



Community College Faculty Attitudes and Trends, 1997

MARY TAYLOR HUBER

National Center for Postsecondary Improvement
Stanford University, School of Education
520 Galvez Mall, 508 CERAS, Stanford, CA 94305-3084
(650) 723-7724 <http://ncpi.stanford.edu>

The work reported herein was supported in part by the Educational Research and Development Center program, agreement number R309A60001, CFDA 84.309A, as administered by the Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI), U.S. Department of Education. The findings and opinions expressed in the report do not reflect the position or policies of OERI or the U.S. Department of Education. Technical Report Number NCPI-4-03.

Copyright © 1998
The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching
555 Middlefield Road, Menlo Park, California 94025

Visit the Carnegie Foundation on the World Wide Web: <http://www.carnegiefoundation.org>.

All rights reserved. No part of this report may be reproduced in any form except for brief quotations not to exceed one thousand words in a review or professional work without permission in writing from the publisher.

This report is published as part of the effort by The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching to explore significant issues in education. The views expressed should not necessarily be ascribed to individual members of the Board of Trustees of The Carnegie Foundation.

CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES	4
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	10
CHAPTER 1: Introduction	12
CHAPTER 2: Community College Faculty: A Profile	16
CHAPTER 3: Teaching and Learning: Concern and Commitment	19
CHAPTER 4: The Goals of Community College Education	22
CHAPTER 5: Faculty Roles in a Teaching Institution	24
CHAPTER 6: Evaluation	27
CHAPTER 7: Working Conditions	30
CHAPTER 8: Governance and Community on Campus	32
CHAPTER 9: Higher Education and Society	34
CHAPTER 10: Reflections	36
APPENDIX A: Technical Notes	39
APPENDIX B: The Carnegie Classification of Institutions of Higher Education	41
TABLES	43

LIST OF TABLES

Chapter 2: Community College Faculty: A Profile

TABLE 1	What is your race or ethnic group?
TABLE 2	What is your sex?
TABLE 3	What is your age?
TABLE 4	How many years have you been employed in higher education?
TABLE 5	What is your highest earned degree?
TABLE 6	Are you currently working for another degree?
TABLE 7	In which discipline was your highest degree awarded?
TABLE 8	What is your current academic rank at this institution?
TABLE 9	Is your current employment at this institution full-time or part-time?
TABLE 10	Part-time and adjunct faculty fill jobs here that would otherwise be filled by regular faculty members.
TABLE 11	What is your institutional salary on a full-time basis before tax and deductions for the current academic year?
TABLE 12	In 1996, roughly how much did you earn over and above your institutional salary?
TABLE 13	There should be a mandatory age of retirement for faculty.
TABLE 14	At my institution, the major purpose of early retirement programs is to force out less productive faculty.
TABLE 15	I would exercise an early retirement option if it were offered to me.
TABLE 16	My institution provides the conditions and support faculty need to retire with dignity.
TABLE 17	I intend to engage in research and professional writing during my retirement.

Chapter 3: Teaching and Learning: Concern and Commitment

TABLE 18	Access to higher education should be available to all who meet minimum entrance requirements.
TABLE 19	My undergraduate students are adequately prepared in written and oral communication.
TABLE 20	My undergraduate students are adequately prepared in mathematics and quantitative reasoning skills.
TABLE 21	This institution spends too much time and money teaching students what they should have learned in high school, 1984-1997.
TABLE 22	My undergraduate students do just enough to get by academically.
TABLE 23	Undergraduates have become more careerist in their concerns.
TABLE 24	Undergraduates have become more grade conscious.
TABLE 25	Today's undergraduates are more willing to cheat in order to get good grades.
TABLE 26	Overall, I'm pleased with my undergraduates.
TABLE 27	Faculty here are concerned with the academic progress of their undergraduate

	students.
TABLE 28	To what extent are you satisfied with your relationships with students?
TABLE 29	How important is undergraduate teaching to you personally?
TABLE 30	How would you assess the quality of the training you received in graduate school for your role as teacher?
TABLE 31	My institution provides adequate mentoring and other support for beginning instructors.
TABLE 32	In your department, how much experimentation has there been with the use of technology in instruction?
TABLE 33	Interdisciplinary teaching is encouraged at my institution.
TABLE 34	Team teaching is encouraged at my institution.
TABLE 35	Do you ever supervise students in service learning activities off campus?
TABLE 36	Faculty should spend more time with students outside the classroom.

Chapter 4: The Goals of Community College Education

TABLE 37	How important do you consider the following possible outcomes for the undergraduate?
TABLE 38	Rate your institution's performance in serving non-traditional age students effectively.
TABLE 39	Rate your institution's performance in preparing undergraduates for a vocation or career.
TABLE 40	The undergraduate curriculum here is in serious need of reform.
TABLE 41	Rate your institution's performance in providing undergraduates with a general education.
TABLE 42	I prefer teaching courses which focus on limited specialties to those which cover wide varieties of material.
TABLE 43	Rate your institution's performance in providing undergraduates the opportunity to explore personal interests through electives.
TABLE 44	Rate your institution's performance in providing opportunities for an undergraduate to explore a subject in depth, through the major.
TABLE 45	Rate your institution's performance in strengthening the values of undergraduates.
TABLE 46	Rate your institution's performance in offering undergraduates an opportunity to experience and understand leadership.
TABLE 47	Rate your institution's performance in creating opportunities for students to engage in public or community service.
TABLE 48	Rate your institution's performance in developing a sense of campus community.
TABLE 49	Undergraduate education in America would be improved if students had a stronger mix of theory and practice in their academic experience.
TABLE 50	Undergraduate education in America would be improved if there were more relevance to contemporary life and problems.
TABLE 51	Undergraduate education in America would be improved if there were more

emphasis on a common core of courses for all students.

TABLE 52 Undergraduate education in America would be improved if there were less emphasis on specialized training and more on broad liberal education.

Chapter 5: Faculty Roles in a Teaching Institution

TABLE 53 My interests lie primarily in or lean toward teaching, 1969-1997.

TABLE 54 Do your interests lie primarily in teaching or in research? (International data)

TABLE 55 Do your interests lie primarily in teaching or in research?

TABLE 56 Regarding teaching and research, have your interests shifted over the course of your professional life?

TABLE 57 During the past fall term, approximately how many hours per week did you spend on each of the following activities?

TABLE 58 In my academic position at this institution, regular research activity is expected.

TABLE 59 Are you currently engaged in any scholarly work that you expect to lead to a publication, exhibit, or a performance?

TABLE 60 Have you, as an individual or as part of an academic group, received any grants or special funding support for research in the last three years?

TABLE 61 If you received such research funding, please estimate the total amount received from all sources during the last three years.

TABLE 62 Which of the following sources have provided these research funds?

TABLE 63 Serving as a consultant is considered part of scholarly work at my institution.

TABLE 64 During the past year, with which types of organizations have you worked, either on a paid or unpaid basis?

TABLE 65 Consider the time you spent engaged in such activities last year. For what percentage of this time were you paid?

TABLE 66 From an economic standpoint, it is necessary for me to engage in paid consulting work.

TABLE 67 The pressure to publish reduces the quality of teaching at this institution.

TABLE 68 Generally speaking, to be a good teacher one must be engaged in research.

TABLE 69 For me, service activity beyond this institution is a distraction and competes with essential academic work.

TABLE 70 Teaching effectiveness should be the primary criterion for promotion of faculty.

TABLE 71 At this institution, faculty evaluation gives appropriate weight to teaching, research, and service.

TABLE 72 This department should give more recognition to the role of professional service and the applied aspects of knowledge among its faculty.

Chapter 6: Evaluation

TABLE 73 Which of your activities are appraised or evaluated regularly?

TABLE 74	By whom is your teaching regularly evaluated?
TABLE 75	By whom is your research regularly evaluated?
TABLE 76	At this institution, we need better ways, besides publications, to evaluate the scholarly performance of the faculty.
TABLE 77	At this institution, we need better ways to evaluate teaching performance.
TABLE 78	Student opinions should be used in evaluating the teaching effectiveness of faculty.
TABLE 79	Peer review should be used in evaluating the teaching effectiveness of faculty.
TABLE 80	In the past several years, have new methods of evaluating faculty in your department been developed in the following areas?
TABLE 81	In my field, most people agree on the standards of good scholarship.
TABLE 82	On the whole, my performance has been evaluated fairly at this institution.
TABLE 83	Thinking about your own situation, do research and/or other creative work count more or less for purposes of faculty advancement today than they did five years ago?
TABLE 84	Thinking about your own situation, does applied scholarship (outreach) count more or less for purposes of faculty advancement today than it did five years ago?
TABLE 85	Thinking about your own situation, does service to the college or university (citizenship) count more or less for purposes of faculty advancement today than it did five years ago?
TABLE 86	Thinking about your own situation, does teaching count more or less for purposes of faculty advancement today than it did five years ago?
TABLE 87	I wish my institution would set clearer priorities for the kind of work faculty should do.
TABLE 88	The stated missions of this institution are clear to the faculty.
TABLE 89	At my institution the goals for undergraduates are clear to the faculty.
TABLE 90	My institution is consistent in what it expects faculty to do, and how it rewards them.

Chapter 7: Working Conditions

TABLE 91	In general, how do you feel about this institution?
TABLE 92	How would you rate your own academic salary?
TABLE 93	My job is a source of considerable personal strain.
TABLE 94	I am more enthusiastic about my work now than I was when I began my academic career.
TABLE 95	To what extent has your teaching load been a source of stress in your professional work during the last two years?
TABLE 96	I hardly ever get the time to give a piece of work the attention it deserves.
TABLE 97	I feel I have less control of my time than I had five years ago.
TABLE 98	To what extent have the following factors been sources of stress in your professional work during the last two years?
TABLE 99	At this institution, how would you evaluate the facilities, resources, or

	personnel you need to support your work?
TABLE 100	How would you rate the “technology infrastructure” at your institution?
TABLE 101	To what extent are you satisfied with your job situation as a whole?
TABLE 102	To what extent are you satisfied with the courses you teach?
TABLE 103	To what extent are you satisfied with your relationships with colleagues?
TABLE 104	To what extent are you satisfied with the way your department and your institution are managed?
TABLE 105	This is an especially creative and productive time in my field.
TABLE 106	My interests have become more interdisciplinary in recent years.
TABLE 107	This is a poor time for any person to begin an academic career in my field.
TABLE 108	If I had it to do over again, I would not become a college teacher.

Chapter 8: Governance and Community on Campus

TABLE 109	How would you rate the sense of campus community at your institution, 1989-1997.
TABLE 110	Please indicate the degree to which your academic discipline, your department and your college or university is important to you personally.
TABLE 111	Faculty in my department have little contact with faculty in other departments.
TABLE 112	The faculty in my department generally tend to isolate themselves from the world outside the campus.
TABLE 113	How would you rate the academic reputation of your department outside your institution?
TABLE 114	How would you rate the sense that you feel valued and appreciated?
TABLE 115	How much opportunity do you feel you have to influence the policies of your department and institution?
TABLE 116	To what extent do you participate in meetings of the following types of organization at your institution?
TABLE 117	Junior faculty members have too little say in the running of my department.
TABLE 118	Faculty meetings in my department generally are a waste of time.
TABLE 119	Faculty governance works effectively at my institution.
TABLE 120	Top-level administrators are providing competent leadership.
TABLE 121	Communication between the faculty and the administration is poor.
TABLE 122	How would you rate relations between the following groups at your institution?
TABLE 123	There is a strong sense of institutional pride here.
TABLE 124	How would you rate student morale at your institution?
TABLE 125	How would you rate the intellectual environment at your institution?
TABLE 126	Female and minority faculty are treated fairly at this institution.
TABLE 127	Racial and ethnic conflicts are a problem among students at my institution.
TABLE 128	Gender issues are a problem among students at my institution.
TABLE 129	How would you rate the overall quality of campus life at your institution?
TABLE 130	The quality of life at my institution is of greater concern today than it was a

few years ago.

Chapter 9: Higher Education and Society

TABLE 131	Have you ever worked abroad to do research, take a sabbatical, or as part of an exchange program?
TABLE 132	Connections with scholars in other countries are very important to my professional work.
TABLE 133	My institution should recruit more international students and faculty.
TABLE 134	Universities and colleges should do more to promote student and faculty mobility from one country to another.
TABLE 135	In order to keep up with developments in my discipline, a scholar must read books and journals published abroad.
TABLE 136	The curriculum at this institution should be more international in focus.
TABLE 137	The goal of an academic scholar is to advance knowledge without regard for the possible implications for society.
TABLE 138	Faculty in my discipline have a professional obligation to apply their knowledge to problems in society.
TABLE 139	Faculty in my discipline have a professional obligation to collaborate with teachers in elementary and secondary schools.
TABLE 140	Universities have a responsibility to contribute to the economic development of their communities.
TABLE 141	This institution should be actively engaged in solving social problems.
TABLE 142	Academics are among the most influential opinion leaders.
TABLE 143	Respect for academics is declining.
TABLE 144	The effectiveness of higher education is being threatened by growing bureaucracies.
TABLE 145	In this country, there are no political or ideological restrictions on what a scholar may publish.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Community College Faculty: Attitudes and Trends, 1997 presents findings from The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching's National Survey of Faculty, 1997, the sixth in a series of faculty surveys begun in 1969. Any project of this complexity owes a great debt to its predecessors and to the many dedicated people who guided the current work to successful completion.

This report has been nurtured in the stimulating intellectual community formed by the collaboration of The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, under the leadership of its new president, Lee Shulman, with The National Center for Postsecondary Improvement (NCPI), directed by Patricia Gumpert. One of a family of projects on community college teaching sponsored by NCPI and The Carnegie Foundation, this study also contributes to The Foundation's program on scholarship in teaching throughout higher education.

The National Survey of Faculty, 1997 was envisioned by The Carnegie Foundation's past president, Ernest L. Boyer, as a way to mark a quarter century of Foundation survey work on college and university faculty. Interim president, Charles Glassick, gave strong support to the project after Boyer's death, seeing it as a capstone, as well, to The Foundation's recent studies on faculty roles and rewards. In addition to authorizing the survey, Dr. Glassick worked with the survey team on the general organization of the study and in selecting issues to address. The Foundation's new president, Lee Shulman, encouraged us to bring the project through to completion. His close reading and insightful comments have contributed much to this report.

Special thanks are due Mary Jean Whitelaw, former Director of Data Management at The Carnegie Foundation, who designed and orchestrated the project from beginning to end. In addition to overseeing the technical aspects of the survey design, Ms. Whitelaw led the survey team in developing the questionnaire, and sought and summarized advice from other Carnegie colleagues, and from scholars and survey experts outside The Foundation. She coordinated arrangements with Wirthlin Worldwide, who administered the survey, produced the cross-tabulated tables that serve as the basis for the data presented in this report, checked the numbers, and wrote the technical notes included as Appendix A. I am especially grateful for her advice on the analysis and interpretation of the results.

The survey team—Mary Jean Whitelaw, Lois Harwood, Dale Coye, and myself—spent weeks reviewing, selecting, and formulating questions, seeking the right balance between new and old. Lois Harwood assisted in many other stages of the study, helping with survey design, sampling methodology, and project administration. Dale Coye provided valuable insight on issues particularly relevant to the Associated New American Colleges, which conducted a parallel survey of their faculty at the same time. Beth Norby deciphered, sorted, and organized our respondents' written remarks on the questionnaires, so that the most relevant comments could be readily identified. Thanks too, to Dawn Berberian for creating the look

and layout of the questionnaire, and to Jackie Calvert, for her extraordinary patience and skill in preparing the tables for this report.

The 1997 National Survey of Faculty benefitted throughout from the advice of many colleagues. Robert Blackburn, Elaine El-Khawas, Martin Finkelstein, and Jack Schuster provided thoughtful opinions about whether to proceed with the survey, and about what issues deserved special attention. Kenneth C. Green critiqued the questionnaire and was particularly instrumental in helping us design technology-related questions. Jerry Berberet, executive director of the Associated New American Colleges, deserves special thanks. He worked tirelessly and diligently with us on the survey instrument, encouraging us to think creatively about issues important to faculty at different types of institutions. We are grateful also to Carnegie Foundation colleagues Stanley Ikenberry, Gene Maeroff, Lee Mitgang, and Michael Timpane for their helpful suggestions and review of the questionnaire. Mary Jean Whitelaw and Julie Kerekes made timely and insightful comments on the final text of this report.

Thanks to Wirthlin Worldwide, who administered the survey with their customary good will and expertise. And finally, our deep gratitude to the 5,151 faculty who took the time and effort to answer our many questions about their professional life, and especially to those who went even further, to provide enriching and insightful commentary about the state of the academic profession today.

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching has surveyed college and university faculty in the United States six times over the last twenty-eight years. In 1969, 1975, 1984, 1989, 1992, and, again, in the spring of 1997, we asked professors to tell us about themselves, their institutions, and their opinions on a variety of issues important to students and parents, scholars, administrators, and public policymakers. Over the years, The Foundation has drawn upon these data to illuminate many aspects of the academic profession, from undergraduate teaching to the definition of scholarship, and from international comparisons of the professoriate to the evaluation of faculty work.¹ Now, as part of a family of studies on teaching in community colleges undertaken in collaboration with the National Center on Postsecondary Improvement, we focus the spotlight for the first time on community college faculty. Our goal is to clarify the status and working conditions of professors in the most teaching-intensive sector of American higher education.

Today, approximately one-third (31 percent) of the American professoriate teach at the nation's 1,449 community colleges. These faculty are educating 39 percent of all students enrolled in higher education—including 46 percent of all first-time freshmen.² To grasp the full range of community college teaching, however, one must realize that most of these institutions now offer a comprehensive set of programs. Nationwide, students intending to transfer to four-year institutions after receiving a two-year associate level degree are only a small proportion of today's community college students. About four-fifths of community college students enroll in technical certificate programs, register for remedial or developmental education courses, or attend for continuing education purposes.³ Community college faculty stand out from many of their professorial colleagues not only because of the size and diversity of their sector of higher education, but also because teaching—far more than research or service—is the heart of their profession.

The Carnegie Foundation's 1997 faculty survey focused with special care on the nature of academic work, reflecting recent debates about the priorities of the professoriate and how faculty divide their time and effort among teaching, research, and service (in the sense of applied scholarship or outreach). Until recently, community college faculty—so clearly focussed on teaching—have enjoyed a special exemption from these debates. As Terry O'Banion, executive director of the League for Innovation in the Community College notes, "The unchallenged assumption was that the community college was the 'teaching college,' and the lack of research and publications on the part of its faculty was ironically cited as proof."⁴ Today, there is a new emphasis on teaching and learning across higher education, and all institutions, including community colleges, are engaged in conversations about enhancing learning and bringing teaching up to date.

While literature on the academic profession often treats faculty at two- and four-year institutions separately, this report highlights the situation of community college faculty by comparing their responses to our questions with those of faculty at other types of colleges and universities. Therefore, in addition to presenting data from community colleges (Associate of

Arts Colleges), we also include findings from Research Universities, Doctoral Universities, Master's Colleges and Universities, and Baccalaureate Colleges, as defined by The Carnegie Foundation's *A Classification of Institutions of Higher Education* (see Appendix B). Our data do not allow us to compare faculty at different types of community colleges—primarily because there is as yet no widely accepted classification of these institutions.⁵ Nor is there time, here, to analyze differences and similarities of outlook and situation between faculty of different gender, age, rank, part- or full-time status, or disciplinary affiliation. We do, however, include historical data from earlier Carnegie surveys, as well as comments that faculty wrote in response to our final question: "Is there anything else you would like to tell The Foundation?"

We have organized this report around defining themes of academic life. Chapter 2 provides a profile of our respondents, their demographic characteristics, education, current employment situation, and past careers. This raises an important caveat concerning part-time faculty. Nationwide, the proportion of part-time faculty has doubled in the past twenty-five years, growing from 22 percent in 1970 to 41 percent in 1995. Our survey aimed to include this fast-growing group of academics, but they remain nonetheless seriously underrepresented, accounting for only 13 percent of our respondents overall. Whereas the National Center for Education Statistics reports that 31 percent of faculty at four-year institutions and 64 percent at two-year institutions are employed part-time, part-timers account for only 9 percent of our respondents from four-year colleges and universities, and 21 percent from community colleges.⁶ Our findings, then, are weighted towards the perspective of full-time faculty across the institutional spectrum.

The next two chapters (3 and 4) focus on teaching and learning, examining faculty views of students, the joys and sorrows of teaching, and the goals of community college education. We find that despite widespread concern about the academic, motivational, even moral, preparation of students for collegiate education, community college faculty are quite satisfied with their students and committed to the educational mission of their institution. Our survey shows, too, that aside from a special regard for career preparation, community college faculty embrace most of the same goals for the education of undergraduates that their colleagues hold for collegiate education at institutions of other kinds.

Faculty roles and rewards provide the themes for Chapters 5 and 6. The results of our 1997 national survey suggest that while community college faculty are indeed more heavily oriented to teaching than their colleagues at four-year colleges and universities, they are also more involved in research and service activities than stereotypes would have one believe. The survey also suggests that community college faculty are like professors elsewhere in recognizing a need for teaching to be better evaluated and rewarded, and to make teaching a more reflective and scholarly act. Indeed, at many campuses, a climate of innovation in teaching is already well underway. As one community college professor wrote: "This is a very exciting time at my college. Collaborative learning and teaching is the focus, and it is changing my views about the education process."

Faculty across the board have mixed views about the conditions of work, governance, and

the nature of community on campus, according to findings we report in Chapters 7 and 8. Community college instructors, in general, find their work less stressful than their colleagues, most notably because they are under little pressure to do research and produce publications. While these faculty tend to be satisfied with the core role of their profession—teaching—they are less sanguine about the more distant issues of how their colleges are run. In fact, few faculty at any type of institution believe they can have an impact on larger institutional affairs. Our survey shows, unfortunately, that the gap faculty perceive between themselves and campus administrators remains relatively large.

What do community college faculty think about higher education's relation to the larger society? In Chapter 9, we show that while community college faculty are less likely than other professors to take an international perspective in their academic work, they share with their colleagues a strong commitment to professional and social responsibility beyond the campus. Community college faculty may be more confident that academics are influential opinion leaders in our society, but share their colleagues' concern that respect for academics is declining in society at large.

These, of course, are just highlights from the far more complex and varied picture of faculty provided by Carnegie's 1997 National Survey of Faculty. While not losing sight of the special missions of the community college, we conclude, there is much to be gained by looking at community college faculty as an integral part of the professoriate at large. The recent emergence of teaching and learning as a key issue in higher education foregrounds shared concerns about how well elementary and high schools are preparing young people for college, and about what colleges and universities can do to reengage students in learning. Increasing diversity of students and programs across higher education has renewed interest in the quality of campus community and given new life to the old question of whether faculty and administrators can work collegially toward common goals. The growing use of part-time faculty raises urgent questions about the health of the academic profession and the well-being of academic programs on campuses of all kinds. And finally, there is the continuing challenge of encouraging a broader range of faculty work. In two-year colleges, especially, there is a need to recognize and reward faculty who use research and professional service to link students to resources in the local community, while throughout higher education, there is a need to encourage innovation in the classroom and to strengthen scholarship in teaching.

NOTES

1. For example, we reported on data from our 1984 surveys of faculty and students in *College: The Undergraduate Experience in America*, by Ernest L. Boyer (New York: Harper and Row 1987) and in several issues of *Change* magazine in 1986 and 1987. Results from our 1989 survey appeared in *The Condition of the Professoriate: Attitudes and Trends, 1989* (Princeton, NJ: The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1989), and *Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the Professoriate* by Ernest L. Boyer (Princeton, NJ: The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1990). *The Academic Profession: An International Perspective*, by Ernest L. Boyer, Philip G. Altbach, and Mary Jean Whitelaw (Princeton, NJ: The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching,

1994) reported on data from our 1992 survey, which was conducted as part of a study of faculty in fourteen countries. We also drew on the 1992 findings for *Scholarship Assessed: Evaluation of the Professoriate*, by Charles Glassick, Mary Taylor Huber, and Gene Maeroff (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc. and The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1997).

2. Statistics on the number of faculty and institutions are from the National Center for Education Statistics publication, *Fall Staff in Postsecondary Institutions, 1995* (Table 2-1, p. 2-2; Table C-2, p.C-6). Enrollment statistics are preliminary figures for 1994, from the Digest of Education Statistics, Table 175, "Total fall enrollment in institutions of higher education by type and control of institution, attendance status, and sex of student: 1970 to 1994"(p. 182). The American Association of Community Colleges provides the figure for enrollment of first-time freshmen in "Facts about Community Colleges" on their website at <http://www.aacc.nche.edu>.
3. For this figure, see *Education Week*, February 25, 1998, p.12.
4. Terry O'Banion, "Teaching and Learning: A Mandate for the Nineties," in *Teaching and Learning in the Community College*, by Terry O'Banion and Associates (Washington, D.C.: Community College Press, 1994, p. 4).
5. Several previous attempts at classifying community colleges have not succeeded in establishing exclusive categories. A promising new attempt by Robert Zemsky and associates, under the auspices of the National Center for Postsecondary Improvement, divides the field into three groups. "Degree-focus" community colleges are those in which full-time enrollments account for at least 50 percent of total enrollment, and more than 15 percent of students are awarded two-year degrees and certificates each year. "Mixed focus" community colleges have full-time enrollments of at least 25 percent of total enrollment, and more than 10 percent of students are awarded two-year degrees and certificates each year. All remaining institutions are "course focus" community colleges in Zemsky's classificatory scheme. Of 1,094 institutions with sufficient data publicly available, Zemsky and his associates found that 20 percent could be classified as "degree focus," 40 percent as "mixed focus," and 40 percent as "course focus" institutions. See The National Center for Postsecondary Improvement, "The User-Friendly Terrain: Defining the Market Taxonomy for Two-Year Institutions," *Change*, Jan/Feb 1998: 57-63.
6. Statistics on part-time faculty are from the U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, *Fall Staff in Postsecondary Institutions, 1995* (1998, Figure 2-3, p. 2-4). It is important to note that although nearly two-thirds of community college faculty work part-time, they do not teach two-thirds of the classes. Indeed, a recent study of part-time faculty in two-year colleges estimates that "part-timers currently teach about 30 to 40 percent of the full-time equivalent contract hours in American community colleges." See John E. Roueche, Suanne D. Roueche, and Mark D. Milliron, *Strangers in Their Own Land: Part-Time Faculty in American Community Colleges* (Washington, D.C.: Community College Press, 1995, p.3).

CHAPTER 2: COMMUNITY COLLEGE FACULTY: A PROFILE

Our inquiry focused first on a profile of community college faculty and their place within the professoriate as a whole. Throughout higher education, faculty respondents are 88 percent White, and 61 percent male. Although the racial balance does not vary greatly by institutional type, differences in gender are striking. The highest proportion of male faculty—around 70 percent—is found at research and doctoral universities (73 and 69 percent, respectively), while at master’s and baccalaureate institutions, it is 59 and 57 percent. Community colleges have the lowest proportion of men on their faculty, at 53 percent.¹ Interestingly, these figures represent progress toward gender equity since 1992, although community colleges were more open to women academics then, as well.

Most faculty are middle-aged, with an average age at all types of institutions between 49 and 51. Mobility is relatively low among community college faculty. Academics at community colleges have served an average of 18 years beyond the teaching assistant level in higher education, and have been at their current institution for an average of 14.5 years. Only faculty at research universities have been at their institutions for a longer time.

As one would expect, the master’s degree is the highest degree earned by the majority of community college faculty responding to our survey (64 percent), while the Ph.D. is the highest degree earned for the majority of faculty at all other types of institutions, ranging from 57 percent at baccalaureate colleges to 81 percent at research universities. About 14 percent of community college faculty are currently working towards another degree.

Community college professors’ fields of study reflect the missions of their institutions. In particular, we may note that a lower proportion of them have degrees in the liberal arts fields (humanities, social sciences, physical sciences, biological sciences, and psychology) than faculty at other types of institutions, and a higher proportion have degrees in applied fields like education, business, nursing, and technical/vocational subjects. Still, the top five disciplines in which community college faculty hold their degrees are quite similar to those in the other types of higher education institutions: education (in all but research universities); humanities (across the board); business (in community colleges, baccalaureate colleges, and doctoral universities); fine arts (in community colleges, baccalaureate colleges, and master’s colleges and universities); and social sciences (in all). The physical sciences are the only fields among the top five in other institutions that are not as highly represented among community college faculty.²

Academic rank in community colleges differs markedly from other institutions. A smaller proportion of community college faculty hold the rank of professor, associate professor, or assistant professor. While these ranks account for over 80 percent of the faculty at research, doctoral, master’s, and baccalaureate institutions, they account for only 46 percent of the faculty at community colleges. Over one-third (38 percent) of community college faculty are instructors or lecturers, while this is the case for only about ten percent of faculty elsewhere.

Community college faculty are more likely than others to hold their positions part-time. As explained earlier, part-timers are seriously underrepresented in our survey, but still account for one-fifth of our respondents at community colleges: the National Center for Education Statistics puts the actual figure at 64 percent.³ Although there are often many good reasons for part-time appointments, a large majority of our respondents from two-year colleges feel that part-timers are replacing full-timers. Indeed, they are more likely than their colleagues at other types of institutions to say that part-time and adjunct faculty fill jobs at their institutions that would otherwise be filled by regular faculty members—71 percent, as compared to around 65 percent at master’s and doctoral institutions; 56 percent at baccalaureate colleges; and 49 percent at research universities.

Clearly, some part-timers at community colleges are fully employed professionals who bring to their teaching important ties to the community and state of the art knowledge. Still, many who wrote comments found the general trend towards part-time employment problematic. “At my institution,” one community college faculty member said, “full-time faculty are being replaced by part-time faculty as the established instructors retire or relocate, and they receive fewer benefits, are given inferior office space and technological equipment, and are given little hope of moving into full-time positions.” Another added that her department had a large pool of part-time faculty “who have no access to departmental meetings, decision-making processes, or current technologies.”⁴

How do salaries of our respondents compare? Overall, the annual (full-time basis) salary received by the largest proportion of *baccalaureate* college faculty is \$30,000-\$39,000 (nearly 30 percent), while the annual salary level received by the largest proportion of faculty in all other groups, including community colleges, is \$40,000-\$49,000 (from 20 to 24 percent). Even so, community college faculty are more likely than others to earn less than \$30,000 on a full-time basis (17 percent). At the upper end, however, just under a quarter of community college faculty are earning over \$60,000—somewhat higher than at baccalaureate colleges (16 percent) and about the same as at master’s colleges and universities. Professors at research and doctoral institutions are far ahead, with about one half and one third respectively earning over \$60,000 a year.

When faculty are asked about outside earnings, nearly 30 percent of baccalaureate and community college faculty report earning nothing above and beyond their institutional salaries, compared to slightly fewer at master’s, doctoral, and research institutions. Interestingly, the proportion of faculty earning 50 percent or more of the value of their institutional salary from outside sources is similar (6 to 8 percent) at all types of institutions.

We also asked faculty for their opinions on retirement. Across institutions, about one quarter favor a mandatory age of retirement for faculty. Although few feel that the major purpose of early retirement programs at their institution is to force out less productive faculty (from 10 percent at community colleges to 28 percent at research universities), only 34 to 40 percent would exercise an early retirement option if it were offered to them. Around half of all faculty agree that their institution provides the conditions and support for faculty to retire with dignity (ranging from 46 percent at master’s and doctoral institutions to 56 percent at

community colleges), and most intend to engage in research and professional writing during their retirement (from a low of 42 percent at community colleges to a high of 73 percent at research universities).

NOTES

1. Figures on faculty demographics from The National Center for Education Statistics for fall 1995 are similar to our findings for spring 1997. According to the NCES report, *Fall Staff in Postsecondary Institutions, 1995*, 86 percent of *full-time* faculty were white (p. 2-8); 60 percent of *all* faculty were male (p. 2-4); and men composed a smaller percentage of faculty in 2-year institutions (52 percent) than in 4-year institutions (64 percent) (p.2-6).
2. The table for this question lists only those fields in which 3 percent or more of community college faculty received their degrees.
3. See National Center for Education Statistics, *Fall Staff in Postsecondary Institutions, 1995* (Figure 2-3, p. 2-4).
4. In a recent survey focussing on community college faculty's connections to local labor markets Dominic Brewer and Maryann Gray concluded that "Part-time faculty, many of whom have strong community connections, are often unable to use these connections on behalf of the institution, largely as a result of their tenuous connection to the college." See *Connecting College and Community in the New Economy? An Analysis of Community College Faculty-Labor Market Linkages* (Santa Monica, CA:Rand, 1997, p. vi). For wider discussion of the issues our respondents raised in their comments, see John E. Roueche, Susanne D. Roueche, and Mark D. Milliron, *Strangers in their own Land: Part-Time Faculty in American Community Colleges* (Washington, DC: Community College Press, 1995), and Judith M. Gappa and David W. Leslie, *The Invisible Faculty: Improving the Status of Part-Timers in Higher Education* (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1993).

CHAPTER 3: TEACHING AND LEARNING: CONCERN AND COMMITMENT

Community colleges serve a special group of students. A recent profile of public two-year institutions reports that, nationwide, their students are older than those attending four-year institutions, with 35 percent under age 21 (compared to 42 percent at other types of colleges and universities) and 36 percent older than age 30 (compared to 23 percent elsewhere). Nearly half (47 percent) of community college students work 35 or more hours a week (compared to 27 percent at four-year institutions), and about 40 percent come from families with incomes of less than \$30,000 (compared to 28 percent of first-year students elsewhere). Further, community colleges serve half of the students in higher education who come from minority or ethnic backgrounds.¹

Faculty at community colleges are very much aware of their institutions' role in providing opportunities for students who might otherwise be unable to continue their formal education. In our survey, two-thirds of the faculty at community colleges strongly agree that access to higher education should be available to all who meet minimum entrance requirements—a higher proportion than faculty at master's (55 percent), baccalaureate (54 percent), doctoral (50 percent), and research (49 percent) institutions. Of course, open access entails certain costs. While faculty at all types of colleges and universities say that their students could be better prepared for college work, underpreparation is most marked at community colleges, most of which are open to any who wish to enroll. Fewer faculty at two-year than at four-year institutions find their students adequately prepared in written and oral skills or in mathematics and quantitative reasoning skills. Only 14 percent of community college faculty give good marks to their students' literacy skills, and even fewer praise their students' training in math.

Recently, much attention has been paid to the rise in number of remedial or “developmental” classes in higher education institutions of all kinds. Today, over 70 percent of community college faculty agree that their institution spends too much time and money teaching students what they should have learned in high school. But they are not alone. Their sentiment is shared by nearly as many of their colleagues at master's colleges and universities (68 percent) and doctoral universities (66 percent), while faculty at research universities (62 percent) and baccalaureate colleges (56 percent) are not far behind. Although many professors told us in written comments that the problem is getting worse, Carnegie survey data indicate that the overall proportion of faculty holding this view has been almost constant since 1984, when the question was first asked.

Faculty have other concerns about their students. Over two-thirds of community college faculty agree that students do just enough to get by academically, perhaps reflecting the fact that community college students are likely to be part-timers, coping with family and work responsibilities, or “experimenters,” trying college out and seeking some subject to turn them on.² Around two-thirds of the faculty at community colleges also find students today more careerist and grade conscious than before, a finding in line with a general tendency toward a focus on preparation for the workplace among college students nationwide.³ The darker side

of these trends is revealed in the high proportion of faculty who believe that today's students are also more likely to cheat to get good grades—42 percent at community colleges compared to 33 to 40 percent at other types of institutions.

Professors from across the institutional spectrum commented that undergraduates, in general, seem to be losing their interest in learning. "Sure," wrote one research university professor, "there is a small percentage of exceptional undergraduates who still have the quest for knowledge, who make teaching such a pleasure. But these days, the majority seem to be only interested in getting good letter grades with the least effort." A faculty member from a baccalaureate college observed that "compared to their peers of the 1980s, the new students of the late 1990s seem to have a much diminished capacity and appetite for sustained academic effort over the course of the school year." A community college professor confided: "I have observed that one of the most vexing problems we teachers face is that most of our students are unmotivated. They have learned that the educational system is a resource to be manipulated...not for purposes of learning and enlightenment, but for the purpose of financial advancement. The most cunning students have so mastered test-taking that they can pass a class without learning a thing."⁴

Despite such concerns, our survey shows that, on the whole, community college faculty are satisfied with their students and committed to the special educational mission of their institutions. For example, over half of community college faculty say they are pleased with their students (57 percent), and most agree that faculty at their institutions are concerned with students' academic progress (87 percent). Community college faculty rank near the top on both these measures, exceeded only by faculty at baccalaureate institutions. Indeed, when it comes to relationships with students, community college faculty are at the top, with 70 percent claiming to be very satisfied, as compared to 68 percent at baccalaureate colleges, and 55 to 60 percent at research, doctoral, and master's institutions.

Undergraduate teaching is ranked highly by community college faculty, with 82 percent saying it is very important to them personally. More than half feel that the quality of training they received in graduate school for their role as a teacher was excellent or good (53 percent), although fewer (43 percent) agree that new teachers at their institution are provided with adequate mentoring and support.

Community college faculty do report innovation in teaching at their institutions. Over four-fifths say their department has experimented with the use of technology in instruction; around half say that interdisciplinary teaching is encouraged at their institution, and about a third say the same for team teaching. In addition, some 40 percent of community college faculty say that they regularly or occasionally supervise their students in service learning activities off campus about the same proportion as their colleagues at research and doctoral institutions, but less than faculty at master's and baccalaureate colleges. Community college professors agree with their colleagues on one area for improvement: over half the faculty at all types of institutions say that faculty should spend more time with students outside the classroom.

Community college teaching clearly has special problems, but also special rewards. As one community college professor told us: "I wouldn't trade for teaching at a four-year university. I love the challenge and rewards of teaching the variety of ages and skill levels. These students are often unsure of what they want to do and often uncommitted to college. When we spark the excitement of learning and thirst for knowledge in *them*, we know we've *really taught*."

NOTES

1. Patrick M. Callan, "Stewards of Opportunity: America's Public Community Colleges," *Daedalus* 126, no. 4 (1997): 95-112. Although Callan's statistics are for public two-year colleges only, the National Center for Education Statistics reports that public institutions serve 96 percent of community college students. See *Digest of Education Statistics 1996* (Table 174, p.181).
2. The term "experimenter" is from C. Manski, "Schooling as Experimentation: A Reappraisal of the College Dropout Phenomenon," *Economics of Education Review* 8 (1989):305-312, as cited in a manuscript by W. Norton Grubb and Associates, *Honored but Invisible: Teaching in Community Colleges* (New York: Routledge, 1999). See also W. N. Grubb, *Working in the Middle: Strengthening Education and Training for the Mid-Skilled Labor Force* (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1996), Chapter 2. According to Grubb, community college instructors interviewed by his research team "are quite aware of how many students are experimenters—and what problems they pose for teaching since they are less interested in learning a course's content than in using course enrollment to find out what they want—so they may not work hard at mastering the course itself" (Personal communication, April 21, 1998).
3. Alexander Astin and his colleagues in the Cooperative Institutional Research Program, have found an increase in materialistic values among college freshmen over the years. For example, "agreement with the statement that 'the chief benefit of a college education is to increase one's earning power' increased from 53.6 percent to 70.9 percent between 1969 and 1989. Similarly, the proportion of students who say they are attending college "to be able to make more money" increased from 49.9 percent to 74.7 percent between 1971 and 1991." See Alexander W. Astin, Sarah A. Parrott, William S. Korn, and Linda J. Sax, *The American Freshman: Thirty Year Trends* (Los Angeles: Higher Education Research Institute, UCLA, 1997), p.13.
4. It is interesting to note that the Cooperative Institutional Research Program finds that American college freshmen in Fall, 1997 "exhibit higher levels of [academic] disengagement...than any previous entering class of students." They are more likely to report being frequently "bored in class" during their last year of high school, to have "overslept and missed class or appointment," and to spend less time "studying or doing homework." See Linda J. Sax, Alexander W. Astin, William S. Korn, and Kathryn M. Mahoney, *The American Freshman: National Norms for Fall 1997* (Los Angeles: Higher Education Research Institute, UCLA, 1997), p.2.

CHAPTER 4: THE GOALS OF COMMUNITY COLLEGE EDUCATION

Most community colleges are now comprehensive institutions, providing a variety of educational services, from general liberal arts education for students hoping to transfer to a four-year institution, to specialized occupational training programs, remedial or developmental education, and enrichment courses of all kinds. Our survey shows, however, that community college faculty embrace most of the same goals for the education of undergraduates that their colleagues hold for collegiate education at institutions of other kinds. Community college faculty hold career preparation in especially high regard, but literacy, problem-solving, and a variety of social and civic skills are valued by faculty across the board.

When asked which outcomes of higher education are *very important* for undergraduates, the overwhelming favorites of community college faculty are the development of oral and written communication (89 percent), and of analysis and problem solving abilities (86 percent). These are followed by such reflective accomplishments as self-knowledge (66 percent) and tolerance of diversity (62 percent). Around half of community college faculty place high priority on students' development of firm moral values and enhanced creative capacities, while 40 to 45 percent mention academic content: appreciation for literature and the arts, and science and technological literacy. Knowledge of one subject in depth and international understanding are chosen by fewer respondents as very important outcomes of undergraduate education.

The only outcome highly favored by community college faculty that is notably different from those chosen by faculty at other institutions is—not surprisingly—preparation for a career. This outcome is considered very important by 59 percent of community college faculty, but by only 34 to 41 percent of faculty elsewhere.

We also asked faculty about their institution's performance. A markedly higher proportion of faculty at community colleges than at other types of institutions rate their institution's performance as excellent or good at serving nontraditional age students effectively (85 percent, compared to the next highest, master's institutions, at 62 percent) and at preparing undergraduates for a vocation or career (83 percent, as compared to the next highest, baccalaureate colleges, at 72 percent). Community college faculty are satisfied with the course of study at their institutions: only a quarter agree that the undergraduate curriculum at their college is in serious need of reform. They also believe their institutions are doing a satisfactory job of general education, with four out of five rating their performance as excellent or good—about the same proportion as baccalaureate college faculty. Interestingly, however, a sizeable minority (43 percent) say they prefer teaching courses on limited specialties to those which cover wide varieties of material—about the same proportion as faculty elsewhere.

A middling range of community college instructors give good to excellent grades to their institution's capacity to provide opportunities for students to explore personal interests through electives or to explore a subject in depth through the major (64 and 63 percent, respectively). Around 40 percent or fewer rate highly their institution's performance in

strengthening the values of undergraduates, offering students opportunities to experience and understand leadership, or to engage in public and/or community service. The greatest challenge is in developing a sense of campus community. Perhaps reflecting the heavily commuter and part-time student bodies at these institutions, only a quarter of community college faculty feel that their institution performs well in this regard.

Community colleges' special circumstances are also reflected in faculty's views of what might improve undergraduate education. More faculty at community colleges than elsewhere agree on the desirability of giving students a stronger mix of theory and practice in their academic experience (80 percent) and making education more relevant to contemporary lives and problems (67 percent). Given the fragmented nature of the academic and vocational programs at many community colleges, it is also understandable that faculty at these institutions feel it is important to place more emphasis on a common core of courses for all students (61 percent). Conversely, fewer faculty at community colleges than elsewhere agree that undergraduate education would be better if less emphasis were placed on specialized training and more on broad liberal education (40 percent).

CHAPTER 5: FACULTY ROLES IN A TEACHING INSTITUTION

In a “teaching institution” like the community college, it is not surprising to find that a large majority of the faculty are oriented more toward teaching than toward research. Yet community college faculty are not alone. National debates may have cast doubt on the commitment of college and university faculty to educating students, but our survey shows that most faculty say their interests lie primarily in or lean toward teaching. In fact, this has long been the case. Beginning from a high of 76 percent of the professoriate in 1969 and declining to a low of 70 percent in 1984, the proportion has risen steadily since to today’s figure of 73 percent.

International findings for faculty in four-year institutions underscore the distinctiveness of this profile. The Carnegie Foundation’s 1992 International Survey of the Academic Profession in four-year or senior institutions, showed a high level of interest in teaching among faculty in only five of fourteen countries: Russia (68 percent), Chile (67 percent), Mexico (65 percent), the United States (63 percent), and Brazil (62 percent). In the nine other countries, more than half the faculty responded that their interests were more in research, with Japan and the Netherlands, at over 70 percent, leading the way.

This is not to say that the sectors of American higher education are all the same. Indeed, when we look more closely at these data, differences appear among faculty in different types of institutions. Not surprisingly, the number of faculty who say their interests are primarily in or leaning toward teaching is highest in community colleges (nearly 95 percent) and lowest in research universities (43 percent), with baccalaureate colleges and master’s colleges and universities in between. No doubt many faculty at community colleges were attracted to those institutions through their interest in teaching, and, indeed, two-thirds say this orientation has not changed over time. Like their colleagues in other types of institutions, however, a notable number of community college faculty *have* learned to take a greater interest in teaching. Across the board, 28 percent of respondents say their interests have shifted more toward teaching over the course of their professional life.

Certainly, community college faculty report spending more time teaching than faculty at other types of institutions. The numbers are most striking for formal classroom instruction, where community college faculty report that they spent around 15 hours a week teaching undergraduates during the fall of 1996, as compared to 10 hours a week for faculty at baccalaureate and master’s institutions, 7.5 hours a week for faculty at doctoral institutions, and 6 hours a week for faculty at research universities. Community college faculty also spent more time providing student tutorial aid (5 hours a week) and academic advising (4 hours a week) than faculty at other types of institutions. Preparation for teaching took up 11.5 hours per week—more than faculty at research universities (10 hours), about the same as faculty in doctoral institutions, but less than faculty at baccalaureate and master’s institutions, who reported spending around 13 hours a week preparing to teach.¹

For many community college faculty, scholarship does not mean engaging in original re-

search so much as keeping up to date in their field. As one professor told us: “My reading is important to my teaching. I run to keep abreast of developments and include them in the courses I teach.” Given their heavy teaching responsibilities, it is not surprising that community college faculty spend less time in original research and/or comparable scholarly activities than their colleagues elsewhere (around 6 hours, as compared to 18 for research university faculty). But this does not mean that these professors only teach. Although it is true that very few community college faculty (5 percent) report that regular research activity is expected in their position, about 40 percent say that they are currently engaged in scholarly work that they expect to lead to a publication, exhibit or performance, and about 20 percent report that they have received a grant or special funding support for research in the last three years.

Most of the grants received by community college faculty are small—about half for amounts under \$5,000. However, about a quarter of the grants are for \$5,000-\$24,999, another quarter for grants over \$25,000, with 4 percent of our community college respondents reporting research grants of \$500,000 or more. Most of this funding comes from government sources (47 percent), followed in frequency by the institutions themselves (39 percent), private foundations (26 percent), and business firms (9 percent). The pattern differs from that of other faculty primarily in regard to the availability of institutional resources for research. Four-year colleges and universities support a much larger proportion of faculty research. The number is only 39 percent in two-year institutions, but ranges from 48 to 63 percent elsewhere.

Community college faculty are also actively engaged in applied scholarship (consulting or professional service). Again, relatively few (17 percent) report that consulting is seen as a component of scholarship at their college. Still, during the past year, 78 percent of faculty in community colleges worked as a paid or unpaid consultant with a variety of organizations—over half with educational institutions, one third with business or industry, and around one fifth each with local government and private social service agencies. This pattern of consulting is similar across the board in higher education—both in regard to the proportion of faculty consultants and the kinds of clients they serve. The only exception concerns national government agencies, for which 30 percent of research university faculty report working, but only around 15 percent of doctoral and master’s institution faculty, and 6 to 7 percent of baccalaureate and community college faculty. Overall, about 29 percent of the time faculty spent in these various activities during the last year was paid, while around a fourth of all faculty said that from an economic standpoint, it was necessary for them to engage in paid consulting work.

Community college faculty do not report much of a conflict among their professional activities, perhaps because their commitment to teaching is so clear. Unlike many of their colleagues at other types of institutions, community college professors see neither negative or positive interaction between their research and teaching activities. For example, few say that the quality of teaching at their institution is reduced by the pressure to publish, and only 27 percent agree that one must be engaged in research to be a good teacher (as compared to 55 to 72 percent elsewhere). It is also worth noting that few faculty anywhere, including com-

munity colleges, consider service activity beyond their institution a distraction that competes with other academic responsibilities.²

Indeed, among community college faculty, there is a very clear sense of what activities should count. Over four-fifths believe that teaching effectiveness should be the primary criterion for promotion of faculty—far higher than faculty at other types of institutions. Interestingly, however, only 38 percent believe that faculty evaluation at their institution currently gives appropriate weight to teaching, research, and service. Fully half the faculty at community colleges would like their departments to give more recognition to the role of *professional service and the applied aspects of knowledge*—a proportion quite similar to their colleagues elsewhere.

NOTES

1. These figures do not add up to total work time: in addition to the endeavors mentioned here, we asked respondents to estimate the hours per week they spent during the past fall term on other activities as well: formal classroom instruction in graduate or professional courses, institutional service, clinical practice, consulting with or without pay, and other employment.
2. For a discussion of the ways in which community college faculty are linked to their local labor markets and wider communities and of how these links are used or not used to benefit the college, see Dominic Brewer's and Maryann Gray's report on their recent survey of community college faculty, *Connecting College and Community in the New Economy? An Analysis of Community College Faculty-Labor Market Linkages* (Santa Monica, CA:Rand, 1997).

CHAPTER 6: EVALUATION

Faculty evaluation is where rhetoric about faculty roles meets the reality of rewards for professional work. Efforts to encourage faculty to broaden their range of scholarly activity—to develop new research topics, engage in professional service, undertake interdisciplinary projects, or improve teaching—cannot succeed if the quality of this work is seldom measured, inadequately weighed in decisions about career advancement and salaries, or if it is judged by standards that are inappropriate or unclear.¹ Understandably, faculty at community colleges suffer less from mixed messages than their colleagues at institutions with complex missions of teaching, research, and service. However, because teaching is the major activity on which faculty at two-year institutions are evaluated, how well it is evaluated takes on special importance in this setting.

At community colleges, 97 percent of faculty report that their teaching activities are regularly evaluated; 47 percent report the same of their service to the institution; 16 percent cite their research and/or other creative work; and only 14 percent note regular evaluation of their applied scholarship or outreach. This pattern is quite distinctive. Virtually all faculty at all types of institutions report the regular evaluation of teaching. But a far smaller proportion of faculty at two-year than at four-year institutions report the regular evaluation of other faculty roles. For research and/or other creative work, the numbers at four-year institutions range from 57 to 86 percent; for service to the college or university, from 67 to 75 percent; and for applied scholarship or outreach, from 25 to 40 percent.

Who evaluates can be as important as what gets evaluated and how often evaluation is done. At community colleges, faculty say that teaching is regularly appraised by students (84 percent), head of their department (77 percent), departmental peers (51 percent), senior administrative staff (34 percent), and members of other departments at their institution (16 percent). Those few reporting regular evaluation of research note especially department head (67 percent) and departmental peers (43 percent). Just under a quarter of community college faculty say their research is subject to external review, but even at research universities, the proportion is only 44 percent.

Given the relatively minor role of academic research in faculty evaluation at community colleges, it is understandable that fewer professors at these institutions report a need for better ways, besides publications, to evaluate the scholarly performance of faculty (42 percent compared to over 60 percent elsewhere). When it comes to teaching, however, they join their colleagues in claiming that better ways are needed to evaluate performance (67 percent as compared to 70 percent or more elsewhere). Most college and university faculty, including those at community colleges, agree that student opinions should be used in evaluating teaching effectiveness—around 70 percent at all types of institutions. But an even higher proportion agree that peer review should be used in evaluations of teaching—74 percent at community colleges (somewhat lower than elsewhere), and 77 percent overall.

Our survey results reflect some of the past decade's experiments in faculty evaluation,

particularly the rapid pace of innovation in reporting, documenting, and evaluating teaching. Over one-third of faculty overall (including community college faculty) report that new methods of evaluating teaching have been developed in their departments. Still, comments suggest that the pace of change is uneven, and methods of documentation and evaluation have not yet caught up to innovation in teaching itself. As one doctoral university respondent said: “I feel that there has been increased emphasis placed on teaching at our institution in the past few years. This emphasis has encompassed innovative approaches to increase critical thinking skills in the classroom and technology related to distance learning. This shift of emphasis has been beneficial to student learning. Unfortunately, the means to evaluate effective teaching has not kept pace.”

Respondents to our survey suggest that evaluation has not changed much for other types of faculty work. Many educators have suggested placing less reliance on numbers of publications and size of grants in appraising research, and advocates of integrative and applied scholarship have come forward with proposals to enhance the visibility and legitimacy of these activities in academe. So far, however, they have had little impact on campus. Few faculty report new developments in the evaluation of research, applied scholarship/outreach, or service to the college or university.

On the whole, respondents give lukewarm endorsement to the quality of faculty evaluation on their campuses. Although 57 percent of all faculty say that most people in their field agree on the standards of good scholarship, only 15 percent say so “strongly.” And while nearly three-quarters agree that their own performance has been evaluated fairly at their institution, only about a third *strongly* agree that these reviews have been fair. Community college faculty stand out well in this regard, with 40 percent agreeing strongly that they have been fairly evaluated, compared to 25 to 34 percent elsewhere.

The reform movement in higher education has called not only for improvement in the ways in which faculty are evaluated, but for change in the weighting of different kinds of faculty work. Thus we also asked our respondents whether, in their experience, various activities count more or less today for purposes of faculty advancement than they did five years ago. The figures from community colleges are in marked contrast with other types of institutions. At community colleges, only small proportions report any change in the low value attributed to research and applied scholarship. However, about 15 percent say that service to the college counts more today, and 18 percent say that teaching—always important—has an even higher weight.

At four-year institutions, by contrast, faculty say that research continues to rise in importance. About one third of the faculty report that research counts more today than it did five years ago at research universities (where research has long been important) and at baccalaureate colleges (where it has mattered less). And at master’s and doctoral institutions, the proportion reporting that research counts more now is over 40 percent. Across the board, very few say research and/or creative work counts less.

The story in regard to teaching is more mixed. At baccalaureate, master’s, and doctoral

colleges and universities only slightly more faculty (19 to 25 percent) say teaching counts more today than those (13 to 20 percent) who say it counts less. But at the research universities, reformers may be able to point to some success. Faculty at these institutions point to the biggest change in regard to teaching: 45 percent report that teaching counts more for purposes of advancement than it did five years ago, while only 13 percent report that it counts less.

Two other figures relate to the alignment of faculty evaluation with institutional missions and goals. The largest change in the importance of applied scholarship is reported by faculty at master's colleges and universities (with 21 percent saying that outreach counts more today), while the largest change in the importance of service to the college or university is reported by faculty at baccalaureate colleges (with 19 percent saying that citizenship counts more now than it did before).

On the whole, relatively few faculty wish that their institution would set clearer priorities for the kind of work faculty should do. Indeed, at community colleges (and baccalaureate colleges), over three-fourths of the faculty agree that the stated missions of their institution are clear to the faculty, and around 70 percent say that the institution's goals for undergraduates are clear a statement with which fewer than half the faculty at research and doctoral institutions would agree. Nonetheless, community college faculty do not generally find the reward system entirely in tune with institutional missions. Fewer than half—44 percent—of community college faculty agree that their institution is consistent in what it expects faculty to do and how it rewards them—and the number is considerably less at master's and research institutions (31 percent) and at doctoral universities (27 percent). This may reflect the need, across higher education, for teaching to be better evaluated and to count more in the system of faculty rewards.

NOTES

1. See Charles Glassick, Mary Taylor Huber, and Gene Maeroff, *Scholarship Assessed: Evaluation of the Professoriate* (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc. and The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1997).

CHAPTER 7: WORKING CONDITIONS

The two-year sector of American higher education expanded enormously in the 1960s and 1970s, and while many community colleges today are situated on relatively new and attractive campuses, they have also experienced the stress and strain of rapid growth. These colleges' physical facilities, along with the administrative, educational, and intellectual environments they support, help shape faculty productivity and morale. We included in our survey many questions designed to explore these conditions as sources of satisfaction and frustration in college faculty's professional lives. We found that professors working at community colleges are the most satisfied faculty in higher education. Nearly 60 percent say that "this institution is a very good place for me"—a figure considerably higher than faculty at other types of colleges and universities.

Although community college faculty are by no means the best paid, they are more likely than their colleagues to say that their academic salaries are excellent or good. Indeed, community colleges are the only setting in which over half the faculty—57 percent—give their salaries such a high rating. In research universities, where faculty earn the most, 49 percent report satisfaction, but the figure is closer to only 35 percent for faculty at doctoral, master's, and baccalaureate institutions.

Community college faculty stand out from their colleagues in several other ways, too. Fewer professors at community colleges report that their job is a source of considerable personal strain (33 percent), and more faculty agree that they are more enthusiastic about their work now than when they began their academic careers (51 percent). This is not to deny that community college faculty are subject to pressures that affect faculty everywhere. For example, professors at two-year colleges are almost as likely as their colleagues at doctoral, master's, and baccalaureate institutions to say that their teaching load is stressful. They are only somewhat less likely than faculty at four-year institutions to agree that they hardly ever get the time to give a piece of work the attention it deserves, although fewer community college faculty feel they have less control of their time now than they had five years ago.

Still, it is the case that community college faculty are less likely to report stress on a wide variety of measures. The highest sources of stress over the past two years for community college faculty have been the campus bureaucracy-institutional procedures and 'red tape'—and time allocation between work and family (58 and 55 percent). These are followed by teaching load (47 percent), committee work (46 percent), and student demands (41 percent), but less than one third say that their own review or promotion process was particularly stressful, and even fewer are troubled by relationships with colleagues or evaluating colleagues for promotion. Perhaps the greatest difference between two-year and four-year college faculty concerns faculty roles and rewards. Whereas 58 percent of research university faculty find demands for research and publishing a source of stress, these trouble only 8 percent of faculty at community colleges.

The story is more mixed in regard to the social and physical infrastructure that supports

faculty work. Overall, more than half of community college respondents rate their institution's facilities, resources, and personnel as excellent or good. This puts them in the middle rank. Those more satisfied are at baccalaureate and research institutions (59 and 57 percent, respectively), while those less satisfied are at master's and doctoral colleges and universities (49 and 47 percent, respectively). Community college faculty rate access to their colleagues very highly (three-quarters marking excellent or good); over three-fifths rate their classroom space as excellent or good; and at least half say the same of technology for teaching, laboratories, and computer facilities at their institutions.

Still, community college faculty tend to rate the technology infrastructure at their institutions less highly than faculty at other institutions. Although 58 percent think their e-mail capability excellent or good, this does not compare well with 72 to 88 percent elsewhere. Likewise, fewer community college faculty think highly of their access to the internet and to library / on-line resources. User support is a problem not just at community colleges, but throughout higher education. Only at research universities do over half the faculty give user support good grades.

Frustrations aside, community college faculty are satisfied with their jobs. Over 80 percent claim to be either very or somewhat satisfied with their job situation as a whole. Indeed, community college faculty have the highest proportion who are very satisfied (41 percent). Over 90 percent are very or somewhat satisfied with the courses they teach, and 85 percent say the same about relationships with colleagues. Fewer express satisfaction with the way their departments are managed (66 percent) or with the way their institutions are managed (38 percent). Overall, these data suggest that faculty are generally satisfied with many critical parts of their job, but not with the more distant institutional issues of how their colleges and universities are run.

The quality of intellectual life available to college and university faculty is widely perceived as one of academia's greatest rewards. Professors across the board agree that this is an especially creative and productive time in their field—from 72 percent at research universities and baccalaureate colleges to 75 percent at master's colleges and universities and at community colleges. Some of this vitality is reflected in the finding that 70 percent of all faculty say that their interests have become more interdisciplinary in recent years. Only a third or so would agree that this is a poor time for a person to begin a career in their field, and only 1 in 10 would agree that they would not become a college teacher, if they had it do over again.

CHAPTER 8: GOVERNANCE AND COMMUNITY ON CAMPUS

Strengthening community on campus remains a critical issue for colleges and universities across the country. As students and faculty become more diverse and as academic programs proliferate, it is harder to perceive shared interests and common goals. Because community colleges have experienced especially rapid change in the past 30 years, it is not surprising that tensions are particularly evident concerning institutional governance and administration.

Our surveys document these changes in faculty perception over time. *Overall*, the proportion of academics who say that the sense of community on campus is excellent or good has declined from 37 percent in 1989 and 1992 to 27 percent today. At community college campuses, the change has been particularly marked: 45 percent of the faculty gave high marks to the sense of community on campus in 1989, while only 27 percent did so in 1997. One community college professor told us that on her campus, “individuals spend an ever-decreasing amount of time on teaching, keeping up with the field, and in committee work, because they are spending more time on personal goals or income producing activities unrelated to the goals of the department or institution.” Of course, the numbers vary by type of institution. In 1997, about half the faculty at baccalaureate colleges rated the sense of community on campus highly. At research universities, as at community colleges, the number was only 27 percent, while at master’s and doctoral institutions, it was even less.

Like faculty across higher education, most community college professors (80 percent) say that their disciplines are very important to them personally; over half (57 percent) feel as strongly about their department; and under half (45 percent) claim such a close connection to the institution itself. Departments, of course, are faculty members’ disciplinary homes on campus, and while nearly half of community college faculty (47 percent) say that faculty in their department have little contact with faculty in other departments, few feel that their departmental colleagues tend to isolate themselves from the world outside. Indeed, three-quarters of community college faculty rate the academic reputation of their department outside their institution as excellent or good, and over half feel highly valued and appreciated.

The division between faculty’s evaluation of department and institution closely reflects their sense of personal empowerment. Over half of all faculty believe they have a great deal or quite a bit of opportunity to influence the policies of their department, while far fewer believe they have much opportunity to influence the policies of their institutions. At community colleges, the figures are 58 percent and 15 percent, respectively.

Participation is also greatest at the departmental level. At community colleges, 89 percent of faculty report that they take part in departmental faculty meetings; about two-thirds attend meetings of campus-wide committees; and about one-third go to faculty senate meetings. Participation at the campus-wide level through committees and faculty senate is highest at baccalaureate institutions (78 and 60 percent respectively) and lowest at research universities

(50 and 19 percent).

A similar gap is evident in faculty's assessment of governance at their institutions. Community college professors are most sanguine about departmental affairs. Few think that junior faculty have too little say in the running of their department, or that faculty meetings in their department are a waste of time. At the institutional level, however, only 38 percent of community college respondents say faculty governance works effectively at their institution, and opinions about the administration are mixed. Just under half the faculty agree that top-level administrators are providing competent leadership, while just over half claim that communication between the faculty and the administration is poor. Fewer (44 percent) say that their institution is managed effectively, while only about one third think that relationships between administration and undergraduates and between administration and faculty are excellent or good.

Faculty rate other features of campus community more highly. For example, 83 percent of community college faculty say that relationships between faculty and students are excellent or good. Just over 60 percent agree that there is a strong sense of institutional pride on their campus, and about the same proportion are confident about student morale. Half the faculty at two-year colleges say that the intellectual environment on campus is excellent or good—fewer than at research universities (67 percent) and baccalaureate institutions (58 percent), but about the same as faculty at master's and doctoral institutions.

Most community college respondents agree that female faculty (85 percent) and minority faculty (82 percent) are treated fairly at their institutions—as compared to about three quarters of faculty at other types of institutions. Nor do many community college faculty think that racial and ethnic conflicts (21 percent) or gender issues (17 percent) are a problem among students at their institutions—a lower figure than at other types of colleges and universities. Still, only 41 percent of community college faculty rate the overall quality of campus life as excellent or good, and 44 percent of community college faculty agree that the quality of life at their institution is of greater concern today than it was a few years ago.

CHAPTER 9: HIGHER EDUCATION AND SOCIETY

What are faculty's attitudes about higher education's role in society beyond the campus? Our survey results suggest that community college faculty have a strong commitment to professional and institutional responsibility beyond the campus. However, their involvement is less likely than that of other faculty to extend beyond our nation's shores.

Community colleges are, by mission, local institutions, and it is understandable that community college faculty tend to have fewer connections with academics abroad than their colleagues at four-year colleges and universities. For example, very few have ever worked abroad to do research, take a sabbatical, or as part of an exchange program (23 percent). For faculty at other types of institutions, the proportion is considerably higher: master's (36 percent); baccalaureate (39 percent); doctoral (42 percent); and research (58 percent). Likewise, few agree that connections with scholars in other countries are very important to their professional work (29 percent, as compared with 46 to 69 percent elsewhere), or that their institution should recruit more international students and faculty (28 percent, as compared to 38 to 48 percent elsewhere). Community college faculty are also less likely than their colleagues to agree that universities and colleges should do more to promote student and faculty mobility from one country to another (54 percent as compared to 61 to 68 percent elsewhere).

Even in regard to academic content, community college faculty are less likely to turn to international material. While half agree that one must read books and journals published abroad in order to keep up with developments in their discipline (54 percent), this compares with two-thirds to three-fourths of their colleagues elsewhere who agree. The pattern is the same in regard to curriculum. Around half the faculty at four-year institutions say that the curriculum at their institution should be more international in focus. At community colleges, the proportion is just over one third. With increasing globalization, however, community colleges may find international studies more relevant to their local communities and thus an area for future growth.

Community college faculty join their colleagues at other types of institutions in regarding social responsibility and civic engagement as obligations of academic life. Few faculty at *any* type of institution believe that academic scholars should aim to advance knowledge without regard for the possible implications to society (from 23 to 31 percent). Further, most agree that scholars in their discipline have a professional obligation to apply their knowledge to problems in society (from 63 percent at community colleges to 73 percent at master's institutions).

Community college faculty are somewhat more likely than their colleagues to claim a professional obligation to collaborate with teachers in elementary and secondary schools (60 percent, as compared to a low of 42 percent at research universities), and 70 percent of community college faculty agree that universities have a responsibility to contribute to the economic development of their communities. However, as compared to about two-thirds of their

colleagues elsewhere, only 55 percent of professors at community colleges agree that their own institution should be actively engaged in solving social problems. Might this relate to a conviction that the community college's educational mission in itself serves an important social and economic role? As one of our respondents said, "The two-year community college is one of this nation's greatest resources. We provide the opportunity for any person to obtain a higher education."

Academics may be confident about the social value of their work, but they are less sure that their contribution is widely appreciated. Community college faculty are more convinced than their colleagues that academics are among the most influential opinion leaders in our society (49 percent as compared to 32 to 40 percent at other types of institutions). But community college faculty join other academics in their belief that respect for academics is declining in society at large (71 to 74 percent at all types of institutions). Indeed, like other academics, community college faculty hold a somewhat negative view of the political climate for scholarly work. Seven out of 10 agree that the effectiveness of higher education is being threatened by growing bureaucracies, and only 4 in 10 agree that there are no political or ideological restrictions in this country on what a scholar may publish.

CHAPTER 10: REFLECTIONS

Community colleges occupy a critical niche in higher education—or, more precisely, several critical niches. Men and women, many of whom might otherwise not continue their education, come to these institutions in order to begin college in a relatively low-cost, close-to-home setting. Others come for a certificate in a technical or vocational field or participate in a training program offered by a community college at their company, on site. Some come to community colleges for a high school equivalency diploma, for remedial or developmental instruction in language arts or mathematics, or to learn English as a second language. Many just take courses—short courses, long courses, in-between courses—looking for a subject to interest them, seeking enrichment, perfecting skills.

Although these varied students and programs give teaching in community colleges unique features, faculty at two-year institutions share many concerns with their colleagues in four-year colleges and universities. Looking at results from The Carnegie Foundation’s National Survey of Faculty, 1997, four issues stand out that will be critical to the future of the academic profession at higher education institutions of all kinds: access and standards, community on campus, the status of part-time faculty, and the scope of scholarly work. Each of these issues has a special inflection in the two-year college context.

Access and Standards. For the past century, the two-year college has made higher education accessible to an increasingly wide range of students. Community college faculty are well aware of the privileges of serving on the front line of educational democratization. They express strong commitment to access to higher education for all who meet minimum entrance requirements, embrace a comprehensive set of goals for their students, find considerable satisfaction with the courses they teach, and—for the most part—take a good deal of pleasure in their students. This is good news for the men and women who attend two-year colleges, and speaks well for the remarkable progress this country has made in extending opportunities for higher—and further—education.

At the same time, however, community college faculty experience democratization’s inevitable dilemmas. First, there is the continuing tension between access and standards. Community college faculty express deep concern about the adequacy of students’ preparation for college-level work, and many worry about the time and resources their institution devotes to teaching what should have been learned in high school. There is also tension between educators’ and students’ understanding of academic success. Community college faculty say that many students do just enough to get by in their courses and that many are willing to cheat to get good grades. Clearly, access to college—whether for purposes of education, job training, developing skills, or enrichment—can have real educational meaning only when students are both prepared and engaged.

Community on Campus. Two-year colleges are called “community colleges” because they are active in their local region, and not because of the cohesive quality of campus life. Indeed, as students and academic programs at these institutions become ever more diverse, it is increas-

ingly hard for students, faculty, and administrators to feel a sense of community—a sense of sharing interests, participation, and fellowship in a common enterprise. The good news is that community college faculty find their institution’s mission clear; the sense of institutional pride, strong; and student morale, good. The bad news is that these good things do not add up to a sense of community in the opinion of most of our respondents. The proportion giving high marks to the sense of community on their campus has dropped precipitously since 1989, and today, only 4 out of 10 rate the overall quality of campus life as excellent or good.

Governance is a particularly thorny area. Faculty are satisfied with the way their departments are managed, participate regularly in departmental meetings, and do not find these meetings a waste of time. When it comes to faculty governance beyond the department, administrative leadership, and institutional management, however, faculty confidence weakens. Of course, tension between faculty and administrators is a long-standing issue in higher education institutions of all kinds. But respondents’ comments suggest that today’s tensions are being interpreted in a new light. Faculty at community colleges join their colleagues at four-year institutions in voicing concern that “business models” are replacing a “community of scholars model” of governance in higher education. Clearly, the challenge is for administrators and academics to work together to respond *collegially* to changing times.

The Status of Part-Time Faculty. The status of part-time faculty is on many academic minds—especially in community colleges where nearly two-thirds of all faculty appointments are part-time. The employment of part-timers is an old practice in community colleges, it being apparent early on that instructors drawn from local schools, businesses, and other social and cultural institutions could lower costs *and* keep the college curriculum connected to local resources and needs. Over time, other rationales have been used to justify the employment of increasing numbers of faculty part-time. For example, it is said that a college can respond more flexibly to changing patterns of demand if faculty can be hired and let go as required.

No one would deny that certain programs are strengthened by community-based practitioners willing and able to devote time to students. But this is not the typical part-timer from the perspective of our respondents, who overwhelmingly believe that part-time and adjunct faculty are filling jobs at their institution that would otherwise be filled by regular faculty members. The concern, as voiced in comments, is both for the health of the academic profession and for the well-being of the academic program. As one community college respondent wrote: “I believe that part-time, non tenure track instructors have too little voice in academic culture, and little access to the monetary and professional rewards of academic life.” If community colleges are to continue to attract and benefit from talented and dedicated scholars and professionals, it will be necessary to better empower and reward those who work part-time.

The Scope of Faculty Scholarship. Community college faculty are teachers, first and foremost. But our survey shows that they are pursuing other scholarly activities as well. Around 40 percent are involved in research that they expect to lead to a publication, exhibit or performance and twice that number engage in consulting, or professional service. These activities

have great potential to enhance teaching and learning. The best teachers involve students in their research, while consulting strengthens faculty members' ties to local businesses and organizations, giving them information that can be used to students' advantage. Indeed, community colleges would be wise to explore policies that recognize and reward faculty who use research and professional service to enrich their students' experience.

The time is right for enhancing the scholarship of teaching in community colleges. Certainly, faculty report that many exciting things are happening in the classroom these days: for example, the use of technology in teaching, team teaching, interdisciplinary teaching, and service learning are making inroads across the academy. But the scholarship of teaching involves more than innovation in the classroom—it also entails efforts to make teaching public, to write and speak about teaching so that others can critique and build upon what one has learned. Some changes in the evaluation of teaching—especially the increasing popularity of portfolios and peer review—seem to be working in that direction. However, there's still a long way to go. As one community college respondent remarked, "I recently returned from an exciting, intellectually invigorating conference. Unfortunately ideas and theories I learned there will not become an actual part of my teaching as I have no time for real planning or reflection. Too many demands are made on my time and energy and all of us lose." Building a culture that supports innovation, reflection, and conversation about teaching and learning should be a priority across higher education, but especially for community colleges the nation's premier "teaching institutions."

Community college teaching is a unique calling—one that many faculty, despite obvious frustrations, find especially satisfying. These scholars and professionals are not the best paid in higher education, nor are they the ones with secure positions, time to pursue research, or the perquisites and prestige available to those at other kinds of higher education institutions. Many of their students face high hurdles, but this is regarded by many community college faculty as an opportunity to be grasped. The remark of one of our respondents is worth repeating: "When we spark the excitement of learning and thirst for knowledge in them, we know we've really taught." That kind of commitment is an asset that community colleges, as well as the localities and the nation they serve, should recognize, care for, and support.

APPENDIX A: TECHNICAL NOTES

The 1997 National Survey of Faculty is part of an ongoing effort at The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching to study trends in the attitudes of faculty at all types of colleges and universities across the United States. This survey builds upon five earlier surveys, which were administered in 1969, 1975, 1984, 1989 and 1992. In addition to updating core issues, this study introduces new questions dealing with current concerns in higher education. This most recent survey was conducted for The Carnegie Foundation by Wirthlin Worldwide of McLean, Virginia.

The survey instrument is similar in length and complexity to the previous waves of the questionnaire. It is 12 pages long and includes 68 items, many of which have several parts, resulting in a total of more than 250 questions. The questionnaire takes 30 to 45 minutes to complete. Sections of the instrument address: personal inventory and demographic information, the working conditions of faculty, scholarly activities, institutional governance, goals of higher education, campus community, higher education and society, and the international dimensions of higher education.

In determining the sampling design, careful consideration was given to methods used in previous studies. The sampling methodology most closely reflects that used in the 1989 National Survey of Faculty. A two-stage, stratified random sample design was used. In the first stage, universities and colleges (both four-year and two-year) were selected; in the second stage, faculty recipients were designated.

In the first stage of the sampling, 306 colleges and universities were randomly selected for inclusion in the study. Approximately 34 institutions were randomly selected from each of the nine Carnegie classification categories. Within each of these categories, a school was selected with a likelihood proportionate to the size of its faculty compared to the other schools within that category.

Once the 306 institutions were selected, nearly 10,000 faculty members were chosen for inclusion in the study, using lists maintained by CMG Information Services of Wilmington, Massachusetts. The sample was divided equally among the nine Carnegie classification categories creating sample sizes of 1,111 per group. Within each classification type, an *n*'th name selection was made.

The schedule included a pre-test administered to 100 randomly selected faculty members in the fall of 1996. Following the pre-test, the questionnaire was revised for use in the full-scale study. In February and March of 1997, four first-class mailings were sent to the college and university faculty selected for inclusion in the survey: a pre-notification letter, the final questionnaire booklet, a reminder postcard, and a second copy of the questionnaire booklet. Completed questionnaires were accepted through May 1, 1997.

Of the 9,991 questionnaires distributed to college and university faculty, 5,151 respondents

returned their questionnaires, representing a completion rate of 52 percent. The completion rate for specific Carnegie classification categories ranges from 43 percent for Associate of Arts Colleges to 58 percent for Baccalaureate Colleges I.

For conducting analyses, faculty responses were weighted by Carnegie classification type, allowing the results to be projectable to the universe of colleges and universities. The targets for weighting are based upon actual total number of faculty for the 1995-96 school year. These figures are available from the National Center for Education Statistics and were obtained by The Foundation from John Minter Associates in Boulder, Colorado.

The data presented in this report describe faculty at five types of institutions: Research, Doctoral, Master's, Baccalaureate, and Associate of Arts, reflecting groupings of Carnegie classification categories described in Appendix B. The numbers in the tables have been rounded and, therefore, some of the rows and/or columns in the tables may not add to exactly 100 percent. For this reason, also, some numbers in the text do not match exactly the numbers in the tables.

If you are interested in receiving a copy of the survey instrument, or if you would like further information on technical aspects of this study, such as sample design, response rates, and sample reliability, please contact The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 555 Middlefield Road, Menlo Park, California 94025, or call The Foundation at (650) 849-8000.

APPENDIX B: THE CARNEGIE CLASSIFICATION OF INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION

The 1994 Carnegie Classification includes all colleges and universities in the United States that are degree-granting and accredited by an agency recognized by the U.S. Secretary of Education. It groups institutions into categories on the basis of the level of degree offered ranging from prebaccalaureate to the doctorate and the comprehensiveness of their educational programs. The categories are as follows:

Research Universities I: These institutions offer a full range of baccalaureate programs, are committed to graduate education through the doctorate, and give high priority to research. They award 50 or more doctoral degrees each year. In addition, they receive annually \$40 million or more in federal support.

Research Universities II: These institutions offer a full range of baccalaureate programs, are committed to graduate education through the doctorate, and give high priority to research. They award 50 or more doctoral degrees each year. In addition, they receive annually between \$15.5 million and \$40 million in federal support.

Doctoral Universities I: These institutions offer a full range of baccalaureate programs and are committed to graduate education through the doctorate. They award at least 40 doctoral degrees annually in five or more disciplines.

Doctoral Universities II: These institutions offer a full range of baccalaureate programs and are committed to graduate education through the doctorate. They award at annually at least 10 doctoral degrees—in three or more disciplines—or 20 or more doctoral degrees in one or more disciplines.

Master's (Comprehensive) Colleges and Universities I: These institutions offer a full range of baccalaureate programs and are committed to graduate education through the master's degree. They award 40 or more master's degrees annually in three or more disciplines.

Master's (Comprehensive) Colleges and Universities II: These institutions offer a full range of baccalaureate programs and are committed to graduate education through the master's degree. They award 20 or more master's degrees annually in one or more disciplines.

Baccalaureate (Liberal Arts) Colleges I: These institutions are primarily undergraduate colleges with major emphasis on baccalaureate degree programs. They award 40 percent or more of their baccalaureate degrees in liberal arts fields and are restrictive in admissions.

Baccalaureate Colleges II: These institutions are primarily undergraduate colleges with major emphasis on baccalaureate degree programs. They award less than 40 percent of their baccalaureate degrees in liberal arts fields or are less restrictive in admissions.

Associate of Arts Colleges: These institutions offer associate of arts certificate or degree programs and, with few exceptions, offer no baccalaureate degrees.

Specialized Institutions: These institutions offer degrees ranging from the bachelor's to the doctorate. At least 50 percent of the degrees awarded by these institutions are in a single discipline.

The Classification is described in further detail in *A Classification of Institutions of Higher Education*, 1994 Edition (Princeton, NJ: The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1994). The book can be purchased from Jossey-Bass Publishers, 350 Sansome Street, San Francisco, California. The text is also available on The Foundation's web site: <<http://www.carnegiefoundation.org>>

The Carnegie Foundation's National Survey of Faculty, 1997 did not include specialized institutions in the sample. For purposes of this report, we have grouped categories at the same level: Research Universities (I and II); Doctoral Universities (I and II); Master's Colleges and Universities (I and II); Baccalaureate Colleges (I and II); and Associate of Arts Colleges. When we use the term "community college" in the text, we are referring to institutions designated as Associate of Arts Colleges in the tables, and classified as Associate of Arts Colleges in the 1994 Carnegie Classification.

APPENDIX B: THE CARNEGIE CLASSIFICATION OF INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION

The 1994 Carnegie Classification includes all colleges and universities in the United States that are degree-granting and accredited by an agency recognized by the U.S. Secretary of Education. It groups institutions into categories on the basis of the level of degree offered ranging from prebaccalaureate to the doctorate and the comprehensiveness of their educational programs. The categories are as follows:

Research Universities I: These institutions offer a full range of baccalaureate programs, are committed to graduate education through the doctorate, and give high priority to research. They award 50 or more doctoral degrees each year. In addition, they receive annually \$40 million or more in federal support.

Research Universities II: These institutions offer a full range of baccalaureate programs, are committed to graduate education through the doctorate, and give high priority to research. They award 50 or more doctoral degrees each year. In addition, they receive annually between \$15.5 million and \$40 million in federal support.

Doctoral Universities I: These institutions offer a full range of baccalaureate programs and are committed to graduate education through the doctorate. They award at least 40 doctoral degrees annually in five or more disciplines.

Doctoral Universities II: These institutions offer a full range of baccalaureate programs and are committed to graduate education through the doctorate. They award at annually at least 10 doctoral degrees-in three or more disciplines-or 20 or more doctoral degrees in one or more disciplines.

Master's (Comprehensive) Colleges and Universities I: These institutions offer a full range of baccalaureate programs and are committed to graduate education through the master's degree. They award 40 or more master's degrees annually in three or more disciplines.

Master's (Comprehensive) Colleges and Universities II: These institutions offer a full range of baccalaureate programs and are committed to graduate education through the master's degree. They award 20 or more master's degrees annually in one or more disciplines.

Baccalaureate (Liberal Arts) Colleges I: These institutions are primarily undergraduate colleges with major emphasis on baccalaureate degree programs. They award 40 percent or more of their baccalaureate degrees in liberal arts fields and are restrictive in admissions.

Baccalaureate Colleges II: These institutions are primarily undergraduate colleges with major emphasis on baccalaureate degree programs. They award less than 40 percent of their baccalaureate degrees in liberal arts fields or are less restrictive in admissions.

Associate of Arts Colleges: These institutions offer associate of arts certificate or degree programs and, with few exceptions, offer no baccalaureate degrees.

Specialized Institutions: These institutions offer degrees ranging from the bachelor's to the doctorate. At least 50 percent of the degrees awarded by these institutions are in a single discipline.

The Classification is described in further detail in *A Classification of Institutions of Higher Education*, 1994 Edition (Princeton, NJ: The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1994). The book can be purchased from Jossey-Bass Publishers, 350 Sansome Street, San Francisco, California. The text is also available on The Foundation's web site: <http://www.carnegiefoundation.org>

The Carnegie Foundation's National Survey of Faculty, 1997 did not include specialized institutions in the sample. For purposes of this report, we have grouped categories at the same level: Research Universities (I and II); Doctoral Universities (I and II); Master's Colleges and Universities (I and II); Baccalaureate Colleges (I and II); and Associate of Arts Colleges. When we use the term "community college" in the text, we are referring to institutions designated as Associate of Arts Colleges in the tables, and classified as Associate of Arts Colleges in the 1994 Carnegie Classification.

TABLES

CHAPTER 2: COMMUNITY COLLEGE FACULTY: A PROFILE

TABLE 1:	What is your race or ethnic group?
TABLE 2:	What is your sex?
TABLE 3:	What is your age?
TABLE 4:	How many years have you been employed in higher education?
TABLE 5:	What is your highest earned degree?
TABLE 6:	Are you currently working for another degree?
TABLE 7:	In which discipline was your highest degree awarded?
TABLE 8:	What is your current academic rank at this institution?
TABLE 9:	Is your current employment at this institution full-time or part-time?
TABLE 10:	Part-time and adjunct faculty fill jobs here that would otherwise be filled by regular faculty members.
TABLE 11:	What is your institutional salary on a full-time basis before tax and deductions for the current academic year?
TABLE 12:	In 1996, roughly how much did you earn over and above your institutional salary?
TABLE 13:	There should be a mandatory age of retirement for faculty.
TABLE 14:	At my institution, the major purpose of early retirement programs is to force out less productive faculty.
TABLE 15:	I would exercise an early retirement option if it were offered to me.
TABLE 16:	My institution provides the conditions and support faculty need to retire with dignity.
TABLE 17:	I intend to engage in research and professional writing during my retirement.

TABLE 1: WHAT IS YOUR RACE OR ETHNIC GROUP?

	White/ Caucasian	African American/ Black	American Indian	Asian	Hispanic	Other
All Faculty	88%	4%	1%	4%	2%	2%
Research	89	3	0	5	1	1
Doctoral	88	3	0	6	3	1
Master's	86	6	1	4	2	2
Baccalaureate	87	8	0	3	2	1
Associate of Arts	88	4	1	3	2	3

TABLE 2: WHAT IS YOUR SEX?

	Male	Female
All Faculty	61%	39%
Research	73	27
Doctoral	69	31
Master's	59	41
Baccalaureate	57	43
Associate of Arts	53	47

TABLE 3: WHAT IS YOUR AGE?

	Mean Years
All Faculty	50.5
Research	50.7
Doctoral	49.9
Master's	50.3
Baccalaureate	49.8
Associate of Arts	50.7

TABLE 4: HOW MANY YEARS HAVE YOU BEEN EMPLOYED IN HIGHER EDUCATION?
(MEAN YEARS)

	At This Institution	In Higher Education
All Faculty	14.3	18.4
Research	15.6	20.1
Doctoral	14.2	18.5
Master's	13.0	17.7
Baccalaureate	13.7	17.5
Associate of Arts	14.5	17.8

TABLE 5: WHAT IS YOUR HIGHEST EARNED DEGREE?

	Less than a Bachelors	Bachelors	Masters	Ph.D	Ed.D	Other
All Faculty	1%	3%	33%	52%	4%	7%
Research	0	1	11	81	3	5
Doctoral	0	1	14	76	4	5
Master's	0	1	20	64	7	8
Baccalaureate	0	2	27	57	6	7
Associate of Arts	3	8	64	15	3	9

TABLE 6: ARE YOU CURRENTLY WORKING FOR ANOTHER DEGREE?

	Yes, at this Institution	Yes, at another Institution	No
All Faculty	2%	6%	92%
Research	3	2	96
Doctoral	2	2	96
Master's	2	4	95
Baccalaureate	1	7	92
Associate of Arts	2	12	86

TABLE 7: IN WHICH DISCIPLINE WAS YOUR HIGHEST DEGREE AWARDED?

	All Faculty	Research	Doctoral	Master's	Bac.	Associate of Arts
Education	14%	7%	12%	16%	12%	18%
Humanities	13	14	12	14	19	11
Business	6	4	7	6	5	8
Fine Arts	6	5	6	6	10	7
Social Sciences	9	13	11	9	9	6
Nursing	3	1	1	2	3	6
Mathematics	5	5	5	5	5	6
Physical Sciences	6	8	7	5	5	4
Biological Sciences	6	9	5	4	7	4
Technical/Vocational	1	0	0	0	0	4
Psychology	5	6	6	5	4	3
Engineering	5	9	7	5	0	3
Communications	3	3	3	5	2	3

TABLE 8: WHAT IS YOUR CURRENT ACADEMIC RANK AT THIS INSTITUTION?

	Professor	Associate	Assistant	Instructor/ Lecturer	No rank designated	Other
All Faculty	34%	22%	16%	19%	4%	5%
Research	47	26	16	7	0	5
Doctoral	37	28	22	9	0	4
Master's	35	27	22	11	1	5
Baccalaureate	31	26	24	12	3	5
Associate of Arts	25	13	9	38	9	7

TABLE 9: IS YOUR CURRENT EMPLOYMENT AT THIS INSTITUTION FULL TIME OR PART-TIME?

	Full-time	Part-time
All Faculty	87%	13%
Research	93	7
Doctoral	92	8
Master's	91	9
Baccalaureate	86	14
Associate of Arts	79	21

TABLE 10: PART-TIME AND ADJUNCT FACULTY FILL JOBS HERE THAT WOULD OTHERWISE BE FILLED BY REGULAR FACULTY MEMBERS

	Strongly agree	Somewhat agree	Neutral	Somewhat disagree	Strongly disagree
All Faculty	35%	27%	13%	15%	11%
Research	22	27	14	22	15
Doctoral	33	31	13	15	9
Master's	36	30	13	13	9
Baccalaureate	26	31	12	18	14
Associate of Arts	47	24	12	9	8

TABLE 11: WHAT IS YOUR INSTITUTIONAL SALARY ON A FULL-TIME BASIS BEFORE TAX AND DEDUCTIONS FOR THE CURRENT ACADEMIC YEAR?

	Below \$30,000	\$30,000-\$39,999	\$40,000-\$49,999	\$50,000-\$59,999	\$60,000-\$69,999	\$70,000-\$79,999	\$80,000 and over
All Faculty	11%	17%	22%	20%	15%	8%	8%
Research	6	8	20	19	16	12	20
Doctoral	8	17	24	18	15	10	9
Master's	10	21	24	21	15	7	2
Baccalaureate	16	29	24	16	7	6	3
Associate of Arts	17	17	21	21	17	5	2

TABLE 12: IN 1996, ROUGHLY HOW MUCH DID YOU EARN OVER AND ABOVE YOUR INSTITUTIONAL SALARY?

	0%	Less than 10%	10%-19%	20%-29%	30%-49%	50% or more
All Faculty	25%	35%	19%	8%	7%	7%
Research	22	38	17	9	8	6
Doctoral	23	33	20	10	7	7
Master's	23	35	22	8	6	6
Baccalaureate	29	39	13	7	3	8
Associate of Arts	27	32	20	7	7	7

TABLE 13: THERE SHOULD BE A MANDATORY AGE OF RETIRMENT FOR FACULTY

	Strongly agree	Somewhat agree	Neutral	Somewhat disagree	Strongly disagree
All Faculty	9%	15%	18%	20%	39%
Research	11	16	17	22	33
Doctoral	11	14	18	18	39
Master's	9	13	19	21	39
Bacca- laureate	10	15	21	21	34
Associate of Arts	6	15	16	17	46

TABLE 14: AT MY INSTITUTION, THE MAJOR PURPOSE OF EARLY RETIREMENT PROGRAMS IS TO FORCE OUT LESS PRODUCTIVE FACULTY

	Strongly agree	Somewhat agree	Neutral	Somewhat disagree	Strongly disagree
All Faculty	6%	11%	40%	18%	24%
Research	10	18	43	16	14
Doctoral	10	13	39	20	18
Master's	6	10	47	18	19
Bacca-laureate	5	11	42	18	24
Associate of Arts	3	7	34	21	35

TABLE 15: I WOULD EXERCISE AN EARLY RETIREMENT OPTION IF IT WERE OFFERED TO ME

	Strongly agree	Somewhat agree	Neutral	Somewhat disagree	Strongly disagree
All Faculty	19%	19%	21%	17%	25%
Research	18	17	20	20	26
Doctoral	23	18	20	15	25
Master's	22	18	19	17	25
Bacca-laureate	20	18	22	16	25
Associate of					

TABLE 16: MY INSTITUTION PROVIDES THE CONDITIONS AND SUPPORT FACULTY NEED TO RETIRE WITH DIGNITY

	Strongly agree	Somewhat agree	Neutral	Somewhat disagree	Strongly disagree
All Faculty	20%	32%	32%	10%	5%
Research	19	35	31	9	5
Doctoral	15	31	34	13	8
Master's	16	31	35	12	7
Bacca-laureate	21	33	28	11	8
Associate of Arts	26	30	32	10	3

TABLE 17: I INTEND TO ENGAGE IN RESEARCH AND PROFESSIONAL WRITING DURING MY RETIREMENT

	Strongly agree	Somewhat agree	Neutral	Somewhat disagree	Strongly disagree
All Faculty	33%	25%	19%	10%	14%
Research	45	29	11	8	8
Doctoral	36	28	17	9	10
Master's	38	25	18	9	11
Bacca-laureate	32	25	22	9	12
Associate of Arts	21	21	25	12	21

TABLES

CHAPTER 3: TEACHING AND LEARNING: CONCERN AND COMMITMENT

TABLE 18:	Access to higher education should be available to all who meet minimum entrance requirements.
TABLE 19:	My undergraduate students are adequately prepared in written and oral communication.
TABLE 20:	My undergraduate students are adequately prepared in mathematics and quantitative reasoning skills.
TABLE 21:	This institution spends too much time and money teaching students what they should have learned in high school, 1984-1997.
TABLE 22:	My undergraduate students do just enough to get by academically.
TABLE 23:	Undergraduates have become more careerist in their concerns.
TABLE 24:	Undergraduates have become more grade conscious.
TABLE 25:	Today's undergraduates are more willing to cheat in order to get good grades.
TABLE 26:	Overall, I'm pleased with my undergraduates.
TABLE 27:	Faculty here are concerned with the academic progress of their undergraduate students.
TABLE 28:	To what extent are you satisfied with your relationships with students?
TABLE 29:	How important is undergraduate teaching to you personally?
TABLE 30:	How would you assess the quality of the training you received in graduate school for your role as teacher?
TABLE 31:	My institution provides adequate mentoring and other support for beginning instructors.
TABLE 32:	In your department, how much experimentation has there been with the use of technology in instruction?
TABLE 33:	Interdisciplinary teaching is encouraged at my institution.
TABLE 34:	Team teaching is encouraged at my institution.
TABLE 35:	Do you ever supervise students in service learning activities off campus?
TABLE 36:	Faculty should spend more time with students outside the classroom.

TABLE 18: ACCESS TO HIGHER EDUCATION SHOULD BE AVAILABLE TO ALL WHO MEET MINIMUM ENTRANCE REQUIREMENTS.

	Strongly agree	Somewhat agree	Neutral	Somewhat disagree	Strongly disagree
All Faculty	57%	26%	6%	10%	3%
Research	49	29	6	13	3
Doctoral	50	28	5	12	4
Master's	55	28	6	8	4
Bacca-laureate	54	28	6	10	3
Associate of Arts	66	21	5	7	1

TABLE 19: MY UNDERGRADUATE STUDENTS ARE ADEQUATELY PREPARED IN WRITTEN AND ORAL COMMUNICATION

	Strongly agree	Somewhat agree	Neutral	Somewhat disagree	Strongly disagree	Not applicable
All Faculty	3%	18%	6%	36%	33%	4%
Research	5	20	7	36	23	9
Doctoral	4	18	7	36	31	5
Master's	2	18	6	38	33	3
Bacca-laureate	6	27	7	34	25	1
Associate of Arts	1	13	5	35	43	2

TABLE 20: MY UNDERGRADUATE STUDENTS ARE ADEQUATELY PREPARED
IN MATHEMATICS AND QUANTITATIVE REASONING SKILLS.

	Strongly agree	Somewhat agree	Neutral	Somewhat disagree	Strongly disagree	Not applicable
All Faculty	2%	11%	10%	28%	30%	20%
Research	3	14	10	27	21	25
Doctoral	3	11	10	27	29	20
Master's	2	10	10	29	32	19
Bacca- laureate	2	18	12	26	23	20
Associate of Arts	1	8	8	28	37	18

TABLE 21: THIS INSTITUTION SPENDS TOO MUCH TIME AND MONEY TEACHING
STUDENTS WHAT THEY SHOULD HAVE LEARNED IN HIGH SCHOOL.
(percent agreeing)

	1984	1989	1997
All Faculty	68%	68%	66%
Research	59	60	62
Doctoral	70	64	66
Master's	70	73	68
Baccalaureate	64	56	56
Associate of Arts	70	73	71

TABLE 22: MY UNDERGRADUATE STUDENTS DO JUST ENOUGH TO GET BY ACADEMICALLY.

	Strongly agree	Somewhat agree	Neutral	Somewhat disagree	Strongly disagree	Not applicable
All Faculty	16%	42%	11%	19%	8%	4%
Research	11	35	14	21	9	9
Doctoral	16	41	12	19	8	5
Master's	17	43	12	18	6	3
Bacca-laureate	15	36	10	23	16	1
Associate of Arts	19	48	7	17	7	2

TABLE 23: UNDERGRADUATES HAVE BECOME MORE CAREERIST IN THEIR CONCERNS.

	Strongly agree	Somewhat agree	Neutral	Somewhat disagree	Strongly disagree
All Faculty	32%	43%	17%	7%	2%
Research	34	45	16	5	1
Doctoral	34	40	20	6	1
Master's	34	43	16	7	1
Bacca-laureate	39	41	13	6	1
Associate of Arts	26	42	20	9	3

TABLE 24: UNDERGRADUATES HAVE BECOME
MORE GRADE CONSCIOUS

	Strongly agree	Somewhat agree	Neutral	Somewhat disagree	Strongly disagree
All Faculty	31%	37%	24%	8%	2%
Research	31	36	25	8	1
Doctoral	30	35	25	8	2
Master's	33	36	24	7	1
Bacca-laureate	37	37	18	7	1
Associate of Arts	28	38	23	8	2

TABLE 25: TODAY'S UNDERGRADUATES ARE MORE WILLING
TO CHEAT IN ORDER TO GET GOOD GRADES.

	Strongly agree	Somewhat agree	Neutral	Somewhat disagree	Strongly disagree
All Faculty	10%	28%	37%	17%	9%
Research	10	23	43	15	9
Doctoral	13	27	39	15	7
Master's	11	26	40	17	6
Bacca-laureate	10	26	34	20	11
Associate of Arts	9	33	31	18	9

TABLE 26: OVERALL, I'M PLEASED WITH MY UNDERGRADUATES.

	Strongly agree	Somewhat agree	Neutral	Somewhat disagree	Strongly disagree	Not applicable
All Faculty	13%	41%	16%	19%	8%	4%
Research	14	36	17	17	7	9
Doctoral	13	39	18	18	7	5
Master's	11	38	19	19	9	3
Bacca-laureate	20	45	14	15	6	0
Associate of Arts	12	45	13	23	7	1

TABLE 27: FACULTY HERE ARE CONCERNED WITH THE ACADEMIC PROGRESS OF THEIR UNDERGRADUATE STUDENTS.

	Strongly agree	Somewhat agree	Neutral	Somewhat disagree	Strongly disagree
All Faculty	41%	41%	10%	7%	2%
Research	24	47	15	11	3
Doctoral	30	46	12	9	3
Master's	41	42	9	7	1
Bacca-laureate	61	30	5	3	1
Associate of Arts	49	38	8	5	1

TABLE 28: TO WHAT EXTENT ARE YOU SATISFIED WITH YOUR RELATIONSHIPS WITH STUDENTS?

	Very satisfied	Somewhat satisfied	Neutral	Somewhat dissatisfied	Very dissatisfied	Not applicable
All Faculty	63%	30%	5%	2%	1%	0%
Research	55	34	7	2	1	1
Doctoral	57	33	5	4	1	0
Master's	60	33	5	2	1	0
Bacca-laureate	68	27	3	2	0	0
Associate of Arts	70	25	3	2	0	0

TABLE 29: HOW IMPORTANT IS UNDERGRADUATE TEACHING TO YOU PERSONALLY?

	Very important	Fairly important	Not too important	Not at all important	Not applicable
All Faculty	71%	21%	3%	1%	3%
Research	54	31	7	3	6
Doctoral	67	24	5	1	4
Master's	72	22	3	1	3
Bacca-laureate	83	15	2	0	0
Associate of Arts	82	14	1	1	3

TABLE 30: HOW WOULD YOU ASSESS THE QUALITY OF THE TRAINING YOU RECEIVED IN GRADUATE SCHOOL FOR YOUR ROLE AS TEACHER?

	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor	Not applicable
All Faculty	24%	30%	21%	17%	8%
Research	22	28	22	23	5
Doctoral	24	31	21	19	5
Master's	25	31	22	17	5
Bacca-laureate	26	30	20	18	6
Associate of Arts	24	29	19	13	15

TABLE 31: MY INSTITUTION PROVIDES ADEQUATE MENTORING AND OTHER SUPPORT FOR BEGINNING INSTRUCTORS.

	Strongly agree	Somewhat agree	Neutral	Somewhat disagree	Strongly disagree
All Faculty	10%	30%	14%	28%	17%
Research	9	31	17	28	15
Doctoral	8	25	19	29	19
Master's	10	29	13	29	19
Bacca-laureate	11	32	14	28	15
Associate of Arts	12	31	13	28	16

TABLE 32: IN YOUR DEPARTMENT, HOW MUCH EXPERIMENTATION HAS THERE BEEN WITH THE USE OF TECHNOLOGY IN INSTRUCTION?

	A great deal	Some	None at all	Don't know
All Faculty	17%	68%	9%	6%
Research	19	68	8	5
Doctoral	12	71	11	6
Master's	14	72	9	5
Baccalaureate	14	69	12	5
Associate of Arts	18	65	8	8

TABLE 33: INTERDISCIPLINARY TEACHING IS ENCOURAGED AT MY INSTITUTION

	Strongly agree	Somewhat agree	Neutral	Somewhat disagree	Strongly disagree
All Faculty	13%	37%	22%	20%	9%
Research	12	37	21	22	8
Doctoral	9	34	25	22	10
Master's	14	37	22	20	8
Bacca-laureate	23	39	17	16	5
Associate of Arts	13	36	24	18	10

TABLE 34: TEAM TEACHING IS ENCOURAGED AT MY INSTITUTION.

	Strongly agree	Somewhat agree	Neutral	Somewhat disagree	Strongly disagree
All Faculty	9%	25%	25%	26%	15%
Research	7	26	26	28	13
Doctoral	6	20	27	28	19
Master's	7	26	23	29	16
Bacca-laureate	12	31	22	23	13
Associate of Arts	10	24	26	25	16

TABLE 35: DO YOU EVER SUPERVISE STUDENTS IN SERVICE LEARNING ACTIVITIES OFF CAMPUS?

	Yes, regularly	Yes, occasionally	No
All Faculty	17%	27%	57%
Research	14	25	61
Doctoral	16	26	59
Master's	23	28	50
Baccalaureate	18	34	48
Associate of Arts	14	26	60

TABLE 36: FACULTY SHOULD SPEND MORE TIME WITH STUDENTS OUTSIDE THE CLASSROOM.

	Strongly agree	Somewhat agree	Neutral	Somewhat disagree	Strongly disagree
All Faculty	19%	39%	26%	12%	4%
Research	18	40	24	14	4
Doctoral	22	38	24	13	3
Master's	22	39	26	10	4
Bacca-laureate	20	40	24	12	4
Associate of Arts	18	37	29	11	4

TABLES

CHAPTER 4: THE GOALS OF COMMUNITY COLLEGE EDUCATION

TABLE 37:	How important do you consider the following possible outcomes for the undergraduate?
TABLE 38:	Rate your institution's performance in serving non-traditional age students effectively.
TABLE 39:	Rate your institution's performance in preparing undergraduates for a vocation or career.
TABLE 40:	The undergraduate curriculum here is in serious need of reform.
TABLE 41:	Rate your institution's performance in providing undergraduates with a general education.
TABLE 42:	I prefer teaching courses which focus on limited specialties to those which cover wide varieties of material.
TABLE 43:	Rate your institution's performance in providing undergraduates the opportunity to explore personal interests through electives.
TABLE 44:	Rate your institution's performance in providing opportunities for an undergraduate to explore a subject in depth, through the major.
TABLE 45:	Rate your institution's performance in strengthening the values of undergraduates.
TABLE 46:	Rate your institution's performance in offering undergraduates an opportunity to experience and understand leadership.
TABLE 47:	Rate your institution's performance in creating opportunities for students to engage in public or community service.
TABLE 48:	Rate your institution's performance in developing a sense of campus community.
TABLE 49:	Undergraduate education in America would be improved if students had a stronger mix of theory and practice in their academic experience.
TABLE 50:	Undergraduate education in America would be improved if there were more relevance to contemporary life and problems.
TABLE 51:	Undergraduate education in America would be improved if there were more emphasis on a common core of courses for all students.
TABLE 52:	Undergraduate education in America would be improved if there were less emphasis on specialized training and more on broad liberal education.

TABLE 37: HOW IMPORTANT DO YOU CONSIDER THE FOLLOWING
 POSSIBLE OURCOMES FOR THE UNDERGRADUATE?
 (Percent responding “very important”)

	All Faculty	Research	Doctoral	Master’s	Baccalaureate	Associate of Arts
Oral and written communication	88%	87%	87%	89%	89%	89%
Analysis and problem solving abilities	85	85	85	85	85	86
Self-knowledge	61	54	57	60	67	66
Tolerance of diversity	59	53	57	62	65	62
Appreciation of literature and the arts	50	49	50	53	62	45
Enhanced creative capacities	48	47	47	48	51	48
Preparation for a career	45	34	40	41	38	59
Firm moral values	45	36	40	46	54	50
Science and technological literacy	41	40	39	39	40	43
Knowledge of one subject in depth	32	31	34	33	37	30
International understanding	32	31	32	36	37	28

TABLE 38: RATE YOUR INSTITUTION'S PERFORMANCE IN SERVING
NON-TRADITIONAL AGE STUDENTS EFFECTIVELY

	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor	Not applicable
All Faculty	25%	40%	24%	9%	3%
Research	9	38	35	14	5
Doctoral	17	36	32	12	3
Master's	19	43	25	11	2
Bacca-laureate	19	35	23	16	7
Associate of Arts	43	42	13	1	1

TABLE 39: RATE YOUR INSTITUTION'S PERFORMANCE IN PREPARING
UNDERGRADUATES FOR A VOCATION OR CAREER.

	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor	Not applicable
All Faculty	23%	51%	22%	3%	1%
Research	13	54	28	3	2
Doctoral	14	53	27	4	2
Master's	15	55	26	2	2
Bacca-laureate	18	54	23	4	1
Associate of Arts	40	43	14	2	0

TABLE 40: THE UNDERGRADUATE CURRICULUM HERE IS IN SERIOUS NEED OF REFORM.

	Strongly agree	Somewhat agree	Neutral	Somewhat disagree	Strongly disagree
All Faculty	10%	21%	25%	29%	15%
Research	11	24	25	29	11
Doctoral	13	23	26	26	12
Master's	14	21	27	27	12
Bacca-laureate	10	23	20	28	19
Associate of Arts	6	19	25	30	20

TABLE 41: RATE YOUR INSTITUTION'S PERFORMANCE IN PROVIDING UNDERGRADUATES WITH A GENERAL EDUCATION.

	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor	Not applicable
All Faculty	25%	49%	21%	4%	1%
Research	17	52	26	5	1
Doctoral	19	50	26	5	1
Master's	20	50	25	4	1
Bacca-laureate	38	44	15	3	0
Associate of Arts	33	48	15	3	0

TABLE 42: I PREFER TEACHING COURSES WHICH FOCUS ON LIMITED SPECIALTIES TO THOSE WHICH COVER WIDE VARIETIES OF MATERIAL.

	Strongly agree	Somewhat agree	Neutral	Somewhat disagree	Strongly disagree
All Faculty	16%	25%	28%	23%	8%
Research	13	25	30	24	8
Doctoral	17	24	27	26	6
Master's	17	26	28	23	7
Bacca-laureate	14	25	29	24	7
Associate of Arts	19	24	26	21	10

TABLE 43: RATE YOUR INSTITUTION'S PERFORMANCE IN PROVIDING UNDERGRADUATES THE OPPORTUNITY TO EXPLORE PERSONAL INTERESTS THROUGH ELECTIVES.

	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor	Not applicable
All Faculty	18%	42%	28%	10%	1%
Research	19	45	27	8	2
Doctoral	13	45	29	12	2
Master's	12	40	33	14	1
Bacca-laureate	24	42	25	9	0
Associate of Arts	23	41	28	8	1

TABLE 44: RATE YOUR INSTITUTION'S PERFORMANCE IN PROVIDING OPPORTUNITIES FOR AN UNDERGRADUATE TO EXPLORE A SUBJECT IN DEPTH, THROUGH THE MAJOR.

	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor	Not applicable
All Faculty	29%	47%	17%	4%	3%
Research	34	49	13	2	1
Doctoral	29	52	15	3	1
Master's	29	51	15	4	1
Bacca-laureate	43	42	11	4	0
Associate of Arts	20	44	23	7	6

TABLE 45: RATE YOUR INSTITUTION'S PERFORMANCE IN STRENGTHENING THE VALUES OF UNDERGRADUATES.

	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor	Not applicable
All Faculty	9%	24%	38%	19%	10%
Research	6	19	37	24	15
Doctoral	7	20	41	22	10
Master's	6	23	45	18	8
Bacca-laureate	19	39	29	10	4
Associate of Arts	12	24	36	19	9

TABLE 46: RATE YOUR INSTITUTION'S PERFORMANCE IN OFFERING UNDERGRADUATES AN OPPORTUNITY TO EXPERIENCE AND UNDERSTAND LEADERSHIP.

	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor	Not applicable
All Faculty	11%	33%	36%	16%	4%
Research	9	30	39	16	6
Doctoral	8	30	39	19	4
Master's	9	35	39	14	4
Bacca-laureate	22	44	24	10	1
Associate of Arts	11	32	36	17	4

TABLE 47: RATE YOUR INSTITUTION'S PERFORMANCE IN CREATING OPPORTUNITIES FOR STUDENTS TO ENGAGE IN PUBLIC OR COMMUNITY SERVICE.

	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor	Not applicable
All Faculty	14%	31%	32%	18%	5%
Research	11	30	34	19	6
Doctoral	11	30	35	19	5
Master's	16	33	33	15	4
Bacca-laureate	30	39	22	9	1
Associate of Arts	11	29	31	22	7

TABLE 48: RATE YOUR INSTITUTION'S PERFORMANCE IN DEVELOPING A SENSE OF CAMPUS COMMUNITY.

	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor	Not applicable
All Faculty	7%	22%	33%	35%	3%
Research	6	25	36	31	4
Doctoral	6	16	34	41	3
Master's	5	20	35	38	2
Bacca-laureate	16	36	28	19	1
Associate of Arts	7	19	31	41	3

TABLE 49: UNDERGRADUATE EDUCATION IN AMERICA WOULD BE IMPROVED IF STUDENTS HAD A STRONGER MIX OF THEORY AND PRACTICE IN THEIR ACADEMIC EXPERIENCE.

	Strongly agree	Somewhat agree	Neutral	Somewhat disagree	Strongly disagree
All Faculty	28%	47%	20%	4%	1%
Research	23	47	23	6	1
Doctoral	25	47	23	4	1
Master's	29	46	21	4	0
Bacca-laureate	29	47	19	5	1
Associate of Arts	31	49	16	3	1

TABLE 50: UNDERGRADUATE EDUCATION IN AMERICA WOULD BE IMPROVED IF THERE WERE MORE RELEVANCE TO CONTEMPORARY LIFE AND PROBLEMS.

	Strongly agree	Somewhat agree	Neutral	Somewhat disagree	Strongly disagree
All Faculty	20%	38%	27%	11%	3%
Research	14	33	30	18	4
Doctoral	17	38	28	14	3
Master's	19	41	30	9	1
Bacca-laureate	20	39	26	13	3
Associate of Arts	26	40	24	8	2

TABLE 51: UNDERGRADUATE EDUCATION IN AMERICA WOULD BE IMPROVED IF THERE WERE MORE EMPHASIS ON A COMMON CORE OF COURSES FOR ALL STUDENTS.

	Strongly agree	Somewhat agree	Neutral	Somewhat disagree	Strongly disagree
All Faculty	22%	33%	24%	17%	5%
Research	16	31	25	22	6
Doctoral	20	30	23	20	7
Master's	21	33	26	15	4
Bacca-laureate	24	34	20	17	5
Associate of Arts	27	34	22	14	3

TABLE 52: UNDERGRADUATE EDUCATION IN AMERICA WOULD BE IMPROVED IF THERE WERE LESS EMPHASIS ON SPECIALIZED TRAINING AND MORE ON BROAD LIBERAL EDUCATION.

	Strongly agree	Somewhat agree	Neutral	Somewhat disagree	Strongly disagree
All Faculty	17%	32%	23%	22%	6%
Research	17	33	24	21	4
Doctoral	16	32	24	22	6
Master's	20	34	22	18	6
Bacca-laureate	23	39	20	15	2
Associate of Arts	13	27	25	27	9

TABLES

CHAPTER 5: FACULTY ROLES IN A TEACHING INSTITUTION

TABLE 53:	My interests lie primarily in or lean toward teaching, 1969-1997.
TABLE 54:	Do your interests lie primarily in teaching or in research? (International Data)
TABLE 55:	Do your interests lie primarily in teaching or in research?
TABLE 56:	Regarding teaching and research, have your interests shifted over the course of your professional life?
TABLE 57:	During the past fall term, approximately how many hours per week did you spend on each of the following activities?
TABLE 58:	In my academic position at this institution, regular research activity is expected.
TABLE 59:	Are you currently engaged in any scholarly work that you expect to lead to a publication, exhibit, or a performance.
TABLE 60:	Have you, as an individual or as part of an academic group, received any grants or special funding support for research in the last three years?
TABLE 61:	If you received such research funding, please estimate the total amount received from all sources during the last three years.
TABLE 62:	Which of the following sources have provided these research funds?
TABLE 63:	Serving as a consultant is considered part of scholarly work at my institution.
TABLE 64:	During the past year, with which types of organizations have you worked, either on a paid or unpaid basis?
TABLE 65:	Consider the time you spent engaged in such activities last year. For what percentage of this time were you paid?
TABLE 66:	From an economic standpoint, it is necessary for me to engage in paid consulting work.
TABLE 67:	The pressure to publish reduces the quality of teaching at this institution.
TABLE 68:	Generally speaking, to be a good teacher one must be engaged in research.
TABLE 69:	For me, service activity beyond this institution is a distraction and competes with essential academic work.
TABLE 70:	Teaching effectiveness should be the primary criterion for promotion of faculty.
TABLE 71:	At this institution, faculty evaluation gives appropriate weight to teaching, research, and service.
TABLE 72:	This department should give more recognition to the role of professional service and the applied aspects of knowledge among its faculty.

TABLE 53: MY INTERESTS LIE PRIMARILY IN OR LEAN TOWARD TEACHING, 1969-1997
(Percent agreeing)

	1969	1975	1984	1989	1992	1997
All Faculty	76%	75%	70%	71%	72%	73%
Research	-	50	40	35	39	43
Doctoral	-	66	62	55	66	62
Master's	-	84	74	77	81	76
Baccalaureate	-	88	84	84	76	83
Associate of Arts	-	94	92	93	94	94

TABLE 54: DO YOUR INTERESTS LIE PRIMARILY IN TEACHING OR RESEARCH?
(Four-year institutions)

	Primarily in teaching	Leaning to teaching	Leaning to research	Primarily in research
Australia	13%	35%	43%	9%
Brazil	20	42	36	3
Chile	18	49	28	5
Germany	8	27	47	19
Hong Kong	11	35	46	8
Israel	11	27	48	14
Japan	4	24	55	17
Korea	5	40	50	6
Mexico	22	43	31	4
The Netherlands	7	18	46	30
Russia	18	50	29	3
Sweden	12	21	44	23
United Kingdom	12	32	40	15
United States	27	36	30	7

Source: *The Academic Profession: An International Perspective*.
(The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1994) p.81.

TABLE 55: DO YOUR INTERESTS LIE PRIMARILY IN TEACHING OR IN RESEARCH?

	Primarily in teaching	Leaning toward teaching	Leaning toward research	Primarily in research
All Faculty	43%	30%	22%	4%
Research	12	31	47	10
Doctoral	25	37	32	6
Master's	37	39	21	3
Bacca-laureate	46	37	15	1
Associate of Arts	75	20	5	1

TABLE 56: REGARDING TEACHING AND RESEACH, HAVE YOUR INTERESTS SHIFTED OVER THE COURSE OF YOUR PROFESSIONAL LIFE?

	No	Yes, more toward teaching	Yes, more toward research
All Faculty	56%	28%	16%
Research	52	29	20
Doctoral	51	29	21
Master's	50	29	21
Baccalaureate	55	27	18
Associate of Arts	66	27	8

TABLE 57: DURING THE PAST FALL TERM, APPROXIMATELY HOW MANY HOURS PER WEEK DID YOU SPEND ON EACH OF THE FOLLOWING ACTIVITIES?
(Mean hours)

	All Faculty	Research	Doctoral	Master's	Baccalaureate	Associate of Arts
Formal classroom instruction in undergraduate courses	10.8	6.3	7.5	9.8	9.9	14.8
Preparation for teaching	11.6	10.4	11.4	12.6	13.1	11.5
Research and/or comparable scholarly activities	12.1	18.3	13.9	9.8	8.4	6.1
Student tutorial aid	4.3	3.7	3.7	3.9	4.4	5.2
Academic advising	3.6	2.9	3.7	3.6	3.5	4.2

TABLE 58: IN MY ACADEMIC POSITION AT THIS INSTITUTION REGULAR RESEARCH ACTIVITY IS EXPECTED.

	Yes	No
All Faculty	53%	47%
Research	92	8
Doctoral	84	16
Master's	69	31
Baccalaureate	50	50
Associate of Arts	5	95

TABLE 59: ARE YOU CURRENTLY ENGAGED IN ANY SCHOLARLY WORK THAT YOU EXPECT TO LEAD TO A PUBLICATION, EXHIBIT, OR A PERFORMANCE?

	Yes	No
All Faculty	69%	31%
Research	94	6
Doctoral	86	14
Master's	81	19
Baccalaureate	70	30
Associate of Arts	38	62

TABLE 60: HAVE YOU, AS AN INDIVIDUAL OR AS PART OF AN ACADEMIC GROUP, RECEIVED ANY GRANTS OR SPECIAL FUNDING SUPPORT FOR RESEARCH IN THE LAST THREE YEARS?

	Yes	No
All Faculty	44%	56%
Research	70	30
Doctoral	54	46
Master's	48	53
Baccalaureate	41	59
Associate of Arts	20	80

TABLE 61: IF YOU RECEIVED SUCH RESEARCH FUNDING, PLEASE ESTIMATE THE TOTAL AMOUNT RECEIVED FROM ALL SOURCES DURING THE LAST THREE YEARS.

	Less than \$5,000	\$5,000- \$24,999	\$25,000- \$99,999	\$100,000- \$249,999	\$250,000- \$499,999	\$500,000 or more
All Faculty	28%	24%	19%	12%	8%	9%
Research	13	18	24	16	12	17
Doctoral	23	28	21	14	7	7
Master's	35	29	19	9	7	3
Baccalaureate	46	26	16	6	3	3
Associate of Arts	51	27	7	8	4	4

TABLE 62: WHICH OF THE FOLLOWING SOURCES HAVE PROVIDED THESE RESEARCH FUNDS?

	This institution	Government entities	Business firms	Private foundations	Other
All Faculty	52%	55%	15%	25%	9%
Research	48	65	20	27	11
Doctoral	56	53	16	26	9
Master's	63	48	13	19	8
Bacca- laureate	60	41	7	32	7
Associate of Arts	39	47	9	26	7

TABLE 63: SERVING AS A CONSULTANT IS CONSIDERED PART OF SCHOLARLY WORK AT MY INSTITUTION.

	Strongly agree	Somewhat agree	Neutral	Somewhat disagree	Strongly disagree
All Faculty	8%	22%	24%	15%	32%
Research	9	24	25	18	25
Doctoral	7	25	27	16	25
Master's	9	32	21	18	21
Bacca-laureate	8	25	23	16	29
Associate of Arts	6	12	24	10	49

TABLE 64: DURING THE PAST YEAR, WITH WHICH TYPES OF ORGANIZATIONS
 HAVE YOU WORKED, EITHER ON A PAID OR UNPAID BASIS?
 (Respondents could choose all that apply)

	All Faculty	Research	Doctoral	Master's	Baccalaureate	Associate of Arts
Business or industry	32%	33%	33%	32%	23%	34%
Educational institutions	55	58	51	56	52	53
Local govern- ment agencies	21	21	21	26	14	19
National government agencies	15	30	15	13	7	6
Private social ser- vice agencies	20	17	20	25	22	18
International government agencies	4	9	6	4	2	1
Other international associations	7	12	8	6	5	4
Other	14	12	13	16	19	13
None	18	16	18	15	21	22

TABLE 65: FOR WHAT PERCENTAGE OF THE TIME YOU SPENT ENGAGED IN CONSULTING AND SERVICE ACTIVITIES WERE YOU PAID?

	Percentage of time paid
All Faculty	29%
Research	30
Doctoral	27
Master's	27
Baccalaureate	28
Associate of Arts	31

TABLE 66: FROM AN ECONOMIC STANDPOINT, IT IS NECESSARY FOR ME TO ENGAGE IN PAID CONSULTING WORK.

	Strongly agree	Somewhat agree	Neutral	Somewhat disagree	Strongly disagree
All Faculty	13%	13%	17%	16%	42%
Research	13	13	14	17	44
Doctoral	14	12	17	17	40
Master's	14	15	19	16	36
Baccalaureate	14	11	18	15	42
Associate of Arts	12	11	19	14	44

TABLE 67: THE PRESSURE TO PUBLISH REDUCES THE QUALITY OF TEACHING AT THIS INSTITUTION.

	Strongly agree	Somewhat agree	Neutral	Somewhat disagree	Strongly disagree
All Faculty	10%	19%	22%	18%	31%
Research	22	33	14	19	12
Doctoral	18	32	18	19	12
Master's	9	22	23	25	22
Baccalaureate	5	16	19	26	35
Associate of Arts	2	4	28	10	56

TABLE 68: GENERALLY SPEAKING, TO BE A GOOD TEACHER ONE MUST BE ENGAGED IN RESEARCH.

	Strongly agree	Somewhat agree	Neutral	Somewhat disagree	Strongly disagree	Not applicable
All Faculty	21%	32%	12%	13%	18%	5%
Research	31	41	11	11	6	0
Doctoral	29	38	10	13	11	1
Master's	24	36	14	13	13	1
Baccalaureate	23	32	12	16	15	2
Associate of Arts	7	20	11	15	35	12

TABLE 69: FOR ME, SERVICE ACTIVITY BEYOND THIS INSTITUTION IS A
DISTRACTION AND COMPETES WITH ESSENTIAL ACADEMIC WORK.

	Strongly agree	Somewhat agree	Neutral	Somewhat disagree	Strongly disagree
All Faculty	4%	12%	18%	29%	37%
Research	5	17	17	27	34
Doctoral	5	14	19	29	34
Master's	3	11	16	32	39
Bacca-laureate	3	10	17	31	40
Associate of Arts	4	8	21	29	38

TABLE 70: TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS SHOULD BE THE PRIMARY
CRITERION FOR PROMOTION OF FACULTY.

	Strongly agree	Somewhat agree	Neutral	Somewhat disagree	Strongly disagree
All Faculty	28%	29%	12%	17%	14%
Research	7	14	14	30	35
Doctoral	15	24	16	26	20
Master's	25	34	12	18	11
Bacca-laureate	35	35	9	15	6
Associate of Arts	47	35	11	5	2

TABLE 71: AT THIS INSTITUTION, FACULTY EVALUATION GIVES APPROPRIATE WEIGHT TO TEACHING, RESEARCH, AND SERVICE.

	Strongly agree	Somewhat agree	Neutral	Somewhat disagree	Strongly disagree
All Faculty	15%	29%	22%	21%	13%
Research	15	29	14	27	16
Doctoral	13	27	17	25	18
Master's	17	34	19	21	11
Bacca-laureate	21	34	18	16	10
Associate of Arts	13	25	33	17	12

TABLE 72: THIS DEPARTMENT SHOULD GIVE MORE RECOGNITION TO THE ROLE OF PROFESSIONAL SERVICE AND THE APPLIED ASPECTS OF KNOWLEDGE AMONG ITS FACULTY.

	Strongly agree	Somewhat agree	Neutral	Somewhat disagree	Strongly disagree
All Faculty	21%	28%	33%	12%	5%
Research	20	27	30	15	8
Doctoral	21	30	29	15	5
Master's	25	27	32	11	5
Bacca-laureate	22	27	32	13	6
Associate of Arts	19	31	36	10	4

TABLES

CHAPTER 6: EVALUATION

TABLE 73:	Which of your activities are appraised or evaluated regularly?
TABLE 74:	By whom is your teaching regularly evaluated?
TABLE 75:	By whom is your research regularly evaluated?
TABLE 76:	At this institution, we need better ways, besides publications, to evaluate the scholarly performance of the faculty.
TABLE 77:	At this institution, we need better ways to evaluate teaching performance.
TABLE 78:	Student opinions should be used in evaluating the teaching effectiveness of faculty.
TABLE 79:	Peer review should be used in evaluating the teaching effectiveness of faculty.
TABLE 80:	In the past several years, have new methods of evaluating faculty in your department been developed in the following areas?
TABLE 81:	In my field, most people agree on the standards of good scholarship.
TABLE 82:	On the whole, my performance has been evaluated fairly at this institution.
TABLE 83:	Thinking about your own situation, do research and/or other creative work count more or less for purposes of faculty advancement today than they did five years ago?
TABLE 84:	Thinking about your own situation, does applied scholarship (outreach) count more or less for purposes of faculty advancement today than it did five years ago?
TABLE 85:	Thinking about your own situation, does service to the college or university (citizenship) count more or less for purposes of faculty advancement today than it did five years ago?
TABLE 86:	Thinking about your own situation, does teaching count more or less for purposes of faculty advancement today than it did five years ago?
TABLE 87:	I wish my institution would set clearer priorities for the kind of work faculty should do.
TABLE 88:	The stated missions of this institution are clear to the faculty.
TABLE 89:	At my institution the goals for undergraduates are clear to the faculty.
TABLE 90:	My institution is consistent in what it expects faculty to do, and how it rewards them.

TABLE 73: WHICH OF YOUR ACTIVITIES ARE APPRAISED OR EVALUATED REGULARLY?
(Respondents could choose all that apply)

	Teaching	Research and/or other creative work	Applied scholarship/ outreach	Service to the college or university
All Faculty	96%	57%	27%	63%
Research	93	86	32	69
Doctoral	96	82	31	70
Master's	98	74	40	75
Baccalaureate	97	57	25	67
Associate of Arts	97	16	14	47

TABLE 74: BY WHOM IS YOUR TEACHING REGULARLY EVALUATED?
(Respondents could choose all that apply)

	All Faculty	Research	Doctoral	Master's	Bacca-laureate	Associate of Arts
Your students	89%	92%	91%	92%	92%	84%
The head of your department	77	73	79	79	76	77
Your peers in your department	54	54	49	61	49	51
Senior administrative staff at this institution	35	25	37	40	50	34
Members of other departments at this institution	15	9	11	18	22	16
External reviewers	6	7	5	6	7	4
Others	2	2	2	2	2	1

TABLE 75: BY WHOM IS YOUR RESEARCH REGULARLY EVALUATED?
(Respondents could choose all that apply)

	All Faculty	Research	Doctoral	Master's	Bacca- laureate	Associate of Arts
The head of your department	78%	81%	83%	80%	70%	67%
Your peers in your department	58	64	57	61	40	43
Senior administrative staff at this institution	42	33	45	49	61	37
External reviewers	35	25	37	40	50	34
Members of other departments at this institution	21	18	16	23	26	23
Your students	8	8	5	9	8	15
Others	4	4	3	3	4	3

TABLE 76: AT THIS INSTITUTION, WE NEED BETTWER WAYS, BESIDES PUBLICATIONS, TO EVALUATE THE SCHOLARLY PERFORMANCE OF THE FACULTY.

	Strongly agree	Somewhat agree	Neutral	Somewhat disagree	Strongly disagree
All Faculty	29%	30%	24%	10%	7%
Research	35	32	14	14	5
Doctoral	38	33	14	11	3
Master's	33	36	17	10	4
Bacca-laureate	30	33	22	12	5
Associate of Arts	20	22	40	6	13

TABLE 77: AT THIS INSTITUTION, WE NEED BETTER WAYS TO EVALUATE TEACHING PERFORMANCE.

	Strongly agree	Somewhat agree	Neutral	Somewhat disagree	Strongly disagree
All Faculty	34%	38%	16%	8%	3%
Research	40	36	13	8	3
Doctoral	43	35	14	6	2
Master's	39	37	15	8	1
Baccalaureate	32	38	17	9	4
Associate of Arts	26	41	20	9	4

TABLE 78: STUDENT OPINIONS SHOULD BE USED IN EVALUATING THE TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS OF FACULTY.

	Strongly agree	Somewhat agree	Neutral	Somewhat disagree	Strongly disagree
All Faculty	26%	45%	11%	13%	5%
Research	27	46	10	14	3
Doctoral	24	45	10	15	6
Master's	25	44	10	15	6
Baccalaureate	27	46	10	13	4
Associate of Arts	27	45	12	11	6

TABLE 79: PEER REVIEW SHOULD BE USED IN EVALUATING THE TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS OF FACULTY.

	Strongly agree	Somewhat agree	Neutral	Somewhat disagree	Strongly disagree
All Faculty	30%	48%	12%	7%	4%
Research	28	51	12	7	2
Doctoral	28	49	12	8	4
Master's	32	46	12	6	4
Bacca-laureate	36	48	11	4	2
Associate of Arts	28	46	13	9	4

TABLE 80: IN THE PAST SEVERAL YEARS, HAVE NEW METHODS OF EVALUATING FACULTY IN YOUR DEPARTMENT BEEN DEVELOPED IN THE FOLLOWING AREAS?
(Percent responding yes)

	Teaching	Research and/or other creative work	Applied scholarship (outreach)	Service to the institution (citizenship)
All Faculty	36%	12%	10%	14%
Research	36	15	10	11
Doctoral	33	17	10	13
Master's	38	16	13	15
Bacca-laureate	34	13	10	15
Associate of Arts	38	5	7	16

TABLE 81: IN MY FIELD, MOST PEOPLE AGREE ON THE STANDARDS OF GOOD SCHOLARSHIP.

	Strongly agree	Somewhat agree	Neutral	Somewhat disagree	Strongly disagree
All Faculty	15%	41%	16%	21%	7%
Research	17	42	11	23	7
Doctoral	16	37	13	25	8
Master's	13	41	14	23	8
Baccalaureate	16	44	14	19	7
Associate of Arts	14	42	22	17	6

TABLE 82: ON THE WHOLE, MY PERFORMANCE HAS BEEN EVALUATED FAIRLY AT THIS INSTITUTION

	Strongly agree	Somewhat agree	Neutral	Somewhat disagree	Strongly disagree
All Faculty	32%	42%	11%	10%	5%
Research	28	40	13	13	6
Doctoral	25	40	13	15	7
Master's	26	45	13	12	4
Baccalaureate	34	41	10	11	5
Associate of Arts	40	43	8	6	3

TABLE 83: THINKING ABOUT YOUR OWN SITUATION, DO RESEARCH AND/OR OTHER CREATIVE WORK COUNT MORE OR LESS FOR PURPOSES OF FACULTY ADVANCEMENT TODAY THAN THEY DID FIVE YEARS AGO?

	Count more today	Count less today	Count about the same as five years ago	Don't know
All Faculty	27%	9%	41%	23%
Research	32	10	49	10
Doctoral	42	9	36	13
Master's	41	11	32	17
Bacca-laureate	35	8	37	20
Associate of Arts	8	8	43	41

TABLE 84: THINKING ABOUT YOUR OWN SITUATION, DOES APPLIED SCHOLARSHIP (OUTREACH) COUNT MORE OR LESS FOR PURPOSES OF FACULTY ADVANCEMENT TODAY THAN IT DID FIVE YEARS AGO?

	Counts more today	Counts less today	Counts about the same as five years ago	Don't know
All Faculty	15%	7%	39%	39%
Research	14	8	40	38
Doctoral	13	11	39	37
Master's	21	8	37	35
Bacca-laureate	17	5	40	39
Associate of Arts	11	5	39	44

TABLE 85: THINKING ABOUT YOUR OWN SITUATION, DOES SERVICE TO THE COLLEGE OR UNIVERSITY (CITIZENSHIP) COUNT MORE OR LESS FOR PURPOSES OF FACULTY ADVANCEMENT TODAY THAN IT DID FIVE YEARS AGO?

	Counts more today	Counts less today	Counts about the same as five years ago	Don't know
All Faculty	13%	9%	53%	25%
Research	8	13	60	20
Doctoral	8	17	54	21
Master's	13	11	55	21
Bacca-laureate	19	8	53	21
Associate of Arts	15	4	45	35

TABLE 86: THINKING ABOUT YOUR OWN SITUATION, DOES TEACHING COUNT MORE OR LESS FOR PURPOSES OF FACULTY ADVANCEMENT TODAY THAN IT DID FIVE YEARS AGO?

	Counts more today	Counts less today	Counts about the same as five years ago	Don't know
All Faculty	27%	13%	45%	15%
Research	45	13	32	10
Doctoral	25	20	41	14
Master's	23	19	42	16
Bacca-laureate	19	13	51	17
Associate of Arts	18	7	56	20

TABLE 87: I WISH MY INSTITUTION WOULD SET CLEARER PRIORITIES FOR THE KIND OF WORK FACULTY SHOULD DO.

	Strongly agree	Somewhat agree	Neutral	Somewhat disagree	Strongly disagree
All Faculty	9%	17%	32%	20%	22%
Research	7	16	27	22	29
Doctoral	11	18	30	22	19
Master's	12	20	31	19	19
Bacca-laureate	11	19	27	21	23
Associate of Arts	8	14	39	20	19

TABLE 88: THE STATED MISSIONS OF THIS INSTITUTION ARE CLEAR TO THE FACULTY

	Strongly agree	Somewhat agree	Neutral	Somewhat disagree	Strongly disagree
All Faculty	30%	38%	12%	14%	6%
Research	21	41	17	16	6
Doctoral	20	36	15	20	10
Master's	28	40	12	14	6
Bacca-laureate	43	33	8	13	4
Associate of Arts	39	37	9	11	5

TABLE 89: AT MY INSTITUTION THE GOALS FOR UNDERGRADUATES ARE CLEAR TO THE FACULTY

	Strongly agree	Somewhat agree	Neutral	Somewhat disagree	Strongly disagree
All Faculty	22%	39%	15%	19%	5%
Research	12	33	25	24	7
Doctoral	13	34	20	25	8
Master's	20	42	14	19	5
Baccalaureate	30	42	9	15	4
Associate of Arts	30	41	10	15	4

TABLE 90: MY INSTITUTION IS CONSISTENT IN WHAT IT EXPECTS FACULTY TO DO, AND HOW IT REWARDS THEM.

	Strongly agree	Somewhat agree	Neutral	Somewhat disagree	Strongly disagree
All Faculty	9%	27%	18%	30%	16%
Research	6	25	20	31	18
Doctoral	5	21	19	33	21
Master's	5	26	17	35	17
Baccalaureate	10	32	14	31	13
Associate of Arts	14	30	18	25	13

TABLES

CHAPTER 7: WORKING CONDITIONS

TABLE 91:	In general, how do you feel about this institution?
TABLE 92:	How would you rate your own academic salary?
TABLE 93:	My job is a source of considerable personal strain.
TABLE 94:	I am more enthusiastic about my work now than I was when I began my academic career.
TABLE 95:	To what extent has your teaching load been a source of stress in your professional work during the last two years?
TABLE 96:	I hardly ever get the time to give a piece of work the attention it deserves.
TABLE 97:	I feel I have less control of my time than I had five years ago.
TABLE 98:	To what extent have the following factors been sources of stress in your professional work during the last two years?
TABLE 99:	At this institution, how would you evaluate the facilities, resources, or personnel you need to support your work?
TABLE 100:	How would you rate the “technology infrastructure” at your institution?
TABLE 101:	To what extent are you satisfied with your job situation as a whole?
TABLE 102:	To what extent are you satisfied with the courses you teach?
TABLE 103:	To what extent are you satisfied with your relationships with colleagues?
TABLE 104:	To what extent are you satisfied with the way your department and your institution are managed?
TABLE 105:	This is an especially creative and productive time in my field.
TABLE 106:	My interests have become more interdisciplinary in recent years.
TABLE 107:	This is a poor time for any person to begin an academic career in my field.

TABLE 91: IN GENERAL, HOW DO YOU FEEL ABOUT THIS INSTITUTION? IT IS...

	A very good place for me	A fairly good place for me	Not the place for me
All Faculty	47%	45%	8%
Research	41	48	11
Doctoral	36	52	12
Master's	40	52	8
Baccalaureate	50	41	9
Associate of Arts	59	37	5

TABLE 92: HOW WOULD YOU RATE YOUR OWN ACADEMIC SALARY?

	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor	Not applicable
All Faculty	9%	37%	32%	22%	1%
Research	10	38	31	20	1
Doctoral	7	29	38	25	1
Master's	4	30	40	25	1
Baccalaureate	6	30	33	30	1
Associate of Arts	13	43	26	17	0

TABLE 93: MY JOB IS A SOURCE OF CONSIDERABLE PERSONAL STRAIN.

	Strongly agree	Somewhat agree	Neutral	Somewhat disagree	Strongly disagree
All Faculty	10%	29%	18%	22%	22%
Research	13	32	18	19	17
Doctoral	12	31	19	21	18
Master's	9	28	18	24	22
Baccalaureate	9	31	16	22	22
Associate of Arts	8	25	18	24	25

TABLE 94: I AM MORE ENTHUSIASTIC ABOUT MY WORK NOW THAN I WAS WHEN I BEGAN MY ACADEMIC CAREER.

	Strongly agree	Somewhat agree	Neutral	Somewhat disagree	Strongly disagree
All Faculty	19%	25%	27%	20%	10%
Research	16	23	28	20	13
Doctoral	17	25	26	21	11
Master's	17	23	28	24	9
Baccalaureate	17	28	24	21	9
Associate of Arts	23	27	25	16	8

TABLE 95: TO WHAT EXTENT HAS YOUR TEACHING LOAD BEEN A SOURCE OF STRESS IN YOUR PROFESSIONAL WORK DURING THE LAST TWO YEARS?

	A great deal	Somewhat	A little	None
All Faculty	16%	30%	26%	28%
Research	10	27	31	32
Doctoral	18	28	24	30
Master's	23	31	25	21
Baccalaureate	18	29	24	29
Associate of Arts	16	32	24	29

TABLE 96: I HARDLY EVER GET THE TIME TO GIVE A PIECE OF WORK THE ATTENTION IT DESERVES.

	Strongly agree	Somewhat agree	Neutral	Somewhat disagree	Strongly disagree
All Faculty	21%	42%	15%	17%	6%
Research	20	42	13	18	6
Doctoral	24	40	15	16	5
Master's	29	38	14	14	5
Baccalaureate	23	45	14	13	6
Associate of Arts	16	43	17	18	7

TABLE 97: I FEEL I HAVE LESS CONTROL OF MY TIME
THAN I HAD FIVE YEARS AGO.

	Strongly agree	Somewhat agree	Neutral	Somewhat disagree	Strongly disagree
All Faculty	21%	25%	22%	19%	13%
Research	22	30	20	17	10
Doctoral	23	27	22	17	11
Master's	25	25	22	17	12
Bacca- laureate	24	26	19	20	12
Associate of Arts	18	21	23	22	17

TABLE 98: TO WHAT EXTENT HAVE THE FOLLOWING FACTORS BEEN SOURCES OF STRESS
 IN YOUR PROFESSIONAL WORK DURING THE LAST TWO YEARS?
 (Percent responding “a great deal” or “somewhat”)

	All Faculty	Research	Doctoral	Master’s	Bacca- laureate	Associate of Arts
Institutional procedures and “red tape”	63%	68%	66%	68%	55%	58%
Time allocation between work & family	58	60	58	59	60	55
Teaching load	46	37	46	54	47	47
Committee work	45	42	46	46	48	46
Demands of students	41	42	43	41	43	41
Your own review/promotion process	42	47	50	49	42	31
Relationships with colleagues	33	38	37	34	34	26
Evaluating colleagues for promotion	27	30	33	30	29	20
Research or publishing demands	36	58	56	44	33	8

TABLE 99: AT THIS INSTITUTION, HOW WOULD YOU EVALUATE THE FACILITIES, RESOURCES, OR PERSONNEL YOU NEED TO SUPPORT YOUR WORK?
(Percent responding "excellent" or "good")

	Overall	Access to colleagues	Class- rooms	Technology for teaching	Labora- tories	Computer facilities
All Faculty	53%	75%	59%	52%	48%	59%
Research	57	77	54	53	48	71
Doctoral	47	70	53	49	40	58
Master's	49	74	58	49	40	57
Baccalaureate	59	75	67	53	48	60
Associate of Arts	54	75	62	55	54	52

TABLE 100: HOW WOULD YOU RATE THE "TECHNOLOGY INFRASTRUCTURE" AT YOUR INSTITUTION?
(Percent responding "excellent" or "good")

	E-mail capability	Internet access	Library/ on-line resources	User support
All Faculty	73%	69%	60%	45%
Research	88	88	72	54
Doctoral	77	72	60	44
Master's	76	71	59	43
Baccalaureate	72	66	60	47
Associate of Arts	58	52	53	41

TABLE 101: TO WHAT EXTENT ARE YOU SATISFIED WITH YOUR JOB SITUATION AS A WHOLE?

	Very satisfied	Somewhat satisfied	Neutral	Somewhat dissatisfied	Very dissatisfied
All Faculty	33%	44%	5%	13%	5%
Research	31	44	7	12	5
Doctoral	21	51	8	14	6
Master's	25	48	7	14	6
Bacca-laureate	31	47	5	12	5
Associate of Arts	41	40	3	12	4

TABLE 102: TO WHAT EXTENT ARE YOU SATISFIED WITH THE COURSES YOU TEACH?

	Very satisfied	Somewhat satisfied	Neutral	Somewhat dissatisfied	Very dissatisfied	Not applicable
All Faculty	52%	39%	3%	4%	1%	1%
Research	51	38	4	4	1	2
Doctoral	52	37	5	5	1	1
Master's	49	43	4	4	1	0
Bacca-laureate	56	36	3	5	0	0
Associate of Arts	55	37	3	4	0	1

TABLE 103: TO WHAT EXTENT ARE YOU SATISFIED WITH YOUR RELATIONSHIPS WITH COLLEAGUES?

	Very satisfied	Somewhat satisfied	Neutral	Somewhat dissatisfied	Very dissatisfied
All Faculty	40%	41%	9%	7%	3%
Research	33	41	10	11	4
Doctoral	35	41	11	8	5
Master's	40	41	9	8	3
Baccalaureate	45	39	7	6	3
Associate of Arts	44	41	8	4	3

TABLE 104: TO WHAT EXTENT ARE YOU SATISFIED WITH THE WAY YOUR DEPARTMENT AND YOUR INSTITUTION ARE MANAGED?
(Percent responding "very" or "somewhat" satisfied)

	Department	Institution
All Faculty	61%	36%
Research	54	33
Doctoral	57	28
Master's	61	36
Baccalaureate	65	45
Associate of Arts	66	38

TABLE 105: THIS IS AN ESPECIALLY CREATIVE AND
PRODUCTIVE TIME IN MY FIELD.

	Strongly agree	Somewhat agree	Neutral	Somewhat disagree	Strongly disagree
All Faculty	38%	36%	17%	8%	2%
Research	36	36	17	10	1
Doctoral	33	38	17	11	1
Master's	38	37	16	7	2
Bacca- laureate	36	36	17	8	3
Associate of Arts	39	36	18	6	1

TABLE 106: MY INTERESTS HAVE BECOME MORE
INTERDISCIPLINARY IN RECENT YEARS.

	Strongly agree	Somewhat agree	Neutral	Somewhat disagree	Strongly disagree
All Faculty	34%	36%	17%	9%	5%
Research	37	34	16	9	5
Doctoral	35	36	16	10	4
Master's	36	36	15	9	5
Bacca- laureate	36	38	15	8	4
Associate of Arts	30	38	19	9	5

TABLE 107: THIS IS A POOR TIME FOR ANY PERSON TO BEGIN AN ACADEMIC CAREER IN MY FIELD.

	Strongly agree	Somewhat agree	Neutral	Somewhat disagree	Strongly disagree
All Faculty	13%	24%	19%	24%	20%
Research	14	26	18	25	18
Doctoral	15	23	18	26	18
Master's	12	25	19	25	20
Bacca-laureate	14	27	17	25	18
Associate of Arts	13	22	21	23	23

TABLE 108: IF I HAD IT TO DO OVER AGAIN, I WOULD NOT BECOME A COLLEGE TEACHER.

	Strongly agree	Somewhat agree	Neutral	Somewhat disagree	Strongly disagree
All Faculty	4%	6%	8%	19%	63%
Research	5	6	10	21	59
Doctoral	5	8	9	19	58
Master's	4	7	9	19	61
Bacca-laureate	4	6	8	20	63
Associate of Arts	4	5	6	17	69

TABLES

CHAPTER 7: WORKING CONDITIONS

- TABLE 109: How would you rate the sense of campus community at your institution, 1989-1997?
- TABLE 110: Please indicate the degree to which your academic discipline, your department and your college or university is important to you personally.
- TABLE 111: Faculty in my department have little contact with faculty in other departments.
- TABLE 112: The faculty in my department generally tend to isolate themselves from the world outside the campus.
- TABLE 113: How would you rate the academic reputation of your department outside your institution?
- TABLE 114: How would you rate the sense that you feel valued and appreciated?
- TABLE 115: How much opportunity do you feel you have to influence the policies of your department and institution?
- TABLE 116: To what extent do you participate in meetings in the following types of organization at your institution?
- TABLE 117: Junior faculty members have too little say in the running of my department.
- TABLE 118: Faculty meetings in my department generally are a waste of time.
- TABLE 119: Faculty governance works effectively at my institution.
- TABLE 120: Top-level administrators are providing competent leadership.
- TABLE 121: Communication between the faculty and the administration is poor.
- TABLE 122: How would you rate relations between the following groups at your institution?
- TABLE 123: There is a strong sense of institutional pride here.
- TABLE 124: How would you rate student morale at your institution?
- TABLE 125: How would you rate the intellectual environment at your institution?
- TABLE 126: Female and minority faculty are treated fairly at this institution.
- TABLE 127: Racial and ethnic conflicts are a problem among students at my institution.
- TABLE 128: Gender issues are a problem among students at my institution.
- TABLE 129: How would you rate the overall quality of campus life at your institution?
- TABLE 130: The quality of life at my institution is of greater concern today than it was a few years ago.

TABLE 109: HOW WOULD YOU RATE THE SENSE OF CAMPUS COMMUNITY
AT YOUR INSTITUTION, 1989-1997?
(Percent responding "excellent" or "good")

	1989	1992	1997
All Faculty	37%	43%	27%
Research	25	35	27
Doctoral	30	41	19
Master's	32	39	22
Baccalaureate	56	44	47
Associate of Arts	45	54	27

TABLE 110: PLEASE INDICATE THE DEGREE TO WHICH EACH OF
THE FOLLOWING IS IMPORTANT TO YOU PERSONALLY.
(Percent responding "very important")

	My academic discipline	My department	My college or university
All Faculty	76%	50%	38%
Research	70	41	29
Doctoral	70	48	33
Master's	78	50	34
Baccalaureate	74	55	48
Associate of Arts	80	57	45

TABLE 111: FACULTY IN MY DEPARTMENT HAVE LITTLE CONTACT WITH FACULTY IN OTHER DEPARTMENTS.

	Strongly agree	Somewhat agree	Neutral	Somewhat disagree	Strongly disagree
All Faculty	11%	31%	12%	31%	16%
Research	11	29	10	32	18
Doctoral	11	34	13	30	12
Master's	13	30	10	33	14
Bacca-laureate	6	22	8	34	31
Associate of Arts	13	34	14	27	12

TABLE 112: THE FACULTY IN MY DEPARTMENT GENERALLY TEND TO ISOLATE THEMSELVES FROM THE WORLD OUTSIDE THE CAMPUS.

	Strongly agree	Somewhat agree	Neutral	Somewhat disagree	Strongly disagree
All Faculty	6%	21%	15%	35%	23%
Research	6	25	16	34	19
Doctoral	9	20	16	37	18
Master's	8	23	14	33	22
Bacca-laureate	5	15	12	39	29
Associate of Arts	5	17	15	36	26

TABLE 113: HOW WOULD YOU RATE THE ACADEMIC REPUTATION OF YOUR DEPARTMENT OUTSIDE YOUR INSTITUTION?

	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor	Not applicable
All Faculty	25%	41%	25%	8%	2%
Research	28	41	24	8	0
Doctoral	15	39	32	13	0
Master's	17	39	33	10	1
Bacca-laureate	19	42	27	10	3
Associate of Arts	33	42	18	5	3

TABLE 114: HOW WOULD YOU RATE THE SENSE THAT YOU FEEL VALUED AND APPRECIATED?

	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor	Not applicable
All Faculty	14%	38%	28%	21%	1%
Research	12	38	31	19	0
Doctoral	8	34	31	26	1
Master's	10	36	28	26	1
Bacca-laureate	16	41	25	18	0
Associate of Arts	18	39	25	18	1

TABLE 115: HOW MUCH OPPORTUNITY DO YOU FEEL YOU HAVE TO INFLUENCE THE POLICIES OF YOUR DEPARTMENT AND INSTITUTION?
(Percent responding "a great deal" or "quite a bit")

	My department	My institution
All Faculty	59%	14%
Research	54	11
Doctoral	58	11
Master's	64	12
Baccalaureate	68	23
Associate of Arts	58	15

TABLE 116: TO WHAT EXTENT DO YOU PARTICIPATE IN MEETINGS OF THE FOLLOWING TYPES OF ORGANIZATION AT YOUR INSTITUTION?
(Percent responding "a great deal" or "sometimes")

	Departmental faculty meetings	Faculty senate	Campus-wide committees
All Faculty	92%	32%	62%
Research	91	19	50
Doctoral	93	23	63
Master's	94	32	69
Baccalaureate	94	60	78
Associate of Arts	89	36	63

TABLE 117: JUNIOR FACULTY MEMBERS HAVE TOO LITTLE SAY IN THE RUNNING OF MY DEPARTMENT.

	Strongly agree	Somewhat agree	Neutral	Somewhat disagree	Strongly disagree
All Faculty	8%	14%	22%	32%	25%
Research	8	17	19	36	21
Doctoral	8	15	21	33	23
Master's	9	13	18	33	27
Bacca-laureate	7	13	18	32	31
Associate of Arts	7	12	28	27	26

TABLE 118: FACULTY MEETINGS IN MY DEPARTMENT GENERALLY ARE A WASTE OF TIME.

	Strongly agree	Somewhat agree	Neutral	Somewhat disagree	Strongly disagree
All Faculty	9%	21%	16%	32%	22%
Research	10	24	19	30	17
Doctoral	12	23	16	30	20
Master's	10	21	14	32	22
Bacca-laureate	7	14	14	35	30
Associate of Arts	8	21	16	33	23

TABLE 119: FACULTY GOVERNANCE WORKS EFFECTIVELY AT MY INSTITUTION.

	Strongly agree	Somewhat agree	Neutral	Somewhat disagree	Strongly disagree
All Faculty	7%	25%	28%	26%	14%
Research	5	22	33	26	15
Doctoral	4	19	29	30	18
Master's	5	24	28	28	15
Baccalaureate	7	29	24	26	13
Associate of Arts	10	27	26	23	13

TABLE 120: TOP-LEVEL ADMINISTRATORS ARE PROVIDING COMPETENT LEADERSHIP.

	Strongly agree	Somewhat agree	Neutral	Somewhat disagree	Strongly disagree
All Faculty	12%	34%	15%	22%	17%
Research	10	33	17	22	18
Doctoral	9	31	15	25	20
Master's	10	35	15	23	18
Baccalaureate	19	36	12	19	15
Associate of Arts	13	34	15	22	17

TABLE 121: COMMUNICATION BETWEEN THE FACULTY AND THE ADMINISTRATION IS POOR.

	Strongly agree	Somewhat agree	Neutral	Somewhat disagree	Strongly disagree
All Faculty	21%	33%	16%	23%	8%
Research	21	35	18	21	6
Doctoral	25	34	16	20	5
Master's	22	33	17	22	7
Baccalaureate	19	29	13	30	10
Associate of Arts	19	32	14	25	10

TABLE 122: HOW WOULD YOU RATE RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN THE FOLLOWING GROUPS AT YOUR INSTITUTION?
(Percent responding "excellent" or "good")

	Administration and undergraduates	Administration and faculty	Faculty and students
All Faculty	36%	31%	78%
Research	35	27	71
Doctoral	29	23	72
Master's	36	28	76
Baccalaureate	50	44	90
Associate of Arts	34	35	83

TABLE 123: THERE IS A STRONG SENSE OF INSTITUTIONAL PRIDE HERE.

	Strongly agree	Somewhat agree	Neutral	Somewhat disagree	Strongly disagree
All Faculty	18%	40%	18%	18%	5%
Research	21	41	18	14	4
Doctoral	10	29	23	27	12
Master's	10	40	21	22	6
Bacca-laureate	25	45	14	12	4
Associate of Arts	22	42	16	16	5

TABLE 124: HOW WOULD YOU RATE STUDENT MORALE AT YOUR INSTITUTION?

	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor	Not applicable
All Faculty	7%	54%	34%	4%	1%
Research	6	54	35	3	2
Doctoral	5	44	43	6	1
Master's	5	53	36	5	1
Bacca-laureate	9	60	27	4	1
Associate of Arts	10	54	32	3	1

TABLE 125: HOW WOULD YOU RATE THE INTELLECTUAL ENVIRONMENT AT YOUR INSTITUTION?

	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor
All Faculty	12%	42%	34%	12%
Research	21	45	27	7
Doctoral	7	40	39	14
Master's	5	42	36	17
Baccalaureate	14	44	31	11
Associate of Arts	10	40	36	13

TABLE 126: FEMALE AND MINORITY FACULTY ARE TREATED FAIRLY AT THIS INSTITUTION. (Percent agreeing "strongly" or "somewhat")

	Female faculty	Minority faculty
All Faculty	78%	77%
Research	73	73
Doctoral	73	76
Master's	74	74
Baccalaureate	78	78
Associate of Arts	85	82

TABLE 127: RACIAL AND ETHNIC CONFLICTS ARE A PROBLEM
AMONG STUDENTS AT MY INSTITUTION.

	Strongly agree	Somewhat agree	Neutral	Somewhat disagree	Strongly disagree
All Faculty	5%	25%	19%	31%	19%
Research	7	33	21	25	14
Doctoral	7	26	22	28	18
Master's	4	24	20	34	19
Bacca-laureate	7	28	17	31	18
Associate of Arts	2	19	18	36	25

TABLE 128: GENDER ISSUES ARE A PROBLEM AMONG
STUDENTS AT MY INSTITUTION.

	Strongly agree	Somewhat agree	Neutral	Somewhat disagree	Strongly disagree
All Faculty	3%	19%	23%	35%	20%
Research	5	22	26	32	16
Doctoral	5	20	25	32	19
Master's	2	20	23	38	17
Bacca-laureate	4	24	19	31	22
Associate of Arts	2	15	20	37	25

TABLE 129: HOW WOULD YOU RATE THE OVERALL QUALITY OF CAMPUS LIFE AT YOUR INSTITUTION?

	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor	Not applicable
All Faculty	7%	38%	43%	11%	2%
Research	7	46	37	8	1
Doctoral	4	31	48	16	1
Master's	2	37	46	13	1
Bacca-laureate	9	47	33	10	1
Associate of Arts	9	32	46	10	3

TABLE 130: THE QUALITY OF LIFE AT MY INSTITUTION IS OF GREATER CONCERN TODAY THAN IT WAS A FEW YEARS AGO.

	Strongly agree	Somewhat agree	Neutral	Somewhat disagree	Strongly disagree
All Faculty	13%	31%	35%	15%	7%
Research	13	32	33	16	6
Doctoral	10	28	39	17	6
Master's	12	30	37	16	6
Bacca-laureate	15	34	31	13	7
Associate of Arts	12	32	34	13	9

CHAPTER 9: HIGHER EDUCATION AND SOCIETY

- TABLE 131: Have you ever worked abroad to do research, take a sabbatical, or as part of an exchange program?
- TABLE 132: Connections with scholars in other countries are very important to my professional work.
- TABLE 133: My institution should recruit more international students and faculty.
- TABLE 134: Universities and colleges should do more to promote student and faculty mobility from one country to another.
- TABLE 135: In order to keep up with developments in my discipline, a scholar must read books and journals published abroad.
- TABLE 136: The curriculum at this institution should be more international in focus.
- TABLE 137: The goal of an academic scholar is to advance knowledge without regard for the possible implications for society.
- TABLE 138: Faculty in my discipline have a professional obligation to apply their knowledge to problems in society.
- TABLE 139: Faculty in my discipline have a professional obligation to collaborate with teachers in elementary and secondary schools.
- TABLE 140: Universities have a responsibility to contribute to the economic development of their communities.
- TABLE 141: This institution should be actively engaged in solving social problems.
- TABLE 142: Academics are among the most influential opinion leaders.
- TABLE 143: Respect for academics is declining.
- TABLE 144: The effectiveness of higher education is being threatened by growing bureaucracies.
- TABLE 145: In this country, there are no political or ideological restrictions on what a scholar may publish.

TABLE 131: HAVE YOU EVER WORKED ABROAD TO DO RESEARCH,
TAKE A SABBATICAL AS PART OF AN EXCHANGE PROGRAM?

	Yes	No
All Faculty	38%	62%
Research	58	42
Doctoral	42	58
Master's	36	64
Baccalaureate	39	61
Associate of Arts	23	77

TABLE 132: CONNECTIONS WITH SCHOLARS IN OTHER COUNTRIES
ARE VERY IMPORTANT TO MY PROFESSIONAL WORK.

	Strongly agree	Somewhat agree	Neutral	Somewhat disagree	Strongly disagree
All Faculty	25%	23%	21%	20%	11%
Research	42	27	14	13	5
Doctoral	28	27	19	18	9
Master's	23	25	21	22	9
Bacca- laureate	21	25	23	21	10
Associate of Arts	13	17	27	24	19

TABLE 133: MY INSTITUTION SHOULD RECRUIT MORE INTERNATIONAL STUDENTS AND FACULTY.

	Strongly agree	Somewhat agree	Neutral	Somewhat disagree	Strongly disagree
All Faculty	14%	23%	34%	20%	9%
Research	15	23	35	20	7
Doctoral	15	25	34	17	8
Master's	20	25	34	15	6
Baccalaureate	19	29	33	14	5
Associate of Arts	9	19	34	24	14

TABLE 134: UNIVERSITIES AND COLLEGES SHOULD DO MORE TO PROMOTE STUDENT AND FACULTY MOBILITY FROM ONE COUNTRY TO ANOTHER.

	Strongly agree	Somewhat agree	Neutral	Somewhat disagree	Strongly disagree
All Faculty	24%	38%	26%	9%	3%
Research	29	39	23	7	2
Doctoral	25	36	28	8	3
Master's	26	38	27	8	1
Baccalaureate	26	39	26	7	2
Associate of Arts	17	37	28	13	5

TABLE 135: IN ORDER TO KEEP UP WITH DEVELOPMENTS IN MY DISCIPLINE,
A SCHOLAR MUST READ BOOKS AND JOURNALS PUBLISHED ABROAD.

	Strongly agree	Somewhat agree	Neutral	Somewhat disagree	Strongly disagree
All Faculty	35%	31%	13%	14%	7%
Research	50	27	7	11	4
Doctoral	42	29	9	15	5
Master's	33	36	12	13	5
Bacca-laureate	35	34	13	14	5
Associate of Arts	23	30	19	17	11

TABLE 136: THE CURRICULUM AT THIS INSTITUTION
SHOULD BE MORE INTERNATIONAL IN FOCUS.

	Strongly agree	Somewhat agree	Neutral	Somewhat disagree	Strongly disagree
All Faculty	15%	31%	32%	18%	5%
Research	18	32	32	15	4
Doctoral	16	31	32	17	4
Master's	17	33	32	16	3
Bacca-laureate	17	34	29	17	3
Associate of Arts	11	27	33	21	8

TABLE 137: THE GOAL OF AN ACADEMIC SCHOLAR IS TO ADVANCE KNOWLEDGE WITHOUT REGARD FOR THE POSSIBLE IMPLICATIONS FOR SOCIETY.

	Somewhat agree	Strongly agree	Neutral	Somewhat disagree	Strongly disagree
All Faculty	8%	18%	13%	39%	22%
Research	8	23	11	41	18
Doctoral	9	20	12	37	22
Master's	8	15	14	38	24
Baccha-laureate	7	16	11	40	25
Associate of Arts	9	17	14	38	22

TABLE 138: FACULTY IN MY DISCIPLINE HAVE A PROFESSIONAL OBLIGATION TO APPLY THEIR KNOWLEDGE TO PROBLEMS IN SOCIETY.

	Strongly agree	Somewhat agree	Neutral	Somewhat disagree	Strongly disagree
All Faculty	33%	36%	18%	8%	6%
Research	36	34	15	9	6
Doctoral	34	36	16	8	6
Master's	36	37	15	7	6
Baccha-laureate	30	39	20	7	4
Associate of Arts	28	35	23	8	6

TABLE 139: COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY FACULTY HAVE A PROFESSIONAL OBLIGATION TO COLLABORATE WITH TEACHERS IN ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY SCHOOLS.

	Strongly agree	Somewhat agree	Neutral	Somewhat disagree	Strongly disagree
All Faculty	19%	35%	24%	12%	11%
Research	14	28	28	16	14
Doctoral	17	30	25	16	12
Master's	25	34	22	11	8
Bacca-laureate	20	37	22	11	10
Associate of Arts	20	41	21	8	10

TABLE 140: UNIVERSITIES HAVE A RESPONSIBILITY TO CONTRIBUTE TO THE ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT OF THEIR COMMUNITIES.

	Strongly agree	Somewhat agree	Neutral	Somewhat disagree	Strongly disagree
All Faculty	23%	47%	16%	11%	3%
Research	19	51	15	10	4
Doctoral	25	43	18	11	3
Master's	23	49	15	11	2
Bacca-laureate	22	45	19	11	3
Associate of Arts	25	45	16	12	2

TABLE 141: THIS INSTITUTION SHOULD BE ACTIVELY ENGAGED IN SOLVING SOCIAL PROBLEMS.

	Strongly agree	Somewhat agree	Neutral	Somewhat disagree	Strongly disagree
All Faculty	20%	41%	20%	14%	6%
Research	21	42	18	12	6
Doctoral	21	41	20	12	6
Master's	21	42	20	14	4
Bacca-laureate	20	44	20	11	4
Associate of Arts	17	39	22	16	7

TABLE 142: ACADEMICS ARE AMONG THE MOST INFLUENTIAL OPINION LEADERS.

	Strongly agree	Somewhat agree	Neutral	Somewhat disagree	Strongly disagree
All Faculty	10%	29%	20%	32%	9%
Research	6	26	20	37	11
Doctoral	7	26	18	37	11
Master's	9	27	19	34	10
Bacca-laureate	9	31	18	32	10
Associate of Arts	15	34	20	25	5

TABLE 143: RESPECT FOR ACADEMICS IS DECLINING.

	Strongly agree	Somewhat agree	Neutral	Somewhat disagree	Strongly disagree
All Faculty	23%	49%	16%	11%	2%
Research	24	47	19	10	1
Doctoral	26	48	15	9	2
Master's	26	46	17	10	2
Bacca-laureate	23	48	16	12	2
Associate of Arts	20	52	13	13	3

TABLE 144: THE EFFECTIVENESS OF HIGHER EDUCATION IS BEING THREATENED BY GROWING BUREAUCRACIES.

	Strongly agree	Somewhat agree	Neutral	Somewhat disagree	Strongly disagree
All Faculty	29%	43%	17%	9%	2%
Research	27	46	17	9	1
Doctoral	32	40	18	8	2
Master's	33	42	15	9	1
Bacca-laureate	25	45	19	9	2
Associate of Arts	28	43	18	9	2

TABLE 145: IN THIS COUNTRY, THERE ARE NO POLITICAL OR IDEOLOGICAL RESTRICTIONS ON WHAT A SCHOLAR MAY PUBLISH.

	Strongly agree	Somewhat agree	Neutral	Somewhat disagree	Strongly disagree
All Faculty	13%	27%	19%	34%	7%
Research	13	26	15	37	9
Doctoral	12	29	17	32	10
Master's	13	27	19	34	7
Bacca-laureate	9	29	23	32	6
Associate of Arts	13	25	20	35	8