SCUII Update: Faculty Service Survey

Angela Hicks (Mathematics) Damien Thévenin (Chemistry)

Faculty Senate Meeting Friday, September 6, 2024



HISTORY

- Started with an assignment to SCUII to "address faculty service burden."
- After consulting with the Advance Office, Chair of Chairs Nick Sawicki, Deputy Provost for Faculty Affairs Larry Snyder, etc., SCUII commissioned a Faculty Survey on Service.
- The Office of Institutional Data (OID) prepared the survey with our input and it was distributed to all faculty at the (very) end of the last academic year.
- The survey focused on determining what service faculty are involved in and how much time they spend doing it.
- 184 respondents /549 total faculty (34%)

	Response Rate	Count of faculty	% of all faculty	Count of responde		Difference in repres
College of Arts & Sciences	41%	255	46%	104	57%	10%
College of Business	28%	90	16%	25	14%	-3%
College of Education	43%	28	5%	12	7%	1%
College of Health	48%	25	5%	12	7%	2%
P.C. Rossin College of Engineer	21%	151	28%	31	17%	-11%
Grand Total	34%	549	100%	184	100%	0%

		Response Rate	Count of faculty	% of all faculty	Count of respondents		Difference in representa
By legal Sex:	F	43%	209	38%	89	48%	10%
	М	28%	340	62%	95	52%	-10%
	Grand Total	34%	549	100%	184	100%	0%

Count of

% of all

Count of

% of all

	Rate	faculty		respondents	respondents	in represen
BIPOC	28%	138	25%	39	21%	-4%
Non-BIPOC	35%	411	75%	145	79%	4%
Grand Total	34%	549	100%	184	100%	0%
	Non-BIPOC	BIPOC 28% Non-BIPOC 35%	Rate faculty BIPOC 28% 138 Non-BIPOC 35% 411	RatefacultyfacultyBIPOC28%13825%Non-BIPOC35%41175%	RatefacultyfacultyrespondentsBIPOC28%13825%39Non-BIPOC35%41175%145	RatefacultyfacultyrespondentsrespondentsBIPOC28%13825%3921%Non-BIPOC35%41175%14579%

Docnonco

Created by: Office of Institutional Data | Data sources: Qualtrics, Banner, OID Data Warehouse.

Difference

- 1. Sharing information with faculty members about the average service reported in their "units".
- 2. Generating a report for the Senate (and other interested parties) summarizing the data on service at the University level.
- 3. Analysis of any possible inequities.
- 4. Further dialogue with interested parties (Advance, Faculty Equitable Workload Policy Committee, Department Chairs Executive Committee, etc.) about the interest/utility of repeating the survey.
- 5. Discussion, based on the data, of any next steps for the Faculty Senate in addressing problems with faculty service burden.

Questions / Comments