

# Chapter IX: HIGHER EDUCATION RESEARCH INSTITUTE FACULTY SURVEY

*Who takes it?*

Faculty and administration.

*When is it administered?*

Every three years. The last administration was Fall 2007.

*How long does it take for the faculty to complete the instrument?*

30 minutes.

*What office administers it?*

The Provost's Office.

*Who originates the survey?*

Higher Education Research Institute  
UCLA Graduate School of Education and Information  
3005 Moore Hall, Box 951521  
Los Angeles, CA 90095-1521  
(310) 825-1925  
<http://www.gseis.ucla.edu/heri/faculty.html>  
e-mail: [heri@ucla.edu](mailto:heri@ucla.edu)

*When are results typically available?*

The summer following the survey.

*What type of information is sought?*

The survey asks for demographic information, highest degree earned, department, tenure information, and primary interest (teaching, research). It also asks about the amount of time spent on teaching, research, advising, service, consulting, scholarly activity, goals for undergraduate education, evaluation and teaching methods in class, and community service required for campus. General opinions are sought on curriculum, college environment, priorities at the institution, satisfactory aspects of job, personal goals, desire to continue teaching, and the amount and source of stress. Local questions are added.

*From whom are the results available?*

Provost's Office, McClain Hall 203.

*To whom are the results regularly distributed?*

The University community through a website, the University Conference, the Strategic Planning and Assessment Workshop, and this *Almanac*.

*Are the results available by department or discipline?*

No.

*Are the results comparable to data of other universities?*

Yes.

The Higher Education Research Institute (HERI) at UCLA issues this nation-wide survey of faculty every three years. Faculty answer several broad questions, each with many sub indicators, concerning demographic information, the campus environment, and their duties and interests. Each participating institution is allowed to develop up to twenty-one “local” questions as well. Truman’s local questions were developed in 2001 by the Vice President’s Advisory Committee on Assessment.

The 2007-2008 HERI Faculty Survey was administered to 414 faculty and administrators in the fall and spring of 2007-2008. 128 returns were submitted for a 31% return rate. Full Faculty Survey results are printed in Volume III of this *Almanac* and are also available on Truman’s assessment website at <http://assessment.truman.edu/components/Faculty.asp>.

**Faculty on Service Learning:**

The 2004 Faculty Survey report presented data on the degree to which faculty had taught a service learning course as this is one of the four “Powerful Pedagogies” and Truman is continuing to focus on this important component of the curriculum. In 2004, 12.8% of the Truman faculty had responded that they had engaged in service learning exercises in the classroom while a slightly higher percentage of faculty (15.4%) had the same response in 2007. This rate is still slightly behind Campus Compact institutions (20.9%) and all four-year institutions (19.7%). Another measure of the degree to which Truman faculty attempt to instill service learning indicates that Truman faculty advise student service/volunteer groups at a significantly higher rate (60.7%) than Campus Compact Schools (45%) or other four-year institutions (42.4%). This important pedagogy will continue to be an area of interest to the faculty and students alike.

**A Sampling of Other Data of Interest:**

The following data points were selected by the editor to reflect some of the positive and significant differences reported in the current HERI survey. The complete survey and results can be viewed in Volume III of this *Almanac*.

	<u>Truman</u>	<u>Public 4-yr</u>	<u>All 4-yr Institutions</u>
<b><i>In the past two years:</i></b>			
Taught an honors course	30.8	17.1	19.9
Taught remedial course (writing)	1.7	10.4	10.3
Taught a women’s study course	11.1	7.2	7.3
Taught an exclusively internet course	9.4	19.9	13.3
Advised student groups in service/ volunteer work	60.7	45.0	42.4
Engaged undergrad in <b>your</b> research	57.3	38.7	41.6
Worked with undergrad on research	87.2	55.7	57.3
Scheduled teaching hours			
9-12	59.8	43.9	35.1
13-16	16.2	15.6	12.1
Total    9-16	76.0	59.5	47.2

It is evident that Truman faculty enjoy the privilege of working with high ability students, especially in Honors class settings, and spend significantly less time with remediation. Truman faculty do not teach as many exclusively internet courses, although this aspect of distance learning is becoming a much larger issue in higher education in general as an attempt to garner more students and control costs. Of great importance are the reported percentages in faculty engaging students in research, either within the context of the faculty's own research or as mentors in undergraduate generated or focused research. Truman faculty spend significantly more time working with students in research and this is in line with Truman's adherence to the four "Powerful Pedagogies". As would be expected from Truman's primary undergraduate focus, a significantly larger percentage of the faculty report actual teaching hours (not credit hours) in the 9-16 hour range versus faculty in both Public 4-year and All 4-year Institutions, whereas faculty in these other two types of schools report their highest density of teaching hours in the 5-8 hour loads. It is of great interest that Truman faculty engage in both significantly greater in-classroom hours and devoting more hours to working on research projects with students.

### **Truman Specific Questions – Some General Observations:**

In accordance with the above mentioned advantage of being afforded an opportunity to teach higher ability students through Honors courses, Truman faculty tended to highly rank the higher order thinking skills of graduating students as 22.2% excellent and 60.7% Good. In particular, 73.3% of the faculty reported that they frequently or occasionally require students to "critique" or "break" an argument; 83.5% ask students to recognize flaws in arguments; and 83.8% ask students to order evidence so as to contribute to a persuasive and coherent argument. Data from previous years of Junior testing considering measures of critical thinking would tend to support these findings; however, it is also evident from the Junior tests that some 30-35% of the juniors are scoring low on these normed measures of critical thinking (CAAP and MAAP), and GSQ results from the 2007-8 academic year show students self-reporting that approximately one third of the graduating students do not feel that their critical thinking skills are well developed.

Faculty satisfaction with senior majors' mastery in their field of study was reported at 84.6% very satisfied or satisfied. 94% of the faculty report being extremely enthusiastic (62.1%) or enthusiastic (31.9%) for teaching in the major, but only 68.1% expressed a similar level of enthusiasm for teaching in the LSP program (22.4% and 45.7%, respectively).

Time management skills were rated as 8.5% excellent and 54.7% good, whereas stress management skills of the students were assessed by the faculty as only 31.7% excellent or good and 50.4% as adequate. These appear to be two areas that might draw attention in the coming years.

Truman faculty are generally very satisfied or satisfied with opportunities for undergraduate research (72.6%), and this is also reflected in the previously mentioned research interaction time versus Public 4-year and all reporting 4-year Institutions.