

Final Report, 2006 Faculty Survey  
Barbara J. Costello  
Department of Sociology and Anthropology

The purpose of the 2006 Faculty Survey was to provide the Faculty Senate Executive Committee with information on the concerns of the faculty. The survey is not intended to be a study of faculty job satisfaction, but rather is intended to identify areas of concern that the Faculty Senate might be able to address in some way. Thus, issues such as faculty satisfaction with salaries and benefits are not included in the survey. The survey is also not intended to be explanatory, rather it is merely a descriptive study of areas of faculty concern. The faculty comments are presented in Appendix B (see [http://www.uri.edu/facsen/Survey\\_Appendix\\_B06.pdf](http://www.uri.edu/facsen/Survey_Appendix_B06.pdf)), and are not systematically analyzed here.

The survey was conducted online, with several invitations to participate being emailed to faculty lists obtained from college Deans. The survey was conducted late in the Spring, 2006 semester. Survey responses were anonymous – submitting the survey did not reveal the respondent's email address. A total of 299 faculty members completed the survey. The full text of the survey is presented in Appendix A (see [http://www.uri.edu/facsen/Survey\\_Appendix\\_A06.htm](http://www.uri.edu/facsen/Survey_Appendix_A06.htm)).

The descriptive statistics for the ordinal variables in the study are presented in Table 1 (nominal variables are only presented as bar charts.) The areas of greatest satisfaction among the faculty are the courses they are assigned to teach, the size of enrollment in their courses, the availability of parking, courtesy among the staff, computer resources, and the availability of forms electronically. The areas of greatest dissatisfaction are financial resources for research, the physical environment in classrooms (such as lighting, furniture, or heating), the condition of buildings on campus, the helpfulness and ease of use of PeopleSoft, time for research, and the efficiency of offices on campus.

The bar charts present more detail on the distribution of responses to each question. In many cases, the distribution of responses is bimodal, indicating a split between those faculty who are satisfied and those who are not.

The general comments about the survey included a number of suggestions for future surveys, such as addressing issues relating to non tenure-track faculty and instructors, the distribution of existing resources within the University, and measuring the relative importance of areas of concern to faculty. It would also be useful for future surveys to include the same measures used in this survey, which will allow direct comparisons of faculty concerns from one survey to the next.

An electronic copy of the full report which includes bar charts may be obtained from [FSO@etal.uri.edu](mailto:FSO@etal.uri.edu).

**Table 1. Descriptive Statistics for 2006 Faculty Survey.**

Variable description	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Electronic equipment in classrooms	291	1	5	3.00	1.340
Availability of supplies in classrooms	293	1	5	2.86	1.219
Physical enviroment in classrooms	294	1	5	3.43	1.264
Course assignments	288	1	5	1.71	.917
Size of enrollment in classes	289	1	5	2.26	1.024
Quality of undergraduate students	274	1	5	2.84	1.109
Quality of graduate students	205	1	5	2.40	1.046
Academic integrity of students	291	1	5	2.88	1.054
Time for research	287	1	5	3.22	1.237
Financial resources for research	281	1	5	3.84	1.024
Physical resources for research	279	1	5	2.98	1.217
Computer resources	283	1	5	2.38	1.115
Conditions of lands and grounds	292	1	5	2.70	1.127
Conditions of buildings	295	1	5	3.41	1.269
Availability of parking	296	1	5	2.34	1.154
Efficiency of offices	293	1	5	3.13	1.137
Courtesy among staff	293	1	5	2.30	1.029
Availability of forms electronically	289	1	5	2.61	1.039
Forms are clear	288	1	5	3.08	1.048
PeopleSoft is easy to use	289	1	5	3.34	1.211
PeopleSoft helps me do my job	290	1	5	3.01	1.179
Opportunities to provide input into U governance	288	1	5	2.92	1.071
Important for faculty to have input into U governance	295	1	4	1.40	.596
Valid N (listwise)	171				

Notes: All variables are coded so that 1=most satisfaction and 5=least satisfaction. "Importance of faculty governance" was measured so that 1=strongly agree that it is important and 5=strongly disagree that it is important.

Nominal variables such as respondents' college affiliations are not presented in this table. See bar charts for those variables. An electronic copy of the full report which includes bar charts may be obtained from

[FSO@etal.uri.edu](mailto:FSO@etal.uri.edu)