FACULTY CLIMATE SURVEY ANALYSIS
Colorado School of Mines Faculty Senate
September 15, 2014

The CSM Faculty Senate conducted a far-reaching survey into faculty attitudes, work patterns, job satisfaction, P&T, faculty retention, and other issues in Feb-Apr 2014. Although the survey was long (50 questions), and took 20-30 minutes to complete, the response rate was approximately 80% of faculty and included 311 comments totaling 20 pages of written remarks. The Senate shared the quantitative results with the faculty in April (see Appendix I for results).

The Senate conducted a combined analysis of the quantitative and qualitative components of the survey. We identified recurring themes in the comments and coded each response to the theme or themes that the comment addressed. We then quantified those comments and compared them to the numerical data from the survey. In this specific report, we highlight and analyze the sections of the survey that address the most pressing concerns of the Academic Faculty.

Summary of findings:
Our report is organized according to the most salient issues that emerged in the survey, as follows:

I.   **Morale And Retention, pg. 2**
       The survey assessed faculty morale via multiple metrics. While many faculty are generally happy at Mines, a sizable minority of more than a third of faculty (35%) is experiencing a perceptible decline in morale that is manifesting in strong feelings of dissatisfaction on many issues combined with increased interest in seeking employment elsewhere.

II.   **Leadership And Workplace Climate, pg. 6**
       Faculty dissatisfaction correlates to strong feelings about campus leadership and decision-making. Chief concerns relate to: (1) transparency, fairness, and efficiency; and (2) workplace climate, which many describe as closed or fearful.

III.   **Workload And Support, pg. 9**
       A perception of an increasing and unreasonable workload is another important source of faculty discontent, especially an increasing administrative workload for faculty and a shortage of staff support.

IV.   **Additional Issues, pg. 12**
       Issues on Promotion & Tenure, mentorship, workload equity, diversity/inclusion, and department-specific results are outlined here.

We note for the record that the Senate's purpose in analyzing these data is not to render judgments about campus politics or make recommendations about courses of actions, but rather to present the data dispassionately so that the campus can have an informed dialogue focused around identifying solutions. We did not include here critical information that (1) referred to specific individuals (multiple comments), (2) was not conveyed with a collegial tone (a tiny fraction of the comments), or (3) compromised anonymity (multiple comments).

Anyone wishing to analyze these data further should contact Dan Knauss, Senate President.

I: MORALE AND RETENTION

The Faculty Survey reveals that although a majority of CSM faculty is satisfied with their work at Mines, a sizable minority of more than a third of faculty is experiencing a perceptible decline in morale that is manifesting in strong feelings of dissatisfaction on many issues. The survey assessed faculty morale via multiple metrics, analyzed below. The broadest spectrum is captured by perceptions of overall job satisfaction (Q23) and searches for employment elsewhere (Qs 35, 36, 38), which is an indicator of the salience of faculty attitudes.

A. Quantitative Data

The data include the following trends with respect to faculty morale and retention:

- 35% of faculty are dissatisfied at CSM; 56% are satisfied; 9% are neither satisfied nor dissatisfied (Q23).

- Faculty are as likely to express a preference for leaving CSM as they are for remaining at Mines. When asked how likely it is that faculty will try to leave CSM in the next three years (Q38): 38% are likely; 38% are unlikely; the remaining 24% are neutral.

- Faculty are applying for other jobs at an increasing rate: 8% applied for jobs at other universities in the past 3-5 years; 13% in past 2-3 years; 15% in past 1 year (Q36). A similar trajectory (on a smaller scale) is true for job applications outside academia (Q36).

- One barometer of how CSM stacks up in comparison to peers is a comparison with Boston University's College of Engineering, which answered many of the same questions as CSM and posted results online. Tenure-line faculty at CSM are much more likely to express dissatisfaction (43% at CSM vs. 25% at BU), and more likely to say they will try to leave Mines in the next three years (37% at CSM vs. 19% at BU). A separate document detailing the value and limitations of this comparison, as well as identifying other points of analysis, has been prepared and is available upon request.

As noted in Tables 1-3 below, the highest rates of dissatisfaction are among CSM's tenured and research faculty; those who have been at CSM longest; women; and faculty who do not identify their race/ethnicity as white. But morale is also perceptibly low among a segment of recently hired and tenure track faculty. General satisfaction among teaching faculty is much higher (with 72% expressing satisfaction), but their interest in leaving CSM is also relatively high.

Table 1. Satisfaction and retention, by position:

	Very or somewhat dissatisfied at CSM (Q23):	Very or somewhat likely to try to leave CSM in the next 3 years (Q38):
CSM (all)	35%	38%
Tenured faculty	47%	41%
Tenure-track, untenured	37%	29%
Teaching faculty	19%	38%
Research faculty	50%	50%

Table 2. Satisfaction and retention, by years of service:

	Very or somewhat dissatisfied at CSM (Q23):	Very or somewhat likely to try to leave CSM in the next 3 years (Q38):
CSM (all)	35%	38%
1-3 years	29%	35%
4-9 years	35%	34%
10+ years	42%	40%
"I prefer not to say"	29%	45%

Table 3. Satisfaction and retention, by gender and race/ethnicity:

	Very or somewhat dissatisfied at CSM (Q23):	Very or somewhat likely to try to leave CSM in the next 3 years (Q38):
CSM (all)	35%	38%
Male	31%	37%
Female	44%	34%
White	32%	37%
Black, American Indian/Alaska Native, Asian/Pacific Islander, or Hispanic	42%	25%

Results by college:

Results by department were distributed to the entire faculty in April (Appendix I). We analyzed departmental responses further to see if there were any patterns among colleges. Although Table 4 shows some variation by college, *these differences appear much less significant when carefully scrutinized*, as noted in the text following the table.

Table 4: Satisfaction and retention, by college:

	Very dissatisfied or somewhat dissatisfied at CSM (Q23):	Very likely or somewhat likely to leave CSM in next three years (Q38):
CSM (all)	35%	38%
College of Applied Science and Engineering (CASE)	31%	37%
College of Engineering and Computational Sciences (CECS)	26%	30%
College of Earth Resource Sciences and Engineering (CERSE)	43%	41%
Did not identify departmental affiliation: "prefer not to say" (14% of respondents)	46%	43%

Although faculty dissatisfaction varies by college, the distinctions appear much less significant when the following considerations are taken into account:

- A sizable 14% of respondents did not identify their departmental affiliation (Q46), and therefore their college affiliation is also unknown. Among these faculty, dissatisfaction is highest at 46%.
- The results for CASE vary widely by department, with dissatisfaction ranging from a low of 11% to a high of 55%.
- The lower rates of dissatisfaction in CECS are affected by the anomalous climate in Mechanical Engineering: 0% of ME faculty express dissatisfaction. In the other departments in that college, dissatisfaction ranges from 29%-33%. If we remove ME from our analysis, dissatisfaction in CECS is only slightly lower than campus wide at 32%.
- Conversely, the higher rates of dissatisfaction in CERSE are affected by Liberal Arts & International Studies (62% dissatisfied) as well as by the fact that LAIS faculty comprised a much larger pool of the respondents for this particular college (24% of CERSE respondents). Although dissatisfaction was also unusually strong in Geophysics (60%), the response rate was low and thus did not influence the college-wide results as strongly. In the other departments in that college, dissatisfaction ranges from 33%-38%. If we remove LAIS from our analysis, dissatisfaction in CERSE is only slightly higher than campus wide at 37%. [We note for the record that, since the survey was administered, CERSE has taken steps to analyze and address LAIS morale, such as via the "LAIS Reimagine" committee and report.]
- If we remove from our analysis the least satisfied department (LAIS) and the most satisfied department (ME), the overall level of faculty dissatisfaction remains at 35%. *Neither extreme sways the campus-wide results*.

Reasons for low morale:

Multiple survey questions provide insights into the main sources of faculty satisfaction or dissatisfaction, such as questions about attitudes toward resources, compensation, and job responsibilities (Q15-17), perceptions of leadership and campus environment (Q20-22), perceptions of workload (Q11-13), sources of stress (Q10), and factors that make faculty want to stay or leave CSM (Q39-40).

Of all these factors, there are a few that stand out as having a reasonably strong correlation with a faculty members' discontent or interest in leaving CSM. In general, these data indicate that issues of workplace climate have the most perceptible impact on faculty morale.

For example, if we zero in on the attitudes of those faculty who say that they are somewhat or very dissatisfied at CSM, we find:

- Most cite the desire to find a more **supportive work environment** as being the biggest consideration for wanting to leave (66% to a great extent), with **enhancing career** just behind (at 63%) and finding a **more satisfying intellectual environment** (at 55%).

- **Salary** is a consideration (39% to a great extent) but respondents rank it as a lesser concern in considering employment elsewhere than other factors. Still, among those who express dissatisfaction at CSM, 71% are dissatisfied with their salaries.

- Most cite **paperwork/bureaucracy, campus politics, departmental politics** as the biggest sources of stress (47%, 45%, and 44% as extensive sources of stress, respectively), with research funding and scholarly productivity close behind.

- They are much more likely to express disillusionment with **CSM decision-making**, such as via Q22: "strongly disagree" that CSM decision-making is collaborative and transparent (60%, vs. 39% campus wide); "strongly disagree" that decision-making at CSM is fair (55% vs. 29% campus wide); and "strongly disagree" that diversity of opinion is respected and valued (46% vs. 25% campus wide).

- **Women** are more likely to be dissatisfied: 44% of female faculty said they were dissatisfied at CSM, compared to 31% of male faculty. A similar pattern holds true for race/ethnicity but the sample pool is small.

If we zero in on the attitudes of those faculty who say they wish to leave CSM in the next three years, we see a similar pattern but with less intensity and with greater emphasis on enhancing career and salary as motives.

B. Comments on Morale and Retention:

- "Campus climate is worse, by far, than at any other time during my 20+ years at Mines. … This has to change, or I see a mass faculty exodus from CSM."

- "I think that it is good that Faculty Senate is doing this survey. That in itself is a very encouraging thing. I hear a lot of complaints about the current political environment at Mines (which was not the case when I joined the faculty). When I am asked by my colleagues elsewhere about my prospects for tenure here, my response is that university politics are going downhill, and that gives me a lot of uncertainty. There are a lot of truly excellent people here at Mines with all of the best intentions, but in some areas we have been on a bad trajectory lately."

- "My observation is that while many aspects of the university have greatly improved over the past 15 years, the faculty morale is at a serious low point."

- "These questions are difficult to answer because the situation at CSM has changed so dramatically in the last 2-3 years. Until the last two years I would never had thought about leaving."

- "Faculty retention does not appear to be on anyone's mind (should be)."

II. LEADERSHIP AND WORKPLACE CLIMATE

As noted above, there is a strong correlation between faculty dissatisfaction and strong feelings about campus decision-making. The quantitative data in the survey indicate that faculty perceptions on this matter are strongly felt. In both the qualitative and quantitative data, the chief concerns relate to: (1) transparency, fairness, and efficiency; and (2) workplace climate, which many describe as closed or fearful.

The qualitative data are also strong in this respect. Although the survey did not specifically ask faculty to comment on CSM leadership, more of the open-ended responses addressed leadership issues than any other topic. 50 comments addressed CSM leadership, or 16% of all comments. Of these, only 5 raised concerns at the departmental or college levels, of which only one specifically expressed reservations about a department head and only one of which pointed to a particular dean as source of dissatisfaction. By contrast, 16 comments specifically cited (by name or position) individual leaders in upper-administration, accounting for 32% of all comments on leadership. In addition, 33 comments (11% of all comments) specifically addressed workplace climate.

A. Quantitative Data

With respect to leadership and climate, most of faculty discontent is not directed at the departmental or college levels (Table 4); in general, departmental and programmatic leadership share the concerns of the faculty as a whole and in some cases more intensely (Table 5).

Table 4. Perceptions of CSM decision-making: departmental vs. CSM (Q21-22):

	Disagree or strongly disagree re CSM	Disagree or strongly disagree re department/unit
Decision making is collaborative and transparent	71%	34%
Decision making is efficient	61%	35%
Decision-making is fair	61%	28%
Decision-making reflects sound priorities and relevant data	58%	32%
Diversity of opinion is respected and valued	45%	22%

Table 5. Perceptions of CSM decision-making, by faculty role (Q22):

	Disagree or strongly disagree (all CSM faculty)	Disagree or strongly disagree, faculty in leadership roles, including dept. heads*	Disagree or strongly disagree, dept. heads only**
Decision making is collaborative and transparent	71%	73%	60% (of which, all strongly disagree)
Decision making is efficient	61%	69%	80% (of which, all strongly disagree)
Decision-making is fair	61%	59%	50%

Decision-making reflects sound priorities and relevant data	58%	59%	50%
Diversity of opinion is respected and valued	45%	53%	60%

* Among 64 CSM faculty who in 2013 were department heads, served as directors of programs or institutes, or served in other administrative capacities, e.g. assistant department heads, as identified by their answers to Q5. Committee chairs and course coordinators are not included in this tally.
** Among 10 CSM faculty who identified themselves as department heads in 2013 on Q5. Results may include some who are no longer department heads or exclude some who are currently serving.

Workplace Climate:

Many of the written comments link issues about leadership with issues of workplace climate. As already noted in Part I, there is also a strong correlation between concerns about both leadership and workplace climate and faculty dissatisfaction. The quantitative data speak to this issue as well:

- Openness and collaboration are issues that are important to faculty: 96% of faculty rate faculty input in decision-making as important; 94% rank academic freedom as important; and 87% of faculty believe an open environment for discussing different ideas is important.

- Yet 38% do not feel comfortable expressing views openly (of which 15% strongly)

- Only 26% of faculty believe that diversity of opinion is respected and valued at CSM, while 45% disagree (of which, 26% strongly disagree).

- The wariness on campus is also substantiated by the high percentage of faculty who did not disclose information that might reveal their identities: 14% of respondents did not indicate which department they belong to; 12% of did not say how long they had been at CSM; 15% did not identify gender; 19% did not identify race/ethnicity. Written comments reveal that fear of retaliation and the importance of anonymity ranked highly in faculty unwillingness to provide such personally identifiable information; 19 respondents wrote comments reflecting these concerns in the survey.

B. Comments on Leadership, Decision-making, and Workplace Climate

- **"**I'm glad you are doing this [the faculty survey], and I hope this can affect some change. I have watched this institution that I love be driven almost into the ground, and the administration is actively punishing those who disagree with their policies. That's not the way academics do things, and actually that's not the way effective managers of any variety do things. I'm just holding on to see whether Mines will again be a place I'm proud to work, a college that educates students rather than churns out a product."

- **"**I want to remove some identifying characteristics [from this survey] because I fear retaliation. I am glad that you will try to keep these responses confidential, but my impression is that faculty/employees who voice disagreements with administration will be punished, and their careers destroyed. It is risky to reveal your identity.**"**

- **"**The principles of shared governance on the CSM campus have been destroyed and despite what some say this is NOT the case across the country. Top-down decision making does not belong on a true University campus and is damaging to our reputation.**"**

- **"**Honestly, it's not so much a quantity problem as it is a quality problem for me...service and advising has certainly increased a great deal, as has the number of students in my courses, but the big problem is that you feel like you're working hard for nothing...the bar will always be raised, and output never quite good enough. The culture is just all about numbers and spreadsheets. The administration should watch Daniel Pink's famous TED talk on what motivates people--it's not extrinsic motivations, its intrinsic ones, that make people happy. Trying to quantify every hour of our day, or every dollar we bring in and them comparing apples and oranges is so demoralizing. Only 'stars' get recognized, and there is not a good sense of community or cooperation. It's just competition and fear. There is no sense of leadership, as in how to inspire people, how to see us as whole people with families or other interests.**"**

- **"**Mines students are wonderful. I love teaching here, and I love my students. I also like my colleagues. This is what keeps me here. But I could be a better teacher and colleague if the institution valued faculty more. My energy can be sapped by the politics and arbitrary edicts that come down from administration."

- **"**I am very happy with teaching and research at CSM. I also really like my colleagues. And I love my students. Yet I am not very happy at CSM. Why is that? Two key reasons stand out. First, Mines does not provide an open forum for encountering and engaging with differing ideas. To the contrary: unlike almost every university in the country, it actually discourages free exchange of ideas. It shuts people up, makes them afraid. I don't understand it. A puzzle. Second, the crushing service load and stultifying administrative atmosphere are very demoralizing. It's as if someone wants this to be an unpleasant place to work, and is doing everything in their power to make it so. I try to be positive, and I'm a positive person by nature, but I don't understand it, and it's extremely disappointing. It doesn't have to be this way.**"**

- "Everyone needs to be evaluated in their work. Currently, we evaluate students and faculty. There should be a way to evaluate department heads, deans, provosts, presidents. We should also hear the voice of administrative staff: who speaks for them?**"**

- "The authoritarian and belittling attitude of the current central administration and the repeated tendency to blame the faculty for any difficulties has changed everything for the worst."

- "The leadership in academic affairs has created many problems. … The leadership in academic affairs … has negatively impacted the operation of the university and the faculty morale to the point where productivity and success is impeded… Faculty salary raises remain low and are unfairly determined while faculty workload has increased. Shared governance is not valued."

III. WORKLOAD AND SUPPORT:

A perception of an increasing and unreasonable workload is another important source of faculty discontent, as reflected in quantitative and qualitative data. 10% of written comments (36 in all) addressed workload issues, and they identified a few key areas of concern: (1) high and growing administrative workload on faculty preventing research productivity and undermining quality, (2) shortage or inadequacy of staff support to assist in these areas, especially with respect to research finances and ORA, (3) a need for more TA support to effectively run classrooms and help manage grading, and (4) a sense of inequality in service loads.

A. Quantitative Data

Workload increase*:*

- 70% say workload has increased during last 2 years and 59% say workload has increased in the preceding 3-5 years (Q11)
- 70% say workload is too heavy; of which 19% say it is "much too heavy" (Q13)

Causes of increase*:*

Faculty were asked (Q12) to identify the causes of workload increase, and to select the single most important factor. The top causes included service, administration, and paperwork; shortage of support staff; and increased teaching and research demands:
- 92% identify **personnel or staffing shortage** as contributing to increase; 20% say it is single most important factor;
- 90% identify **paperwork/reporting** as contributing to the increase; 15% most important factor. Faculty ranked "paperwork/bureaucracy" as the second most extensive source of stress (35% extensive), just behind securing research funding (37% extensive, Q10);
- 87% identify **research demands** as contributing to increase; 24% most important factor;
- 84% identify **service/administration** contributed to increase; 31% most important factor; 83% identify **teaching demands** e.g. increased student numbers as contributing to increase; 31% most important factor.

Personnel/staffing:

With respect to resources, personnel concerns were the strongest sources of dissatisfaction (Q16):
- 55% dissatisfied with number or breadth of faculty to deliver curriculum
- 46% dissatisfied with staff support
- 46% dissatisfied with number or breadth of faculty to advance research
- 43% dissatisfied with support level for submitting grants

College structure:

An additional theme of the data is a sense that the college structure may not be helping matters (Q20). Only 15% of faculty belief that the creation of colleges has made their lives easier; 49% disagree, of which 31% strongly disagree. Several comments suggest a perception that the college structure has primarily led to more paperwork and bureaucracy rather than improvements in efficiency or assistance with the teaching and research missions of Mines.

B. Comments on Workload and Support

On feeling valued and having administrative support:

- "We're in academia. To do this right requires a big effort so it's really about mitigating the little things that might pile on top if it, providing the appropriate admin support where appropriate, controlling long term expectations (less teaching = more time for research productivity), and feeling valued and rewarded for the considerable work and effort that we put in."

- **"**Job satisfaction and workload are inter-related. I love the job, but it is much to manage at times and the administration makes it harder and not easier on faculty. It seems that we police our own without trust entirely too much and are not partners in something bigger. Maybe a few bad apples in some senior faculty have hung it up so to speak, but this should not dictate the nature of the relationship between administration and the rest of the academic community. We are partners in education and research, it would be nice for that viewpoint to take hold and to see what the university is doing to make faculty work-life better for doing their job and increasing their job satisfaction. Faculty sacrifice much to do this job, and it would be nice to be met halfway on some things.**"**

- "My job would be a lot easier and less stressful if CSM had a reasonable level of administrative support. I feel like between staff turnover and just plain understaffing, things in this area have been steadily getting worse over the past five years, and really bad in the past two. Benefits and pay for our classified staff do not seem competitive."

With respect to bureaucracy, colleges:

- **"**It seems the layers and amount of administrative reporting has increased significantly the last few years. It seems increasingly difficult to (a) understand at what level decisions are being made, and (b) to get administrative decisions within a reasonable time frame."

- "Too many layers of administration force cutbacks in course delivery and impede our ability to engage students and keep them at Mines."

- "The creation of colleges has created silos and created bureaucracy that negatively impacts efficiency."

- "College system has not helped CSM-- as feared, it appears to have simply added another layer of administration (with additional required approvals for everything) without simplifying/enhancing our primary focus/mission on teaching research. … The college system is creating new barriers where previously CSM's structure did not have such barriers between departments!"

On the impact on quality in research and teaching:

- "In general, I feel that I spend far too much time doing administrative work (accounting, reporting, paperwork, emails) at the expense of teaching, research and service. It's not so much the workload, which I expect to be high, it's more the allocation of my time."

- "I am spending so much time on service and administration that I do not have time to think about teaching, pedagogy, and content in a truly meaningful way that allows me to bring real innovation to the classroom."

- "It is getting impossible to do my job well with the continuous increase in undergraduate enrollment. I am afraid for the reputation and quality of this school if things do not change. There needs to be a balance between money brought in and the capability of the university to accommodate all the students, activities, etc."

On evolving expectations of being a top-notch research institution, lack of a "service culture":

- "We write proposals and discuss research with potential funders, only to have the proposal fail due to delays in paperwork at ORA. The administrative help in ORA is overworked and so it is extremely difficult to have a timely proposal preparation. …   Technical help for experimental work is lacking. Technical personnel are teaching lab sections of courses and cannot assist with experimental work. Safety issues are made into a witch hunt."

- "There is a sweet spot for research load here at CSM, and it is lower than at other universities, for many reasons. Certainly a big reason is that so much of the administrative load for securing funding and managing it is placed on the faculty themselves. Yet the evolving expectations by the university administration for external research funding in terms of $/yr/faculty keep increasing without a congruent increase in support (administrative, foundation money for cost share, expansion of lab facilities, more grad student scholarships, etc.) to achieve and maintain such research operations. This is exceptionally frustrating and only serves to incentivize doing as little as possible, because as usual, the burden is always on the faculty to get it done. Everyone else (HR, ORA, etc.) is either in police or CYA mode. It would be much more helpful if the professor was supported in trying to obtain funding, where the administration was a facilitator and partner in making it so, rather than another hurdle in the process. Question: What is the administration doing for the faculty in making it BETTER? The faculty deserve real measurable specifics on this score."

On the high administrative workload and inefficiency:

- "'Paperwork creep' seems to lead every year to additional forms to fill out, hoops to jump through, etc. Although each additional request by itself seems reasonable, taken together and cumulatively, these continuously escalating requests represent a significant regulatory/administrative burden on the faculty. The administration should devote time to carefully examine our current policies, forms, regulations, etc and ask in each case whether

they are necessary and/or how they can be streamlined/simplified or automated so as to free up the faculty to focus on our primary mission of teaching and research."

- **"**The university finance system is broken. Every year there are problems with getting things balanced and it ends up taking at least 80 hours out of a work year to do simple things. Assessments are also time consuming (the registrar knows exactly what classes I taught and how many students were in there, why make me track those things down? same with grants and papers, those things are out there).**"**

- "The tremendous inefficiency of Mines at every level -- HR, admin, routine paperwork -- plus micromanagement from above needlessly increase the workload and stress levels every day, and are demoralizing. Rather than make our lives easier, so we can focus on research and teaching, administrative micromanagement, paperwork, and counterproductive second-guessing of what we are doing takes up tons of time and effort -- and gets in the way of our research productivity and teaching effectiveness. It's a huge problem. Mines creates a climate that actually undermines faculty ability to do the work we were hired to do. In this respect, things are much worse here at Mines than elsewhere. I know of no colleagues at any institution who are as distracted and consumed by such matters as we are here at CSM."

On TA support:

- "Perhaps the simplest and most cost-effective way to reduce faculty workload is to increase TA budgets. When one considers the equivalent hourly rates paid to a graduate teaching assistant compared with a professor, this is also the most economic way to operate. By giving the professors more time for their other duties, this also increases the research productivity of the professors, and increases their ability to secure funding for research."

On improving the campus environment for our new hires:

- **"**CSM will continue to improve if we can convince over-qualified young faculty that Golden is wonderful. In a similar way, Santa Barbara and San Diego succeeded in taking advantage of location to significantly improve their faculty research. The role of the administration is to make sure the campus environment is supportive enough that these young people don't leave."

- **"**CSM needs to find a way to adapt to having top young faculty that are going to need more than their predecessors to keep them around."

IV. ADDITIONAL ISSUES:

Although the issues above appear to be the most salient and important to faculty at the moment, the survey data are suggestive or potentially useful in the following areas as well:

Promotion & Tenure:
The survey reveals a not trivial concern about the fairness, transparency, and effectiveness of campus P&T processes and procedures. By a wide margin, in some cases by a factor of 2-3, more faculty express distrust and lack of confidence in the P&T process than express confidence in the process. 33 comments (11% of the total) addressed the P&T process; much of it critical, with many doubts about the independence of the P&T Committee. These data should be analyzed and additional actions undertaken.

Table 6: Perceptions of promotion and tenure process (Q31)

	Disagree or strongly disagree
Criteria are clearly communicated	59%
Process and procedures are open and transparent	56%
Criteria are assessed fairly at all levels	40%
Process and procedures are efficient	40%
Criteria reflect norms and standards of my discipline	37%
Process and procedures are fair	34%
Criteria are reasonable	29%

Mentorship:
The survey points to the potential value of establishing a mentorship program. For example, 46% of faculty who have had a mentor report that it was helpful. 16 written comments addressed mentorship, with many constructive suggestions. These data should be analyzed and additional actions undertaken.

Workload equity and non-tenure-track faculty:
The survey contains a wealth of data about faculty workloads across departments and across positions. Additional analysis of these data may provide especially helpful insights into the roles of non-tenure-track faculty on campus. In addition, the data on publications, service, and productivity may provide useful frames of reference for communicating departmental or disciplinary norms across campus, for example in P&T process.

Department-specific analysis:
Faculty attitudes and perceptions on workload, P&T, leadership, satisfaction, and other matters can be assessed by department (see Appendix I). These results can be helpful for departments and leadership to identify areas of strength as well as areas of concern.

Inclusivity and "family friendliness":
Quantitative and qualitative information suggests that CSM could do more to create a support environment for female faculty, for ethnic and racial minorities, and for faculty with families. (A recurring theme of written comments, for example, speaks to need for childcare options for faculty). These data should be analyzed and additional actions undertaken.

APPENDIX I: Email from former Faculty Senate President (2013-14) Lincoln Carr to CSM faculty announcing survey results (April 29, 2014).

Dear Fellow Faculty,

The response to the Faculty Climate Survey was overwhelming. Roughly three-quarters of the faculty responded to the survey (196 total responses, with at least 176 respondents completing the entire survey). Each department is well represented in the results, as are faculty with varying appointments (tenure-line, teaching, etc).

We hope to analyze the data and report some preliminary conclusions to the faculty in the fall. In the meantime, we want to share with you the overarching summary data from the survey.

You may view the campus-wide results (all respondents) by following this link:

https://www.surveymonkey.com/results/SM-WVMZJDS/

In addition, by following the links at the end of this message (scroll all the way down to see them), you may see results broken down by position (tenure-line, teaching, etc) and by department. We think these results can be very useful as points of comparison, and may help in identifying priorities, concerns, and strengths within individual departments and among differing positions.

We hope that this survey will help us identify key issues for the faculty, and the faculty senate, to work on collectively in the coming academic year. The faculty senate would be very pleased to work with faculty members, department heads, committees, academic affairs, and others on campus to analyze the data further in ways that would support positive change on campus, while keeping our commitment to protect faculty anonymity in the survey responses.

We also remind you that we will soon elect our next faculty senate — it's not too late to get involved!

Sincerely,
Lincoln
--> for the Faculty Senate

p.s. Your senators are:
1.Joel Bach—Mechanical Engineering
2.Bernard Bialecki—Applied Mathematics and Statistics
3.Jerry Bourne -- Metallurgical and Materials Engineering
4.Lincoln Carr – Physics
5.Uwe Greife – Physics
6.Dan Knauss – Chemistry and Geochemistry
7.Thomas Monecke—Geology & Geological Engineering
8.Ken Osgood – Liberal Arts and International Studies, McBride
9.Steve Pankavich – Applied Mathematics and Statistics
10.Kamini Singha – Hydrologic Science and Engineering
11.John Spear—Civil & Environmental Engineering
12.Kim Williams—Chemistry & Geochemistry
13.Ray Zhang—Civil & Environmental Engineering

CSM - CAMPUS-WIDE RESULTS (all respondents):
https://www.surveymonkey.com/results/SM-WVMZJDS/

RESULTS BY POSITION:

Tenured or tenure-track faculty:
https://www.surveymonkey.com/results/SM-DCVMRYS/

Teaching Faculty:
https://www.surveymonkey.com/results/SM-PCRLNYS/

Research Faculty:
https://www.surveymonkey.com/results/SM-WYQ3NYS/

DEPARTMENT-SPECIFIC RESULTS:

Applied Math & Statistics:
https://www.surveymonkey.com/results/SM-QWX76DS/

Chemical and Biological Engineering:
https://www.surveymonkey.com/results/SM-H3YMTDS/

Chemistry & Geochemistry:
https://www.surveymonkey.com/results/SM-RX22NDS/

Civil and Environmental Engineering:
https://www.surveymonkey.com/results/SM-TYQWZDS/

Economics and Business:
https://www.surveymonkey.com/results/SM-MRYVLYS/

Electrical Engineering and Computer Science:
https://www.surveymonkey.com/results/SM-2PFT5DS/

Geology and Geological Engineering:
https://www.surveymonkey.com/results/SM-ZPLLVYS/

Geophysics:
https://www.surveymonkey.com/results/SM-L3PC7YS/

Liberal Arts and International Studies:
https://www.surveymonkey.com/results/SM-CRBFYYS/

Library:
https://www.surveymonkey.com/results/SM-V53K2YS/

Mechanical Engineering:
https://www.surveymonkey.com/results/SM-QHHX8YS/

Metallurgical and Materials Engineering:
https://www.surveymonkey.com/results/SM-LT9ZNDS/

Mining Engineering:
https://www.surveymonkey.com/results/SM-FPXN2YS/

Petroleum Engineering:
https://www.surveymonkey.com/results/SM-YBR2CYS/

Physics:
https://www.surveymonkey.com/results/SM-Q8QF3DS/

No department identified by respondent:
https://www.surveymonkey.com/results/SM-PZYXSYS/