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(Emphasis is on areas in which there is a 9-10 percentage point difference between IPFW faculty and national norms or on areas in which differences are negligible.)

Sample

• 172 of 333 full-time faculty (51.7%) responded to the survey.

• The sample slightly under-represents female associate professors (28% of the sample v. 36% actual), otherwise the sample is representative by gender and rank.

Demography

• Age, race, marital status, and year of initial appointment of IPFW faculty are similar to that of faculty at other 4-year institutions. Exceptions are explained by IPFW’s age and periods of growth.

• Fewer IPFW faculty have parents who were academics (11% v. 21%).

• More IPFW female faculty have master’s degrees than at other 4-year institutions (37% v. 24%), thus reducing the overall percentage of women with PhD’s (47% v. 63%), reflecting IPFW’s program mix.

• 17% of IPFW faculty vs. 36% of faculty nationally are full professors.

Teaching

• Areas in which IPFW faculty are very similar to their peers:
  • Interests lie very heavily in teaching (28% IPFW vs. 26% nationally).
• Opportunities for teaching was an important reason for pursuing an academic career (70% vs. 68%).

• Being a good teacher is a very important or essential personal goal (99% vs. 97%).

• My teaching is valued by my department (86% vs. 85%).

• The institutional emphasis on teaching was very important in my decision to work at this university (46% v. 49%).

• IPFW faculty are more likely than their national peers to use multiple-choice mid-term and/or final exams (40% IPFW v. 28% nationally).

• Gender differences concerning preferred evaluation methods are more pronounced at IPFW than at other institutions. For example:
  • Use multiple choice (30% men, 52% women at IPFW v. 28%/29% nationally).
  • Use student presentations (23% men, 45% women at IPFW v. 33%/49% nationally).
  • Require term papers (28%/40% at IPFW v. 38%/42% nationally).
  • Have students evaluate each other’s work (4%, 23% at IPFW v. 12% 22% nationally).
  • Grade on a curve (23% /4% at IPFW v. 23%/11% nationally).

• The gender differences regarding instructional methods reflect national patterns: Examples:
  • Use class discussion (57% men to 78% women at IPFW, v. 68%/80% nationally).
  • Use small group learning (27%/60% at IPFW v. 33%/56% nationally).
  • Experiential learning (17%/28% at IPFW v. 18%/30% nationally).
  • Independent projects (31%/51% at IPFW v. 32%/44% nationally).
  • Extensive lecturing (55%/43% at IPFW v. 55%/32% nationally).
  • Multiple drafts of written work (10%/21% at IPFW v. 16%/25% nationally).
  • Readings on women and gender issues (13%/22% at IPFW v. 13%/29% nationally).
• Student selected projects for course content (5%/15% at IPFW v. 8%/14% nationally).

• Community service as part of coursework (4%/14% at IPFW v. 4%/8% nationally).

• IPFW faculty spend more time in teaching and in teaching preparation and less time in advising than faculty at other 4-year institutions. Examples include:
  • 55% IPFW faculty spend 9-12 hours teaching vs. 38% nationally. 62% spend 9 or more hours a week in preparation vs. 49% nationally.
  • 73% of IPFW faculty vs. 61% of peers spend 1-4 hours a week advising; 16% IPFW vs. 27% nationally spend 5-8 hours advising.

• IPFW faculty are less likely than their peers to consider helping students develop personal values (46% to 58%) or preparing them for graduate or advanced education (49% to 58%) as important undergraduate goals.

• IPFW faculty are less likely than their peers to believe that teaching students the classic works of Western civilization is an important goal (19% vs. 30%).

• More IPFW faculty (66% vs. 56%) have participated in a teaching enhancement workshop.

Curriculum

• Fewer agree that most students are well prepared academically (19% vs. 37%).

• Fewer IPFW faculty than faculty at other 4-year institutions have developed a new course in the last two years (62% vs. 73%).

• Fewer have taught an interdisciplinary course (28% to 42%).

• Fewer have team-taught (26% to 38%).

• Fewer are “very involved” in general education (18% v. 27%).

• Fewer believe that the university should place a priority on
  • helping students examine and understand their personal values (38% v. 51%)
  • developing a sense of community among students and faculty (31% v. 47%)
  • developing leadership ability among students (28% vs. 46%)
  • facilitating student involvement in community service (21% vs. 39%)
  • helping students learn how to bring about change in society (17% to
• Fewer agree that IPFW courses involve students in community service (22% vs. 37%).

• Fewer believe that students are committed to community service (11% to 31%).

Research

• IPFW faculty parallel national norms in interests that include teaching “but leaning toward research” (30% vs. 29%) and “very heavily in research” (4% vs. 5%) and as a reason for pursuing an academic career (48% vs. 47%).

• IPFW faculty are only slightly below their national peers in research productivity, e.g. 35% vs. 31% have published 1-2 professional pieces in the last two years and 17% vs. 22% have published 3-4. 16% of IPFW faculty and 15% nationally have never published an article; 57% vs. 53% have never published a book. Other examples of similarities:
  • Only 13% (vs. 22% nationally) chose to work at IPFW because of its emphasis on research.
  • 74% (vs. 71% nationally) say that “my research is valued by faculty in my department.”
  • 64% IPFW faculty (vs. 58% nationally) felt that research or publishing demands were a source of stress during the last two years.

Services

• Satisfied or Very Satisfied with services at rate of 75% plus:
  • Safety and Security (87%)
  • Helmke Library (83%)
  • Physical Plant (80%)
  • Web access at Helmke Library (79%)
  • Help Desk through ITServices (76%)

• At rate of 67%% plus:
  • Helmke resources (74%)
  • CELT programs and services (71%)
  • Instructional technology support from LRC (70%)
• Computers, printers, and software for faculty offices (68%)
• At 50% plus:
  • HR processes for providing clerical, service, and technical candidates (63%)
  • Equipment request and delivery services from LRC (62%)
  • Services from the Registrar’s Office (62%)
  • Instructional technology permanently placed in classrooms (61%)
  • EAP program (57%)
  • Process for obtaining IPFW summer grants (55%)
• Less than 50% satisfaction:
  • Non-financial support for research (43%)
  • User support for WebCT (38%)

**Overall Aspects of Job** (IPFW v. national averages, from highest to lowest)
• Autonomy and independence (93% v. 86%)
• Opportunity to develop new ideas (79% v. 75%)
• Overall job satisfaction (78% v. 74%)
• Professional relationships with other faculty (78% v. 76%)
• Job security (77% v. 77%)
• Competency of colleagues (74% v. 71%)
• Office/lab space (69% v. 59%)
• Social relationships with other faculty (66% v. 63%)
• Relationships with administration (65% v. 58%)
• Opportunity for scholarly pursuits (64% v. 56%)
• Teaching load (62% v. 52%)
• Availability of child care (59% v. 35%)
• Visibility for jobs at other institutions/organizations (47% v. 40%)
• Salary and fringe benefits (40% v. 46%)
Conclusions

• IPFW faculty have a somewhat more traditional and technical view of the role and content of higher education than faculty at other 4-year institutions.

• Generally, IPFW faculty are as satisfied as their national peers with their job and with the institution.

Areas for further attention (VCAA)

• Continued efforts to improve faculty salaries/fringe benefits.

• Integration of more active learning methods.

• Expansion of service learning.

• Encouragement of more faculty involvement in collaborative curriculum development and delivery.

• Support for/development of methods to build community among faculty and students.

• Improvement of non-financial research support (already under way).

• Improvement of WebCT training and support (note shift to Vista).

• Better alignment between curriculum and university mission, especially in areas of diversity and community engagement.
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