TTUHSC El Paso Faculty Satisfaction Survey
Three Year Report
Executive Summary

Table 1. TTUHSCEP Faculty Satisfaction Survey Three Year Response Rates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Surveys Delivered</strong></td>
<td>323</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>334</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Respondents</strong></td>
<td>N = 137</td>
<td>N = 158</td>
<td>N = 112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Response Rates</strong></td>
<td>42.4%</td>
<td>54.5%</td>
<td>33.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Method

TTUHSC El Paso’s Faculty Satisfaction Surveys were conducted over the course of three weeks in the Spring of 2016, 2017, and 2018. Each year, a link to the online surveys was distributed via email to all active faculty. Faculty self-selected to complete the surveys. Participants were informed of the voluntary nature of the surveys and were assured as to the anonymity of their responses.

In order to determine the survey population each year, an active faculty report was generated from Banner HR by staff at the Office of Institutional Research and Effectiveness (OIRE). This report was compared against faculty email distribution lists maintained by staff at the PLFSOM and the GGHSON, and updated appropriately to ensure all currently employed faculty were included.

Survey questions were originally developed by Texas Tech University Health Sciences Center (Lubbock) and modified for TTUHSC El Paso in 2015. Modifications were based on a review of surveys used by other institutions of higher education, as well as input from departments across TTUHSC El Paso. The final surveys were reviewed and approved by the President of TTUHSC El Paso. In addition, survey items are refined annually based on institutional data needs; therefore, certain items may not appear in each survey iteration. In cases where an item was not present in a survey, data is reported as not available (“n/a”) and a note indicating the time of item introduction is included.

Surveys were administered via the subscription service Qualtrics, an online service software that provides an external online site for the development and delivery of the surveys. Qualtrics provides anonymous links to the surveys, which were included in the emails sent to all faculty on the TTUHSC El Paso employee distribution lists. The anonymous links do not collect any personal information on the participant and cannot be linked to an individual IP address. Respondents return their online surveys to Qualtrics.com and the de-identified data is warehoused at this site. Secured access to the data is available to OIRE staff via user authentication. One reminder email was sent out weekly for a period of three weeks, in order to bolster response rates for every iteration of the survey.

Analyses and Results

Descriptive analysis of the data from the three surveys was conducted in October 2018. Analyses were conducted to determine significant differences among survey items across the three survey iterations. Items that are significantly different at the .05 level are annotated in the corresponding data tables. Please also see Table 2 (p. 2) for an overview of these items. All data is reported in aggregate format. Overall
results with a respondent n of less than five were not reported, in order to maintain the confidentiality of participants. Combined levels of dissatisfaction or disagreement at or above 25% are highlighted in yellow in the tables. Please see Table 3 (p. 3) for an overview of the items that were at or above 25% combined levels of dissatisfaction or disagreement for all three survey iterations.

Table 2. TTUHSC El Paso Mean Differences Across Survey Iterations: 2016-2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Interpretation</th>
<th>p - value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level of agreement</td>
<td>Mean agreement levels significantly increased between 2016 and 2018.</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty is given opportunities to evaluate senior leadership.</td>
<td>Mean agreement levels significantly increased between 2016 and 2018.</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of agreement</td>
<td>Mean agreement levels significantly increased between 2016 and 2018.</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior leadership provides a clear direction for TTUHSC El Paso’s future</td>
<td>Mean agreement levels significantly increased between 2016 and 2018.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of agreement</td>
<td>Mean agreement levels significantly increased between 2016 and 2018.</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My immediate supervisor seems to care about me as a person.</td>
<td>Mean agreement levels significantly increased between 2016 and 2018.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of value in the tenure process</td>
<td>Mean value levels indicating “Undervalued” significantly increased between 2016 and 2017. Mean value levels indicating “Undervalued” significantly increased between 2016 and 2018.</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching contributions</td>
<td>Mean value levels indicating “Undervalued” significantly increased between 2016 and 2017. Mean value levels indicating “Undervalued” significantly increased between 2016 and 2018.</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of value in the tenure process</td>
<td>Mean value levels indicating “Undervalued” significantly increased between 2016 and 2017. Mean value levels indicating “Undervalued” significantly increased between 2016 and 2018.</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service and committee work</td>
<td>Mean value levels indicating “Undervalued” significantly increased between 2016 and 2017. Mean value levels indicating “Undervalued” significantly increased between 2016 and 2018.</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of value in the tenure process</td>
<td>Mean value levels indicating “Undervalued” significantly increased between 2016 and 2017. Mean value levels indicating “Undervalued” significantly increased between 2016 and 2018.</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advising and mentoring</td>
<td>Mean value levels indicating “Undervalued” significantly increased between 2016 and 2017. Mean value levels indicating “Undervalued” significantly increased between 2016 and 2018.</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of value in the tenure process</td>
<td>Mean value levels indicating “Undervalued” significantly increased between 2016 and 2017. Mean value levels indicating “Undervalued” significantly increased between 2016 and 2018.</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional reputation</td>
<td>Mean value levels indicating “valued appropriately” significantly decreased in between 2016 and 2017.</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sources of work stress</td>
<td>Mean value levels indicating “Not at all” significantly increased between 2016 and 2018. Mean value levels show a pattern of movement toward “Not at all” a source of work stress between 2017 and 2018.</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review/promotion process</td>
<td>Mean value levels indicating “Not at all” significantly increased between 2016 and 2018. Mean value levels show a pattern of movement toward “Not at all” a source of work stress between 2017 and 2018.</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3. TTUHSC El Paso Disagreement or Dissatisfaction levels At Or Above 25% Across All Survey Iterations: 2016-2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Level of disagreement at or above 25%</th>
<th>Level of dissatisfaction at or above 25%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I have a voice in the decision-making that affects the direction of my department.</td>
<td>Criteria used to reach promotion decisions.</td>
<td>Criteria used to reach tenure decisions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My department has adequate faculty to achieve our goals.</td>
<td>Criteria used to reach tenure decisions.</td>
<td>Annual evaluation process of faculty.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Annual evaluation process of faculty.</td>
<td>Opportunities to develop research skills.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Prospect of career advancement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Clarity of the merit pay process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Criteria used to reach merit pay.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q1 Please indicate your PRIMARY TTUHSC El Paso affiliation:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Primary TTUHSC El Paso Affiliation</th>
<th>2016 (n=137)</th>
<th>2017 (n=153)</th>
<th>2018 (n=108)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PLFSOM</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GGHSON</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GSBS</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>89%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## 2018 Faculty Satisfaction Survey
### Results Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GGHSON</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLFSOM</td>
<td>72.3%</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>83.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GSBSa</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutionalb</td>
<td>15.3%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Otherb</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>n &lt; 5</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*aNote: The 2018 iteration of the survey introduced “Primary” and “Secondary” affiliations, where only GGHSON and PLFSOM were options as primary affiliations. Those also affiliated with the GSBS had the option to select this school as a secondary affiliation, of which 75% of respondents did (n=9). The remainder chose “Other” as a secondary affiliation (n <5).*

*bNote: The 2018 iteration of the survey removed “Institutional” and “Other” as response categories for primary affiliation, as TTUHSC-E Faculty are all given primary appointments either in GGHSON or PLFSOM.*
Q2 In addition to your faculty appointment, do you hold a senior administrative title, including Dean, Associate Dean, Assistant Dean, Vice President, and/or Department Chair or Vice Chair?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Yes (%)</th>
<th>No (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016 (n/a)</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017 (n=119)</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018 (n=102)</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>2016(^a)</th>
<th></th>
<th>2017</th>
<th></th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>92.4%</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>85.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\)Note: This item was introduced in the 2017 iteration of the survey.
Q3 Please indicate the degree to which you agree with each of the following statements about TTUHSC El Paso:

**I am aware of TTUHSC El Paso's mission**

- 2016 (n=124): 95%
- 2017 (n=145): 95%
- 2018 (n=96): 95%

**I am aware of TTUHSC El Paso's strategic plan**

- 2016 (n/a)
- 2017 (n=143): 87%
- 2018 (n=96): 87%
I think TTUHSC El Paso is following its mission

2016 (n=122) 2017 (n=138) 2018 (n=93)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TTUHSC El Paso’s policies ensure fair treatment for employees

2016 (n=123) 2017 (n=140) 2018 (n=91)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TTUHSC El Paso's policies give me the flexibility to balance my work and personal life.

- 2016 (n=123): 20% Disagree, 80% Agree
- 2017 (n=140): 10% Disagree, 90% Agree
- 2018 (n=95): 10% Disagree, 90% Agree

TTUHSC El Paso follows operating policies and procedures

- 2016 (n/a): 92% Agree
- 2017 (n/a): 92% Agree
- 2018 (n=88): 92% Agree
TTUHSC El Paso operates with integrity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2016 (n/a)</th>
<th>2017 (n/a)</th>
<th>2018 (n=93)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TTUHSC El Paso operates with honesty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2016 (n/a)</th>
<th>2017 (n/a)</th>
<th>2018 (n=96)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
There is a sense that we are all on the same team at TTUHSC El Paso

I am proud to be part of TTUHSC El Paso
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summary Statistics: Mission/Policies</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Min.</td>
<td>Max.</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am aware of TTUHSC El Paso’s mission.</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am aware of TTUHSC El Paso’s strategic plan.</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I think TTUHSC El Paso is following its mission.</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TTUHSC El Paso’s policies ensure fair treatment for employees.</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TTUHSC El Paso’s policies give me the flexibility to balance my work and personal life.</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TTUHSC El Paso follows operating policies and procedures.</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TTUHSC El Paso operates with integrity.</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TTUHSC El Paso operates with honesty.</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### There is a sense that we are all on the same team at TTUHSC El Paso.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1.0</th>
<th>2.0</th>
<th>3.0</th>
<th>4.0</th>
<th>5.0</th>
<th>6.0</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>121</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>28.9%</td>
<td>71.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** Items were introduced in the 2017 iteration of the survey.

### I am proud to be part of TTUHSC El Paso.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1.0</th>
<th>2.0</th>
<th>3.0</th>
<th>4.0</th>
<th>5.0</th>
<th>6.0</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>120</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>91.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** Items were introduced in the 2018 iteration of the survey.
Q4 Please indicate the degree to which you agree with each of the following statements about TTUHSC El Paso:

**TTUHSC El Paso senior leadership is receptive to faculty input**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2016 (n=120)</th>
<th>2017 (n=140)</th>
<th>2018 (n=87)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Combined Disagree Levels</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combined Agree Levels</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TTUHSC El Paso senior leadership recognizes faculty accomplishments**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2016 (n=122)</th>
<th>2017 (n=140)</th>
<th>2018 (n=92)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Combined Disagree Levels</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combined Agree Levels</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Faculty is given opportunities to evaluate TTUHSC El Paso senior leadership

- 2016 (n=115): 22% Disagree, 78% Agree
- 2017 (n=132): 30% Disagree, 70% Agree
- 2018 (n=90): 44% Disagree, 56% Agree

Senior leadership provides a clear direction for TTUHSC El Paso’s future

- 2016 (n=121): 32% Disagree, 68% Agree
- 2017 (n=143): 22% Disagree, 78% Agree
- 2018 (n=92): 12% Disagree, 88% Agree
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Senior leadership models TTUHSC El Paso values

- 2016 (n=119): Disagree 22%, Agree 71%
- 2017 (n=133): Disagree 20%, Agree 78%
- 2018 (n=89): Disagree 16%, Agree 82%

Senior leadership communicates openly about important matters

- 2016 (n=122): Disagree 12%, Agree 65%
- 2017 (n=141): Disagree 12%, Agree 69%
- 2018 (n=93): Disagree 12%, Agree 77%
I believe what I am told by senior leadership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016 (n=121)</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017 (n=143)</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018 (n=94)</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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#### Summary Statistics: Senior Leadership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>TTUHSC El Paso senior leadership is receptive to faculty input.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Min. Max. Mean Std Dev.</td>
<td>1.0 6.0 4.0 1.0</td>
<td>1.0 6.0 4.1 1.6</td>
<td>1.0 6.0 4.4 1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combined Disagree Levels</td>
<td>32.5%</td>
<td>20.7%</td>
<td>20.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combined Agree Levels</td>
<td>67.5%</td>
<td>79.3%</td>
<td>79.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TTUHSC El Paso senior leadership recognizes faculty accomplishments.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Min. Max. Mean Std Dev.</td>
<td>1.0 6.0 4.1 1.0</td>
<td>1.0 6.0 4.3 1.4</td>
<td>1.0 6.0 4.5 1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combined Disagree Levels</td>
<td>34.4%</td>
<td>23.6%</td>
<td>18.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combined Agree Levels</td>
<td>65.6%</td>
<td>76.4%</td>
<td>81.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Faculty is given opportunities to evaluate TTUHSC El Paso senior leadership.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Min. Max. Mean Std Dev.</td>
<td>1.0 6.0 3.2 1.0</td>
<td>1.0 6.0 3.3 1.8</td>
<td>1.0 6.0 3.8* 1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combined Disagree Levels</td>
<td>55.7%</td>
<td>53.8%</td>
<td>41.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combined Agree Levels</td>
<td>44.3%</td>
<td>46.2%</td>
<td>58.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Senior leadership provides a clear direction for TTUHSC El Paso’s future.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Min. Max. Mean Std Dev.</td>
<td>1.0 6.0 4.0 1.0</td>
<td>1.0 6.0 4.2 1.4</td>
<td>1.0 6.0 4.5* 1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combined Disagree Levels</td>
<td>34.7%</td>
<td>28.0%</td>
<td>22.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combined Agree Levels</td>
<td>65.3%</td>
<td>72.0%</td>
<td>77.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Senior leadership models TTUHSC El Paso values.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Min. Max. Mean Std Dev.</td>
<td>1.0 6.0 4.1 1.0</td>
<td>1.0 6.0 4.4 1.4</td>
<td>1.0 6.0 4.6 1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combined Disagree Levels</td>
<td>29.4%</td>
<td>21.8%</td>
<td>18.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combined Agree Levels</td>
<td>70.6%</td>
<td>78.2%</td>
<td>82.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Senior leadership communicates openly about important matters.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Min. Max. Mean Std Dev.</td>
<td>1.0 6.0 3.9 1.0</td>
<td>1.0 6.0 4.1 1.5</td>
<td>1.0 6.0 4.3 1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combined Disagree Levels</td>
<td>35.3%</td>
<td>31.2%</td>
<td>22.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combined Agree Levels</td>
<td>64.7%</td>
<td>68.8%</td>
<td>77.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>I believe what I am told by senior leadership.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Min. Max. Mean Std Dev.</td>
<td>1.0 6.0 4.1 1.0</td>
<td>1.0 6.0 4.2 1.4</td>
<td>1.0 6.0 4.4 1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combined Disagree Levels</td>
<td>27.3%</td>
<td>28.7%</td>
<td>24.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combined Agree Levels</td>
<td>72.7%</td>
<td>71.3%</td>
<td>75.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Mean differences between 2016 and 2018 are statistically significant (p < .05).*
Q5 Please indicate your level of agreement with each of the following statements about your department:

- The mission or purpose of my department makes me feel my job is important
- My department’s procedures are fair to all

**The mission or purpose of my department makes me feel my job is important**

- 2016 (n=120): 82% Agree, 18% Disagree
- 2017 (n=143): 82% Agree, 18% Disagree
- 2018 (n=93): 89% Agree, 11% Disagree

**My department’s procedures are fair to all**

- 2016 (n=118): 71% Agree, 29% Disagree
- 2017 (n=142): 77% Agree, 23% Disagree
- 2018 (n=92): 79% Agree, 21% Disagree
My department’s procedures are transparent

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Combined Disagree Levels</th>
<th>Combined Agree Levels</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016 (n/a)</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017 (n=140)</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018 (n=92)</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

My department’s procedures are open for discussion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Combined Disagree Levels</th>
<th>Combined Agree Levels</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016 (n/a)</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017 (n=140)</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018 (n=93)</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
My immediate supervisor (chair, associate dean, dean, etc.) helps me obtain the resources I need

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2016 (n=119)</th>
<th>2017 (n=142)</th>
<th>2018 (n=94)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agree Levels</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree Levels</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Combined Disagree Levels

I have a voice in the decision-making that affects the direction of my department

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2016 (n=120)</th>
<th>2017 (n=143)</th>
<th>2018 (n=93)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agree Levels</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree Levels</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Combined Disagree Levels
My department has adequate faculty to achieve our goals

- **2016 (n=120):**
  - Combined Disagree Levels: 22%
  - Combined Agree Levels: 78%

- **2017 (n=143):**
  - Combined Disagree Levels: 19%
  - Combined Agree Levels: 81%

- **2018 (n=94):**
  - Combined Disagree Levels: 20%
  - Combined Agree Levels: 80%

My department has adequate staff to achieve our goals

- **2016 (n=120):**
  - Combined Disagree Levels: 32%
  - Combined Agree Levels: 68%

- **2017 (n=142):**
  - Combined Disagree Levels: 31%
  - Combined Agree Levels: 69%

- **2018 (n=93):**
  - Combined Disagree Levels: 28%
  - Combined Agree Levels: 72%
Promotions in my department are based on a person’s performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Combined Disagree Levels</th>
<th>Combined Agree Levels</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016 (n=105)</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017 (n=141)</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018 (n=81)</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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#### Summary Statistics:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Min.</td>
<td>Max.</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The mission or purpose of my department makes me feel my job is important.</td>
<td>1.0 6.0 4.6</td>
<td>1.0 120</td>
<td>18.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My department’s procedures are fair to all.</td>
<td>1.0 6.0 4.2</td>
<td>1.0 118</td>
<td>28.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My department’s procedures are transparent.*</td>
<td>n/a n/a n/a n/a n/a n/a n/a n/a</td>
<td>1.0 6.0 4.2</td>
<td>1.7 140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My department’s procedures are open for discussion.*</td>
<td>n/a n/a n/a n/a n/a n/a n/a n/a</td>
<td>1.0 6.0 4.3</td>
<td>1.5 140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My immediate supervisor (chair, associate dean, dean, etc.) helps me obtain the resources I need.</td>
<td>1.0 6.0 4.5</td>
<td>1.5 119</td>
<td>21.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have a voice in the decision-making that affects the direction of my department.</td>
<td>1.0 6.0 4.0</td>
<td>1.8 120</td>
<td>36.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My department has adequate faculty to achieve our goals.</td>
<td>1.0 6.0 3.5</td>
<td>1.5 120</td>
<td>47.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My department has adequate staff to achieve our goals.</td>
<td>1.0 6.0 3.6</td>
<td>1.5 120</td>
<td>42.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotions in my department are based on a person’s performance.</td>
<td>1.0 6.0 4.1</td>
<td>1.6 105</td>
<td>35.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: Items were not introduced until the 2017 iteration of the survey.*
Q6 Please indicate the degree to which you agree with each of the following statements about your department:

**Issues of low performance are addressed in my department**

- 2016 (n=103): 32% Agree, 68% Disagree
- 2017 (n=129): 31% Agree, 69% Disagree
- 2018 (n=81): 24% Agree, 76% Disagree

**I receive feedback from my immediate supervisor that helps me improve my work performance**

- 2016 (n=114): 32% Agree, 68% Disagree
- 2017 (n=140): 20% Agree, 80% Disagree
- 2018 (n=92): 17% Agree, 83% Disagree
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Faculty in my department work well together

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2016 (n=117)</th>
<th>2017 (n=143)</th>
<th>2018 (n=92)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agree Levels</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree Levels</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is open communication about issues that impact work

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2016 (n=116)</th>
<th>2017 (n=141)</th>
<th>2018 (n=92)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agree Levels</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree Levels</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
There is collaboration among faculty within my department

- 2016 (n=116): 87% agree, 13% disagree
- 2017 (n=141): 84% agree, 16% disagree
- 2018 (n=92): 89% agree, 11% disagree

There is collaboration among faculty across departments

- 2016 (n=117): 77% agree, 23% disagree
- 2017 (n=141): 77% agree, 23% disagree
- 2018 (n=91): 72% agree, 28% disagree
I feel that opportunities for female faculty in my department are at least as good as those for male faculty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2016 (n=109)</th>
<th>2017 (n=133)</th>
<th>2018 (n=87)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I feel that opportunities for minority faculty in my department are at least as good as those for non-minority faculty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2016 (n=113)</th>
<th>2017 (n=134)</th>
<th>2018 (n=86)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Overall, my department is a good place to work

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2016 (n=110)</th>
<th>2017 (n=143)</th>
<th>2018 (n=93)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Overall</strong></td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Agree</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Disagree</strong></td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Combined Disagree Levels**

**Combined Agree Levels**
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### Results Summary

### Summary Statistics:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department Satisfaction</th>
<th>Min.</th>
<th>Max.</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Combined Disagree Levels</th>
<th>Combined Agree Levels</th>
<th>Min.</th>
<th>Max.</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Combined Disagree Levels</th>
<th>Combined Agree Levels</th>
<th>Min.</th>
<th>Max.</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Combined Disagree Levels</th>
<th>Combined Agree Levels</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Issues of low performance are addressed in my department.</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>32.0%</td>
<td>68.0%</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>31.0%</td>
<td>69.0%</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>23.5%</td>
<td>76.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I receive feedback from my immediate supervisor that helps me improve my work performance.</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>22.8%</td>
<td>77.2%</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>23.6%</td>
<td>76.4%</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>17.4%</td>
<td>82.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty in my department work well together.</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>18.0%</td>
<td>82.0%</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>17.5%</td>
<td>82.5%</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>14.1%</td>
<td>85.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is open communication about issues that impact work.</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>24.1%</td>
<td>75.9%</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>27.7%</td>
<td>72.3%</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>22.8%</td>
<td>77.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is collaboration among faculty within my department.</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>12.8%</td>
<td>87.2%</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>16.3%</td>
<td>83.7%</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>89.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is collaboration among faculty across departments.</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>22.9%</td>
<td>77.1%</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>22.7%</td>
<td>77.3%</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>27.5%</td>
<td>72.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel that opportunities for female faculty in my department are at least as good as those for male faculty.</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>15.9%</td>
<td>84.1%</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
<td>84.2%</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>12.6%</td>
<td>87.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel that opportunities for minority faculty in my department are at least as good as those for non-minority faculty.</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>16.4%</td>
<td>83.6%</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>14.2%</td>
<td>85.8%</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
<td>90.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall, my department is a good place to work.</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
<td>78.9%</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>16.8%</td>
<td>83.2%</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
<td>88.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q7 Please indicate the degree to which you agree with each of the following statements about your job/position:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>2016 (n=112)</th>
<th>2017 (n=141)</th>
<th>2018 (n=95)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>My current job makes good use of my skills</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am confident in my ability to do my job well</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>99%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
At work I have the opportunity to do what I do best every day

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Combined Disagree Levels</th>
<th>Combined Agree Levels</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016 (n=112)</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017 (n=140)</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018 (n=95)</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

My colleagues value my research/scholarship

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Combined Disagree Levels</th>
<th>Combined Agree Levels</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016 (n=101)</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017 (n=130)</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018 (n=85)</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
My immediate supervisor (chair, associate dean, dean, etc.) values my research/scholarship

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Combined Disagree Levels</th>
<th>Combined Agree Levels</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016 (n=103)</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017 (n=129)</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018 (n=83)</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>96%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

My colleagues value my teaching

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Combined Disagree Levels</th>
<th>Combined Agree Levels</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016 (n=106)</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017 (n=134)</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018 (n=92)</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>97%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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My immediate supervisor values my teaching

- **2016 (n=107)**: 19% Disagree, 81% Agree
- **2017 (n=134)**: 10% Disagree, 90% Agree
- **2018 (n=91)**: 11% Disagree, 89% Agree

My colleagues value my service activities (e.g. committee work)

- **2016 (n/a)**: 10% Disagree, 90% Agree
- **2017 (n=137)**: 10% Disagree, 90% Agree
- **2018 (n=87)**: 11% Disagree, 89% Agree
My immediate supervisor values my service activities (e.g., committee work)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Combined Disagree Levels</th>
<th>Combined Agree Levels</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016 (n/a)</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017 (n=136)</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018 (n=89)</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Summary Statistics: Job Satisfaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>My current job makes good use of my skills.</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am confident in my ability to do my job well.</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At work I have the opportunity to do what I do best every day.</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My colleagues value my research/scholarship.</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My immediate supervisor (chair, associate dean, dean, etc.) values my research/scholarship.</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My colleagues value my teaching.</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My immediate supervisor values my teaching.</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My colleagues value my service activities (e.g. committee work).*</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My immediate supervisor value my service activities (e.g. committee work).*</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: Items were not introduced until the 2017 iteration of the survey.*
Q8 Please indicate the degree to which you agree with each of the following statements about your job/position:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>2016 (n=110)</th>
<th>2017 (n=130)</th>
<th>2018 (n=93)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>My immediate supervisor supports my efforts to balance my work and personal life</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My immediate supervisor supports me when I need to take earned leave (vacation, sick, etc.) time</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
My immediate supervisor seems to care about me as a person

- 2016 (n=109): 79% agree, 21% disagree
- 2017 (n=132): 83% agree, 17% disagree
- 2018 (n=93): 90% agree, 10% disagree

I am treated fairly by my immediate supervisor

- 2016 (n=111): 83% agree, 17% disagree
- 2017 (n=138): 80% agree, 20% disagree
- 2018 (n=93): 90% agree, 10% disagree
I know what is expected of me in my position

- 2016 (n=111): 93%
- 2017 (n=139): 91%
- 2018 (n=94): 94%

I am given the freedom to do my job

- 2016 (n=112): 93%
- 2017 (n=139): 85%
- 2018 (n=94): 91%
My colleagues are committed to doing quality work

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2016 (n=111)</th>
<th>2017 (n=138)</th>
<th>2018 (n=92)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Combined Disagree Levels</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combined Agree Levels</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>94%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When I offer a new idea, I believe it will be fully considered

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2016 (n=111)</th>
<th>2017 (n=138)</th>
<th>2018 (n=91)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Combined Disagree Levels</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combined Agree Levels</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I receive appropriate recognition from my immediate supervisor for my individual contributions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Agree (%)</th>
<th>Disagree (%)</th>
<th>Total Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Summary Statistics: Job Satisfaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>My immediate supervisor supports my efforts to balance my work and personal life.</strong></td>
<td>1.0 6.0 4.8</td>
<td>1.0 6.0 4.7</td>
<td>1.0 6.0 5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>My immediate supervisor supports me when I need to take earned leave (vacation, sick, etc.) time.</strong></td>
<td>2.0 6.0 5.3</td>
<td>1.0 6.0 5.2</td>
<td>1.0 6.0 5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>My immediate supervisor seems to care about me as a person.</strong></td>
<td>1.0 6.0 4.6</td>
<td>1.0 6.0 4.8</td>
<td>1.0 6.0 5.1*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>I am treated fairly by my immediate supervisor.</strong></td>
<td>1.0 6.0 4.7</td>
<td>1.0 6.0 4.9</td>
<td>1.0 6.0 5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>I know what is expected of me in my position.</strong></td>
<td>1.0 6.0 5.1</td>
<td>1.0 6.0 5.1</td>
<td>1.0 6.0 5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>I am given the freedom to do my job.</strong></td>
<td>1.0 6.0 5.1</td>
<td>1.0 6.0 4.8</td>
<td>1.0 6.0 5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>My colleagues are committed to doing quality work.</strong></td>
<td>1.0 6.0 5.1</td>
<td>2.0 6.0 5.1</td>
<td>1.0 6.0 5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>When I offer a new idea, I believe it will be fully considered.</strong></td>
<td>1.0 6.0 4.4</td>
<td>1.0 6.0 4.5</td>
<td>1.0 6.0 4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>I receive appropriate recognition from my immediate supervisor for my individual contributions.</strong></td>
<td>1.0 6.0 4.3</td>
<td>1.0 6.0 4.5</td>
<td>1.0 6.0 4.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Mean differences between 2016 and 2018 are statistically significant (p < .05).
Q9 Overall, how would you rate your workload?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer: Workload Rating</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016 (n=113)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too light</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Light</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>About right</td>
<td>45.1%</td>
<td>46.0%</td>
<td>44.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heavy</td>
<td>37.2%</td>
<td>32.4%</td>
<td>43.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too heavy</td>
<td>14.2%</td>
<td>18.7%</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017 (n=139)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too light</td>
<td>n &lt; 5</td>
<td>n &lt; 5</td>
<td>n &lt; 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Light</td>
<td>n &lt; 5</td>
<td>n &lt; 5</td>
<td>n &lt; 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>About right</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heavy</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too heavy</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018 (n=95)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too light</td>
<td>n &lt; 5</td>
<td>n &lt; 5</td>
<td>n &lt; 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Light</td>
<td>n &lt; 5</td>
<td>n &lt; 5</td>
<td>n &lt; 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>About right</td>
<td>44.2%</td>
<td>44.2%</td>
<td>44.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heavy</td>
<td>43.3%</td>
<td>43.3%</td>
<td>43.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too heavy</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q10 In your opinion, how appropriately are the following items valued in the tenure process?

**Research and scholarly work**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Undervalued</th>
<th>Valued Appropriately</th>
<th>Overvalued</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016 (n=85)</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017 (n=109)</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018 (n=67)</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Teaching contributions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Undervalued</th>
<th>Valued Appropriately</th>
<th>Overvalued</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016 (n=85)</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017 (n=111)</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018 (n=68)</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td></td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Service (e.g., committee work)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2016 (n=86)</th>
<th>2017 (n=108)</th>
<th>2018 (n=63)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Undervalued</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valued Appropriately</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overvalued</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Professional reputation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2016 (n=83)</th>
<th>2017 (n=102)</th>
<th>2018 (n=64)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Undervalued</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valued Appropriately</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overvalued</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
36% 37% 41%
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## 2018 Faculty Satisfaction Survey
### Results Summary

Office of Institutional Research and Effectiveness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question: Tenure Process</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Research and scholarly work</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching contributions</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service (e.g., committee work)</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional reputation</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advising and mentoring</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Mean differences between 2016 and 2018 are statistically significant (p < .05).
**Mean differences between 2016 and 2018 are statistically significant (p < .01).
***Mean differences between 2016 and 2017 are statistically significant (p < .01).
Q11 Please indicate the degree to which you are satisfied with each of the following:

### Clarity of the promotion process

- **2016 (n=97):**
  - Combined Dissatisfaction Levels: 24%
  - Combined Satisfaction Levels: 76%
  - Total: 100%

- **2017 (n=120):**
  - Combined Dissatisfaction Levels: 25%
  - Combined Satisfaction Levels: 75%
  - Total: 100%

- **2018 (n=73):**
  - Combined Dissatisfaction Levels: 22%
  - Combined Satisfaction Levels: 78%
  - Total: 100%

### Criteria used to reach promotion decisions

- **2016 (n=94):**
  - Combined Dissatisfaction Levels: 12%
  - Combined Satisfaction Levels: 88%
  - Total: 100%

- **2017 (n=118):**
  - Combined Dissatisfaction Levels: 10%
  - Combined Satisfaction Levels: 90%
  - Total: 100%

- **2018 (n=73):**
  - Combined Dissatisfaction Levels: 11%
  - Combined Satisfaction Levels: 89%
  - Total: 100%
Clarity of the pre-tenure/midpoint review process

- 2016 (n/a)
- 2017 (n/a)
- 2018 (n=64)

Combined Dissatisfaction Levels:
- 2016: 10%
- 2017: 10%
- 2018: 10%

Combined Satisfaction Levels:
- 2016: 90%
- 2017: 90%
- 2018: 90%

Clarity of the tenure review process

- 2016 (n=82)
- 2017 (n=101)
- 2018 (n=64)

Combined Dissatisfaction Levels:
- 2016: 19%
- 2017: 19%
- 2018: 19%

Combined Satisfaction Levels:
- 2016: 81%
- 2017: 81%
- 2018: 81%
Clarity of the post-tenure review process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Combined Dissatisfaction Levels</th>
<th>Combined Satisfaction Levels</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016 (n/a)</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017 (n/a)</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018 (n=51)</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Criteria used to reach tenure decisions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Combined Dissatisfaction Levels</th>
<th>Combined Satisfaction Levels</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016 (n=80)</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017 (n=96)</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018 (n=58)</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Annual evaluation process of faculty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Combined Dissatisfaction Levels</th>
<th>Combined Satisfaction Levels</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **2016 (n=98)**
- **2017 (n=118)**
- **2018 (n=71)**
### Summary Statistics: Tenure Process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clarity of the promotion process.</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Min.</td>
<td>Max.</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Std Dev.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criteria used to reach promotion decisions.</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarity of the pre-tenure/midpoint review process.*</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarity of the tenure review process.</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarity of the post-tenure review process.*</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criteria used to reach tenure decisions.</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual evaluation process of faculty.</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: Items were not introduced until the 2018 iteration of the survey.
Q12 Please indicate the degree to which you are satisfied with each of the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Professional development opportunities for faculty to attend national conferences</th>
<th>Opportunities to develop research skills</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>2016 (n=107)</strong></td>
<td><strong>2016 (n=106)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combined Dissatisfaction Levels</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combined Satisfaction Levels</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combined Dissatisfaction Levels</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combined Satisfaction Levels</td>
<td>97%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Summary Statistics: Professional Development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Professional Development</th>
<th>Min.</th>
<th>Max.</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std Dev.</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Combined Dissatisfaction Levels</th>
<th>Combined Satisfaction Levels</th>
<th>Min.</th>
<th>Max.</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std Dev.</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Combined Dissatisfaction Levels</th>
<th>Combined Satisfaction Levels</th>
<th>Min.</th>
<th>Max.</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std Dev.</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Combined Dissatisfaction Levels</th>
<th>Combined Satisfaction Levels</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professional development opportunities for faculty to attend national conferences.</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>13.1%</td>
<td>86.9%</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>17.4%</td>
<td>82.6%</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
<td>86.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities to develop research skills.</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>29.2%</td>
<td>70.8%</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>13.1%</td>
<td>86.9%</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>30.9%</td>
<td>69.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities to develop teaching skills.</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>20.4%</td>
<td>79.6%</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>17.5%</td>
<td>82.5%</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>14.9%</td>
<td>85.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prospect of career advancement.</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>37.0%</td>
<td>63.0%</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>33.6%</td>
<td>66.4%</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>29.2%</td>
<td>70.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q13 Please indicate the degree to which you are satisfied with each of the following:

![Salary/Compensation Chart]

### Salary/Compensation

- **2016 (n=110)**
  - 77% Combined Satisfaction Levels
  - 23% Combined Dissatisfaction Levels
- **2017 (n=134)**
  - 65% Combined Satisfaction Levels
  - 35% Combined Dissatisfaction Levels
- **2018 (n=91)**
  - 72% Combined Satisfaction Levels
  - 28% Combined Dissatisfaction Levels

![Salary Raises Chart]

### Salary Raises

- **2016 (n/a)**
  - 44% Combined Satisfaction Levels
  - 56% Combined Dissatisfaction Levels
- **2017 (n/a)**
  - 41% Combined Satisfaction Levels
  - 59% Combined Dissatisfaction Levels
- **2018 (n=80)**
  - 60% Combined Satisfaction Levels
  - 40% Combined Dissatisfaction Levels
Clarity of the merit pay process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Combined Dissatisfaction Levels</th>
<th>Combined Satisfaction Levels</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016 (n=84)</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017 (n=99)</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018 (n=74)</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Criteria used to reach merit pay

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Combined Dissatisfaction Levels</th>
<th>Combined Satisfaction Levels</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016 (n=78)</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017 (n=96)</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018 (n=69)</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Health benefits package

- 2016 (n=108): 91% dissatisfaction, 9% satisfaction
- 2017 (n=128): 90% dissatisfaction, 10% satisfaction
- 2018 (n=87): 86% dissatisfaction, 14% satisfaction

Retirement benefits package

- 2016 (n=107): 95% dissatisfaction, 5% satisfaction
- 2017 (n=127): 90% dissatisfaction, 10% satisfaction
- 2018 (n=86): 86% dissatisfaction, 14% satisfaction
### Office equipment and supplies

- **2016 (n=110)**
  - Dissatisfaction: 12%
  - Satisfaction: 88%

- **2017 (n=131)**
  - Dissatisfaction: 12%
  - Satisfaction: 88%

- **2018 (n=89)**
  - Dissatisfaction: 10%
  - Satisfaction: 90%

![Graph showing satisfaction levels over years for office equipment and supplies](image1)

### Laboratory and/or research space

- **2016 (n=69)**
  - Dissatisfaction: 10%
  - Satisfaction: 90%

- **2017 (n=81)**
  - Dissatisfaction: 17%
  - Satisfaction: 83%

- **2018 (n=55)**
  - Dissatisfaction: 22%
  - Satisfaction: 78%

![Graph showing satisfaction levels over years for laboratory and/or research space](image2)
Space for meetings, conferences, and other collaborative activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Combined Dissatisfaction Levels</th>
<th>Combined Satisfaction Levels</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016 (n=109)</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017 (n=129)</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018 (n=88)</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>89%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Physical campus environment (e.g., buildings, landscape, walkways)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Combined Dissatisfaction Levels</th>
<th>Combined Satisfaction Levels</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016 (n=109)</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017 (n=132)</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018 (n=92)</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>89%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Cleanliness of my work environment

- 2016 (n=109): 96% satisfaction, 4% dissatisfaction
- 2017 (n=135): 95% satisfaction, 5% dissatisfaction
- 2018 (n=92): 92% satisfaction, 8% dissatisfaction

Availability of parking

- 2016 (n/a)
- 2017 (n=135): 78% satisfaction, 22% dissatisfaction
- 2018 (n=91): 71% satisfaction, 29% dissatisfaction
### Sense of personal safety in the work environment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Combined Dissatisfaction Levels</th>
<th>Combined Satisfaction Levels</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016 (n=109)</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017 (n=134)</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018 (n=91)</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>97%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Availability of clerical or administrative support

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Combined Dissatisfaction Levels</th>
<th>Combined Satisfaction Levels</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016 (n=103)</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017 (n=134)</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018 (n=92)</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Summary Statistics: Benefits

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Salary/Compensation</strong></td>
<td>Min. 1.0 Max. 6.0</td>
<td>Min. 1.0 Max. 6.0</td>
<td>Min. 1.0 Max. 6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Benefits Level</strong></td>
<td>Mean 4.2 SD 1.2</td>
<td>Mean 4.0 SD 1.4</td>
<td>Mean 4.0 SD 1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dissatisfaction Level</strong></td>
<td>n=110</td>
<td>n=134</td>
<td>n=134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Satisfaction Level</strong></td>
<td>22.7%</td>
<td>35.1%</td>
<td>35.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Combined Dissatisfaction Levels</strong></td>
<td>77.3%</td>
<td>64.9%</td>
<td>64.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Combined Satisfaction Levels</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Salary raises</strong></td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Clarity of the merit pay process</strong></td>
<td>1.0 6.0 Mean 3.6 SD 1.6</td>
<td>1.0 6.0 Mean 3.5 SD 1.7</td>
<td>1.0 6.0 Mean 3.5 SD 1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Criteria used to reach merit pay</strong></td>
<td>1.0 6.0 Mean 4.6 SD 1.2</td>
<td>1.0 6.0 Mean 4.3 SD 1.7</td>
<td>1.0 6.0 Mean 4.3 SD 1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Health benefits package</strong></td>
<td>1.0 6.0 Mean 4.8 SD 1.0</td>
<td>1.0 6.0 Mean 4.6 SD 1.1</td>
<td>1.0 6.0 Mean 4.6 SD 1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Retirement benefits package</strong></td>
<td>1.0 6.0 Mean 4.8 SD 1.1</td>
<td>1.0 6.0 Mean 4.6 SD 1.1</td>
<td>1.0 6.0 Mean 4.6 SD 1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Availability of human resources services</strong></td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Office space/work space</strong></td>
<td>1.0 6.0 Mean 4.8 SD 1.1</td>
<td>1.0 6.0 Mean 4.7 SD 1.2</td>
<td>1.0 6.0 Mean 4.7 SD 1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Office equipment and supplies</strong></td>
<td>1.0 6.0 Mean 4.7 SD 1.2</td>
<td>1.0 6.0 Mean 4.8 SD 1.2</td>
<td>1.0 6.0 Mean 4.8 SD 1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Laboratory and/or research space</strong></td>
<td>1.0 6.0 Mean 4.5 SD 1.3</td>
<td>1.0 6.0 Mean 4.5 SD 1.3</td>
<td>1.0 6.0 Mean 4.5 SD 1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Space for meetings, conferences, and other collaborative activities</strong></td>
<td>1.0 6.0 Mean 4.7 SD 1.0</td>
<td>1.0 6.0 Mean 4.7 SD 1.2</td>
<td>1.0 6.0 Mean 4.7 SD 1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Physical campus environment (e.g., buildings, landscape, walkways)</strong></td>
<td>1.0 6.0 Mean 4.9 SD 0.9</td>
<td>2.0 6.0 Mean 4.8 SD 1.0</td>
<td>2.0 6.0 Mean 4.8 SD 1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cleanliness of my work environment</strong></td>
<td>1.0 6.0 Mean 5.1 SD 0.9</td>
<td>1.0 6.0 Mean 5.1 SD 0.9</td>
<td>1.0 6.0 Mean 5.1 SD 0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Availability of parking</strong></td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sense of personal safety in the work environment</strong></td>
<td>1.0 6.0 Mean 5.2 SD 0.9</td>
<td>1.0 6.0 Mean 5.2 SD 0.9</td>
<td>1.0 6.0 Mean 5.2 SD 0.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q14 Please indicate the degree to which you are satisfied with each of the following:

### Accessibility of onsite library resources (e.g., books, journals)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Combined Dissatisfaction Levels</th>
<th>Combined Satisfaction Levels</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>93%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Accessibility of online library resources (e.g., books, journals online)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Combined Dissatisfaction Levels</th>
<th>Combined Satisfaction Levels</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>94%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: Item was not introduced until the 2018 iteration of the survey.

*Note: Items were not introduced until the 2017 iteration of the survey.
Accessibility of search software (e.g., OVID, MD Consult, Micromedex)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2016 (n=102)</th>
<th>2017 (n=126)</th>
<th>2018 (n=86)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dissatisfaction</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adequacy of library collection

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2016 (n=96)</th>
<th>2017 (n=114)</th>
<th>2018 (n=76)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dissatisfaction</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Study facilities available in the library

- **2016 (n=78):** 100%
- **2017 (n=99):** 94%
- **2018 (n=67):** 95%

### Library hours of operation

- **2016 (n=87):** 97%
- **2017 (n=108):** 97%
- **2018 (n=64):** 95%
Helpfulness of librarians

- 2016: 100% (n=94)
- 2017: 98% (n=110)
- 2018: 96% (n=70)

Overall adequacy of library services

- 2016: 98% (n=97)
- 2017: 95% (n=121)
- 2018: 96% (n=83)
## Summary Statistics: Library Resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Min.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Max.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Mean</strong></td>
<td><strong>Std Dev.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessibility of onsite library resources (e.g., books, journals)</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessibility of online library resources (e.g., books, journals online)</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessibility of search software (e.g., OVID, MD Consult, Micromedex)</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequacy of library collection</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study facilities available in the library</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library hours of operation</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helpfulness of librarians</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall adequacy of library services</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q15 Please indicate your level of satisfaction with each of the following statements:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>2016 (n=110)</th>
<th>2017 (n=131)</th>
<th>2018 (n=92)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Technology support (Help Desk)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combined Dissatisfaction Levels</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combined Satisfaction Levels</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interactive video broadcasting system (e.g., Webex)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combined Dissatisfaction Levels</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combined Satisfaction Levels</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1: Combined Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction Levels for Audio-video Equipment in Classrooms and Conference Rooms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Classrooms</th>
<th>Conference Rooms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Classrooms**
  - 2016: 10% dissatisfaction, 90% satisfaction
  - 2017: 8% dissatisfaction, 92% satisfaction
  - 2018: 6% dissatisfaction, 94% satisfaction

- **Conference Rooms**
  - 2016: 15% dissatisfaction, 85% satisfaction
  - 2017: 12% dissatisfaction, 88% satisfaction
  - 2018: 10% dissatisfaction, 90% satisfaction
Learning management system (e.g., Blackboard, Canvas)

- 2016 (n=81): 22% Satisfaction, 78% Dissatisfaction
- 2017 (n=96): 20% Satisfaction, 80% Dissatisfaction
- 2018 (n=62): 10% Satisfaction, 90% Dissatisfaction

Course evaluation system

- 2016 (n/a)
- 2017 (n=107): 20% Satisfaction, 80% Dissatisfaction
- 2018 (n=75): 14% Satisfaction, 86% Dissatisfaction
2018 Faculty Satisfaction Survey
Results Summary

Office of Institutional Research and Effectiveness

Availability of application software

- 2016 (n/a)
- 2017 (n=108)
- 2018 (n=78)

Usability of TTUHSC El Paso website

- 2016 (n/a)
- 2017 (n=129)
- 2018 (n=92)
## Summary Statistics: IT Resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Min.</td>
<td>Max.</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology support (Help Desk)</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interactive video broadcasting system (e.g., Webex)</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audio-video equipment in classrooms</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audio-video equipment in conference rooms</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning management system (e.g., Blackboard, Canvas)</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course evaluation system*</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability of application software*</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Usability of TTUHSC El Paso website*</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: Items were not introduced until the 2017 iteration of the survey.
Q16 Overall, how satisfied are you with being an employee at TTUHSC El Paso?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Min.</th>
<th>Max.</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std Dev.</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Combined Dissatisfaction Levels</th>
<th>Combined Satisfaction Levels</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>17.8%</td>
<td>82.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>26.1%</td>
<td>73.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>18.5%</td>
<td>81.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q17 Please indicate your level of agreement when reading the following statement: I feel I have adequate time to devote to...

**Managing a research group or grant (e.g., finances, personnel)**

- **2016 (n=80)**: 44% Dissatisfaction, 56% Satisfaction
- **2017 (n=98)**: 54% Dissatisfaction, 46% Satisfaction
- **2018 (n=68)**: 43% Dissatisfaction, 57% Satisfaction

**Submitting research grant proposals**

- **2016 (n=79)**: 47% Dissatisfaction, 53% Satisfaction
- **2017 (n=101)**: 38% Dissatisfaction, 62% Satisfaction
- **2018 (n=69)**: 56% Dissatisfaction, 44% Satisfaction
2018 Faculty Satisfaction Survey
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Scholarly productivity

- 2016 (n=98): 41% Dissatisfaction, 59% Satisfaction
- 2017 (n=124): 49% Dissatisfaction, 51% Satisfaction
- 2018 (n=89): 29% Dissatisfaction, 71% Satisfaction

Teaching responsibilities

- 2016 (n=105): 17% Dissatisfaction, 83% Satisfaction
- 2017 (n=124): 22% Dissatisfaction, 78% Satisfaction
- 2018 (n=90): 11% Dissatisfaction, 89% Satisfaction
2018 Faculty Satisfaction Survey
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Clinical responsibilities

2016 (n=81) 2017 (n=102) 2018 (n=73)

- Combined Dissatisfaction Levels
- Combined Satisfaction Levels
### Summary Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Time Allotment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managing a research group or grant (e.g., finances, personnel)</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submitting research grant proposals</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarly productivity</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching responsibilities</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advising responsibilities</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committee and/or administrative responsibilities</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinical responsibilities</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Combined Disagreement Levels</strong></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Managing a research group or grant (e.g., finances, personnel)</td>
<td>43.8%</td>
<td></td>
<td>43.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submitting research grant proposals</td>
<td>46.8%</td>
<td></td>
<td>50.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scholarly productivity</td>
<td>38.8%</td>
<td></td>
<td>50.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching responsibilities</td>
<td>23.8%</td>
<td></td>
<td>25.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advising responsibilities</td>
<td>23.3%</td>
<td></td>
<td>27.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committee and/or administrative responsibilities</td>
<td>23.9%</td>
<td></td>
<td>27.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinical responsibilities</td>
<td>16.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td>14.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q18 Please indicate the extent to which each of the following aspects of WORK has been a source of stress for you over the past twelve months.

- **Committee and/or administrative responsibilities**
  - 2016 (n=102): 45% Not At All, 34% Somewhat, 21% Extensive
  - 2017 (n=123): 43% Not At All, 47% Somewhat, 27% Extensive
  - 2018 (n=88): 47% Not At All, 44% Somewhat, 19% Extensive

- **Review/promotion process**
  - 2016 (n=98): 45% Not At All, 38% Somewhat, 11% Extensive
  - 2017 (n=101): 45% Not At All, 38% Somewhat, 17% Extensive
  - 2018 (n=82): 47% Not At All, 43% Somewhat, 20% Extensive
2018 Faculty Satisfaction Survey
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Work politics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Not At All</th>
<th>Somewhat</th>
<th>Extensive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016 (n=99)</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017 (n=126)</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018 (n=90)</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Unequal treatment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Not At All</th>
<th>Somewhat</th>
<th>Extensive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016 (n=100)</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017 (n=120)</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018 (n=89)</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Uncertain or undefined job expectations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Not At All</th>
<th>Somewhat</th>
<th>Extensive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Lack of community at work

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Not At All</th>
<th>Somewhat</th>
<th>Extensive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Other

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2016 (n=18)</th>
<th>2017 (n=24)</th>
<th>2018 (n=14)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not At All</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extensive</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- 2016 (n=18)
- 2017 (n=24)
- 2018 (n=14)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question: Work Stress</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>2017</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>2018</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Min.</td>
<td>Max.</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Std Dev.</td>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>Somewhat</td>
<td>Extensive</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>Min.</td>
<td>Max.</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Std Dev.</td>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>Somewhat</td>
<td>Extensive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committee and/or administrative responsibilities</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>37.6%</td>
<td>42.6%</td>
<td>19.8%</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>47.2%</td>
<td>19.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review/promotion process</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>44.9%</td>
<td>33.7%</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>37.6%</td>
<td>45.5%</td>
<td>16.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work politics</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>27.6%</td>
<td>35.7%</td>
<td>36.7%</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>27.8%</td>
<td>34.9%</td>
<td>37.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unequal treatment</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>57.6%</td>
<td>27.3%</td>
<td>15.2%</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>56.7%</td>
<td>25.8%</td>
<td>17.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncertain or undefined job expectations</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>39.2%</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>55.6%</td>
<td>28.2%</td>
<td>16.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of community at work</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>53.9%</td>
<td>30.4%</td>
<td>15.7%</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>54.0%</td>
<td>29.8%</td>
<td>16.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>44.4%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>44.4%</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Mean differences between 2016 and 2018 and 2017 and 2018 are statistically significant (p < .05).
Q19 In the last five years, while at TTUHSC El Paso, have you received outside official job offer(s)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer: Job Offers</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes, and I took the offer(s) to my department head or dean</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, and I did not take the offer(s) to my department head or dean</td>
<td>48.6%</td>
<td>49.6%</td>
<td>34.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>45.8%</td>
<td>45.0%</td>
<td>61.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q20 In the next three years how likely are you to leave TTUHSC El Paso, including for retirement?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summary Statistics: Likelihood of leaving TTUHSCEP</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In the next three years how likely are you to leave TTUHSC El Paso, including for retirement?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Min.</td>
<td>Max.</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Std Dev.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q21 To what extent, if at all, have you considered the following as reasons to leave in the next three years?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>2016 (n=102)</th>
<th>2017 (n=126)</th>
<th>2018 (n=32)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To increase your salary</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To improve your prospect for tenure</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Bar charts showing the percentage of faculty who considered each reason to leave, with data from 2016, 2017, and 2018.
To enhance your career

- Not at all
- To some extent
- To a great extent

2016 (n=101) 2017 (n=126) 2018 (n=31)

To find a more supportive work environment

- Not at all
- To some extent
- To a great extent

2016 (n=99) 2017 (n=127) 2018 (n=31)
To increase your time to do research

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2016 (n=98)</th>
<th>2017 (n=117)</th>
<th>2018 (n=32)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To some extent</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To a great extent</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To pursue a nonacademic job

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2016 (n=98)</th>
<th>2017 (n=123)</th>
<th>2018 (n=32)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To some extent</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To a great extent</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2018 Faculty Satisfaction Survey
Results Summary

To reduce stress

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>To some extent</th>
<th>To a great extent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To address child-related issues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>To some extent</th>
<th>To a great extent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
To address other family-related issues

- 2016 (n=96): 25% Not at all, 34% To some extent, 60% To a great extent
- 2017 (n=125): 24% Not at all, 50% To some extent, 25% To a great extent
- 2018 (n=32): 69% Not at all, 34% To some extent, 15% To a great extent

To improve the employment situation of your spouse or partner

- 2016 (n=93): 12% Not at all, 75% To some extent, 13% To a great extent
- 2017 (n=122): 20% Not at all, 71% To some extent, 10% To a great extent
- 2018 (n=32): 16% Not at all, 69% To some extent, 15% To a great extent
For health reasons

- 2016 (n=99): 95% not at all, 4% to some extent, 1% to a great extent
- 2017 (n=123): 93% not at all, 7% to some extent, 0% to a great extent
- 2018 (n=31): 95% not at all, 4% to some extent, 1% to a great extent

Current appointment ending

- 2016 (n=92): 95% not at all, 4% to some extent, 1% to a great extent
- 2017 (n=119): 93% not at all, 7% to some extent, 0% to a great extent
- 2018 (n=29): 93% not at all, 7% to some extent, 0% to a great extent
2018 Faculty Satisfaction Survey
Results Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2016 (n=97)</th>
<th>2017 (n=120)</th>
<th>2018 (n=32)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Retirement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To some extent</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To a great extent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2016 (n=18)</th>
<th>2017 (n=25)</th>
<th>2018 (&lt;5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To some extent</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To a great extent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## 2018 Faculty Satisfaction Survey
### Results Summary

**Office of Institutional Research and Effectiveness**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question: Reasons for Leaving</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Min.</td>
<td>Max.</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To increase your salary</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To improve your prospect for tenure</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To enhance your career</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To find a more supportive work environment</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To increase your time to do research</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To pursue a nonacademic job</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To reduce stress</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To address child-related issues</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To address other family-related issues</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To improve the employment situation of your spouse or partner</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For health reasons</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current appointment ending</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retirement</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q22 How many years have you worked at TTUHSC El Paso?

![Bar chart showing years employed at TTUHSC El Paso for 2016, 2017, and 2018]

- **Years Employed**
  - 0-5 years
  - 6-10 years
  - 11-15 years
  - 16-20 years
  - 21 or more years

- **2016 (n=102)**
  - 0-5 years: 40%
  - 6-10 years: 12%
  - 11-15 years: 8%
  - 16-20 years: 3%
  - 21 or more years: 7%

- **2017 (n=119)**
  - 0-5 years: 50%
  - 6-10 years: 11%
  - 11-15 years: 8%
  - 16-20 years: 3%
  - 21 or more years: 3%

- **2018 (n=90)**
  - 0-5 years: 57%
  - 6-10 years: 8%
  - 11-15 years: 11%
  - 16-20 years: 3%
  - 21 or more years: 3%
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer: Years Employed</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-5 years</td>
<td>40.2%</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>50.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10 years</td>
<td>30.4%</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>30.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15 years</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-20 years</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 or more years</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q23 What is your gender?

![Bar chart showing gender distribution over years]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Transgender</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Prefer not to answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016 (n=99)</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017 (n=124)</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018 (n=93)</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Answer: Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2016</th>
<th></th>
<th>2017</th>
<th></th>
<th>2018</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>42.4%</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>34.7%</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>39.8%</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>57.6%</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>49.2%</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>44.1%</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transgender*</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>n &lt; 5</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other*</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>n &lt; 5</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>n &lt; 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefer not to answer*</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>14.5%</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15.1%</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: Items were not introduced until the 2017 iteration of the survey.*
Q24 What is your race and/or Ethnicity? Mark all that apply.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race/Ethnicity</th>
<th>2016 (n=96)</th>
<th>2017 (n=124)</th>
<th>2018 (n=98)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American Indian or Alaska Native</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or African American</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic or Latino</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefer not to answer</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Answer: Race/Ethnicity</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td></td>
<td>2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian or Alaska Native</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or African American</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>n &lt; 5</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic or Latino</td>
<td>36.5%</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>33.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>38.5%</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>37.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefer not to answer*</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>23.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: Item was not introduced until the 2017 iteration of the survey.
Q25 Do you consider yourself multilingual (able to converse fluently in a language other than English)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer: Multilingual</th>
<th>2016(^a)</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>68.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>31.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\)Note: Item was not introduced until the 2017 iteration of the survey.