

IUPUI Faculty Survey – 2015

Overview of Findings – Community Engagement & Service Learning

Prepared for
Center for Service & Learning

April 2015

Survey Research Office
Planning and Institutional Improvement
1100 Waterway Blvd
Indianapolis, IN 46202

Anne Mitchell
Director
317-278-9230
amitch29@iupui.edu

Robbie Janik
Assistant Director
317-278-0640
rjanikii@iupui.edu

PURPOSE: To measure indicators related to employment satisfaction, satisfaction with services, and engagement in high impact practices in order to better understand faculty experiences at IUPUI.

METHODS: Survey administered to census of all full-time and part-time faculty (excluding School of Medicine) in spring 2015.

RESPONDENT CHARACTERISTICS:

	All Respondents	All Invited
<i>Female</i>	52.4%	50.0%
<i>Male</i>	47.6%	50.0%
<i>White</i>	80.4%	78.1%
<i>Black</i>	6.1%	6.6%
<i>Hispanic</i>	2.3%	2.2%
<i>Asian</i>	9.1%	10.8%
<i>Other</i>	2.1%	2.3%
<i>34 and under</i>	11.5%	15.0%
<i>35-44</i>	22.0%	23.5%
<i>45-54</i>	24.7%	24.8%
<i>55-64</i>	30.1%	26.9%
<i>65+</i>	11.7%	9.8%
<i>Liberal Arts</i>	21.3%	20.7%
<i>Science</i>	13.1%	13.2%
<i>Dentistry</i>	7.6%	10.7%
<i>Nursing</i>	7.1%	7.6%
<i>ENGT</i>	7.7%	7.4%
<i>Business</i>	6.5%	6.0%
<i>PETM</i>	3.9%	4.2%
<i>Social Work</i>	4.4%	3.8%
<i>Herron</i>	3.6%	3.8%
<i>SPEA</i>	3.7%	3.2%
<i>Public Health</i>	4.0%	3.2%
<i>Education</i>	3.7%	3.0%
<i>Law</i>	2.3%	3.0%
<i>Informatics</i>	2.3%	2.8%
<i>SHRS</i>	2.5%	2.5%
<i>University Library</i>	2.0%	1.5%
<i>Philanthropy</i>	0.6%	0.7%
<i>UGE</i>	1.0%	0.7%
<i>Other</i>	2.7%	2.0%
N	815	1890
Response Rate	43%	--

- Participants approximate the demographic characteristics of IUPUI faculty as a whole.
- Faculty from every School participated in the survey.
- Full-time faculty were more likely to respond than part-time faculty. There are 31 part-time faculty who responded to this survey who are also full-time staff at IUPUI.

RESPONDENT CHARACTERISTICS BY POSITION:

	Tenure-track Faculty	Lecturer	Part-time Faculty
<i>Female</i>	46.0%	54.4%	58.7%
<i>Male</i>	54.0%	45.6%	41.3%
<i>White</i>	75.0%	92.2%	86.1%
<i>Black</i>	6.3%	1.0%	8.2%
<i>Hispanic</i>	3.3%	3.9%	1.0%
<i>Asian</i>	12.3%	2.9%	2.9%
<i>Other</i>	3.0%	0.0%	1.9%
<i>34 and under</i>	6.7%	4.9%	17.3%
<i>35-44</i>	26.7%	14.6%	21.2%
<i>45-54</i>	27.3%	26.2%	21.6%
<i>55-64</i>	29.3%	38.8%	26.0%
<i>65+</i>	10.0%	15.5%	13.9%
<i>Liberal Arts</i>	21.7%	35.0%	26.0%
<i>Science</i>	18.3%	18.4%	9.1%
<i>Dentistry</i>	7.0%	0.0%	7.7%
<i>Nursing</i>	5.0%	1.0%	10.6%
<i>ENGT</i>	9.7%	11.7%	2.4%
<i>Business</i>	3.7%	9.7%	12.5%
<i>PETM</i>	2.3%	4.9%	6.3%
<i>Social Work</i>	5.3%	4.9%	1.4%
<i>Herron</i>	5.0%	3.9%	3.8%
<i>SPEA</i>	3.3%	1.9%	6.7%
<i>Public Health</i>	5.0%	1.0%	3.4%
<i>Education</i>	4.0%	0.0%	5.8%
<i>Law</i>	3.0%	0.5%	0.0%
<i>Informatics</i>	3.0%	3.9%	1.0%
<i>SHRS</i>	2.3%	2.9%	1.0%
<i>Philanthropy</i>	1.3%	0.0%	0.0%
<i>UGE</i>	0.0%	1.0%	1.9%
N	300	103	208
Response Rate	46%	54%	33%

QUALITY OF IUPUI SERVICES & DEPARTMENT/PROGRAM:

	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor	Do not use
Center for Service and Learning	35.7%	51.1%	10.4%	2.7%	36.9%
Center for Teaching and Learning	46.1%	43.0%	8.8%	2.2%	17.2%
Center for Research and Learning	33.8%	53.2%	10.0%	2.9%	41.1%
The quality of community engagement in my department/program	40.6%	39.2%	16.8%	3.3%	--
The quality of professional service (in the discipline) in my department/program	46.1%	41.6%	10.8%	1.5%	--
The quality of service to the institution in my department/program (e.g. committees)	49.0%	39.3%	10.7%	1.0%	--
The quality of teaching in my department/program	49.5%	42.8%	7.1%	0.5%	--
The quality of research in my department/program	36.9%	45.2%	15.5%	2.5%	--

- A larger percentage of faculty report not using the CSL (37%) and the CRL (41%) compared to the CTL (17%).
- Of those that use them, the vast majority of faculty rank the separate Centers at IUPUI as excellent or good with part-time faculty having slightly higher scores than full-time faculty.
- The Center for Service and Learning has seen a rise in perception of quality among full-time faculty from 80% rating the center as excellent/good in 1998 to 87% in 2015.
- Faculty have a somewhat more positive view of the quality of professional service and service to the institution compared to the quality of community engagement in their specific department/program.
- Excluding lecturers rating of the quality of teaching in their department/program, no other significant differences are found concerning the quality ratings of adjunct or lecturers compared to tenure-track faculty.

Mean score of faculty types (4 point scale)	Tenure-track		Part-time
	Faculty	Lecturer	Faculty
Center for Service and Learning	3.13	3.14	3.31
Center for Teaching and Learning	3.29	3.27	3.44
Center for Research and Learning	3.12	2.97	3.22
The quality of community engagement in my department/program	3.14	3.11	3.20
The quality of professional service (in the discipline) in my department/program	3.32	3.23	3.33
The quality of service to the institution in my department/program (e.g. committees)	3.40	3.33	3.29
The quality of teaching in my department/ program	3.37	3.58**	3.42
The quality of research in my department/ program	3.11	3.29	3.16

***p<.001; **p<.01; *p<.05, group compared to tenure-track faculty

COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT:

	Frequently	Occasionally	Rarely	Never
Engaged in a collaborative research project with a community partner	16.6%	16.9%	15.8%	50.6%
Served on a board or committee of a local business or civic/ social service agency in a professional capacity	22.1%	18.7%	12.1%	47.0%
Gave talks to local community organizations	12.7%	30.8%	21.9%	34.6%
Provided professional services to a community group, local business, or government agency for free or reduced rate	16.1%	23.4%	16.1%	44.3%
Participated in campus (or school) sponsored community service event	7.6%	22.7%	23.5%	46.2%

- Less than half of all faculty respondents participate in the community engagement activities frequently or occasionally.
- Tenure-track faculty are significantly more likely than both lecturers and part-time faculty to have engaged in a collaborative research project with a community partner frequently or occasionally.
- Tenure-track faculty are also significantly more likely to give talks to local community organizations at a higher frequency.
- Part-time faculty who are also staff are more likely to engage in these activities compared to other adjuncts.

Percentage of faculty who engage in the following activities occasionally or frequently:	Tenure-track Faculty	Lecturer	Part-time Faculty
Engaged in a collaborative research project with a community partner	44.6%	25.0%**	13.9%***
Served on a board or committee of a local business or civic/ social service agency in a professional capacity	41.9%	39.2%	35.0%
Gave talks to local community organizations	46.9%	34.3%*	36.2%***
Provided professional services to a community group, local business, or government agency for free or reduced rate	41.0%	35.1%	44.4%
Participated in campus (or school) sponsored community service event	29.7%	30.9%	24.0%*

***p<.001; **p<.01; *p<.05, group compared to tenure-track faculty

FACULTY SATISFACTION:

	Very satisfied	Satisfied	Somewhat satisfied	Not satisfied
Service load (committees, etc.)	13.4%	53.3%	23.8%	9.6%
Opportunities for community engagement	25.1%	48.8%	20.1%	6.0%
Opportunities for research	19.6%	44.1%	25.0%	11.3%
Rewards and recognition for service to the institution	10.5%	41.4%	27.2%	20.9%
Rewards and recognition for community engagement	10.7%	43.3%	27.3%	18.3%
Reward and recognition for professional service	9.0%	42.8%	26.8%	21.4%
Faculty development opportunities concerning community engagement	15.4%	41.9%	28.0%	14.7%
Faculty development opportunities concerning teaching	22.9%	42.1%	24.8%	10.1%
Faculty development opportunities concerning research	15.9%	42.9%	28.0%	13.2%

- Faculty as a whole have higher satisfaction regarding their opportunities for community engagement compared to their opportunities for research or service load.
- Faculty have slightly higher rates of being very satisfied with development opportunities regarding teaching as opposed to research or community engagement development opportunities.
- Part-time faculty are significantly more satisfied with their service load as well as being less satisfied with their opportunities for community engagement compared to tenure-track faculty.

	Tenure-track Faculty	Lecturer	Part-time Faculty
Service load (committees, etc.)	2.56	2.62	2.95***
Opportunities for community engagement	2.98	2.87	2.75*
Opportunities for research	2.71	2.32**	2.67
Rewards and recognition for service to the institution	2.35	2.23	2.46
Rewards and recognition for community engagement	2.43	2.29	2.48
Reward and recognition for professional service	2.27	2.34	2.46
Faculty development opportunities concerning community engagement	2.62	2.47	2.62
Faculty development opportunities concerning teaching	2.80	2.68	2.81
Faculty development opportunities concerning research	2.68	2.46	2.59

***p<.001; **p<.01; *p<.05, group compared to tenure-track faculty

HIGH IMPACT PRACTICES AND OTHER ENGAGEMENT:

Done in past two years?	Done or in progress	Plan to do	Do not plan to do	Have not decided
Require students to participate in a community-based project (service-learning) as part of a course	25.5%	11.8%	51.9%	10.8%
Include an internship, co-op, field experience, student teaching, or clinical placement for credit as part of a course	31.3%	6.7%	53.5%	8.5%
Require an undergraduate research project as part of your course	39.2%	12.0%	40.4%	8.4%
Advise a student organization or group	31.2%	10.7%	45.5%	12.7%

- It is most common for faculty that teach undergraduate courses to have required a research project as part of a course in the past two years.
- Roughly a quarter of undergraduate course faculty have required their students to participate in a community-based project as a part of their course. Slightly more than one-fifth (22.6%) of faculty either plan to require that or have not yet decided.
- Tenure-track faculty are more likely to participate in high-impact practices overall.
- Half of lecturers have advised a student organization in the past two years (compared to 31% of tenure-track faculty).
- More than half of faculty who are also full-time staff at IUPUI (55.0%) have advised a student group in the past two years.
- Tenure-track faculty are significantly more likely than part-time faculty to have included an internship/etc., required a research project, and advised a student group.

Percentage of faculty who have done the following in the past two years:	Tenure-track Faculty	Lecturer	Part-time Faculty
Require students to participate in a community-based project (service-learning) as part of a course	23.3%	32.3%	19.6%
Include an internship, co-op, field experience, student teaching, or clinical placement for credit as part of a course	37.7%	36.6%	14.7%***
Require an undergraduate research project as part of your course	55.9%	39.8%*	21.0%***
Advise a student organization or group	31.3%	49.5%**	13.4%***

***p<.001; **p<.01; *p<.05, group compared to tenure-track faculty

ALLOCATION OF CLASS TIME:

Percentage of class time for a typical course spent on...	0%	1-24%	25-49%	50-74%	75% or more
Community engagement/service learning	62.6%	28.1%	4.4%	2.9%	2.1%
Community-based research	72.3%	21.3%	3.7%	1.7%	1.1%
Experiential activities (labs, field work, clinical or field placements, etc.)	43.2%	31.4%	13.1%	7.4%	5.0%

- More than one-third of all faculty (37.4%) spend at least some percentage of class time on community engagement or service learning.
- If faculty spend any class time on community engagement/service learning or community-based research, they are most likely to spend somewhere between 1 and 24 percent of their class on those activities.
- Tenure-track faculty are significantly more likely than both lecturers and part-time faculty to spend any class time regarding community-based research

Percentage of faculty that spend ANY percentage of class time in a typical course on...	Tenure-track Faculty	Lecturer	Part-time Faculty
Community engagement/service learning	36.5%	39.2%	32.7%
Community-based research	31.7%	20.6%*	20.5%*
Experiential activities (labs, field work, clinical or field placements, etc.)	56.4%	50.5%	49.3%

***p<.001; **p<.01; *p<.05, group compared to tenure-track faculty