student-initiated petition which garnered signatures from nearly 20% of the student body. Faculty Senate reversed their earlier decision in February 1994 by voting to repeal legislation which would have enacted the new grading system (Ernst, 1994). Nearly 62% of the survey participants disagreed with the proposed plus/minus grading system, with almost 37% "definitely disagreeing".

The seventh question dealt with whether KSU should switch to a pay-by-the-credit-hour tuition plan. The Kansas Board of Regents postponed a move to per-credit-hour pricing at KSU and KU in November 1993. Under the proposed tuition schedule, changes in the pricing system would have resulted in revenue losses, adding to existing budget strain (January, 1993). Currently undergraduate students who are Kansas residents and enrolled in 6 or fewer credit hours pay \$55 per credit hour. Undergraduate students enrolled in 7 or more credit hours pay a set fee of \$825. A majority of respondents (61%) agreed that KSU should adopt a pay-by-the-credit-hour tuition plan.

Table 11  
Analysis of Special Questions

| Item   | Percentages       |                   |                |                |
|--|-------------------|-------------------|----------------|----------------|
|  | Definite Disagree | Somewhat Disagree | Somewhat Agree | Definite Agree |
| 1. Washburn Admittance to Regents System         | 60.3%             | 22.9%             | 12.1%          | 4.7%           |
| 2. Implementation of Admission Standards         | 8.9               | 10.7              | 31.8           | 48.6           |
| 3. Quality of Students Improving                 | 9.1               | 42.8              | 45.2           | 2.9            |
| 4. Creation of Collective Bargain Unit           | 29.8              | 26.3              | 23.9           | 20.0           |
| 5. Faculty Choose Governance by Heads or Chairs  | 9.2               | 13.1              | 40.3           | 37.4           |
| 6. KSU Adopt Plus/Minus Grading System           | 36.8              | 24.9              | 20.6           | 17.7           |
| 7. Adoption of Pay-by-Credit Hour                | 13.1              | 25.8              | 43.4           | 17.7           |
| 8a. Faculty Tuition Waiver                       | 3.7               | 5.6               | 30.2           | 60.5           |
| b. University Employee Spouse Tuition Waiver     | 5.1               | 13.4              | 30.6           | 50.9           |
| c. University Employee Children Tuition Waiver   | 6.9               | 14.4              | 26.4           | 52.3           |
| 9. Lafene Fees Optional for Part-time Students   | 3.9               | 15.2              | 34.8           | 46.1           |
| 10. Pursue Network Linkages for Library Journals | 7.1               | 10.9              | 43.1           | 38.9           |
| 11. Build a Parking Garage                       | 15.7              | 22.4              | 30.0           | 31.9           |
| 12. Allow Credit Card Solicitation on Campus     | 64.3              | 24.8              | 9.5            | 1.4            |

Another issue addressed in this section is tuition waivers for faculty and university employee spouses and children. The sample indicated overwhelming support for faculty tuition waivers. Over 90% of the sample agreed that faculty should receive tuition waivers. Approximately 82% of the respondents supported the proposal to provide tuition waivers to university employee spouses; and nearly 79% of participants indicated support for tuition waivers for university employee children. Over 50% of the sample definitely agreed with each of these proposals.

When asked whether Lafene fees (health service) should be assessed of part-time students who are covered by other health insurance policies, nearly 81% of the sample agreed that part-time students meeting this criteria should not be assessed Lafene fees.

The tenth question in this section originated from a growing concern regarding how to fund the increased cost of subscriptions to academic journals. In recent years, average subscription prices have been increasing much faster than average acquisition budgets. KSU departments were asked to put together lists of serials which could be cancelled in 1992 and 1993. According to Brice Hobrock, dean of Farrell Library, "One possible solution to this crisis is for universities to bypass publishers and establish electronically distributed journals on their own" (Diebel, 1994). When asked whether Farrell Library should investigate network linkages for journal access, rather than endeavor to subscribe to all/most academic journals, 82% of the sample agreed.

The lack of parking on campus has been criticized by faculty and students in recent years. One proposed solution, which has been discussed over the last several years, is the construction of a parking garage. Approximately 61% of the 1994 survey respondents agreed that KSU should build a parking garage. Nearly one-third of the sample definitely agreed to this proposal.

The final issue addressed in the special question section is whether credit card solicitation should be allowed on campus. A majority of survey respondents (89%) disagreed with the current policy which allows on-campus credit card solicitation.

#### Comparison of 1994 Results to Prior Years

This section of the report compares the results of the 1994 administration of the survey with the results from 1991 and 1993. Two new questions were added to the KSU Issues section in 1993. With the exception of these questions, the comparisons between this year's administration and past administrations of the survey will include 1991, 1993 and 1994.

General Satisfaction -- The 34 items in the general satisfaction section were divided into four subsections: University Mission and Leadership, Personal Rewards and Recognition, Instructional and Departmental Concerns, and University Support Services and Resources. For ease of explanation, comparisons were completed using these groupings. Please note that the means corresponding to the 1991 and 1993 administrations of the survey will be slightly different from last year because disparate subsets of individuals are used in this year's analysis, depending on who answered the questionnaire during the last three consecutive years.

Table 12 presents the means and standard deviations for the 8 questions concerning Satisfaction with the University Mission and Leadership. Analysis of variance results showed that no significant differences existed across the last three administrations of the survey, indicating that the levels of satisfaction with leadership and mission issues have not changed significantly in the last three years. In examining the means, all but three of the items showed slightly positive (satisfactory) levels. The items concerning the "relationship between administration and faculty" and the "quality of research facilities" have stayed at or below the scale midpoint of 2.5. The average satisfaction score for "leadership quality of Faculty Senate" dropped from 2.8 in 1993 to 2.5 in 1994.

Further analysis revealed that over one third (39%) of the sample continued to report that they were "somewhat" to "very dissatisfied" with the Quality of Leadership at the All-University Level. Over one third of the

**Table 12**  
**Comparison of Leadership Items Over Time**

| Item No. | Description                 | 1991          | 1993          | 1994          |
|----------|-----------------------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|
| 1h.      | Overall reputation of KSU   | 3.0<br>(.88)  | 3.0<br>(.80)  | 3.0<br>(.78)  |
| 1i.      | KSU mission/philosophy      | 2.8<br>(.84)  | 2.7<br>(.87)  | 2.8<br>(.68)  |
| 1k.      | College lead quality        | 2.7<br>(.99)  | 2.7<br>(1.03) | 2.7<br>(1.01) |
| 1l.      | KSU lead quality            | 2.4<br>(.87)  | 2.5<br>(.88)  | 2.6<br>(.87)  |
| 1n.      | Faculty Senate quality      | 2.7<br>(.87)  | 2.8<br>(.81)  | 2.5<br>(.74)  |
| 1o.      | Admin/Faculty relations     | 2.5<br>(.84)  | 2.4<br>(.84)  | 2.4<br>(.78)  |
| 1p.      | Interdepart cooperation     | 2.6<br>(.71)  | 2.6<br>(.76)  | 2.6<br>(.81)  |
| 1q.      | Research facilities quality | 2.4<br>(1.21) | 2.3<br>(.94)  | 2.2<br>(.96)  |

Note: Numbers shown in parenthesis are standard deviations. The response categories ranged from Very Dissatisfied ("1") to Very Satisfied ("4"). None of the means for items in this group was found to be significantly different over the last three administrations of the survey.

respondents also indicated some level of dissatisfaction with the Quality of Faculty Senate. The percent of respondents reporting they were "somewhat" to "very dissatisfied" with the Relationship between Administration and Faculty increased from over 40% to over 50%. Meanwhile, the percentage of faculty who indicated they were "somewhat" to "very dissatisfied" with the Quality of Their Research Facilities and Support remains near 50%. Changes in the response patterns for the questions were not great enough to significantly alter the overall mean.

Table 13 displays the means and standard deviations for the 7 items assessing Faculty Satisfaction with Personal Rewards and Recognition. In comparing across years, the analysis revealed significant differences for only one item, "promotion policies". Satisfaction with promotion policies has increased slightly from the last administrations of the survey. The remaining 6 items showed no significant change in satisfaction level from prior years, although the means decreased for two items, "opportunity for advancement" and "salary". In general, means for all of the remaining items fell between "somewhat dissatisfied" to "somewhat satisfied".



**Table 13**  
**Comparison of Satisfaction with Recognition**

| Item No. | Description                   | 1991          | 1993          | 1994                |
|----------|-------------------------------|---------------|---------------|---------------------|
| 1a.      | Job security                  | 3.2<br>(.98)  | 3.2<br>(.90)  | 3.3<br>(.88)        |
| 1d.      | Mix of teach/research/ser/adm | 3.0<br>(.98)  | 2.9<br>(.96)  | 2.9<br>(.85)        |
| 1e.      | Opportunity for advancement   | 2.5<br>(1.02) | 2.5<br>(1.05) | 2.3<br>(.97)        |
| 1x.      | Salary                        | 2.4<br>(.86)  | 2.4<br>(.97)  | 2.3<br>(.96)        |
| 1z.      | Promotion policies            | 2.7<br>(1.17) | 2.5<br>(.95)  | <u>2.6</u><br>(.98) |
| 1bb.     | Work load                     | 2.7<br>(.82)  | 2.5<br>(.96)  | 2.6<br>(.89)        |
| 1cc.     | Consulting freedom            | 3.1<br>(1.10) | 3.0<br>(.84)  | 3.0<br>(.88)        |

Note: Numbers shown in parenthesis are standard deviations. The response categories ranged from Very Dissatisfied ("1") to Very Satisfied ("4"). Underlined numbers represent means found to be significantly higher or lower than others.

Table 14 presents the means and standard deviations for the 8 items that measured Satisfaction with Instructional and Departmental Concerns. The comparison across years showed differences in the means for "course content autonomy" ( $p < .08$ ) to be approaching significance. Although faculty continue to be satisfied with their autonomy regarding course content, the level of satisfaction has decreased since the 1993 administration of the survey.

Satisfaction with "research assistance" and the "teaching evaluation system" continue to receive the lowest ratings for items related to department concerns. In both areas faculty tend to be more dissatisfied than satisfied. Over 55% (an increase from 45% in 1993) of the participants indicated some dissatisfaction with research assistance. Similar to 1993, about 55% of the sample reported dissatisfaction with the current teaching evaluation system. With the exception of teaching assistance, the remaining items showed means between "somewhat satisfied" to "very satisfied". The mean for teaching assistance fell between "somewhat dissatisfied" and "somewhat satisfied".

**Table 14**  
**Comparison of Satisfaction with Department Concerns**

| Item No. | Description                   | 1991          | 1993          | 1994          |
|----------|-------------------------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|
| 1b.      | Course autonomy               | 3.4<br>(.72)  | 3.4<br>(.84)  | 3.3<br>(.75)  |
| 1c.      | Course content autonomy       | 3.7<br>(.65)  | 3.7<br>(.57)  | 3.6<br>(.60)  |
| 1j.      | Department leadership quality | 3.0<br>(.95)  | 2.9<br>(.94)  | 2.8<br>(1.01) |
| 1r.      | Undergraduate quality         | 2.8<br>(.83)  | 2.8<br>(.79)  | 2.8<br>(.74)  |
| 1s.      | Graduate student quality      | 2.9<br>(.82)  | 3.0<br>(.83)  | 2.8<br>(.88)  |
| 1t.      | Teaching assistance           | 2.6<br>(1.03) | 2.6<br>(1.05) | 2.5<br>(.98)  |
| 1u.      | Research assistance           | 2.4<br>(1.24) | 2.3<br>(.99)  | 2.2<br>(.97)  |
| 1aa.     | Teaching evaluation system    | 2.5<br>(.91)  | 2.3<br>(.89)  | 2.3<br>(.90)  |

Note: Numbers shown in parenthesis are standard deviations. The response categories ranged from Very Dissatisfied ("1") to Very Satisfied ("4"). None of the means for items in this group was found to be significantly different over the last three administrations of the survey.

Table 15 displays the means and standard deviations for the 7 items related to Satisfaction with University Support Services and Resources. No significant differences were found across the last three years of study. Respondent means fell in the range of "somewhat satisfied" for "availability of support services and equipment", the "quality of office space", and with the "adequacy of computing resources". Satisfaction ratings for "spousal employment opportunities" and the "quality of classrooms and labs" fell between "somewhat satisfied" and "somewhat dissatisfied". Survey participants continue to be most dissatisfied with "adequacy of library resources" and "travel support".

**Table 15**  
**Comparison of Satisfaction with Other Support**

| Item No. | Description                  | 1991          | 1993          | 1994          |
|----------|------------------------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|
| 1f.      | Support services             | 2.6<br>(1.06) | 2.5<br>(1.00) | 2.7<br>(.99)  |
| 1g.      | Spouse employ opportunities  | 2.8<br>(1.25) | 2.6<br>(1.12) | 2.5<br>(1.00) |
| 1v.      | Office space quality         | 2.9<br>(.95)  | 2.9<br>(1.05) | 2.8<br>(1.05) |
| 1w.      | Classroom/labs quality       | 2.6<br>(.98)  | 2.5<br>(1.04) | 2.5<br>(.94)  |
| 1y.      | Travel support               | 2.2<br>(1.07) | 2.1<br>(1.06) | 2.1<br>(1.07) |
| 1dd.     | Library resources adequacy   | 2.2<br>(.95)  | 2.2<br>(.85)  | 2.1<br>(.80)  |
| 1ee.     | Computing resources adequacy | 2.6<br>(.97)  | 2.6<br>(.83)  | 2.6<br>(.82)  |

Note: Numbers shown in parenthesis are standard deviations. The response categories ranged from Very Dissatisfied ("1") to Very Satisfied ("4"). None of the means for items in this group was found to be significantly different over the last three administrations of the survey.

KSU Issues. This portion of the questionnaire is comprised of 16 questions concerning views on a wide variety of issues at KSU. The questions were divided into 5 subsections: 1) Faculty Workload/Instruction and Service Rewards/Administrative Support (seven questions), 2) Faculty Participation in University Governance (four questions), 3) Rewards and Values Placed on Faculty Research and Consulting (three questions), 4) Minority Recruiting (two questions) and Minority Retention (two questions). Participants were asked to respond using a five point scale ranging from "way too little", "too little", "about right", "too much", and "way too much".

Table 16 presents the means and standard deviations for the 7 questions in the Faculty Workload/Instruction and Service Rewards/Administrative Support subsection. There were no significant differences found across the three administrations of the survey. Respondents continue to indicate that "faculty workload" and "resources allocated to administrative functions" were closer to "too much" than "about right". In addition, participants report again that "too little" reward is being given for teaching and undergraduate advising. Rewards for graduate advising, extension, and service tend to be assessed somewhere between "too little" and "about right".

Table 16  
Comparison of Work Load

| Item No. | Description                  | 1991         | 1993          | 1994          |
|----------|------------------------------|--------------|---------------|---------------|
| 3b.      | Faculty work load            | 3.8<br>(.76) | 3.7<br>(.79)  | 3.6<br>(.79)  |
| 3c.      | Reward for undergrad advsng  | 2.0<br>(.73) | 2.3<br>(.79)  | 2.3<br>(.80)  |
| 3d.      | Reward for grad advising     | 2.2<br>(.81) | 2.5<br>(.69)  | 2.5<br>(.81)  |
| 3f.      | Reward for extension         | 2.3<br>(.83) | 2.5<br>(.89)  | 2.5<br>(.86)  |
| 3g.      | Reward for service           | 2.2<br>(.80) | 2.8<br>(1.02) | 2.7<br>(1.01) |
| 3j.      | Reward for teaching          | 2.1<br>(.77) | 2.1<br>(.92)  | 2.0<br>(.84)  |
| 3n.      | Resources for administration | 3.8<br>(.97) | 3.9<br>(1.10) | 4.1<br>(.76)  |

Note: Numbers shown in parenthesis are standard deviations. The response categories ranged from Way Too Little ("1") to Way Too Much ("5"). None of the means for items in this group was found to be significantly different over the last three administrations of the survey.

Table 17 shows the means and standard deviations for the 4 items related to opinions concerning Faculty Participation in University Governance. Comparative analysis of the data shows that there were no significant changes over the three years. Mean satisfaction with faculty "participation in tenure" and "participation in promotion decisions" increased slightly, moving closer to "about right". All four items had a mean response between "Too Little" and "About Right". A majority of participants reported that the levels of faculty participation was "about right" for each of these items.

**Table 17**  
**Comparison of Participation Issues**

| Item No. | Description                 | 1991         | 1993         | 1994         |
|----------|-----------------------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|
| 3a.      | Participation in governing  | 2.5<br>(.71) | 2.8<br>(.67) | 2.8<br>(.86) |
| 3h.      | Part in tenure decisions    | 2.8<br>(.61) | 2.7<br>(.64) | 2.8<br>(.68) |
| 3i.      | Part in promotion decisions | 2.8<br>(.65) | 2.7<br>(.73) | 2.8<br>(.72) |
| 3l.      | Value of academic freedom   | 2.8<br>(.65) | 2.8<br>(.68) | 2.8<br>(.65) |

Note: Numbers shown in parenthesis are standard deviations. The response categories ranged from Way Too Little ("1") to Way Too Much ("5"). None of the means for items in this group was found to be significantly different over the last three administrations of the survey.

Table 18 presents the means and standard deviations for the 3 items measuring the Value Placed on Faculty Research and Consulting. Although there was some variation in means over the last three administrations, the changes were not statistically significant. Survey respondents indicate that their "freedom to do outside consulting" and the "value placed on consulting" were "about right". However, the mean associated with the "reward for creative work" continues to move toward the "too much" category. Approximately 53% of the sample felt that rewards for creative work were "too much" or "way too much".

**Table 18**  
**Comparison of Research and Consulting Value Issues**

| Item No. | Description              | 1991         | 1993         | 1994         |
|----------|--------------------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|
| 3e.      | Consulting Freedom       | 2.8<br>(.67) | 2.8<br>(.68) | 2.9<br>(.57) |
| 3k.      | Reward for creative work | 3.1<br>(.94) | 3.6<br>(.95) | 3.7<br>(.91) |
| 3m.      | Value of consulting      | 2.9<br>(.74) | 3.0<br>(.82) | 2.9<br>(.61) |

Note: Numbers shown in parenthesis are standard deviations. The response categories ranged from Way Too Little ("1") to Way Too Much ("5"). None of the means for items in this group was found to be significantly different over the last three administrations of the survey.

Table 19 shows the two items dealing with the degree of emphasis given to the Recruitment of Women and Minorities. Analysis of the data indicates that there was no significant differences across the last three administrations of the survey for either item. However, the mean for "recruiting minority faculty" did increase from 2.8 in 1993 to 3.0; suggesting the emphasis was "about right". The mean for "recruiting women faculty" remained constant, with over 50% of the sample indicating that the emphasis in this area was "about right".

**Table 19**  
**Comparison of Recruiting Issues**

| Item No. | Description                 | 1991          | 1993          | 1994          |
|----------|-----------------------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|
| 3o.      | Recruiting women faculty    | 2.8<br>(.89)  | 2.8<br>(.99)  | 2.8<br>(.99)  |
| 3q.      | Recruiting minority faculty | 2.8<br>(1.00) | 2.8<br>(1.08) | 3.0<br>(1.12) |

Note: Numbers shown in parenthesis are standard deviations. The response categories ranged from Way Too Little ("1") to Way Too Much ("5"). None of the means for items in this group was found to be significantly different over the last three administrations of the survey.

Table 20 shows the two items dealing with the degree of emphasis given to the Retention of Women and Minorities. These two questions were added in 1993. While analysis of the data indicates a slight shift in means during past two administrations, these changes are not statistically significant. Overall means indicated that the emphasis placed on the "retention of women and minority faculty" is approaching "about right". However, nearly 40% of respondents reported that the emphasis on retaining both minority and women faculty was "too little" or "way too little". One should note that patterns in faculty attitudes regarding these two items cannot be discerned from just two years of data.

**Table 20**  
**Comparison of Retention Issues**

| Item No. | Description                | 1993          | 1994          |
|----------|----------------------------|---------------|---------------|
| 3p.      | Retaining women faculty    | 2.7<br>(1.01) | 2.6<br>(1.04) |
| 3r.      | Retaining minority faculty | 2.7<br>(1.27) | 2.8<br>(1.13) |

Note: Numbers shown in parenthesis are standard deviations. The response categories ranged from Way Too Little ("1") to Way Too Much ("5"). None of the means for items in this group was found to be significantly different over the last three administrations of the survey.

## Discussion

This report provides insight into the attitudes of unclassified personnel towards KSU and their work, and opinions concerning important issues at KSU. The Faculty Morale and Satisfaction survey has been administered for four years and trends in participant attitudes are becoming apparent. This discussion will summarize the findings of this report following the format from the questionnaire: General Satisfaction, KSU Issues, and Special Questions.

### General Satisfaction

These questions were divided into four subsections: University Mission and Leadership, Personal Rewards and Recognition, Instructional and Departmental Concerns, and University Support Services and Resources. Similar to last year, the means for all items concerning general satisfaction did not experience any significant change from the prior administrations of the survey. Specific findings will be discussed by subsection.

Respondents' Satisfaction with the University Mission and Leadership continues to be somewhat mixed. In general, survey participants are most satisfied with the overall reputation of KSU and are least satisfied with the quality of research facilities and administrative/faculty relations. KSU's mission, college leadership, quality of KSU leadership, and inter-departmental cooperation all tended to receive ratings which were closer to "somewhat satisfied" than to "somewhat dissatisfied". Mean ratings for the quality of Faculty Senate fell at the midpoint of the satisfaction-dissatisfaction scale. Further examination of the data indicates that participants in Architecture and Design, Veterinary Medicine and Salina were more dissatisfied with the leadership of their college than the other colleges/units.

Participant ratings of Satisfaction with Personal Rewards and Recognition also varied. Job security and consulting freedom received the highest satisfaction ratings, indicating that respondents were somewhat satisfied in these areas. In contrast, the sample was least satisfied with opportunities for advancement and salaries. Participants tended to lean toward "somewhat satisfied" with regard to their mix of teaching, research, service and administration; promotion policies; and work load. Predictably, full and associate professors were found to be more satisfied with job security than others in the sample. Research associates were least satisfied with promotion policies. Gender analysis indicates that female respondents were less satisfied with faculty work loads than their male counterparts.

Some of the items related to Satisfaction with Instructional and Departmental Concerns received the highest ratings of all the general satisfaction questions. Respondents were "somewhat satisfied" with course autonomy and were leaning toward being "very satisfied" about their course content autonomy. However, satisfaction was lowest for research assistance and the teaching evaluation system, with ratings for both falling in the "somewhat dissatisfied" range. Means for department leadership quality, undergraduate student quality, and graduate student quality were in the "somewhat satisfied" range, while means for teaching assistance fell at the midpoint of the satisfaction-dissatisfaction scale. There were no specific differences between particular colleges/units, ranks, or faculty gender on these items. While most of the items in this subsection appear to be

receiving lower satisfaction ratings (becoming less positive), analysis did not reveal any significant differences.

With regard to Satisfaction with University Support Services and Resources, respondents appear to be the least satisfied with some of the items comprising this category. While quality of office space received ratings nearing "somewhat satisfied", participants were "somewhat dissatisfied" with travel support and the adequacy of library resources. Ratings for support services and computing resources adequacy were in the "somewhat satisfied" range. Means for spousal employment opportunities and the quality of classrooms and labs fell on the midpoint of the 4-point scale. With regard to distinctions between colleges/units, Architecture & Design and Arts & Sciences were the least satisfied with the quality of classroom/lab facilities. In addition, Arts & Sciences, Business Administration, Education, and Human Ecology had significantly lower mean satisfaction ratings for the quality of library resources compared to the other colleges/units. With regard to gender, men were more satisfied than women with the quality of library resources and the adequacy of computer resources.

Similar to last year, mean ratings suggest that, in addition to Salina, respondents in the Colleges of Agriculture, Education, and Engineering are more satisfied than those in other colleges/units. In contrast, participants in the Colleges of Architecture & Design, Arts & Sciences, Extension, and Other appear to be the least satisfied. Male participants were more satisfied than females with the quality of library resources and the adequacy of computer resources.

#### **Turnover Issues**

Respondents were asked three questions regarding the likelihood of their seeking another job or retiring. A majority of respondents indicated that they were "somewhat" or "very likely" to seek another job in higher education. With regard to seeking another job in industry, respondents in the College of Arts & Sciences were least likely to indicate that they intended to pursue another job in industry. Moreover, Full and Associate professors were also least likely to indicate that they would pursue this option. Men were more likely to indicate that they planned to seek other job opportunities in industry. Responses to a question on retirement indicated that Full professors were more likely to seek this option.

#### **KSU Issues**

These issues were divided into four subsections: Workload issues, Participation in Governance issues, Value Placed on Research and Consulting issues, and Recruiting and Retention issues. The discussion will follow these subsections.

With regard to issues related to Workload, participant responses have changed very little. Respondents continued to feel that "too little" emphasis was being placed on activities unrelated to research, such as teaching, graduate advising, extension work, and service. Given the low rating, the sample felt this was especially true of teaching. Respondents continued to indicate that too many resources were being targeted for administration and that faculty workloads were too high. Analysis of gender differences in respondent opinions indicates that women feel the faculty workload is too heavy.



Responses to questions related to Participation in Issues indicate that faculty were generally satisfied with their participation in governance, tenure and promotion decisions, and the value placed on academic freedom.

Ratings for issues concerning the Value Placed on Research and Consulting indicate that respondents continued to feel that "too much" emphasis was being placed on research and creative work. This is not surprising, since these activities have received more emphasis from administration in the last few years and appear to count more heavily in tenure and promotion decisions than they have in the past. Respondents reported that the value placed on consulting and the freedom to do outside consulting was "about right".

For items related to Recruiting Issues, the report suggests that, overall, respondents feel that the amount of emphasis being placed on recruiting minority faculty is "about right" and that emphasis on recruiting women is moving closer to "about right". Further analysis shows a divergence in opinions by gender. Women believe the emphasis on recruitment of minorities and women is "too little", while men feel the emphasis in this area is "about right".

Finally, with regard to Retention Issues, overall respondent ratings indicate that the emphasis placed on the retention of women and minorities is closer to "about right" than "too little". However, further examination of the data shows that respondents in Education and Other feel that "too little" is being done to retain women and minority faculty. Women are also more likely to indicate that "too little" emphasis is placed on retaining women and minority faculty.

### Special Questions

In 1994 the special questions covered a number of different issues. In general, a majority of participants did not support the following proposals:

- the admission of Washburn into the regents system,
- the creation of a collective bargaining unit,
- adoption of a plus/minus grading system, and
- credit card solicitation on campus.

A majority of respondents did support the following proposals:

- implementation of admission standards for new KSU students,
- allowing departmental faculty to decide whether they are governed by heads or chairs,
- adoption of a pay-by-the-credit-hour tuition plan,
- waiver of tuition for faculty and university employee spouses and children,
- exempting part-time students who are covered by other health insurance policies from paying Lafene fees,
- investigating network linkages for journal access, rather than trying to subscribe to all/most academic journals, and
- construction of a parking garage.

The sample was almost evenly split over the question of whether the quality of students at KSU was improving. However, the majority of respondents (52%) disagreed with this statement.

## Conclusions

This report ends with the following cautions: As with any survey study, there are limitations to how one should interpret and utilize the results of this effort. Through this survey process, we now know more about how faculty and other employees feel about working at KSU, but, by no means, do we have all of the information. This survey should not be used as the sole basis for decisions made at KSU, but as one piece of input into the decision making process. The specific findings of this survey should promote more discussion and communication to better understand the meanings of responses. Only through such discussion can any problems be solved.

## KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY 1994 FACULTY ATTITUDE SURVEY

Directions: The Faculty Senate is conducting an annual survey of the faculty. We would like for you to take some time and complete this form. Thank you for your time and effort.

**PART I -- BACKGROUND**

1. What is your principal activity in your current KSU position?  
 Administration  
 Teaching  
 Research  
 Extension  
 Other
2. What is your present title?  
 Professor  
 Associate Professor  
 Assistant Professor  
 Instructor  
 Research Asso./Assist.  
 Other
3. How many tenths are you employed?  
 \_\_\_\_\_
4. What is your gender?  
 Male  Female
5. What is your highest degree?  
 BA/BS  
 MA/MS  
 PhD or equivalent
6. What year did you receive your highest degree?  
 \_\_\_\_\_
7. How many years have you worked at KSU (include all employment)? \_\_\_\_\_
8. What is your age?  
 \_\_\_\_\_
9. What is your current annual salary? \_\_\_\_\_
10. What is your appointment?  
 9 months  12 months
11. Are you employed as a ...?  
 Permanent employee  
 Temporary employee
12. Are you ...?  
 Tenured  
 Tenure Track  
 Non Tenure Track
13. Based on your last departmental evaluation, what percent of your effort are you to devote to the following activities (please make numbers add to 100%)? If percentages are not a part of your formal evaluation, please make your best estimate as to departmental expectations.
 

| PERCENTAGE | ACTIVITY   |
|------------|--|
| _____      | 1. INSTRUCTION -- Teaching, advising, course dev., etc.  |
| _____      | 2. CREATIVE WORK -- Scholarship, Research, Art, etc.     |
| _____      | 3. SERVICE -- Departmental and Professional service.     |
| _____      | 4. EXTENSION -- Ag/Hum. Eco. Efforts, Contin. Ed., Etc.  |
| _____      | 5. ADMINISTRATION -- Formal Management Responsibilities. |
14. If you could change your responsibilities here at KSU, would you want to do, More, Less, or About the Same Amount of each of the following (circle the appropriate numbers)? Use the same definitions as in the previous question.
 

|                     | More<br>of this | Same amount<br>of this as<br>I do now | Less<br>of this |
|---------------------|-----------------|---------------------------------------|-----------------|
| INSTRUCTION.....    | 1               | 2                                     | 3               |
| CREATIVE WORK.....  | 1               | 2                                     | 3               |
| SERVICE.....        | 1               | 2                                     | 3               |
| EXTENSION.....      | 1               | 2                                     | 3               |
| ADMINISTRATION..... | 1               | 2                                     | 3               |
15. What is your college? \_\_\_\_\_

(CONTINUED ON NEXT PAGE)

16. What is your department? \_\_\_\_\_

17. On the average, how many hours per week do you spend in consulting activities outside the University? \_\_\_\_\_

**PART II -- GENERAL ATTITUDES**

1. For each of the following questions please indicate how satisfied/dissatisfied you are about your job at KSU by circling the appropriate codes. Use the following scale.

1=Very Dissatisfied; 2=Somewhat Dissatisfied;  
3=Somewhat Satisfied; 4=Very Satisfied  
DNA=Does Not Apply

|   | <u>SATISFACTION</u> |   |   |   |     |
|---|---------------------|---|---|---|-----|
|   | 1                   | 2 | 3 | 4 |     |
| a. My job security . . . . .  | 1                   | 2 | 3 | 4 | DNA |
| b. The authority I have to make decisions about what courses I teach . . . . .                        | 1                   | 2 | 3 | 4 | DNA |
| c. The authority I have to make decisions about content and methods in the courses I teach . . . . .  | 1                   | 2 | 3 | 4 | DNA |
| d. The mix of teaching, research, service and administration I have . . . . .                         | 1                   | 2 | 3 | 4 | DNA |
| e. Opportunity for advancement at KSU . . . . .   | 1                   | 2 | 3 | 4 | DNA |
| f. Availability to me of support services and equipment (include clerical, computers, etc.) . . . . . | 1                   | 2 | 3 | 4 | DNA |
| g. Employment opportunities for my spouse in this area . . . . .                                      | 1                   | 2 | 3 | 4 | DNA |
| h. Overall reputation of KSU . . . . .  | 1                   | 2 | 3 | 4 | DNA |
| i. Institutional mission or philosophy . . . . .  | 1                   | 2 | 3 | 4 | DNA |
| j. Leadership quality in department . . . . .   | 1                   | 2 | 3 | 4 | DNA |
| k. Leadership quality in college . . . . .  | 1                   | 2 | 3 | 4 | DNA |
| l. Leadership quality at KSU . . . . .  | 1                   | 2 | 3 | 4 | DNA |
| m. Quality of my colleagues . . . . .   | 1                   | 2 | 3 | 4 | DNA |
| n. Leadership quality of Faculty Senate . . . . .   | 1                   | 2 | 3 | 4 | DNA |
| o. Relationship between administration and faculty . . . . .  | 1                   | 2 | 3 | 4 | DNA |
| p. Interdepartmental cooperation at KSU . . . . .   | 1                   | 2 | 3 | 4 | DNA |
| q. Quality of my research facilities and support . . . . .  | 1                   | 2 | 3 | 4 | DNA |
| r. Quality of undergraduate students in my department . . . . .                                       | 1                   | 2 | 3 | 4 | DNA |
| s. Quality of graduate students in my department . . . . .  | 1                   | 2 | 3 | 4 | DNA |
| t. The teaching assistance I receive . . . . .  | 1                   | 2 | 3 | 4 | DNA |
| u. The research assistance I receive . . . . .  | 1                   | 2 | 3 | 4 | DNA |
| v. Quality of my office space . . . . .   | 1                   | 2 | 3 | 4 | DNA |
| w. Quality of classrooms and labs . . . . .   | 1                   | 2 | 3 | 4 | DNA |
| x. My salary . . . . .  | 1                   | 2 | 3 | 4 | DNA |
| y. Travel support I receive . . . . .   | 1                   | 2 | 3 | 4 | DNA |
| z. Promotion policies in my department . . . . .  | 1                   | 2 | 3 | 4 | DNA |
| aa. The teaching evaluation system . . . . .  | 1                   | 2 | 3 | 4 | DNA |
| bb. My work load in general . . . . .   | 1                   | 2 | 3 | 4 | DNA |
| cc. My freedom to do consulting . . . . .   | 1                   | 2 | 3 | 4 | DNA |
| dd. Adequacy of library resources . . . . .   | 1                   | 2 | 3 | 4 | DNA |
| ee. Adequacy of computing resources . . . . .   | 1                   | 2 | 3 | 4 | DNA |
| ff. General professional travel support . . . . .   | 1                   | 2 | 3 | 4 | DNA |
| gg. General support for computers . . . . .   | 1                   | 2 | 3 | 4 | DNA |
| hh. KSU's general unclassified salary . . . . .   | 1                   | 2 | 3 | 4 | DNA |
| ii. Rate your present job satisfaction overall . . . . .  | 1                   | 2 | 3 | 4 | DNA |

(CONTINUED ON NEXT PAGE)

2. During the next three years, how likely is it you will...? Circle a number for each item.

|   | NOT AT ALL | SOMEWHAT | VERY |
|---|------------|----------|------|
| a. Seek another job in higher education.... | 1          | 2        | 3    |
| b. Seek a job in industry.....              | 1          | 2        | 3    |
| c. Retire.....                              | 1          | 2        | 3    |

3. For each of the following questions please indicate how you feel about these issues at KSU by circling the symbol that matches your view.

|  | WAY<br>TOO LITTLE | TOO LITTLE | ABOUT<br>RIGHT | TOO MUCH | WAY<br>TOO MUCH |
|--|-------------------|------------|----------------|----------|-----------------|
| a. Faculty participation in governance.....                                | --                | -          | 0              | +        | ++              |
| b. Faculty work load.....  | --                | -          | 0              | +        | ++              |
| c. The value placed on undergraduate student advising.....                 | --                | -          | 0              | +        | ++              |
| d. The value placed on graduate student advising.....                      | --                | -          | 0              | +        | ++              |
| e. Freedom to do outside consulting.                                       | --                | -          | 0              | +        | ++              |
| f. The value placed on public service (e.g., extension).....               | --                | -          | 0              | +        | ++              |
| g. The value placed on university service (e.g., committees).....          | --                | -          | 0              | +        | ++              |
| h. Faculty participation in tenure decisions.....                          | --                | -          | 0              | +        | ++              |
| i. Faculty participation in promotion decisions.....                       | --                | -          | 0              | +        | ++              |
| j. The value placed on teaching.....                                       | --                | -          | 0              | +        | ++              |
| k. The value placed on research, creative activities and publications..... | --                | -          | 0              | +        | ++              |
| l. Value placed on academic freedom.                                       | --                | -          | 0              | +        | ++              |
| m. Value placed on consulting.....   | --                | -          | 0              | +        | ++              |
| n. The amount of resources going for administrative functions.....         | --                | -          | 0              | +        | ++              |
| o. Emphasis on recruitment of women faculty .....                          | --                | -          | 0              | +        | ++              |
| p. Emphasis on retention of women faculty.....                             | --                | -          | 0              | +        | ++              |
| q. Emphasis on recruitment of minority faculty.....                        | --                | -          | 0              | +        | ++              |
| r. Emphasis on retention of minority faculty.....                          | --                | -          | 0              | +        | ++              |

(CONTINUED ON NEXT PAGE)

**PART III -- SPECIAL QUESTIONS**

The following questions were developed this year to address current special issues. Please answer using the following four-point scale:

1 = Definitely Disagree; 2 = Somewhat Disagree;  
3 = Somewhat Agree; 4 = Definitely Agree

|   |   |   |   |   |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. Washburn University should be admitted to the Regents system . . . . .   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 2. Qualified admissions standards should be implemented for new students at K-State . . . . .   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 3. The quality of students at K-State is improving . . . . .  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 4. A collective bargaining unit should be created at K-State . . . . .  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 5. Departmental faculty should be allowed to decide whether they are governed by heads or chairs . . . . .  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 6. K-State should adopt a plus/minus grading system . . . . .   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 7. K-State should switch to a pay-by-the-credit-hour tuition plan . . . . .   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 8a. K-State should give a tuition waiver to faculty . . . . .   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| b. K-State should give a tuition waiver to university employee spouses . . . . .  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| c. K-State should give a tuition waiver to university employee children . . . . .   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 9. Lafene fees should not be assessed of part time students who are covered by other health insurance policies . . . . .                              | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 10. Farrell Library should investigate network linkages for journal access, rather than endeavor to subscribe to all/most academic journals . . . . . | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 11. K-State should build a parking garage . . . . .   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 12. Credit card solicitation should be allowed on campus . . . . .  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |

**THANK YOU FOR YOUR TIME AND EFFORT.  
PLEASE RETURN IN THE ENVELOPE PROVIDED  
TO INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH AND ANALYSIS.**

## Appendix B

March 1994

Dear Faculty Member:

In the fall of 1989 the Faculty Senate appointed a committee to study faculty morale and satisfaction at Kansas State University. The committee hopes this annual morale survey will clarify issues important to faculty and provide information that will be valuable to administrators as they formulate policy and pursue and distribute resources. You are being asked to participate in this survey. In order that the results truly reflect faculty attitudes and changes in attitudes over an extended period of time, you are asked to make a commitment to participate on an annual basis. This commitment will require that you spend about thirty minutes a year to complete the survey.

To develop an accurate description of the faculty's morale and track its changes over a long period of time, the committee has developed a survey instrument that will be administered to a stratified random sample of the university's faculty. An identification code will be placed in the upper right hand corner of each annual survey. This is included so that I will be able to determine that your questionnaire has been returned. You can be assured of complete confidentiality.

The results of this research will be presented annually to Faculty Senate and copies will be made available to other interested parties. The results will be reported along two dimensions, by college and by rank. No data will be reported in a way that would enable the identification of a person's response.

We hope you will agree to participate. Remember, you are being asked to make a commitment that will require about thirty minutes of your time annually. The results will not be interpreted or used as a vote but they are expected to yield important information which can be used to improve our educational environment. Please indicate your willingness to participate by filling out and returning the enclosed form by **March 16, 1994**.

The Office of Institutional Research and Analysis has agreed to help the Faculty Senate in collecting and analyzing the data. The final report will be produced by a Faculty Senate Committee. I would be happy to answer any questions you may have. Please write or call me at the above address. Thank you for your assistance.

Sincerely,

Brenda S. Fergen  
Faculty Morale and Satisfaction Committee  
Enclosure: Response Card

Brenda S. Fergen  
Office of Institutional Research and Analysis  
215 Fairchild Hall  
CAMPUS

I have received your request and I have decided that I am willing \_\_\_\_/  
not willing \_\_\_\_ to participate in the Annual Survey of Faculty Satisfaction and  
Morale.

---

Signature

---

Please Print Name

**Please fold this letter with the address showing on the back side, staple it  
together and return in the campus mail by March 16, 1994. Thank you for  
your time.**



March 15, 1994

Dear Faculty Member:

In the past you agreed to participate in the annual Faculty Morale and Satisfaction Study that is conducted by the Faculty Senate. This survey was designed to monitor faculty attitudes over time; and the results will serve as an aid in formulating campus policy and decision making.

We appreciate your continued participation in the Faculty Morale and Satisfaction Study. Last year's report has been completed and will be available later this semester from the Faculty Senate. In the near future, you will be receiving this year's survey. Similar to last year, an identification code will appear in the upper right hand corner of your survey. This number is included to identify those who have responded so that they will not receive follow-up surveys. Please be assured that your responses will be kept completely confidential. All responses will be aggregated across rank and/or unit (college). No data will be reported in a way that would enable identification of your individual responses.

This questionnaire is being sent to a small, but representative, sample of the KSU faculty. Therefore, your participation in this year's survey is critical.

Thank you for your assistance.

Sincerely,

Brenda S. Fergen  
Faculty Morale and Satisfaction Committee

## References

- Diebel, Ken. (1994, February 1). Scholarly Journals Face Cost Cuts. Kansas State Collegian, p. 1.
- Ernst, Tawnya. (1994, January 28). Senate to Vote on Plus/minus System. Kansas State Collegian, p. 1.
- Janney, Christina. (1993, November 19) Pay-per-hour Plan put on Hold. Kansas State Collegian, p. 3.
- Janney, Christina. (1994, January 31) Washburn's Inclusion Discussed. Kansas State Collegian, p. 1.
- Kansas State University Faculty Senate Minutes (1993, November 9).
- Kansas State University Faculty Senate Minutes (1994, February 8).
- Montgomery, Jennifer. (1994, February 9). Plus/Minus Grading Fails. Kansas State Collegian, p. 1.