

# University of Colorado Faculty Service Survey 2008

Developed, Analyzed, and Reported by

Rodney Muth, Susan Krebs, and Robert Snead

with assistance from

Cary Aplin, Wendy Chiado, Denise Cordova, Curtis Lee, Cornelia Santos, and Deborah Wise<sup>1</sup>

Faculty service at the University of Colorado (CU) has long been considered by faculty and administrators to be a source of confusion and consternation: Who is supposed to do what, in what settings, for what rewards? The answers have varied from department to department, from college to school, and across the CU campuses. Thus, faculty in one setting might feel that they are doing more than faculty in other settings for the same rewards, and some might feel that their service is not recognized while similar activities of their colleagues are honored.

Such issues about faculty service, including faculty participation in faculty governance, have been discussed time and again at all levels in the university. In July 2007, then-President Hank Brown requested that expectations for faculty service at the University of Colorado be clarified in response to eight key questions:

1. What activities qualify as [normal] faculty service?
2. What relation does faculty service [have to] evaluation, promotion, and tenure?
3. How is faculty service evaluated?
4. How many hours a week, a month, or a year [are] required to satisfy the faculty service requirement?
5. What service in the university is over and above the expected compensated service requirement and thus currently merits additional compensation?
6. Should additional teaching or research be recognized as compensating for or making up for the failure to meet the service requirement?
7. What should the consequences be of failing to satisfy the service requirement?
8. Under what circumstances would service over and above the required amount be allowed to compensate for the teaching or research requirements for faculty?<sup>2</sup>

These questions drove the development of a systemwide survey, the results of which are addressed systematically below. First, objectives of the study are identified, and the methodology of the study is outlined. Next comes discussion of the survey used to collect data from the faculty on all four of the CU's campuses—UC Boulder (UCB), UC Colorado Springs (UCCS), and UC Denver (UCD) at both the downtown and health sciences locations—in order to compare the data supplied by the respondents (the sample) with data on all faculty (the population) provided by each of the institutions. Finally, a brief discussion of the robustness of the survey is undertaken.

## Study Objectives

Former President Brown's questions led to the development of a survey (see Appendix A) addressed to all faculty and released at the three universities in the CU system in February 2008. Prior to its release, the survey was reviewed, critiqued, and modified by faculty in system and

campus faculty governance, by system and campus administrators, and through a pilot study conducted in late 2007. The primary objective of the survey was to elicit from faculty and administrators their perspectives on the issues raised by President Brown.

### **Methodology**

The 33-item survey ([Appendix A](#)) was conducted online via Zoomerang, a for-profit, Internet-based survey tool often used by universities and businesses. Zoomerang allows for collection of confidential information at reasonable cost. The questions included demographic information, collected primarily to assess the representativeness of the respondents as well as to connect responses clearly with various faculty ranks, campuses, salary levels, tenure classifications, and other variables that might assist in understanding the forced-choice and open-ended responses of those taking the survey. The survey was available online for two weeks following its announcement through each university's blast e-mail system. One reminder was sent to faculty at the beginning of the second week. Of the 4,436 faculty at CU at the time of the survey, about 1,400 participated, some of whom were not faculty. Overall, 832 (about 19%) surveys were completed sufficiently to be included in most for analyses; a few analyses used 836 or 838 responses but often fewer faculty responded to some questions, especially the open-ended ones.<sup>3</sup>

### **The Survey**

At the beginning of the survey, an extensive list of types of service was provided for faculty respondents to give them a common frame of reference as they thought about service and responded to the survey questions. This is found in Appendix A and included eight categories: service to the profession; academic or professional committee member; service to department, constituency, university, and/or system; faculty governance; conferences; consultant or mentor to students and faculty; public service; and honors and awards. Each of the major categories included 2 to 8 descriptors or subcategories and specified roles such as discipline-related consultant, supporter or participant in university fund-raising activities, participant in system-level committees, presenter of in-service programs for faculty and staff, and provider of discipline-related service to community organizations.

Questions in the survey included forced-choice and open-ended questions designed to respond to President Brown's key questions. Other questions asked about the characteristics of faculty important to assessing the representativeness of the responding faculty when compared to campus demographics. These demographics were supplied by each of the three institutions, UCB, UCCS, and UCD. However, demographic data provided by UCD did not separate the Denver Campus from the Anschutz Medical Campus. Nevertheless, most analyses examine faculty at the Anschutz Medical Center (AMC) separately from UCD's Denver campus.

### **Margins of Error and Segmentation**

A total of 832 surveys were considered fully complete from a CU faculty population of 4,436 at the time of the survey, resulting in a margin of error of  $\pm 3\%$ , with a 95% level of confidence in the results. This margin can be estimated using Web sites such as

<http://www.raosoft.com/samplesize.html>. These results represent a strong one-time survey, as a longitudinal study is not planned at this time.

In terms of segmentation, most variables such as rank and gender are distributed across campuses. However, a few variables, including ethnicity, could not be subdivided across campuses because of the small numbers in the samples from each campus. A useful guideline for subdividing segments in a medium to large population (many thousands or more) is determining whether the group in question has a hundred or more respondents. If not, the group cannot normally be subdivided because the results probably will not have statistical significance. This is the case for ethnicity in this study because of the limited number of minority faculty who belong to the total faculty population at CU and who responded to the survey. Of those who responded to the survey, only 45 Asians, 13 African Americans, 32 Latino, and 2 Hawaiian/Pacific Islanders were self-identified. Thus, ethnicity is reported for CU only, not for each campus. Even then, statistical conclusions about ethnic trends cannot be drawn although certain trends might be investigated in a future study.

This study also considered correlations among other variables. Because “Years in Unit,” “Years at CU,” and “Years in Higher Education” are highly correlated with one another, subdividing all three by campuses was unwarranted. Hence, only Years in Unit was chosen to represent these three variables, because it conveyed the effects of time on service and other faculty work. Additional assessments were completed to determine which categories could be divided further by campus, which could not, or which variables might be suitable for cross tabulations. The results of these assessments follow:

- A. Rank—yes, further distributed across campuses
- B. Tenure Track Status—yes, further distributed across campuses
- C. Gender—yes, further distributed across campuses
- D. Ethnicity—no, not distributed across campuses (very few minority instructors, for example)
- E. Salary—yes, further distributed across campuses
- F. Years in Unit—yes, further distributed across campuses
- G. Years at CU—no, no value added to F (almost identical information)
- H. Years in Higher Education—no; any differences between F and H occurred somewhere else (at the college level, perhaps); this variable has no special meaning for campus of respondents
- I. Faculty vs. Administration—no, not distributed across campuses (only 91 total administrators cannot be cross tabulated even at the CU level)
- J. Administration Level—no, not distributed across campuses (only 91 total)

### **Faculty Characteristics for CU Population, Institutions, and Respondents**

Faculty status at the various campuses is shown in [Table A, Appendix B](#). At UCB and UCD, tenured faculty constituted the largest number of respondents, 157 and 83 respectively. At Anschutz (AMC), the largest group of respondents was 108 non-tenure-track faculty. Respondents considering themselves faculty or administration are shown below faculty status in Table A. Faculty respondents outnumbered administrators by about 10 to 1 in this survey.

Administrative level at the various campuses is shown in [Table B, Appendix B](#). The largest number of respondents served either at the departmental (or program) level or reported no

administrative responsibilities: 300 and 385 respectively for a total of 685. The remaining 53 considered themselves primarily administrators. At 9th and Colorado (UCD), only non-administrators responded. The difference in the totals for questions 3 and 4 result from the fact that many respondents answered some questions (e.g., faculty status) but not others (e.g., administrative level).

At the time that the survey was announced, UCD did not have a faculty-only e-mail list, so the e-mail message about the survey was sent to all faculty and staff. At the opening of the survey ([see Appendix A](#)), respondents were asked about their *faculty rank* both to establish their rank for analyses and to discourage non-faculty from continuing the survey. This question helped eliminate possible respondents who were not faculty, according to the definition in question 1, “What is your current faculty rank?”

Responses from non-faculty, particularly from UCD, were eliminated from consideration. While dozens of non-faculty responded to the e-mail about the survey to inquire about whether or not to respond and were asked not to participate, many simply started the survey, quitting rather quickly when they recognized that the questions simply did not apply to them. The initial question about faculty status served as an important screen; even so, some non-faculty continued through a few additional questions, generally not responding, and all such surveys were deleted from any analyses as were surveys judged generally incomplete.

#### *Distributional Data*

The data about faculty were developed through various questions about salary, gender, ethnicity, rank, tenure status, and other characteristics. Each of the three institutions supplied data about the total population of faculty at each institution, allowing comparisons with the respondents as well as projecting sample results to the institutions and CU generally. All of the data are shown in [Appendix B](#), Tables C through Q. While disparities between some table totals are reported below which necessitate caution in interpreting some results, many of the differences probably are explained by different methods of data collection, incomplete reporting, and other vagaries associated with data collection and reporting in large organizations.

#### *Overall Population* (see [Table C](#))

Based on information provided by institutional research on each campus, Table C, Rank Population, shows that the total number of rostered faculty at CU at the time of the survey was 4,436. Of these, 1,497 were rostered at UCB, 328 at UCCS, and 2,611 at UCD. All counts for UCD include both locations, Denver and Anschutz. (At the time of the survey, 9th and Colorado faculty also were part of UCD and now reside at AMC.)

The distribution of faculty by rank included 448 Full Professors at UCB, 81 at UCCS, and 466 at UCD; 322 Associate Professors at UCB, 53 at UCCS, and 550 at UCD; and 305 Assistant Professors at UCB, 76 at UCCS, and 682 at UCD. For all Instructors, the counts were as follows: 422 at UCB, 118 at UCCS, and 913 at UCD.

*Overall Sample* (See [Tables D and E](#))

After weeding out non-faculty and incomplete responses as indicated earlier, 832 faculty were included in the survey: 305 or 20% of the UCB faculty with 104 (23%) Full Professors, 71 (22%) Associate Professors, 65 (21%) Assistant Professors, and 65 (15%) Instructors; 72 or 22% of the UCCS faculty with 24 (30%), 17 (32%), 17 (22%), and 14 (12%) respectively; and 455 or 17% of the UCD faculty with 91 (20%), 137 (25%), 145 (21%), and 82 (9%) respectively. In most ranks, between 17% and 25% of the faculty responded, except for Instructors and Senior Instructors, which ranged from 9% to 15%. At UCCS, the tenure-track faculty respondents ranged from 22% to 32%.

*Ethnicity Population* (see [Table F](#))

Of the 4,436 faculty at CU, only 554 (12.5%) faculty were identified by the 3 institutions as coming from various ethnic groups, including 29 (< 1%) American Indian or Alaskan Native, 287 (6.4%) Asian, 73 (1.6%) Black or African, or 165 (3.7%) Hispanic or Latino/a. An additional 397 (8.9%) were identified as “Other.” Caucasians clearly constituted the bulk of the faculty: 3,567 (80.4%). (These numbers can be used only for approximate comparisons because the UCB and UCD institutional ethnicity figures for all faculty did not correlate with totals supplied for the numbers for ethnic designations. The discrepancies may be a product of non-self-reporting by faculty at UCB and UCD. Only UCCS’s ethnicity numbers equate with the total figures supplied in Table C.)

*Ethnicity Sample* (see [Tables G and H](#))

For the respondents who identified their ethnicity, the numbers and percentages of faculty in the survey were as follows. For UCB, 2 (22%) American Indian or Alaskan Native, 16 (15%) Asian, 5 (17%) Black or African, 14 (24%) Hispanic or Latino/a, and 10 (10%) Other constituted 47 (15.4%) of the UCB respondents. In the case of UCCS, 2 (100%) American Indian or Alaskan Native, 2 (13%) Asian, 1 (20%) Black or African, 4 (31%) Hispanic or Latino/a, and 2 (17%) Other, totaled 11 (15.3%) of the UCCS sample. For UCD, 5 (28%) American Indian or Alaskan Native, 28 (17%) Asian, 7 (18%) Black or African, 14 (15%) Hispanic or Latino/a, and 18 (6%) Other formed 72 (16.4%) of the respondents from UCD. Please recall that the percentages for UCB and UCD are approximate because of differences between the total figures reported by rank (Table C) and the figures provided for ethnicity (Table F).

*Salary Population* (see [Table I](#))

The distribution of salaries also has some inherent challenges for comparisons. In this case, the distribution of salary data for UCB had to be estimated because UCB only reported averages for ranks. As well, none of the institutional numbers for the salary categories do not add up to the numbers reported for total faculty ([Table C](#)) at each institution. Thus, percentages in the samples have to be interpreted liberally.

Nevertheless, for the overall faculty population at UCB, 165 faculty were reported as earning less than \$40,000, 81 between \$40-50,000, 75 between \$51-60,000, 129 between \$61-70,000, 153 between \$71-80,000, 264 between \$81-100,000, and 408 more than \$100,000. For UCCS, the distribution was 9 faculty earning less than \$40,000, 18 from \$40,000 to \$50,000, 75 from \$51 to \$60,000, 27 from \$61,000 to \$70,000, 84 from \$71,000 to \$80,000, 84 from \$81,000 to \$100,000, and 72 more than \$100,000. At UCD, the numbers were 331 earning less than \$40,000, 102 between \$40-50,000, 166 between \$51-60,000, 220 between \$61-70,000, 225 between \$71-80,000, 292 between \$81-100,000, and 1,212 more than \$100,000.

*Salary Sample* (see [Tables J and K](#))

The self-reported salary categories for Boulder-faculty respondents were as follows: 26 (16%) less than \$40,000, 25 (31%) between \$40-50,000, 31 (41%) between \$51-60,000, 37 (29%) between \$61-70,000, 45 (29%) between \$71-80,000, 64 (24%) between \$81-100,000, and 76 (19%) more than \$100,000. For UCCS, the distribution was 8 (89%) faculty earning less than \$40,000, 3 (17%) from \$40,000 to \$50,000, 21 (28%) from \$51 to \$60,000, 12 (44%) from \$61,000 to \$70,000, 11 (13%) from \$71,000 to \$80,000, 7 (8%) from \$81,000 to \$100,000, and 9 (13%) more than \$100,000. At UCD, the numbers were 38 (11%) earning less than \$40,000, 23 (23%) between \$40-50,000, 50 (30%) between \$51-60,000, 46 (21%) between \$61-70,000, 48 (21%) between \$71-80,000, 69 (18%) between \$81-100,000, and 164 (14%) more than \$100,000. To reiterate, the percentages, which are calculated against the total for each salary category for each level, may not be entirely accurate because of the disparities among the data reported by each institution. However, they are sufficient for comparisons and inferences about representativeness of the respondent pool.

*Gender Population* (see [Table L](#))

At UCB, about 62% (926) of the faculty are male, whereas at UCCS a little more than 50% of the faculty are female. UCD is more like UCCS in that about 52% of the faculty are male and 48% female. For Boulder, the total reported in this table matches that of the total faculty reported in Table C. On the other hand, once again some discrepancy exists in the totals for UCD (compare Tables C and L), while the numbers for UCCS match.

*Gender Sample* (see [Tables M and N](#))

The sample for gender for each of the institutions is distributed differently than for the total population. For instance, female faculty from UCD constituted 55% (241) of the respondents while only 48% (1,324) of the faculty at UCD are female. Similarly, the male respondents from UCCS were 46% (33) of the sample, while they are 49% (161) of the population. Again, for UCB the female respondents were 43% (129) of the sample while only 38% (571) of the population. For UCB, sample males constituted 19% (173) of the population and females 23% (129). At UCCS, the split was females 23% (39) and males 20% (33), while for UCD it was 18% (241) and 14% (198).

*Years of Service at Institution, Population* (see [Table O](#))

At UCD, the total for years of service in this table, 2,722, do not match the totals by rank, 2,611 (Table C), but the distribution was as follows: less than 5 years = 1,030 (37.8%), 6 to 15 years = 1,080 (39.7%), and more than 16 years = 612 (22.5%). For UCB, the distribution was 484 (30.3%), 517 (32.4%), and 594 (37.2%), while UCCS showed 146 (45.1%), 101 (31.2%), and 77 (23.8%). Not all percentages round precisely to 100.

*Years of Service at Institution, Sample* (see [Tables P and Q](#))

For UCD, the sample was distributed as follows: less than 5 years = 59 (13.7%), 6 to 15 years = 177 (41%), and more than 16 years 196 (45.4%), while UCCS was 10 (13.9%), 20 (27.8%), and 42 (58.3%). At UCB, the numbers were 34 (11.4%), 113 (37.9%), and 151 (50.7%). Again, not all percentages equal 100.

Of those responding, the UCB faculty constituted 7% of those reporting less than five years of service at UCB, 22% of those reporting 6 to 16 years of service, and 25% of those indicating more than 16 years. For UCCS, the percentages were 7, 20, and 55, and for UCD they were 6, 16, and 32. In all cases, those with more experience appeared more likely to respond to the survey.

### **Survey Questions 5, 6, and 7**

Faculty responses to these questions generally are reported by campus—UCB, UCCS, UCD, and AMC (combining AMC and 9th and Colorado)—as well as for CU as a whole. In some cases, the tables, figures, and analyses are reported only for CU, primarily because the similarities across the campuses were great, the categories such as years of service showed similar results, or the numbers of faculty in a category, such as ethnicity, did not warrant separate examinations by campus.

All figures for questions 5, 6, and 7 are found in [Appendix C](#), and a typical set of figures for a single analysis are numbered as follows: 6.1a, 6.1b, 6.1c, 6.1d, and 6.1e. The first number, “6” in this case, refers to question 6, and the second, “1,” is for the particular subject for the figure, in this case actual time spent teaching. Figures with an “a” in the sequence generally contain data from UCB respondents while those with a “b” refer to UCCS. Figures ending in “c” focus on UCD Denver, “d” figures to CU as a whole, and “e” to AMC.

#### *How to Read the Primary Figures*

Two types of figures are used in this part of the report. The first and most prevalent type shows percentages for faculty responses as horizontal bars arranged by frequency of responses to a category. For example, for percentage of time teaching arrayed by years in one’s unit, the bars are arranged by three categories, less than 5 years, 6 to 15 years, and 16 years or more. Within each category, the percentages for the ranges 0-9%, 10-19%, 20-29%, 30-39%, 40-49%, 50-59%, 60-69%, 70-79%, 80-89%, 90-99%, and 100% are provided. For example, those saying that they had no more than 5 years in a unit at CU might be reported as 26% for the range 40-49% for actual time teaching. This means that 26% of the responding faculty who had been at CU for 5 years or fewer at the time of the survey said that they teach between 40 and 49% of the time

during their work week. It is important to remember that “teaching” at CU includes all aspects of teaching, including preparation, advising, in-class time, grading, working with teaching assistants, and so forth.

The second type of figure has vertical bars that provide equivalent information. That is, a figure for actual time spent teaching, according to self-identified ethnicity (see [Figure 6.10a, Appendix C, online](#)), shows vertically that 10% of the total faculty said that they taught less than 0 to 9% of the time. Comparatively, by reading across the same range, the [Figure 6.10a](#) shows that only 3% of the responding Latinos said that they taught 0 to 9% of the time, while 12% of the Asians gave this response. Caucasians, who constituted 80.4% of the survey respondents, were 10% for this same range, pushing the total in this range to 10% across all ethnicities.

One figure of the second type is [6.3e](#), which shows both actual and preferred service by rank for all CU faculty. The most common frequency (mode) for actual and preferred service tend to be 20 to 29%, except for assistant professors and associate professors, who both slightly preferred the 10 to 19% range of service. In most cases, though, faculty preferred to do less service than they reported that they were doing each week. For example, while 77% of the assistant professors at CU said that they spent at least 29% (0% to 29%) of their time in all service activities, 79% suggested that they would like to keep their service in this range. Given the emphasis on the importance of teaching and research at CU, this preference is understandable.

#### *Comparing Actual and Preferred Allocations*

For questions 6 and 7, faculty were asked to report the actual time (question 6) that they spent teaching, conducting research activities, and engaging in service as well as the time that they preferred to spend in these endeavors (question 7). Using vertical bars to make comparisons, [Figure 6.18b](#), “Actual percent of time in research per week by years in higher ed,” shows that 30% of the responding faculty who had been at CU 16 years or more said that they spent between 40 and 49% of their time engaged in research. This same group had only 23% who preferred to do this much research ([Figure 7.18b](#), “Preferred percent of time in research per week by years in higher ed”). Examination of the CU total (Grand Total), also shows that 17% reported doing 0 to 9% research ([6.18b](#)), while 10% indicated that they preferred to do this much research ([7.18b](#)). Similarly, 5% said that they spent 50 to 59% of their time doing research, while 13% hoped to spend 50 to 59% of their time in research endeavors. These latter examples may suggest that faculty in general want to be able to do more research than they are doing, perhaps because of the pressure for research and research dollars on all campuses.

#### *Per Week*

Most of the figures report time spent or time preferred in teaching, research, and service as “per week.” The research team has assumed that most faculty tend to think of the time that they engage with university expectations in terms of a week, a common norm in American work. However, because this assumption is not certain and the questions were not specifically geared to a work week, the explanations of the data use equivalencies throughout: time spent, time, weekly, time per week, each week, per week, average week, and so on.



### *Reporting Notes*

The titles for all figures are within the body of the figure, while the number for the figure is listed according to the primary questions, for example “6,” with decimal numbers (e.g., 6.1) and letters (e.g., 6.1a) signifying sub-classifications of figures. For all figures, the labels for 2% or fewer responses typically are deleted for better legibility. Also, the bars in figures represent actual percentages, while the labels are rounded to the nearest whole number. Thus, some bars may appear to be very slightly different in length, even with the same stated values. Additionally, because of rounding, some graphs may appear not to add to 100%.

Following discussion of question 5, an initial introduction to the analysis of the data by rank for question 6 below, and an initial examination of preferred teaching, research, and service time by rank for question 7, discussions of actual and preferred time allocations shift back and forth between question 6 and question 7. Doing so facilitates contrasts between the work that faculty do in teaching, research, and service and the teaching, research and service work that they would prefer to do. These contrasts are varied by the characteristics that distinguish among faculty, beginning with tenure status and continuing with examinations of gender, ethnicity, salary, years in unit, and years in higher education. Figures for each section can be found in [Appendix C](#).

### **Survey Questions 5, 6, and 7**

Key to this survey of faculty at CU is understanding how faculty view their service time relative to the two other areas of their work: teaching and research. Thus, the survey asked faculty about whether they performed service as part of their “contractual” expectations (question 5). If they did perform service, two additional questions asked about the allocation of their time among teaching, research, and service (question 6) and what was their preferred allocation across these three areas (question 7). Each of these three questions are examined in turn in the sections that follow.

*Question 5: Is service part of your "contract"? (That is, is it explicitly written into your expectations such as 40-40-20 or some other portion of your time commitment to the university?)*

At UCB, full professors (90%) and associate professors (92%) reported the highest percentage of service expectations, while assistant professors said that their expectations were a bit lower (86%). (See [Figure 5a](#).) Only 71% of the senior instructors and instructors indicated that they were expected to engage in service. The remaining respondents indicated “no” (they were not expected to render service according to their contract) or “I’m not sure,” or they simply left the item blank.

[Figure 5b](#) shows that at UCCS only 43% of senior instructors and instructors believe that they have service expectations in their contract. On the other hand, 94% of assistant professors said that they have a service contract, 88% of associate professors have one, and 88% of full professors have similar requirements. Here as with UCB, the instructors were more likely to say that they were not sure or to leave the question blank. However, fully 50% indicated that they did not have contractual expectations for service.

At UCD, as shown in [Figure 5c](#), only 29% of senior instructors and instructors said that they had a service contract, probably due in part to the nature of faculty contracts at the Anschutz Medical Campus. Continuing this trend, only 44% of assistant professors indicated that they had a service contract, while 58% of associate professors and 51% of full professors said likewise. Assistant professors had the largest number of respondents (22%) who either answered that they were not sure about expectations for their service or left the question blank. Leaving the question blank also may indicate that those respondents were not sure of their contractual status in this area. At UCD, all groups were relatively unsure about service expectations when compared to the other campuses.

For the system as a whole, [Figure 5d](#) shows that 39% of all senior instructors and instructors indicated that they had a service contract at the time of this survey. The percentages for the other faculty included 52% of assistant professors, 67% of associate professors, and 67% of full professors have contracts that explicitly call for service. Overall, assistant professors constituted the largest number of respondents (26%) who either were not sure of their status or left the question blank.

*Question 6: If you do perform service, **whether or not it is part of your contract**, please assign any number between 1 and 100 to the three categories below that **reflect the actual allocation of your time**. The three areas should total 100, but you can use "0" for any category.*

\_\_\_\_\_ Teaching  
 \_\_\_\_\_ Research  
 \_\_\_\_\_ Service

*Actual Teaching Time by Rank of Respondent*

As should be expected, at UCB senior instructors and instructors reported the highest percentage of teaching time “per week.” (Please note that, while questions did not request weekly distributions of time, faculty generally think in terms of what they do in the course of a week, so “per week” and similar designations are used metaphorically throughout this report.) [Figure 6.1a](#) also indicates that 38% of the instructor respondents said that they spend over 70% of their week teaching. In contrast, the largest group for assistant, associate, and full professors was in the 40 to 49% range.

[Figure 6.1b](#) indicates that for UCCS, like UCB, senior instructors and instructors report the highest percentage of teaching time per week: All but 8% of instructors said that they spent over 50% of their average week in teaching activities. In contrast, the largest group for assistant, associate, and full professors was in the 40 to 49% range, with assistant professors at 59% and associate professors at 53%. About 50% of the full professors said that they taught between 40 to 59% of the average week.

For UCD’s Denver campus, [Figure 6.1c](#) indicates that, like UCB and UCCS, senior instructors and instructors have the highest percentage teaching time per week: 71% of the instructors responding to the survey said that they spend 70% or more of their week teaching. In contrast, large groups of assistant, associate, and full professors were in the 40 to 49% range, with 56% of

assistant professors teaching either 20 to 29% or 40 to 49% of their week, 32% of associate professors 40 to 49%, and 37% of full professors teaching 40 to 49% of their time.

[Figure 6.1d](#) shows that, as should be expected, for the combined CU campuses senior instructors and instructors report the highest percentage of teaching time per week: 55% said that they spend 70% or more of their week teaching. In contrast, large groups of assistant, associate, and full professors were in the 40 to 49% range, with 28% of assistant professors, 30% of associate professors, and 32% of full professors teaching between 40 and 49% of their time each week.

For AMC, [Figure 6.1e](#) reflects that most of the faculty (56%) say that they teach from 0 to 29% of the time, while the rest teach from 30 to 90% of the time. While 46% of the “instructors” teach up to 9% of their time, 61% of the full professors teach up to 29% of the time and 49% associate assistant professors do the same.

#### *Actual Research Time by Rank*

It is worth noting that at CU overall, only 11% of instructors spent above 80% of their time in research; the rest were below 30% (see [Figures 6.2a through 6.2e](#)). Generally, instructors are not rewarded for engaging in research, but variance within and across institutions does occur, according to these respondents. Overall, however, senior instructors and instructors do considerably less research than other groups, which are relatively equal in their time distributions. Seventy-four percent of instructors are below 20%, whereas the mode (most common frequency) for the other groups was 40 to 49%. UCCS had the least variance within ranked groups. For example, no faculty at UCCS reported more than 60% research time. Finally, the full professors at AMC generally report spending less time in research activities than do their peers at the other campuses, given the responses of those completing the survey. In part, this may be due to responses from clinical faculty, rather than research faculty, data points that were not collected.

#### *Actual Service Time by Rank*

The most common frequency of actual service reported for all schools and categories was 20 to 29% of time spent in service of all kinds (see [Figures 6.3a through 6.3f](#)). Assistant professors at UCB had the lowest percentages with 83% of them indicating that they spent 30% or less of their time in service activities, while AMC respondents showed a wider distribution of actual percentages than was the case for the other institutions. The plurality of full professors at AMC, though, spent 20 to 29% of their time in service work.

[Figure 6.3e](#) highlights the differences and similarities between reports of actual and preferred CU service. Comparing actual service with preferred service, at the low end instructors would prefer to do more service, and across the board full professors would prefer to do less service.

*Question 7: If you could assign any number between 1 and 100 to the three categories below so that the three categories equal 100, what distribution would you prefer for yourself?, You may use "0" for one or two of the categories.*

\_\_\_\_\_ Teaching  
 \_\_\_\_\_ Research  
 \_\_\_\_\_ Service

### *Preferred Teaching Time by Rank*

By way of summary (see [Figures 7.1a through 7.1e](#)), senior instructors and instructors reported the highest percentage of preference for teaching time per week, while only about 3% of CU full professors preferring to teach 70% of the time or more. Further, a plurality of full professors (32%) prefer a 40 to 49% teaching week, but only about 11% of CU full professors preferring to teach 50% or more of the time.

At UCB, as shown in Figure 7.1a, senior instructors and instructors report the highest percentage of preferred teaching time each week. Over 75% of the instructors responding to the survey said that they preferred to spend 50% or more of their week teaching, with about 48% of these preferring 70% or more. In contrast, only about 6% of full professors preferred to teach 50% or more of the time, with 83% wanting to have a 20 to 50% teaching work week. At UCB, associate professors stood out: 44% wanted to teach only 40 to 49% of their work week.

As shown in Figure 7.1b, at UCCS 92% of senior instructors and instructors reported that they preferred to spend 50% or more of their time teaching, with about 62% of these preferring to teach 70% or more. In contrast, only about 9% of full professors preferred to teach 50% or more of the time, with 87% preferring a 20 to 50% teaching load. At UCCS, a group of associate professors stood out, with 53% saying that they wanted teach 40 to 49% of the time. This allocation also was favored by assistant professors and full professors.

Figure 7.1c indicates that UCD senior instructors and instructors have the highest percentage of preferred teaching time per week. About 52% of the responding instructors said that they preferred to spend 70% or more of their time teaching. In contrast, only about 4% of full professors prefer to teach 70% or more of the time, with 56% of full professors preferring a 20 to 50% teaching load; the plurality of full professors (25%) wanted 40 to 49% teaching time. Intriguing was a large group of instructors (23%) who said that 0 to 9% teaching was preferable. We assume that these may be part-time instructors whose actual teaching loads may reflect these preferences.

Figure 7.1d combines all campuses at CU. For all of CU, senior instructors and instructors reported the highest percentage of preferred teaching time, with about 55% saying that they preferred to spend 70% or more of their time teaching. In contrast, overall only about 3% of full professors preferred to teach 70% or more of the time, with 67% of full professors wanting only a 20 to 50% teaching load. The plurality (32%) of full professors preferred 40 to 49% teaching, while a plurality (20%) of instructors wanted to teach 70 to 79% of the time.

At AMC (Figure 7.1e), 46% of the instructors (probably lecturers) prefer to teach no more than 9% of the time, and 21% prefer to teach 10 to 29% of the time; the remaining 33% range between 40 and 100%. The mode for assistant professors was 10 to 19% (21%) with the majority preferring the range 20% and above. On the other hand, associate professors preferred 0 to 9%

(20%), 10 to 19% (11%), and 20 to 29% (18%), while the remaining 51% were spread from 30 to 100%. Full professors clustered from 40 to 49% (13%) to 0 to 9% (23%) with only 13% preferring teaching obligations 50% or greater. Across all ranks, 56% of the respondents preferred between 0 and 29% teaching loads. Overall, 56% of AMC faculty preferred not to teach more than 30% of the time, while at CU overall only 33% preferred to teach no more than 30% of the time. One explanation for this at AMC may be the tremendous pressure on faculty at AMC to produce most of their income from grants or clinical practice.

#### *Preferred Research Time by Rank*

For preferences about research expectations across all campuses, see [Figures 7.2a to 7.2e](#) which show that more than 50% of CU instructors preferred less than 20% research time, while 70% of the CU full professors who responded to the survey chose 40% research time. AMC faculty displayed a bi-modal research-preference distribution, peaking at 70 to 90% and 20 to 29%, perhaps reflecting the distribution of expectations according to tenure status (see sections below). All instructors at UCCS want to spend less than 40% of their time engaged in research.

#### *Preferred Service Time by Rank*

CU overall ([Figure 7.3d](#)) shows many differences in preferences for service by rank. Pronounced differences exist for the individual campuses (see [Figures 7.3a-7.3c](#) and [7.3e](#)). For example, UCD full professors (57%) stand out in their desire to be in the 20 to 29% range. Assistant professors at UCB tend to have a lower preference for service than the other ranks, which is understandable because of the pressure to conduct research and succeed at teaching in order to gain tenure. Full professors at CU are more likely to be in the 20 to 29% service preference category than are the other ranks.

#### *Actual Teaching Time by Tenure Status*

Tenure status was determined at the outset of the survey with a question that asked for each participant's tenure status: tenured, tenure-track, not tenure track. Big differences exist in the actual teaching percentages among tenure-status categories of faculty (see [Figures 6.4a through 6.4e](#)). For example, faculty teaching more than 50% of the time constitute 55% of those who were non tenure-track, 20% of those faculty on the tenure track but not yet tenured, but only 13% of tenured faculty (see [Figure 6.4d](#)). The preferred percentages for teaching (see the [Figures 7.4a to 7.4e](#)) are relatively well matched, with 51% of non tenure-track, 15% of tenure-track, and 9% of tenured faculty declaring that they prefer to teach more than 50% of the time (see [Figure 7.4d](#)).

#### *Actual Research Time by Tenure Status*

Many faculty at CU are not doing as much research as they would prefer (see [Figures 6.5a through 6.5e](#)). For example, actual CU research figures are 22% for non-tenure-track faculty, 10% for tenure-track, and 19% for tenured. Preferred CU research percentages for non-tenure-track faculty are 26%, tenure-track 52%, and tenured 39% (see [Figures 7.5a to 7.5e](#)). This gap is particularly pronounced at UCB where actual research for tenure-track faculty responding to the

survey show only 6% who spend at least 40% of their time in research activities, but 79% who would like to spend more than 40% per week on research.

*Actual Service Time by Tenure Status*

According to the reports of the responding faculty, only 13% of CU tenured faculty perform less than 20% service per week, while 36% of CU tenure-track faculty engage in less than 20% service (see [Figures 6.6a-6.6e](#)). Only 27% of AMC tenured faculty perform less than 20% service per week, while 52% of AMC tenure-track faculty do less than 20% service per week. At UCCS, 61% of the non-tenure-track faculty spent less than 20% of their week in service activities, while only 8% of tenure-track faculty engaged in less than 20% service and none of the faculty tenured at UCCS who responded did less than 20% service.

*Preferred Teaching Time by Tenure Status*

The overall CU preferred percentages for teaching more than 50% of the time (see [Figures 7.4a to 7.4e](#)) are relatively matched to the reported actual teaching time ([Figures 6.4a through 6.4e](#)). About 51% of non-tenure-track, 15% of tenure-track, and 9% of tenured faculty preferred this commitment. The reports for CU of actual time teaching indicate that those who teach more than 50% of the time constitute 55% of non-tenure-track respondents, 20% of the tenure-track, and 13% of tenured faculty. UCB has a particularly high number of non-tenure-track faculty who want to teach more than 50% of the time (68% of those responding). These responses are slightly less than the actual designations, which were 74%. Overall, the distributions for actual and preferred teaching time align well across the campuses with variations generally less than 5%.

*Preferred Research Time by Tenure Status*

Many faculty at CU do not conduct as much research as they would prefer to (see [Figures 7.5a through 7.5e](#)). Actual CU research figures (see [Figure 6.5d](#)) are 22% for non-tenure-track, 10% for tenure-track, and 19% for tenured faculty, whereas preferred research percentages for CU faculty are 26%, 52%, and 39%, respectively. These gaps are particularly pronounced at UCB, where actual research for tenure-track faculty respondents shows that only 6% spend at least 40% of their time in research activities, but 79% would prefer to spend more than 40% of their time on research.

*Preferred Service Time by Tenure Status*

Thirty-nine percent of CU faculty would prefer to spend less than 20% of their week doing service. This preference is especially prevalent at UCD, where 42% of the faculty prefer to spend less than 20% of their week doing service. The reasons for this will be examined further by the analysis of the open-ended questions in this survey. For this same preference, UCB is at 35%, UCCS at 28%, and AMC at 30%. See [Figures 7.6a through 7.6e](#).

*Actual Teaching Time by Gender*

Analyses of gender show relative gaps between actual time spent in teaching and preferences. For example, 34% of CU female faculty in this survey preferred to teach more than 50% of the time (see [Figures 7.7a-7.7e](#)), but only 22% do that (see [Figures 6.7a through 6.7e](#)). Only 24% of CU male faculty preferred to teach more than 50% of the time, but 31% reported teaching more than 50%. These gaps are pronounced at UCB, where 40% of males teach more than 50%, but only 23% of females teach more than 50% of the time. However, only 17% of male faculty prefer to teach this much, while 38% of female faculty would prefer to spend more than 50% of their time teaching.

#### *Actual Research Time by Gender*

Overall at CU, faculty report doing considerably more or considerably less research than they would prefer (see [Figures 6.8a-e](#) and [7.8a-e](#)). Further, actual research and preferred research are less well matched for males than females. That is, 48% of men are spending 40% of their time or less on research, whereas 61% of the female faculty are spending 40% or less. However, only 30% of men would prefer to be doing research less than 40% of the time, while 51% of responding women would prefer to be in this range. On the other hand, only 18% of the male faculty report spending 60% or more of their time on research although 32% would prefer to be doing so. By contrast, 20% of the women would like to spend 60% of their time on research, but 16% report that they already are there. The campuses show similar percentages for actual and preferred research time by gender, and the percentages for UCB align well with the CU totals.

#### *Actual Service Time by Gender*

Men and women are quite similar in their actual service at all campuses (see [Figures 6.9a through 6.9e](#)), unlike the comparisons for actual research ([Figures 6.8a to 6.8e](#)). The most common range for the actual service category for both men and women (plurality) at CU is 20 to 29%. Seventy-four percent of the CU male faculty said that they spent 40% or less of their week in service. However, examination of their preferences ([Figures 7.9a to 7.9e](#)) show that 84% would prefer to limit their service to less than 40% of their week. Conversely, 75% of the CU female faculty spent 40% or less of their time on service activities, but an even larger group, 79%, would prefer to spend less than 40% time on service. According to all respondents, 13% of the CU male faculty say that they engage in service 60% or more of their time, while only 7% would prefer to do so. Further, 13% of the CU female faculty also spent 60% or more of their time in service, but only 9% would prefer to be doing that. Although much controversy exists relative to faculty service, it seems that faculty are spending more time proportionally than load expectations might suggest, and generally faculty say that they would like to spend less time than they do in service activities—probably because they feel that much of their service neither is valued nor rewarded.

#### *Preferred Teaching Time by Gender*

Among CU female faculty, 34% of the respondents prefer to teach more than 50% of the time (see [Figures 7.7a through 7.7e](#)), but only 22% do so ([Figures 6.7a-6.7e](#)). Conversely, only 24% of CU male faculty prefer to teach more than 50% of the time, but 32% teach more than 50% of the time. This gap is quite noticeable at UCB ([Figures 6.7a and 7.7a](#)) where 40% of males teach

more than 50% of the time, but only 23% of females teach more than 50% of the time. Yet only 17% of male faculty prefer to teach this much, while 38% of female faculty would prefer to teach more than 50% of the time.

#### *Preferred Research Time by Gender*

Female and male faculty both would prefer doing more research than they currently do with males generally seeking greater engagement. For example, as Figures 6.8a to 6.8e show, responding men report spending more time on research than women do with 52% of the CU male faculty spending more than 40% of their week on research but 38% of the CU female faculty spending 40% or more of their week on research. On the other hand, 69% of males would prefer to be doing research 40% of the time or more, whereas 49% of females would prefer to be so engaged (see [Figures 7.8a-7.8e](#)). Eighteen percent of the CU male faculty spent 60% or more of their week on research, while 32% would prefer to be in that category. By contrast, 16% of the CU female faculty spent 60% or more of their week on research, and 20% would prefer to be doing so.

#### *Preferred Service Time by Gender*

Among all of the respondents, women prefer service activities just slightly more than men do (see [Figures 7.9a through 7.9e](#)). For example, at CU overall (Figure 7.9d), 84% of men would like to be under 40%, while only 79% of women would like to be in that time range. However, the most common preferred service category for both men and women (plurality of 33% each) at CU is in the 20 to 29% range. Even so, the 10 to 19% range is a close second at 27% (25% female, 29% male). While 84% of CU male faculty want to spend less than 40% of their time in service, 74% say that they spend 40% or less of their time in service activities. By contrast, 75% of the CU female faculty spend 40% or less of their week on service, but 79% would prefer to be in that time category. Further, although 13% of the CU male faculty expend 60% or more of their time in service, only 7% want to do that. Similarly, 13% of the CU female faculty devote 60% or more of their time in service, while only 9% prefer to be doing so.

#### *Actual Teaching, Research, and Service Time by Ethnicity*

[Figures 6.10a through 6.10c](#) show the responses of all CU faculty participating in the survey. The numbers of non-Caucasian faculty per campus were small, so only three figures are presented in this section, one each for teaching, research, and service.

*Teaching.* Differences are apparent among the various CU ethnicities in actual teaching time, as shown in Figure 6.10a. For example, for those teaching less than 30% of the time, Caucasians were 33%, Latinos 13%, Asians 41%, and African Americans 9%. (With only 13 African Americans in the full survey, representing about 16% of the total of 81 African American faculty at CU, this result is unlikely to be definitive, though it may be suggestive.) Comparing preferences to actual allocations, for those faculty who said that they preferred to teach no more than 30% of the time, Caucasians were 35%, Latinos 27%, Asians 45%, and African Americans 19%. In other words, actual and preferred allocations are matched at the low end of the spectrum, just as it does at the high end of time spent on teaching.



*Research.* The CU faculty showed an appreciable difference in actual research by ethnicity (Figure 6.10b). For those engaging in research from 0 to 29% of the time, Caucasians were 60%, Latinos 66%, Asians 78%, and African Americans 45%. (The same qualification applies here as for teaching, given the small number of African Americans in the sample.) The most common frequency for each group was 20 to 29%: Caucasians 32%, Latinos 33%, Asians 41%, and African Americans 27%. Those doing research 50% or more of the time included 17% of Caucasians, 10% of Latinos, 14% of Asians, and 9% of African Americans.

*Service.* Marked differences exist in the CU service graph for those spending 30% or more time in service with Caucasians at 39%, Latinos 33%, Asians 22%, and African Americans 54% (Figure 6.10c). Comparing these actual percentages with preferences, for those at CU who prefer 30% or more time in service, Caucasians are at 30%, Latinos 23%, Asians 21%, and African Americans 37%.

#### *Preferred Teaching, Research, and Service Time by Ethnicity*

[Figures 7.10a through 7.10c](#) show the overall CU faculty preferences relative to teaching, research, and service due to the small numbers of non-Caucasian faculty at each campus. Thus, only three figures need to be referenced in this section, one each for teaching, research, and service.

#### *Teaching*

All of the CU faculty ethnic groups would prefer to spend a little more time teaching than they do (7.10a). Comparing preferences to actual allocations ([6.10a](#)), for those preferring to teach no more than 30% of the time, Caucasians were at 35%, Latinos 27%, Asians 45%, and African Americans 19%. For those teaching less than 30% of the time, Caucasians were at 33%, Latinos 13%, Asians 41%, and African Americans 9%. In other words, a fairly good match exists at the low end of the spectrum (as well as the high end).

#### *Research*

The CU faculty showed an appreciable difference in actual research by ethnicity ([Figure 6.10b](#)). For those spending less than 30% of their time in research, Caucasians were at 45%, Latinos 30%, Asians 28%, and African Americans 50%. For faculty at CU preferring to spend 50% or more of the time on research, Caucasians were at 38%, Latinos 31%, Asians 53%, and African Americans 20% ([Figure 7.10b](#)). For faculty doing research 50% or more of the time, Caucasians were at 22%, Latinos 13%, Asians 40%, and African Americans 22% ([6.10b](#)). At this level of research, the actual and preferred allocations of time for the first three ethnic groups are not well matched.

#### *Service*

Comparing actual allocations ([6.10c](#)) with preferred allocations ([7.10c](#)), for those at CU who prefer 30% or more time in service, Caucasians are at 30%, Latinos 23%, Asians 21%, and

African Americans 37%. Actual service reported on the CU service graph for those with 30% or more time in service show Caucasians at 39%, Latinos 33%, Asians 22%, and African Americans 54%.

#### *Actual Teaching Time by Salary*

[Figure 6.11d](#) indicates that, for the combined CU campuses, those in the \$60,000 and under salary range (mostly senior instructors and instructors) have the highest percentage teaching time per week. In particular, 58% of the under \$60,000 respondents said that they spend 50% or more of their week teaching. (See also [Figures 6.11a-6.11c](#) and [6.11e](#).)

In contrast, large groups of faculty between \$61,000 and \$100,000 stated that they taught in the 40 to 49% range with only 23% of the respondents teaching 50% or more. Further, only 12% of those in the over-\$100,000 group reported teaching 50% or more of the time. It is worth noting that a plurality of the over-\$100,000 group were in the 20 to 29% range. All of the campuses follow this pattern, except for UCCS where none of the faculty reporting income of \$100,000 or more taught 50% or more of their time.

Comparing actual with preferred teaching time at CU (see [Figure 7.11d](#)), no significant gaps appear. That is, faculty generally state that their actual teaching hours are their preferred teaching hours. (Also see [Figures 7.11a-7.11c](#) and [7.11e](#).)

#### *Actual Research Time by Salary*

At CU overall in the under-\$60,000 salary category (see [Figure 6.12d](#) as well as the others in this sequence), 68% of the faculty reported that they were doing research less than 40% of the time. The over-\$100,000 category had the second most under 40% for research time at 54%, and the \$61,000 to \$100,000 category had 48% who were engaged less than 40% of their time in research.

In contrast, faculty preferences ([Figure 7.12d](#) and others) show that the under-\$60,000 group had the largest percentage (55%) of faculty preferring to devote less than 40% of their time to research. Here again, the over-\$100,000 group had the second highest preference, 41%, for under 40%, and the \$61,000 to \$100,000 respondents had 35% who preferred to do research less than 40% of their week.

Interestingly, at UCD, for example, the 0 to 9% category for actual research time was the mode (30%, the most frequently occurring selection) for the under-\$60,000 category of faculty responses, which corresponds closely to the overall CU percentage (29%) for this level of research activity. Also, the 40 to 49% range was the most common frequency (34%) for the \$61,000 to \$100,000 category of faculty responses, whereas it was 31% for CU overall. For the over-\$100,000 group, the distribution was bi-modal, with 17% in the 40 to 49% range and 17% in the 20 to 29% range. For this upper salary level, the distributions did not match those for CU as a whole, with 23% of the UCD faculty teaching 50% time or more, while CU overall was 12%.

*Actual Service Time by Salary*

For all campuses ([Figure 6.13d](#); see also [Figures 6.13a-c](#) and [6.13e](#)), the most common category of service time by salary was 20 to 29%: 36% over all salary categories with the range from 31 to 41%. The over-\$100,000 group had the most faculty (47%) spending 30% or more of their time on service; the \$61,000 to \$100,000 category had 38% above this level; and the \$60,000 and under group had only 26%.

Preferences for service time generally were less than actual time spent for service at CU overall ([Figure 7.13d](#)). The mode was the same although the under-\$60,000 group was bi-modal: 33% also preferred 10 to 19%. Many more faculty were below the most common frequency than above it (38% at CU overall). The over-\$100,000 category had the most faculty (38%) above 30%, and the \$61,000 to \$100,000 category had only 26%. The \$60,000 and under category had only 20%. (See also the [other figures in this sequence](#).)

*Preferred Teaching Time by Salary*

For all faculty for the combined CU campuses, senior instructors and instructors tend to have the highest percentage of teaching time each week ([Figure 6.1d](#)) and the lowest salaries ([Tables I, J and K](#), [Appendix B](#)). Thus, it is not surprising that 58% of the faculty in the under-\$60,000 group said that they spend 50% or more of their week teaching (see [Figure 6.11d](#)). At the same time, this group tends to prefer this teaching load: 51% of the under-\$60,000 respondents said that they would prefer to spend 50% or more of their week teaching (see [Figure 7.11d](#)). (See also [Figures 6.11a-6.11c](#), [6.11e](#), [7.11a-7.11c](#), and [7.11e](#).)

Comparing the three CU salary categories overall ([Figure 7.11d](#)), the \$100,000 or more group had 31% who preferred to teach at least 40% of the time, and the \$61,000 to \$100,000 group had 49% who preferred to spend at least 40% of their time teaching. For the \$60 and under group, 68% of the respondents said that they preferred to teach at least 40% of the time.

*Preferred Research Time by Salary*

[Figure 6.12d](#) shows that for CU faculty the under-\$60,000 category had the largest percentage (68%) spending less than 40% of each week doing research, while the over-\$100,000 category had the second most, 54%, under 40%. The \$61,000 to \$100,000 category had 48% who were under 40%.

According to their preferences (see [Figure 7.12d](#)), the under-\$60,000 category had the most faculty (55%) who preferred to do research less than 40% of the week. On the other hand, the over-\$100,000 category again had the second highest preference (41%) for under 40% research activity. For the \$61,000 to \$100,000 category, 35% preferred to engage in research less than 40% of the week.

Focusing on the AMC ([Figure 7.12e](#)), the 80 to 89% level of research activity was the most common frequency (29%) for the under-\$60,000 category, while the 70 to 79% range was

preferred (17%) by the \$61,000 to \$100,000 category. The modal group (17%) in the \$100,000 range preferred to spend 20 to 29% of their time engaged in research activities.

For CU overall ([7.12d](#)), the 20 to 29% category was the preferred research mode (18%) for the under-\$60,000 category, and the 40 to 49% range was the mode (26%) for the \$61,000 to \$100,000 category. The \$100,000 or more most common category (16%) was also in the 40 to 49% range, while the mode (20%) for faculty from all campuses was 40 to 49%.

For other distributions, see Figures 6.12a-e and 7.12a-e.

#### *Preferred Service Time by Salary*

As Figure [6.13d](#) shows, the most common range for actual service for all schools and categories was 20 to 29%. Further, the over-\$100,000 category had the most faculty (47%) above 30%. The \$61,000 to \$100,000 group had 38% above 30%, and the \$60,000 and under category had only 26% above this percent.

As might be expected, preferences for service time ([Figure 7.13d](#)) generally were less than actual service time at CU overall. The mode was the same, 20 to 29% (except for the \$60,000 or under group, which was bi-modal with 33% at both the 20 to 29% and 10 to 19% ranges), although many more CU faculty (38%) were below the mode than above it. The over-\$100,000 group had the most faculty, 38%, above 30%. In the \$61,000 to \$100,000 category, only 26% were above 30%, whereas for the \$60,000 and under group only 20% were above that percentage.

The full set of comparisons can be seen in the [6.13a-e](#) and the [7.13a-e](#) figures.

#### *Actual Teaching Time by Years in Unit*

[Figure 6.14d](#) indicates that for all CU campuses combined, faculty who have been in their unit 5 years or fewer had the highest percentage of teaching time, with 30% being above 50% of the time. In contrast, those who have been in their unit 6 to 15 years had a lesser percentage of teaching time each week: 30% of the respondents 6 to 15 years in their unit said that they spend 50% or more of their week teaching, and 23% of those in the over-16-year group are teaching 50% or more. Interestingly, a plurality of the all three groups were in the 40 to 49% range.

All of the campuses follow approximately the same pattern of those with fewer years in a unit teaching more, but AMC ([6.14e](#)) is particularly extreme, with 43% of the of those faculty with 5 years or fewer in a unit teaching 70% or more of the time, compared with those with 16 years or more in a unit at only 13% in the 70% or more category. (See also [Figures 6.14a-c](#).)

Comparing actual teaching time with preferences, no significant gaps exist at CU overall. That is, faculty as a whole tend to prefer the same teaching hours that they already have. (See [Figures 7.14a through 7.14e](#).)

#### *Actual Research Time by Years in Unit*

For all CU faculty (see [6.15d](#)), 46% OF those with over 16 years in their unit engage in research activities 40% or more of the time. Further, 48% of those with 6 to 15 years in their unit spend time in 40% or more of their time in research; 40% of those with 5 or fewer years in their unit do research 40% of the time or more. Unlike the other two groups, the mode (25%) for the faculty with 5 or fewer years in their unit is the 0 to 9% category. (The mode for the other two groups is 40 to 49%). See also [Figures 6.15a-c](#) and [6.15e](#).

Contrasting actual with preferred research time ([7.15d](#)), those who prefer to do research 40% or more of the time include 58% of those with over 16 years in their unit, 62% of those with 6 to 15 years in their unit, and 55% of those with 5 or fewer years in their unit. So while the differences among groups might not be great, the trend says that, overall, faculty would rather devote more to research than they say that they currently do.

#### *Actual Service Time by Years in Unit*

At CU overall (see [Figure 6.16d](#)), those who have 5 or fewer years in their unit spend the lowest percentage of time in service per week: 73% engage in service less than 30% of the time each week. On the other hand, 65% of the 6-to-15-year CU faculty are in the 30% category, while 58% of those faculty with 16 years and over in a unit spend less than 30% of their week in service activities. These figures are quite uniform across the campuses, as shown in [Figures 6.16a-c](#) and [6.16e](#).

Faculty preferences for service time are mostly similar to the actual time spent in service activities across the board except that more faculty in all categories prefer to be in the 10 to 19% service range than report being in that category (see [Figures 7.16a through 7.16e](#)).

#### *Preferred Teaching Time by Years in Unit*

[Figure 6.14d](#) shows that those who had been in their unit for 6 to 15 years reported a smaller teaching obligation than those in the other years-in-unit categories. For example, only 30% of the respondents with 6 to 15 years in their unit said that they spent 50% or more of their week teaching, compared to 34% overall. Further, 23% of those in the over-15-year group reported teaching 50% or more of the time. The plurality of the all three groups shown in [6.14d](#) were in the 40 to 49% range, with the largest aggregation, 28%, arrayed in the 6- to-15-year group. See also [Figures 6.14a-c](#) and [6.14e](#).

Comparing actual with preferred at CU ([Figure 7.14d](#); see as well [7.14a-c](#) and [7.14e](#)), generally no significant gaps were found. Faculty at CU by and large reported that their preferred teaching time was similar to their actual teaching time, although AMC provided an exception: In the bottom category of actual teaching, 0 to 9%, a number of faculty would like to teach more than they do. It may be that these respondents are part-time faculty who would like a larger teaching assignment.

#### *Preferred Research Time by Years in Unit*

In [Figure 6.15d](#) for CU faculty overall, 46% of those with over 16 years in their unit reported that they spend 40% or more of their time on research. For those with 6 to 15 years in their unit, a comparable 48% do research 40% or more of the time, and 40% of those with 5 or fewer years in a unit engage in research 40% of their time or more. (See also [Figures 6.15a-c](#) and [6.15e](#).)

To contrast these reports of actual time with preferences (see [Figures 7.15d](#), [7.15a-c](#), and [7.15e](#)), those who prefer to do research 40% or more of the time constitute 58% of faculty with over 16 years in their unit, 62% of those with 6 to 15 years, 55% of those with 5 or fewer years. While differences among the groups are not great, the trends suggest that faculty would rather do more research than they reported doing.

#### *Preferred Service Time by Years in Unit*

As [Figure 6.16d](#) indicates, CU faculty overall with 5 years or fewer years in their unit have the lowest percentage of time spent in service per week. Seventy-three percent of these faculty devoted less than 30% of their hours per week to service while 65% of the 6-to-15-year category of CU faculty were in this range and 58% of the 16-years-and-over category were engaged less than 30% of time in service. These figures are much the same across all of the campuses (see [Figures 6.16a-c](#) and [6.16e](#)).

Faculty preferences for time spent on service ([Figures 7.16a-e](#)) are fairly similar to the reported actual time spent on service across the board except that more faculty in all categories of longevity within a unit preferred to be in the 10 to 19% service category than actually were in that category. Actual percentages of time for service show 14%, 24%, and 24% respectively, while preferences were 23%, 31%, and 31%.

Overall, CU faculty said that they want to devote less time to service activities. While this preference may relate to the perceived absence of recognition they say that they receive for their service work, it may also reflect the disproportionate relationship between actual service time and how faculty are evaluated for that time.

#### *Actual Teaching, Research, and Service Time by Years at CU*

[Figures 6.17a through 6.17e](#) show that actual percentages of time for teaching, research, and service by years at CU follow patterns similar to those found in [Figures 6.14 through 6.16](#). For years at CU, again no significant gaps appear to exist between actual and preferred percentages of time for teaching, research, and service ([Figures 7.17a through 7.17c](#) and [7.14 to 7.16](#)). Small exceptions do exist, however. For example, more faculty would prefer to teach 10 to 19% of the time rather than their current percentages, and this preference appears partly the case for the 0 to 9% range, particularly for the 6-to-15-year group. Thus, more faculty would prefer to contain their teaching obligations, as also suggested by the percentages of those actually teaching over 50% (about 30%) versus those preferring to teach that much (about 25%).

#### *Preferred Teaching, Research, and Service Time by Years at CU*

Again, faculty preferences generally match their practices in teaching, research, and service, when arrayed by years at CU. Some exceptions can be found, though. As already indicated, more faculty would prefer to teach less than they do, particularly at the bottom ranges of teaching time, which is counterbalanced by the preferences of CU faculty overall to devote more time to research than they do ([Figure 7.17b](#)), when compared to their actual time allocations in [Figure 6.17b](#). Again, this applies particularly to faculty at the lower end. For faculty who report spending 29% of their time or less in research (43%), just over 30% would prefer to be in this range, and about 21% report spending 50% or more of their time doing research, while about 37% would prefer to be in this range. For service, the pattern continues ([6.17c](#) and [7.17c](#)). About 60% of the CU faculty reported being engaged in service 29% or less of their time while about 70% preferred spending no more than 29% of their time in service. Again, a smaller percent, about 11%, said that they preferred spending more than 50% of their time in service, while more than 17% reported doing so.

#### *Actual Teaching, Research, and Service by Years in Higher Education*

The following sections examine actual teaching, research, and service according to the number of years the respondents have spent in higher education. These years may have been spent in other higher educational institutions as well as CU.

##### *Teaching*

For teaching when aggregated by years in higher education ([Figure 6.18a](#)), the clear plurality, 32%, of all CU faculty report that they teach 40 to 49% of the time, with almost 30% teaching 50% or more. At the lower end, about 20% of the respondents reported teaching about less than 29% of the time.

##### *Research*

Actual research time ([Figure 6.18b](#)) ranged from 17% reporting less than 0 to 9% and 21% reporting 50% or more of their time spent doing research. The most common response for all groups was 40 to 49% with the average across all groups 23% and the range from 19 to 30%.

##### *Service*

In reporting on their actual service by years in higher education, over 60% said that they spend up to 29% of their time in service, with the plurality for all groups at 33%, ranging from 29 to 37%. Those reporting more than 50% time in service ([Figure 6.18c](#)) comprised about 17% of the faculty while those reporting 19% or less were 28%.

#### *Preferred Teaching, Research, and Service by Years in Higher Education*

The following sections examine preferred time allocations for teaching, research, and service according to the number of years spent in higher education by the respondents. These years could have been spent in various higher educational institutions, including CU.

### *Teaching*

The largest percentage (plurality) of faculty at CU said that they prefer the 40 to 49% range as the time to allocate to teaching although the plurality dropped to 23% (see [Figure 7.18a](#)). Further, the percentage preferring to teach 50% of the time or more dropped to about 25%. On the other hand, those preferring to teach 29% of the time or less grew to 34%.

### *Research*

CU faculty reported that they preferred to give 40 to 49% of their time to research, ranging from 18 to 23% with the average 21% (see [Figure 7.18b](#)). Yet almost 40% said that they preferred engaging in research 50% or more of the time, constituting an approximate 15% increase over actual allocations of time in research activities.

### *Service*

When arrayed by years in higher education, faculty continued to prefer doing less service than they reported doing ([7.18c](#) and [6.18c](#)). For example, over 70% of the faculty preferred a range at the lower end, less than 29% service (compared to just over 60% reporting actual service time in this range). Only 11% of the respondents preferred spending more than 50% of their time in service whereas about 17% reported this range as their actual service.

## **Survey Questions 8, 9, 10**

Questions 8 through 10 focus on how faculty regard various components of faculty service and how they view the regard of others about service. In question 8, faculty were asked to indicate the value that they placed on the service components in the list that opened the survey. Thus, faculty were asked to rate each of the eight areas on a scale from 1 (lowest) to 10 (highest), according to the importance of the area to them individually. For example, a faculty member who thought that “service to the profession” was significant might rate it as 8 or above. On the other hand, someone else who thought that “public service” was less valuable, might rate it as 3 or below.

For question 9, faculty respondents were asked to rate on a similar scale the value placed on the 8 components by their department or program, whichever constituted their home “unit.” Faculty perspectives were investigated from this point of view vary because it is at the departmental or program level where initial decisions are made about merit, promotion, and tenure. How service activities are appreciated and evaluated at this level determines how well faculty work in service and other areas fares in such decisions. Thus, while a faculty member might value “service to the profession” highly, say scoring it 9, but the same faculty person believes that the department only values it at 5, then a discrepancy exists. Over time, this faculty member might diminish the effort and time spent in professional service.

For question, 10 faculty were asked to rate the value placed on the item by their dean because deans are responsible, finally, for decisions about merit and recommendations for promotion and tenure. A dean’s perspective on what service is of value is critical in the calculations that faculty



make about the service that they undertake. If a dean does not value certain types of service, even though that service is viewed broadly as worthy of faculty attention, the likelihood may be small that faculty will pursue service tasks that are greatly at variance with the dean's preferences.

In order to limit the number of tables and figures in this section, the responses to question 8, 9, and 10 are organized around 4 areas: (1) years in unit and value of types of service, (2) differences between faculty and departmental values by gender, (3) gender differences on the value of different types of service, and (4) differences among the campuses on the value placed on various types of service. Because the faculty responses to question 10 were so similar to those for question 9, basically equating the value placed on a type of service by their department with that placed on the same type of service by their dean, responses to question 10 are not included here.

### *Years in Unit Versus Value of Service Types*

For the CU campuses overall, a positive correlation exists between years in unit and value of service to department, constituency, university, and/or system. Further, it appears that a negative correlation exists between years in unit and value of conferences, mentoring, and public service over all CU campuses.

#### *Explanation*

[Table 8-10](#), Percent of Respondents at CU Who Marked Scores of 8 or More for a Category (see Appendix D), shows respondents' value ratings for the various categories of service, but only for those faculty rating the value of the item as 8 or more. Column 1 lists the correlations between the values that faculty gave to a particular type of service and their years in their unit; *pos* indicates a positive correlation, and *neg* indicates a negative correlation.

A positive correlation between years in unit was found with the values held by the respondents for service to department, constituency, university, and/or system. That is, the longer faculty have been in their unit, the more likely they are to value service type C. However, negative correlations exist between years in unit and the values given to other types of service, suggesting that the longer faculty belong to their units, the less likely they are to value participating in conferences, being consultants or mentors, or performing public service.

The survey results for several of the CU campuses, organized by years of service, are shown in [Figures 8-10a through 8-10i](#) (see [Appendix D](#)), with [Figure 8-10i](#) providing a summary for the three institutions, contrasting personal values and departmental valuing of service. [Figure 8-10a](#) shows that, for UCD faculty, the personal value of service to department, constituency, university, or system correlates positively with years in unit. That is, as the years in one's unit increase, the percentage of faculty saying that they value service to their department, constituency, the university, or system also increases. This is the only type of service that shows such a positive correlation.

[Figures 8-10b](#), [8-10c](#), and [8-10d](#) show the negative correlations displayed in [Table 8-10](#) for years in unit and conferences, consultant or mentor (especially at UCCS), and public service (at all but UCCS). Note that all three of these types of service involve direct work with others and public service and conferences involve activities that are external to the university. Thus, it appears that faculty, as they gain years in their units, limit their outreach in dramatic ways across service areas. Presumably, they have learned what pays and what does not.

### *Hypothesis*

These survey results suggest that the longer faculty have been in their unit, the more they respond to pressures to focus on internal services rather than external services. The data in columns 7 and 8 of [Table 8-10](#) suggest that faculty do not feel that their departments or programs value external services, especially public service, perhaps because few rewards prompt them to do so. While newer faculty place relatively more value on these services, perhaps anticipating that such efforts will help them with tenure decisions, faculty tend to abandon them as they stay longer and longer in a unit.

When faculty perceive that the department or program does not value a service, this understanding is likely to reduce the value of the service because it is not likely to be well rewarded and it may take time from activities that are rewarded. See column 2 in [Table 8-10](#) which shows a slight negative correlation between years in service with perceived department value of conferences and a stronger negative correlation of years in service with perceived department value of mentoring and public service. The longer that faculty are in their units, the more likely they perceive that their department does not value these services and the less likely they are to perform non-rewarded services.

### *Differences between Faculty Values and Department Values for Both Males and Females*

At CU campuses overall, marked differences were found between the values that faculty members place on the service categories and their perceptions of the value that their departments place on these services. These differences are particularly true of services that are highly valued by the faculty and are true for both males and females.

Column 3 in [Table 8-10](#) shows the percent of male faculty who assigned a value of 8 or more (on a scale of 1 to 10) to a particular type of service. In like manner, column 4 indicates the same for female faculty. These two columns can be compared with columns 7 and 8, which represent the percent of male and female faculty who perceived that their departments would place a value of 8 or more on the same category. Note that the values in columns 3 and 4 are greater than the values in Columns 7 and 8. In other words, faculty indicate that their departments do not value most categories of service as much as the respondents do, especially the categories that faculty value the most.

A good example of this disparity can be seen for service as a consultant or mentor to students and faculty. The data in [Table 8-10](#), column 3, show that 60% of males value this service at a level of 8 or more, but only 22% of them consider that their departments value mentoring at this

level. For females, the disparity is even greater; 74% rated mentoring at 8 or higher, while only 32% of them believe that their department values mentoring as highly.

A t-test determined the likelihood that this disparity could have happened by chance. Pairing the values in column 3 with the values in column 7 supported rejecting the null hypothesis that the two groups of male data came from the same population at the .05 level, with the t statistic at .024. Pairing the values in column 4 with the values in column 8, again rejected the null hypothesis that the two groups of female data came from the same population at the .01 level, with the t statistic at .0032. In other words, these tests concluded that both males and females perceived that their departments value these services considerably less than faculty value them.

Especially noteworthy in these columns of data are the percentages of perceived department value for public service in columns 7 and 8. These values are only 6% and 15% respectively, the lowest scores for any of the service categories. If CU wants faculty to value public service and make contributions to their communities as representatives of CU, these scores strongly suggest that action is required to ensure that departments place higher value on public service.

#### *Male and Female Differences in Values That They Themselves Place on Service Categories*

The scores in [Table 8-10](#) show that female faculty across the board rated service categories more highly than their male colleagues. Their respective ratings were similar for service to department, constituency, university, or system and faculty governance, while those for service to the profession, committees, conferences, consultant or mentor, public service, honors or awards were from 8 to 14 points higher for women.

However, their views of departmental ratings were mixed. That is, females rated the value placed on service to the profession, conferences, consultant or mentor, and public service by their departments more highly than males, but males rated professional, departmental and other, and faculty governance more highly than females. Both females and males clearly believe that their departments or programs do not value public service as has already been pointed out.

Further analyses are needed to determine whether the differences between female and male valuation of various service categories and their ratings of value assigned to their departments to see if any of the differences are statistically significant. This will be the case as well for other the variable sets that are analyzed in the sections below.

#### *Differences between UCB, UCD, and UCCS Campuses*

In many of the responses in this survey, the faculty at UCB and UCD were quite similar despite certain marked differences. Their similarity was especially apparent when compared to the UCCS faculty. [Figure 8-10e](#) (UCCS) shows that the correlation between years in unit and value of public service is neutral rather than clearly negative as for UCB and UCD. [Figures 8-10e](#) (UCCS) and [8-10d](#) (CU) indicate that faculty in their units for 6 to 15 years declare a lower value for public service than do faculty who have been in their units under 6 years, and the values for faculty with 16 years or more in their unit correspond to the values for faculty in the under-6-year category.

An even more striking difference between UCCS and the other campuses can be seen in [Figure 8-10h](#). Here, UCCS is the only campus where perceived departmental value for public service was positively correlated with years in unit. [Figure 8-10h](#), compared with [Figure 8-10i](#), shows the negative correlation for CU overall of perceived department value of public service with years in the unit. [Figure 8-10i](#) would show an even larger negative correlation if UCCS were not included in the data.

For consulting or mentoring service, [Figure 8-10f](#) shows that the UCCS faculty had the most negative correlation of the three campuses. The longer the faculty at UCCS have been in their unit, the less value they placed on mentoring students and other faculty.

[Figure 8-10i](#), which displays average personal and department values for all campuses together, shows differences among the campuses on the valuing of public service. Clearly, differences exist between UCCS and the other two institutions, especially in the positive correlation at UCCS of years in unit with perceived department value (red bars on the right) compared with the downward trend of department values of the other two institutions as years in unit increase (blue and green bars on the right).

### Question 11

Question 11 asked faculty to identify forms of service that they considered the most highly valued in their unit?" The response rate for this question was the highest of any of the open-ended questions in the survey: 723 (87%) of the 832 respondents.

An overwhelming number of these respondents (639 or 88% of those responding to this question; see [Table 11](#)) identified various types of service as important. Although, 64 (9%) respondents said that they did not know or had no opinion about what was important, only 14 (2%) said that service neither is considered nor valued in their units. Of those who identified types of service as important in their unit, the respondents listed an average of 1.15 forms of service, even though the question asked only for "the most highly valued form of service."

Four categories or levels of service emerged from the 835 responses to question 11: department or unit (391 or 46.9% of all responses to this question), profession/discipline (193, 23.1%), university (148 responses or 17.7%), and community or public (58, 7%). These figures suggest the importance of proximity in that service to one's own unit or department was most highly valued, followed by service to one's own field, institution, and the wider community.

At the department level, respondents said that the most highly valued forms of service included committees or meetings (30.7%), mentoring or advising (14.3%), chair or administrative services (11.8%), teaching (11.3%), and income or grants (10.7%). Because many respondents listed committees in general without specifying the university or the department level, these general committee comments were scored at both levels. Also, categories were not mutually exclusive because respondents could answer in more than one category. The teaching category provides a particularly intriguing possibility for follow-up because a sizable percentage of the respondents indicated that teaching has aspects that perhaps should be counted as service. Understanding

what they might be and why could prove helpful as decisions are made about the role of service at CU.

Under the profession or discipline heading, four highly valued service themes emerged: products or publications (writing, editing, reviewing) (28.5%), policy, national, and international activities of leadership (26.4%), professional society activities or conferences (15%), and awards or honors (8.7%). National and international activities included statements about national and international efforts in general with no specific jobs or activities cited; professional society activities, however, included respondent's statements specifically referencing various groups in which they worked.

Within the university category, the most highly valued service in order of importance was serving on committees (69.6%) and faculty governance (7.4%). Of the respondents indicating that university-level activities were important, 23% were not specific about which activities these might be.

The final major area highlighted in question 11 was community or public service. Within this category, practice, patient care, and clinical service were mentioned in 62% of all responses. Next, K-12 and higher education were listed by 10.3% of the responses, and organizational involvement, lectures and public education by 8.69%. No specific activities were mentioned in 19% of the responses.

Forty-five comments, about 5.4% of the total, did not fit into one of these four areas. Many of these statements, not counted in other categories, expressed some cynicism about how service is viewed. Comments such as "service that the chair or director 'sees,'" "anything that makes the dean look good," "ass kissing," "defined by dean," and "saying yes to the dean" provide examples of this perspective.

## Question 12

Question 12 of the survey asked faculty about how they might change the evaluation of service in their unit or university. The response rate to this question was the second highest of all the open-ended questions in the survey: 74% (617 responses out of 832 possible; see [Table 12](#)). The vast majority (526, about 85%) of respondents identified needed changes in the way that service is evaluated. However, 9% (57 respondents) felt that no changes were needed. The rest of the respondents either did not know (17, 2.8%), did not provide a relevant answer to the question (16, 2.6%), or stated that their opinion would not matter (1, 0.2%).

Of those who listed needed changes, 285 (36.8% of the 774 coded comments) stated that recognition or rewards for service need to be elevated in five areas: department (89, 31.2%), community or public (76, 26.7%), profession or discipline (62, 21.8%), university (22 or 7.7%), and faculty position (14, 4.9%). In the department category, teaching, training, advising, and mentoring (of both fellow teachers and students) was mentioned most often (54, or 53% of all responses within the category). Next were student interactions (13, 12.8%), research (9, 8.8%), and recruitment or outreach (7, 6.7%). These responses have a curious turn: They seem to suggest that traditional teaching and research work can and should be viewed as service as well

on their own in the evaluation process. Other items in this category received six or fewer responses.

Under the community or public category (the second highest category needing additional recognition or rewards), clinical or patient care (billable and non-billable) was mentioned the most often (11 responses, 14.5% of all responses in this category). However, 52 responses (68%) mentioned no specific type of community or public service. All other types mentioned had 3 or fewer responses.

For profession or discipline, including reviewing, editing, and writing publications or proposals (12 responses, 16% within category) and participation in professional societies and conferences (11, 15.5%) were identified as activities that should be accorded more credit, while 19 responses (27%) suggested that national or international activities and leadership should receive more recognition or rewards in the evaluation process. Additionally, 30 responses (42.3%) mentioned no specific service type in this category, saying only that professional or discipline service should be elevated. All other types of service within this category had 4 or fewer responses.

Under the university heading, appreciation for club advising was mentioned twice (9.1% for this category) as was committee service (2, 9.1%). However, 15 respondents (68.2%) mentioned no specific service; they simply indicated that university service in general needed to be recognized or rewarded more.

Finally, for faculty position the highest percentage, 21.4% (3 responses), sought to include junior faculty in service opportunities and give more credit to new, junior faculty, or graduate students involved in outreach services. It may be that a few faculty simply felt that junior faculty and others are not getting the credit that they deserve for the service that they do or that other opportunities to serve should be available to them.

Across all of the 774 comments to question 15, five other categories were determined: formal agreements about service (197, 25.5%), specific rewards, incentives, or compensation (142 responses, 23%), flexible definition of service (118, 15.3%), and fair evaluation of service across faculty (32, 4.1%). Comments about formal agreements included the allocation of rewards based on actual workload or outcomes of service (84 responses, 34.9%), establishment of metrics or standardized rewards (point system, annual goals, recording-reporting instruments, or expectations) (59, 24.5%), clear definition of service or benefits (26, 11%), a flexible formula (i.e., variations on the 40-40-20 allocation) (19, 7.8%) or a 33-33-33 formula (15, 6.2%). These latter items suggest the need for reconsideration of the traditional 40-40-20 work-load distribution. This point of view and others in these comments are interesting in that annual professional development plans could address these issue. It may be, however, professional development plans are not understood in this way and that work is needed in this area to ensure that professional development plans and annual reviews can help develop such flexibility. Other categories not listed here received 14 or fewer responses each.

The second category of responses raised issues about specific rewards, incentives, or compensation methods that faculty would like to see for various service activities. These included increased salary, stipends, or bonuses (43 responses, 23%), higher performance ratings

and promotion or merit consideration equivalent to research (33, 17.7%), better evaluation of service (21 responses or 11.2%), public or dean's recognition, respect, or appreciation of service (20, 10.7%), and more unstructured or protected time and tenure consideration (both with 15 responses or 8% or all responses within this category). These responses reassert the claims made earlier that faculty believe that service generally is under appreciated or rewarded.

The third theme, flexible definition of service (118 comments or 15.3%), arrayed activities that traditionally have not been considered "service." That is, student-contact hours (18 responses, 14%) were mentioned most often, followed by teaching or research (17, 13.3%). Next, some faculty thought that a wider variety of service (12, 9.4%) and committees in general or search committees specifically (11, 8.6%) needed to be appreciated more. All other categories (22) received 8 or fewer responses each.

Finally, comments about the fair evaluation of service focused on equitable service workloads for all faculty (14, 43.8%), and six (18.8%) said that fairer distribution of service opportunities (6, 18%), processes that make individual service transparent or awards based on quality of work (5, 15.6%), and fuller explanation of the FRPA (Faculty Report of Professional Activities) (2, 6.3%).

### **Questions 13 through 15**

Questions 13 through 16 addressed respondents' perspectives on types of service expected of them, types of service discouraged, and treatment of service activities through fair annual reviews or evaluations. Tables for these questions can be found in [Appendix D](#).

#### *Areas of Service That Are Expected of You*

*Question 13: Of the following list of activities, please mark all those areas of service that are expected of you. (That is, your reviews would not go well if they were missing, even if other areas were excellent.) See [Tables 13a and 13b](#), [Appendix D](#).*

At CU campuses overall, the highest expectation of service was for service to the department, constituency, university, or system. Of the 832 respondents, 676 (81%) indicated that these areas of service were expected of them. In addition, 540 respondents (64%) said that service to the profession is expected as well. Only respondents who were at the 9th and Colorado health sciences campus of UCD at the time of the survey had a different top category, and this was service to the profession (46 out of 61 or 75%) and service as a consultant or mentor (42 out of 61 or 69%). For this group, service to the department was cited by 67% (41) of the faculty. Only 6% (49) of those responding felt that none of the categories of service was expected of them.

#### *Areas of Service That Are Discouraged*

*Question 14: Of the following list of activities, please mark all those that you feel are discouraged by those who make annual merit decisions. (See [Table 14a](#) and [Table 14b](#).)*

Overall at CU, public service was the area perceived by faculty to be most discouraged (208 or 27% of the 770 who responded to this question). The Denver campus of UCD had the highest response (35%) of all the campuses, while UCCS had the lowest (20%). The largest number (429) and percentage (56%) of responding faculty indicated that none of the categories of service was discouraged.

### *Establishing Expectations*

*Question 15: I believe that faculty should establish with their department chair or dean what is expected for service each year. See [Table 15a](#) and [Table 15b](#).*

At all of the CU campuses, strong support was evidenced for the establishment of expectations for the coming year. Over 90% did not disagree with this approach, and 79% either strongly agreed (37%) or agreed (42%) with this idea.

### **Questions 16 and 17**

Question 16 asked whether faculty felt that their service contributions were evaluated fairly in their annual merit reviews (see [Tables 16a and 16b](#)). Across all CU campuses, many more faculty felt that they were fairly evaluated (56%) than those who did not (22%). This response was especially true at the UCD 9th and Colorado campus. On the other hand, UCCS had the highest percentage (26%) of those who felt that they were not fairly evaluated (“not at all” or “a little bit”) for their service contributions, with UCD’s Denver campus close behind (25%).

Survey question 17 asked faculty to elaborate on their responses to question 16. The response rate for this open-ended question was 41.2% (351 respondents out of 832). Those faculty who chose to elaborate their responses in 17 had an average scale score of 3.1 (partly fair) while those who chose not to elaborate their answers had an average score of 3.64 (closer to mostly fair than to partly fair) (see [Table 16](#)). Thus, those choosing not to comment on average viewed their individual evaluations as somewhat fairer than those who chose to elaborate their answers, a typical response pattern in which those who are more dissatisfied tend to comment while those who are more satisfied tend not to comment.

Nonetheless, 100 respondents (29% of all respondents) chose a scale score of less than 3 on question 16, suggesting that they felt that they had not been fairly evaluated. Eighty-four respondents (24%) rated their evaluation as partly fair (3), while a plurality (139, 39%) of respondents indicated that their service had been evaluated fairly. However, 29 (8%) chose to comment in question 17 without responding to question 16. All but one of these comments indicated that the respondents did not know how their service was being evaluated or that they had not yet been evaluated, partially explaining why they had not responded to 16.

Of those who marked a scale score of 3, 65 (76%) responded with negative comments, 8 (10%) with positive ones, and 10 (14%) with neither but identified problems with the current evaluation system. Further, of the 165 (47%) faculty who commented that they had had unfair evaluations of their service contributions, 11 (3%) also said that they did not know how they were evaluated or had not yet been evaluated, that service had little or no effect on their review (50, 14%), or



that they received infrequent or inaccurate evaluations of the service component of their work (100, 28%).

On the other hand, of those faculty who viewed their service contribution as fairly valued (147, 42%), 66 (35%) said that changes were not needed in how service is evaluated. Conversely, 73 (39%) indicated that their service was evaluated fairly but that changes were needed nonetheless. While 66 (10%) respondents said that they did not see any need for change, 15 (24%) felt that their service was valued, rewarded, or judged fairly by an evaluation committee. Another 6 (12%) stated that the established evaluation metrics, processes, or reporting systems were sufficient.

Respondents who made either “yes” or “no” comments (215, approximately 61% of all comments) described problems with the current system. Those most frequently listed included declarations that (a) the total amount of time spent in service was not recognized or rewarded (48, 22%); (b) publishing, research, or teaching were more highly valued and rewarded but are not a replacement for service (31, 14%); (c) service was differentially or inconsistently valued (26, 12%); (d) service activities were unrelated to pay, compensation, promotions, rewards, or recognition for exceeding expectations (25, 12%); (e) a small or no percent of service activities were evaluated, recognized, or understood (22; 10%); or (f) evaluations were performed by unknowledgeable, subjective, or unfair evaluators (21; 10%). Other problems that received fewer than 21 responses include organizational issues (20, 9%) focused on lack of metrics, transparency, or feedback; inflexible formula (13, 6%); and service discouraged or seen as a distraction from “real” work (11, 3%). These issues raised by faculty point to inconsistencies within and across units and colleges; they suggest the need for a thorough review, reappraisal, and realignment of the means by which service is evaluated at CU.

In their recommendations for the future, 28 faculty commented that changes needed to the evaluation of service components should address the value of public outreach, recruitment of students, and professional activities such as service (10, 36%). Others (7, 25%) said that faculty need to be recognized more effectively for their student/faculty interactions, which should be counted as service. Still others (11) made a range of recommendations, including clarifying the role of service evaluation in reviews, providing higher monetary rewards for service, assessing service based on effectiveness, and making service “protected time” like research. An additional 35 comments were left uncoded because they did not correspond to this question.

### **Questions 18, 19, and 20**

Questions 18 through 21 examined the time spent in service, teaching, and research as well as the cost of service to CU. Further, faculty perceptions of how their service contributions compare to those of other faculty are analyzed. (See [Appendix D](#) for tables in this section.)

#### *Hours Per Week Spent on Service*

*Question 18: On average, how many hours per week do you spend on service (include all related activities such as preparations, time in meetings, and follow-up)?*

Of UCB faculty responding to the survey, 301 (98.7% of 305 UCB respondents; see [Table 18a](#), [Appendix D](#)) provided input for this question, and 198 or 65.8% of the respondents faculty said that they spend 7 or more hours each week in service activities, with 152 (50.5%) engaged in service more than 10 hours a week. Conversely, 34.2% (103) spent 6 or fewer hours a week employed in service activities. Of the lower-hour group, the 42 (14%) who were in the less than \$60,000 group spent fewer than 6 hours per week in service activities. A similar distribution held for the \$61,000 to \$100,000 group, but the clear trend shows that as salaries increase, so do the number of faculty spending more time doing service.

At UCCS, 68 (94.4%) faculty responded, and none of them who said that they were paid \$100,000 or more put in fewer than 5 hours per week in service, with the clear majority (6) indicating 10 or more hours per week. (See [Table 18b](#).) A similar distribution was evident for the group earning less than \$60,000 and the \$61,000 to \$100,000 group. Even so, a large number (13, 18%) of those in the less-than-\$60,000 group engaged in service fewer than 6 hours per week, a distribution to be expected among this lower-paid group, likely instructors or new tenure-track faculty.

For the UCD faculty ([Tables 18c](#), [18d](#), and [18e](#)), similar distributional patterns existed for each of the three campuses at the time of the survey. That is, lower-salaried faculty tended to do less service, while higher-paid faculty did more, although for UCD Denver this pattern was less so in that all salary ranges tended to do more service. Of the 165 (32.3%) faculty responding to this question, fully 105 (63.6%) put in 7 or more hours of service each week. The only anomaly among these campuses was the 9th and Colorado group: More than 50% of the respondents said that they spent fewer than 4 hours per week engaged in service activities.

See “Summary” below for an analysis of [Tables 18f and 18g](#).

#### *Hours Per Week Spent on Teaching*

*Question 19: For comparison, how many hours per week do you spend on average on teaching? Include all related activities such as preparation, grading, advising, and development grants that focus on students. (See [Tables 19a through 19f](#), [Appendix D](#).)*

For CU overall, 780 respondents chose to reply to question 19 and question 29 (salary). The pattern of responses generally is similar to that found for question 18: The more a faculty respondent was compensated, the more time he or she tended to spend teaching. Exceptions are apparent for 2 to 3 hours, where the numbers dip, and 7 to 9 hours where they again dip, negating the upward pattern. The largest number of respondents, 599 (76.8%) reported teaching at least 10 to 15 hours per week, while only 150 (19%) indicated that they spent fewer than 6 hours per week teaching. This pattern is not surprising because 67% of the faculty who responded to the survey were tenured or tenure-track faculty who generally are expected to teach 2 to 3 courses each semester; with all of the expectations around teaching included, at least 10 to 15 hours per week is required to meet those obligations. It also is not surprising that the plurality of respondents (383, 49%) reported teaching more than 15 hours per week. Furthermore, 161 (11%) of the sample respondents (see [Tables D and E](#), [Appendix B](#)) were instructors who generally teach more hours than tenured or tenure-track faculty. Even so, 21% (227) of the sample were

assistant professors who are most likely to have fairly consistent 2-2, 2-3, 3-2, or 3-3 course loads each semester, depending on institutional and departmental policies. Similar patterns exist for each of the campuses, except UCD 9th and Colorado ([Table 19e](#)) where no pattern is clear. This may be explained by the fact that at the time of the survey (Spring 2008) very few programs and faculty were left on that campus. Most faculty had already moved to AMC.

*Hours Per Week Spent on Research*

*Question 20: For comparison, how many hours per week do you spend on average on research or creative activities? Include all related activities as well as time spent on research grants. See Tables 20a through 20f.*

At CU overall, 780 (93.8%) of all respondents replied to both question 20 and question 29. Of these, 530 (67.9%) said that they spent more than 10 hours per week in research, a proportion similar to but lower than that for teaching. For research, no clear patterns emerged, except that the plurality at CU (360, 46.2%) and all of the campuses indicated that they engaged in research more than 15 hours per week.

*Summary of Service, Teaching, and Research Hours and Costs for Service*

At all CU campuses combined, 312 out of 803 responding faculty spent less than 15% of their work week (0 to 6 hours) on service activities. On the other hand, 491 faculty, or 61% of the responding faculty said that they spend more than 7 hours per week, with 122 (15%) spending 7 to 9 hours, 174 (22%) 10 to 15 hours, and 195 (24%) more than 15. While it is noteworthy that a sizable number of faculty appear to be spending relative few hours weekly on service, these faculty tend to come from the lower ranks, as [Tables 18f and 18g](#) suggest.

In [Table 18g](#), the dollar amount spent on salaries corresponding to service hours performed shows the importance to the university and to the community of “getting service right.” The \$20.4 million figure in [Table 18g](#) represents about 18%—the percentage of faculty at CU responding to the survey for this question (803 of 4,436 total faculty)—of the total probable outlay for the salaries of all of the faculty on all of the campuses. Thus, \$113.3 million in services are provided by all faculty to their campuses, the system, their disciplines, and in other areas is a rough approximation.

These calculations are based on a 40-hour week, using the following formula:

$$\frac{\text{average hours per week}}{40 \text{ hours per week}} \times \text{average salary for category X number in service-hour category} = \text{cell value}$$

Then the dollar values in all cells are totaled. As some studies show that faculty tend to average more than 50 hours per week in their university-based activities, the dollar value placed on service would change accordingly. Regardless of how the value of faculty service is calculated, however, very few of these dollars have been spent to support public service because faculty do not see that such service is valued by their departments.

The UCD Anschutz campus stands out in this analysis because the highest paid faculty on that campus performed the most service (see [Tables 18c](#) and [18f](#)). Of the AMC faculty responding, 61 out of 107 (57%) of those paid over \$100,000 annually reported that they spent 10 or more hours in service activities per week, compared to only 7 out of 42 (17%) at \$60,000 or under who said that they performed service at same rate. Conversely, faculty at the Denver campus who commit to more than 10 hours per week tend to group in the \$61,000 to \$100,000 salary range, a pattern reflected somewhat at UCB and UCCS.

While it is expected that senior faculty perform more service, it is worth examining the associated costs as well as the areas to which such service is applied. A broader distribution of service opportunities and obligations might decrease overall costs while increasing time for teaching and research.

### Questions 21 and 22

Questions 21 and 22 focused on respondents' comparisons of their service commitments to those of other faculty. While question 21 asked faculty to make this comparison, question 22 requested that they elaborate their response by specifying just how they differed, if they did.

*Question 21: How do your service commitments compare to those of faculty in other departments or colleges? My obligations are not nearly as great, almost as great, the same, greater, or much greater.*

Of the 826 faculty who responded to this question from all of the CU campuses (see [Table 21, Appendix D](#)), the plurality (325 or 38.9%) felt that they did not know enough about what other faculty did to make such comparisons, so they responded "Don't Know." Most of the faculty who compared their work to that of their colleagues (501, 60.7%) said that their personal commitments were greater (135, 16.3%) or much greater (165, 19.9%) than those of other faculty. Another 134 (16.2%) said that their work was about the same as that of others, while another 67 (8.1%) thought that their contributions were less than those of their colleagues'.

*Question 22: In what ways do they differ?*

In question 22, faculty were asked to expand their numerical responses to 21 by indicating "In what ways do they differ?" The response rate to question 22 was the lowest of all of the open-ended questions on this survey: 32% (266 responses of 832).

Those faculty who elaborated their responses to question 21 had an average scale score of 4.28 while those who chose not to elaborate their responses had an average scale score of 4.74. This indicates that, on average, those choosing not to comment viewed their commitments as slightly higher than those of their counterparts or that they did not know if their commitment was less, greater, or about the same.

Of the 32 faculty who indicated in their comments to question 22 that their service was "not nearly as great" as that of their colleagues, the most frequent reasons cited were lower or no service expectations, responsibilities, or opportunities (7 or 19.4% within the category) and non-

tenure track, pre-tenure, or junior faculty (7, 19.4%). In the response category for the same service (24 or 9% of respondents' comments), 10 (42%) respondents listed no reason, including "who really knows," and 6 (25%) said that different departments had different requirements. All other reasons received two or fewer responses, including comments that the university does not pay the respondent's salary, grants limit service time, and work was more geared to the profession than the university.

In the "greater" and "much greater" categories (165 responses or 62% of all responses to question 22), 45 or 22.7% of the comments focused on personal interests, talents, value system, or their unique job or position; 23 or 11.6% enumerated multiple committee memberships or meetings; 20 (10%) listed the department or the university mission and increased expectations or requirements; and 19 or 9.6% said that either they were in a smaller department with fewer personnel or had outside commitments (profession, community, clinical, or outreach). All other reasons in this category were cited in 10 or fewer statements and included such comments as the lower expectations of other departments, differentiated workloads, colleague buyouts, non-equitable service workloads, or lower seniority which leads to higher service workloads.

Two additional themes emerged from comments on question 22: types of service (131 or 37.2%) and problems with the current system (32, 10.9%). Four types of service were prominent in respondents' comments, including committees and meetings (27 comments or 10.6% of responses within this category), professional organizations or national service (15, 7.6%), student interactions (teaching, mentoring, or advising), and community or business group activities, community service, or advocacy (11 or 8.4%). All other types of service were cited by 10 or fewer respondents. These focused on such activities as building a new department, planning, consulting, providing patient care, speaking at a conference, accepting responsibilities as librarians (whose jobs often are viewed as service oriented), and developing policy.

Second, 32 (10.9%) of the responses mentioned problems with the current system. Eleven (34.4% of the category) responses said that service is poorly defined, uncompensated, or unrecognized when considering salary, evaluation, rewards, or tenure. Seven (22%) comments focused on non-equitable workloads across faculty. All other problems mentioned by faculty had four or fewer responses and included comments such as lack of state funding, service being detrimental to one's career, females getting higher service workloads, or unrealistic service expectations.

### Questions 23 and 24

In question 23, respondents were asked to answer "yes" or "no" to indicate whether they thought that people who were deans, or department chairs or who had roles in faculty governance should be able to count their work as service. In question 24, respondents were to elaborate their responses if they so chose.

[Table 23](#) shows that the overwhelming majority of respondents (669 or 84% of the respondents to this question), answered "Yes" to indicate that such activities should be counted as service. The remaining respondents (124, 16%) said "No." Responses across the campuses were

consistent with this distribution, except for UCD Denver (77% yes, 23% no) and system (67% yes, 33% no) respondents.

Question 24 of the service survey focused on explanations provided by faculty respondents relative to question 23. The responding faculty (328 or 41% of those responding to question 23) supplied 495 codable comments.

Of the faculty who responded “no” to question 23, 79 (16%) comments indicated that people engaged in these roles should not have their work count as service. The major objections voiced by respondents were that it is already part of their job (71%): “This is their job: a service role and not a research one.” Another said that “They are already paid” for such work. Still another said that credit should not be given “if they are already being recognized and paid for that work.” Many of these same respondents said that deans or chairs (11%) should not be able to count their work as service. Nine percent indicated that governance is expected and that administration is different from service.

A recurring theme within this category was that many respondents see service as an altruistic activity: “If . . . a faculty member receives benefits, perks and higher salary for a position, this is quite different from giving of themselves to help the community.” Another respondent said, “If it is not compensated, then it is service.”

On the other hand, those who responded “yes” to question 23 made 290 (59%) comments that suggested that leadership roles, whether in formal administrative positions or in faculty governance, should count as service. However, continuing the altruistic theme, several respondents stated that such service should count only if it is uncompensated. Among these respondents, four major themes accounted for about 61% of the reasons stated for people responding yes to question 24: Service is part of the job and formula (i.e., 40-40-20), and by definition not teaching, research, or clinical practice (23%); governance is time intensive and requires a high percentage of service (20%); service is vital and important to department, college, or university (14%); or it depends on the job description (5%).

The last area suggests another theme: the need to develop a unique category for leadership in governance activities and not lump such activities under “service.” Typical comments included “Maybe ‘administrative’ credit, rather than lumped under the general not-often appreciated ‘service’ term”; “What else could it be?”; and “They count unless another category of ‘administration’ is added to the evaluation form.” Another 105 (21%) of the comments focused on needed changes: Service should be compensated, evaluated, and valued (51%), service should be measured using a fixed formula or standardized metrics (24%), and service should be measured based on a flexible formula or differentiated workload (20%).

### **Question 25**

A total of 640 respondents addressed the issues in question 25 (see [Table 25a](#)). The question asked, “If someone does not engage in service, would additional teaching or research be an adequate substitute?” While well-known, two conditions contributing to the context for these responses should be noted: Most faculty are evaluated on their teaching, research, and service

responsibilities—typically 40%, 40%, and 20% respectively—and some faculty have “distributed workloads,” which may vary in unique ways from the 40-40-20 assessment requirement for most faculty. The 40-40-20 distribution is expected of non-tenured, tenure-track faculty, even though these faculty often are advised to “limit” their service and focus on research and teaching. Thus, many new, non-tenured, tenure-track faculty focus their service on departmental or unit work, an occasional college- or university-level committee, and appropriate professional activities such as conferences.

For question 25, the distribution across the various CU campuses (see [Table 25a](#)) showed 248 (38.8%) respondents from UCB, 59 (9.2%) from UCCS, 328 (51.3%) from UCD (9th, 41 [12% of UCD]; AMC, 151 [46% of UCD]; Denver, 136 [42% of UCD]), and 5 (< 1%) from System. The resounding majority of the respondents, 379 (59.2%), concluded “Yes,” additional teaching or research would be appropriate substitutes for service activities (see [Table 25b](#)), while 196 (30.6%) said “No,” 38 (5.9%) essentially said “maybe,” and 27 (4.2%) did not respond such that a definitive yes, no, or maybe could be discerned.

Table 25c also shows that 452 respondents elaborated their yes, no, or maybe responses with specific comments about this question. The largest number (66, 15%) said that everyone should have a minimum service requirement, and another 51 (11%) thought that, regardless of how such decisions might go, everyone’s load should be “equitable,” with no faculty expected to contribute more overall than any other faculty. Other breakdowns show that 46 (10%) respondents felt that only increased teaching should be substituted for decreased service, while 26 (6%) felt the same but only if an individual’s research expectations did not increase. Thirty-two (7%) faculty indicated that only special circumstances should be considered when approving diminution of a faculty member’s service obligations while another 30 (7%) suggested that “individual personality and talent” should be taken into account in such determinations. Further, 33 (7%) stated that such arrangements should be codified in formal agreements.

Citing one of the initiating reasons for this survey, 23 (5%) respondents said that service needs to have the same status as teaching and research. While this particular comment does not suggest that service should receive more than its current 20% emphasis, unless faculty negotiate differentiated work loads, it does speak to faculty concerns that service is undervalued in decisions about annual rewards, tenure, and promotion when compared to teaching and research.

Perhaps clarifying their no responses, 30 (7%) said that service is part of the university’s mission and therefore a requirement for all faculty. Another 36 (8%) said that service is part of the professional responsibility of public employees. Seventeen (4%) added that service already is part of a faculty member’s defined work.

Smaller numbers raised the following points: that service might need to be redefined (12, 3%), that justification would be needed for any reductions in service (9, 2%), that current practice should be respected (2, < 1%), or that reducing one’s service obligations would create unfair career advancement (1, < 1%).

Fully 50% of those elaborating their yes, no, or maybe response also expressed concern that service obligations be maintained at CU. For example, 66 (15%) faculty said that everyone

should have a minimal service requirement with 51 (11%) indicating that faculty work loads need to be equitable. Further, 36 (8%) said that service is a professional responsibility or part of CU's mission (30, 7%) while others indicated that a defined ratio (17, 4%) already exists, service is part of current practice (2, < 1%), or its diminution might facilitate unfair career advancement (1, < 1%).

On the other hand, many agreed that it could be appropriate to diminish service only if additional expectations for teaching and research were imposed. Specific comments from this group suggested that only additional teaching (46, 10%) or additional research (15, 3%) would be fair. Conversely, 2 (< 1%) faculty said that teaching responsibilities should not be increased while 26 (6%) preferred that research not be increased. Further, 32 (7%) clarified that only special circumstances should dictate changes in existing workloads. Others said that changed workloads should be incorporated in formal agreements (33, 7%), should accommodate individual personalities or talents (30, 7%), and should be justified (9, 2%) in some way.

Another small group thought that service requires redefinition (12, 3%) or its diminution might diminish faculty voice (3, 1%). Other wide-ranging comments came from 18 faculty who constituted 4% of the 640 respondents.

## **Appendices**

[Appendix A](#)

[Appendix B](#)

[Appendix C](#)

[Appendix D](#)



## Notes

<sup>1</sup>Rodney Muth is a Professor of Educational Leadership and Policy in the School of Education and Human Development (SEHD), University of Colorado Denver (UCD), and a former Chair of Faculty Council and Chair of the Faculty Assembly at UCD. Susan Krebs and Robert Snead are doctoral students in the Educational Leadership and Innovation (EDLI) PhD program in the SEHD and were team leaders for the data analyses. Deborah Wise helped develop and supervised the online survey. Cary Aplin, Wendy Chiado, Denise Cordova, Curtis Lee, and Cornelia Santos, also PhD students in the EDLI program, assisted Susan and Robert with the data analyses.

<sup>2</sup>Brown, Hank. (2007, April 6). Memorandum to Vice President Michael Poliakoff with copies to Chancellors Peterson, Shockley-Zalabak, Wilson and Leonard Diniger and Charles Sweet. Denver: University of Colorado.

<sup>3</sup> In most cases, fewer than 832 faculty responded to the open-ended questions in the survey, but this is not unusual: Many survey respondents simply do not take the time to elaborate their responses in the open-ended questions, even when invited to do so. However, providing the opportunity to elaborate forced-choice items often increases overall responses to surveys.