SURVEY OF FACULTY OPINION ABOUT PERFORMANCE EVALUATIONS AND JOB RESPONSIBILITIES

Introduction

The results of a "Survey of Faculty Opinion about Performance Evaluations and Job Responsibilities" are attached. The results are presented in three parts.

1. Selected quantitative results from both Tenure Line and Non-Tenure Line faculty members. (p. 2 & 5)
2. Complete quantitative results and selected qualitative quotes from Tenure Line faculty members (p. 10)
3. Complete quantitative results and selected qualitative quotes from Non-Tenure Line faculty members (p. 28)

Background

The survey was conducted on Qualtrics. A link to the survey was emailed to a total of 736 DU faculty members (696 full time and 40 part-time) in the fall of 2015. Several reminders to fill out the survey were sent. A total of 264 tenure-line faculty members and 103 non-tenure line faculty members responded (for a response rate of 50%).

The survey asked respondents about their opinions on several review processes: annual reviews, promotion and tenure reviews, and contract reviews. Faculty members were also asked to respond to questions about developmental review opportunities and about their feelings of belongingness at DU.

Several open-ended (qualitative) prompts followed the closed-ended (quantitative) survey questions:

1. What, if any, additional faculty contributions should be captured (on annual performance reviews)?
2. Is there anything else about the (annual) performance review process that you would like to share with the committee?
3. Is there anything else about the tenure process that you would like to share with the committee?
4. Is there anything else about the contract review process that you would like to share with the committee?
5. What professional development opportunities at DU promote high quality work?
6. Is there anything else you would like to share with the committee about your experiences at DU?

The qualitative data consisted of 52 single-spaced pages of quotes in response to the 6 open-ended queries noted above. Two of the report authors, who are experts in qualitative methods, reviewed the quotes for apparent patterns of responses. Quotes that suggested a pattern of responses among the other quotes were pasted directly into the report to illustrate the quantitative results. Time limits did not allow for a more formal thematic analysis of these data. However, the 2 authors adhered to ethical qualitative research practice in order to provide an objective rendering of the qualitative data.

Report created by (in alphabetical order): Nicole Nicotera, Ph.D., Charles (Chip) Reichardt, Ph.D., and Kate Willink, Ph.D.

**SURVEY OF FACULTY OPINION ABOUT PERFORMANCE EVALUATIONS
AND JOB RESPONSIBILITIES**

I. SELECTED RESULTS
for both TENURE LINE AND NON-TENURE LINE Faculty

Selected Results for TENURE LINE Faculty
(N = 264)

One reason faculty are reviewed is to assess annual performance and determine merit raises. The following set of questions pertains to your experience with annual performance reviews used to determine merit raises.

1. I believe this is a fair process for evaluating performance.
- 8% Not at all fair
- 20% Somewhat fair
- 14% Neither fair nor unfair
- 40% Fair
- 19% Very fair

2. This performance review process takes into account all important faculty contributions.
- 10% Strongly Disagree
- 19% Disagree
- 15% Neither Agree nor Disagree
- 41% Agree
- 15% Strongly Agree

Traditional performance evaluation of tenure track and tenured faculty is 40% research, scholarship, and creative activities; 40% teaching; and 20% service. The following questions pertain to your experiences with and opinions of this type of evaluation.

3. I am evaluated according to this formula.
- 9% Strongly Disagree
- 25% Disagree
- 19% Neither Agree nor Disagree
- 37% Agree
- 10% Strongly Agree

4. This formula is an appropriate way to evaluate faculty pre-tenure.
- 4% Strongly Disagree
- 16% Disagree
- 20% Neither Agree nor Disagree
- 48% Agree
- 12% Strongly Agree

**SURVEY OF FACULTY OPINION ABOUT PERFORMANCE EVALUATIONS
AND JOB RESPONSIBILITIES**

5. This formula is an appropriate way to evaluate faculty post-tenure.
    - 7%   Strongly Disagree
    - 23%   Disagree
    - 24%   Neither Agree nor Disagree
    - 33%   Agree
    - 12%   Strongly Agree

6. I would like the option to negotiate a shift in allocation of job responsibilities (from a traditional 40% research, scholarship, and creative activities; 40% teaching; and 20% service) post tenure.
    - 4%   Strongly Disagree
    - 14%   Disagree
    - 19%   Neither Agree nor Disagree
    - 39%   Agree
    - 24%   Strongly Agree

Some universities conduct developmental reviews where faculty receive professional development support over their career lifespan. The following questions will help us assess current developmental review practices at DU and gauge interest in modifying such practices.

7. What type of professional development reviews have you received? (Check all that apply)
    - 30%   Teaching
    - 29%   Research, Scholarship, and Creative Activities
    - 16%   Internal Funding
    - 14%   External Funding
    - 6%   Career Path Consultation
    - 17%   Other

8. I would like to receive direct professional development feedback not associated with pay, promotion, or contract.
    - 7%   Strongly Disagree
    - 12%   Disagree
    - 28%   Neither Agree nor Disagree
    - 40%   Agree
    - 13%   Strongly Agree

9. In general, professional development opportunities that already exist at DU are effective in promoting high quality faculty work.
    - 5%   Strongly Disagree
    - 25%   Disagree
    - 48%   Neither Agree nor Disagree
    - 19%   Agree
    - 3%   Strongly Agree

10. What motivates you, or could motivate you, to continue your professional
    development? (Check all that apply)
    - 49%   Expectation of tangible reward
    - 53%   Financial support for developmental activities
    - 74%   Increased time to devote to what I believe I do best
    - 35%   Greater feeling that I belong to a community of colleagues at DU
    - 26%   Opportunity to forge deeper connections with students
    - 39%   Evidence that such development would enable me to do a better job
    - 37%   Tools that would help me be more efficient at my job (e.g., grading
             papers, submitting publications)
    - 24%   Being mentored
    - 8%   Other

One reason faculty members might be evaluated is to identify unsatisfactory
performance and determine whether remedial measures are necessary. The
following questions pertain to evaluations related to remedial measures.

11. I think faculty should be reviewed for this purpose.
    - 4%   Strongly Disagree
    - 9%   Disagree
    - 17%   Neither Agree nor Disagree
    - 48%   Agree
    - 22%   Strongly Agree

12. What should be the potential consequence for unsatisfactory performance in
    your academic unit? (Check all that apply)
    - 67%   Mentoring/coaching
    - 61%   Negotiated development plan
    - 50%   Negotiated development timeline
    - 53%   Negotiated change in allocation of duties in current post (e.g.,
             teaching, research/creation)
    - 38%   Negotiated change of responsibilities within the university
    - 46%   Lower or nonexistent pay raises
    - 45%   In rare cases of chronic and remedied deficiencies: sterner measures.
    - 9%   Other

The following items refer to your experience at DU.

13. I feel a sense of belonging in my academic unit.
    - 7%   Strongly Disagree
    - 12%   Disagree
    - 11%   Neither Agree nor Disagree
    - 40%   Agree
    - 30%   Strongly Agree

14. I feel a sense of belonging at DU.
    - 7%   Strongly Disagree
    - 13% Disagree
    - 21% Neither Agree nor Disagree
    - 42% Agree
    - 18% Strongly Agree

15. I feel valued for the ways that I contribute to the university.
    - 10% Strongly Disagree
    - 18% Disagree
    - 20% Neither Agree nor Disagree
    - 37% Agree
    - 16% Strongly Agree

16. What is your college, school, or division?
    - 4%   Daniel Felix Ritchie School of Engineering and Computer Science
    - 10% Daniels College of Business
    - 35% Divisions of Arts, Humanities and Social Sciences
    - 16% Divisions of Natural Sciences and Mathematics
    - 6%   Josef Korbel School of International Studies
    - 2%   Graduate School of Professional Psychology (GSPP)
    - 5%   Graduate School of Social Work (GSSW)
    - 5%   Morgridge College of Education
    - 3%   The Sturm College of Law
    - 1%   Other
    - 13% Choose not to report

Selected Results for NON-TENURE LINE Faculty
(N = 103)

One reason faculty are reviewed is to assess annual performance and determine merit raises. The following set of questions pertains to your experience with annual performance reviews used to determine merit raises.

1. I believe this is a fair process for evaluating performance.
    - 8%   Not at all fair
    - 15% Somewhat fair
    - 17% Neither fair nor unfair
    - 54% Fair
    - 6%   Very fair

2. This performance review process takes into account all important faculty contributions.
    - 5%   Strongly Disagree

19%   Disagree
23%   Neither Agree nor Disagree
38%   Agree
15%   Strongly Agree

Non-tenure-line faculty members are often evaluated with regard to their contract renewal. The following questions pertain to the criteria for reviewing non-tenure-line faculty members.

3. I am aware of these criteria.
  7%   Strongly Disagree
11%   Disagree
17%   Neither Agree nor Disagree
51%   Agree
14%   Strongly Agree

4. I believe these criteria are fair.
4%   Strongly Disagree
12%   Disagree
31%   Neither Agree nor Disagree
50%   Agree
  4%   Strongly Agree

5. I believe these criteria promote high quality work.
10%   Strongly Disagree
16%   Disagree
34%   Neither Agree nor Disagree
36%   Agree
  5%   Strongly Agree

6. I receive adequate support to meet these criteria.
  6%   Strongly Disagree
14%   Disagree
26%   Neither Agree nor Disagree
42%   Agree
13%   Strongly Agree

Some universities conduct developmental reviews where faculty receive professional development support over their career lifespan. The following questions will help us assess current developmental review practices at DU and gauge interest in modifying such practices.

7. What type of professional development reviews have you received? (Check all that apply)
50%   Teaching

    20%   Research, Scholarship, and Creative Activities
    10%   Internal Funding
     1%   External Funding
     7%   Career Path Consultation
    18%   Other

8. I would like to receive direct professional development feedback not associated with pay, promotion, or contract.
     2%   Strongly Disagree
     4%   Disagree
    23%   Neither Agree nor Disagree
    53%   Agree
    17%   Strongly Agree

9. In general, professional development opportunities that already exist at DU are effective in promoting high quality faculty work.
     2%   Strongly Disagree
    15%   Disagree
    43%   Neither Agree nor Disagree
    38%   Agree
     2%   Strongly Agree

10. What motivates you, or could motivate you, to continue your professional development? (Check all that apply)
    47%   Expectation of tangible reward
    59%   Financial support for developmental activities
    54%   Increased time to devote to what I believe I do best
    52%   Greater feeling that I belong to a community of colleagues at DU
    42%   Opportunity to forge deeper connections with students
    44%   Evidence that such development would enable me to do a better job
    47%   Tools that would help me be more efficient at my job (e.g., grading papers, submitting publications)
    23%   Being mentored
     8%   Other

One reason faculty members might be evaluated is to identify unsatisfactory performance and determine whether remedial measures are necessary. The following questions pertain to evaluations related to remedial measures.

11. I think faculty should be reviewed for this purpose.
     1%   Strongly Disagree
     2%   Disagree
    13%   Neither Agree nor Disagree
    50%   Agree
    34%   Strongly Agree

12. What should be the potential consequence for unsatisfactory performance in
    your academic unit? (Check all that apply)
    - 73% Mentoring/coaching
    - 75% Negotiated development plan
    - 64% Negotiated development timeline
    - 40% Negotiated change in allocation of duties in current post (e.g.,
            teaching, research/creation)
    - 33% Negotiated change of responsibilities within the university
    - 38% Lower or nonexistent pay raises
    - 56% In rare cases of chronic and remedied deficiencies: sterner measures.
    - 8%   Other

The following items refer to your experience at DU.

13. I feel a sense of belonging in my academic unit.
    - 4%   Strongly Disagree
    - 7%   Disagree
    - 12% Neither Agree nor Disagree
    - 48% Agree
    - 28% Strongly Agree

14. I feel a sense of belonging at DU.
    - 2%   Strongly Disagree
    - 14% Disagree
    - 16% Neither Agree nor Disagree
    - 52% Agree
    - 16% Strongly Agree

15. I feel valued for the ways that I contribute to the university.
    - 3%   Strongly Disagree
    - 14% Disagree
    - 22% Neither Agree nor Disagree
    - 52% Agree
    - 10% Strongly Agree

16. What is your college, school, or division?
    - 4%   Daniel Felix Ritchie School of Engineering and Computer Science
    - 12% Daniels College of Business
    - 16% Divisions of Arts, Humanities and Social Sciences
    - 9%   Divisions of Natural Sciences and Mathematics
    - 4%   Josef Korbel School of International Studies
    - 2%   Graduate School of Professional Psychology (GSPP)
    - 7%   Graduate School of Social Work (GSSW)
    - 5%   Morgridge College of Education

3%   The Sturm College of Law
19%   Other
18%   Choose not to report

**SURVEY OF FACULTY OPINION ABOUT PERFORMANCE EVALUATIONS
AND JOB RESPONSIBILITIES**

II.   Complete Results for TENURE LINE Faculty
(N = 264)

1. What are the reasons your performance has been and/or will be reviewed?
    (Check all that apply)
    97%   Merit-raise determination (e.g., annual review)
    56%   Progress toward tenure (e.g., 3rd year review)
    52%   Progress toward promotion
    3%   Contract review
    5%   Remediation (e.g., assessment of teacher/teaching effectiveness;
            assessment of publication record)
    8%   Professional Development outside of annual review (e.g., formal
            discussion about career progress).

2. One reason faculty are reviewed is to assess annual performance and determine merit raises. The following set of questions pertains to your experience with annual performance reviews used to determine merit raises.

    Who conducts your performance review? (Check all that apply)
        71%   Chair
        21%   Committee
        47%   Dean
        5%   Other

    How do you receive feedback?
        15%   Meeting
        17%   Letter
        64%   Both
        4%   Other

    How are you reviewed? (Check all that apply)
        92%   Activity Insight Report
        41%   Individual case-by-case qualitative feedback
        14%   Point system
        8%   Other

- Activity Insight simply cannot capture the diverse ways faculty perform and create. It is a pinhole view of our work.

- I rarely receive feedback that is helpful. Primarily a pat on the back; keep up the good work. But I guess this lack of rigor fits well with a the incredibly small amount of institutional merit raise (less than inflation) available.

- An annual snapshot of progress provides incentives to get something published, rather than to try to get more important work published that

might have a broader impact. Listing publications for a three-year window (specified and uniform for everyone) might provide more incentive to try to publish more meaningful, albeit potentially fewer, pieces.

- It would be nice if on top of the annual review there would also be a 3-year or 5-year review for additional merit increases, as often it is easier to assess a researcher over such extended period of time.

- When it is done in good faith and with high quality standards, it works well. However, when faculty, Chairs, Deans do not take it seriously, shoddy performance can continue.

- For me, meeting with the dean as part of the third year review was beneficial.

3. I believe this is a fair process for evaluating performance.
     8%   Not at all fair
     20%   Somewhat fair
     14%   Neither fair nor unfair
     40%   Fair
     19%   Very fair

NOTE– The qualitative prompts <u>did not</u> specify which sets of criteria the respondents were considering when they replied so the quotes about fairness are distributed between the promotion to associate and promotion to full and annual performance review.

- Teaching quality is exclusively evaluated according to student satisfaction on student "course evaluations." There is a growing scholarly literature that documents how problematic this "short cut" is. Also, response rates have plummeted since the transition to online-only evaluations, even when class time is provided to students to complete course evaluations.

- The hundreds of hours I spend working with students is reduced to the number of students I teach, and absolutely no interest or attention is shown to what that teaching looks like or the amount of time it requires. Although I receive strong evaluations and strong reviews in general, the experience of being reviewed is alienating and highlights, for me, the fact that those in the administration have no idea what my colleagues and I do, and little interest in finding out.

- It is a very involved and time consuming process for what amounts to minimal salary increases. Faculty who go above and beyond the call of duty in research, teaching, and service--which is common in my department--essentially get very little compensation relative to people who do well but are not as outstanding year to year.

- Decisions about merit raises are completely lacking in transparency. I have absolutely no idea what factors are used in determining raises. While I have been very pleased with my raises thus far, I have no idea what I did well so I can't know for sure how to continue to do well. A more transparent process is urgently needed.

- When I select the option "neither fair nor unfair" above, it is because I have no way of judging that question - I do not know what feedback others receive, I do not know what others are compensated. I can only take my annual review as it applies to me in a vacuum. I'm not sure what the solution is, but I simply assume the system is not fair.

- It's not entirely equitable and the inequities can add up with length of service.

- Certain faculty members are allowed to get away with things that others are not. This creates inequities and distrust.

- I wish there were greater rewards for those of us who carry the service work. Some faculty will never do it and don't mind making the rest of us do it for them. Those of us who step up should be rewarded for it. I don't get a sense from the annual review process that this is the case. It seems we're still rewarded mostly for publications.

NOTE- There were no qualitative entries suggesting a pattern of responses to describe why or what factors were related to faculty agreeing that the criteria are fair.

4. This performance review process takes into account all important faculty
   contributions.
   - 10% Strongly Disagree
   - 19% Disagree
   - 15% Neither Agree nor Disagree
   - 41% Agree
   - 15% Strongly Agree

- Faculty of color have additional "tax" in that students of color often come to them with concerns, issues, etc. This "work" is not captured in contributions.

- This system seems to favor publications and standard university committee work, etc. It does not look at issues like the complexity of advising loads, or the relational aspects of the work we do with the students. Additionally, there is not a place to discuss the depth of contribution of activities such as doing an independent study (though you can note it) or of working in collaboration with peers on an internal process/changing the WAY we do our work--very hard to quantify in this technical system.

SURVEY OF FACULTY OPINION ABOUT PERFORMANCE EVALUATIONS AND JOB RESPONSIBILITIES

- Service, as always, is undervalued relative to the time spent in these activities.

- The performance review process is incapable of capturing interdisciplinarity at any stage in its development. It is incapable of measuring, incentivizing, rewarding such.

The following questions pertain to the criteria and review process for attaining tenure.

5. I am aware of the criteria for attaining tenure in my academic unit.
   - 2%   Strongly Disagree
   - 4%   Disagree
   - 8%   Neither Agree nor Disagree
   - 48%   Agree
   - 38%   Strongly Agree

6. I believe these criteria are fair.
   - 2%   Strongly Disagree
   - 6%   Disagree
   - 18%   Neither Agree nor Disagree
   - 49%   Agree
   - 26%   Strongly Agree

- It's not that I think that there is some area of faculty contributions that are not captured per se. Rather, my issue with the process is that it has always been opaque, and has become more so in the last few years. Rumors about favoritism are rampant and making the process more transparent would help to build confidence in the process.

- It's too damn arbitrary. So much depends on who is on the Divisional Committee in any particular year.

- It is difficult to evaluate faculty fairly because different "generations" of faculty have been hired under different expectations and performance standards have shifted over time at DU. Faculty who have been here longer are sometimes resentful that their service contributions are not sufficiently recognized. While newer faculty may feel that their research/creative work may not be sufficiently recognized. It is also extremely frustrating that different departments within the same division have different teaching loads while standards for promotion are the same for the division - i.e., work loads vary but expectations of productivity are the same.

- There seems to be a ratchet-up effect, whereby each candidate must clear the bar set by predecessors, even if an individual predecessor was exceptional and most other candidates did not achieve nearly as much. Ditto for promotion to full.

NOTE- There were no qualitative entries suggesting a pattern of responses to describe why or what factors were related to faculty agreeing that the criteria are fair.

7. I am confident the criteria promote high quality work.
    - 2%   Strongly Disagree
    - 14%   Disagree
    - 22%   Neither Agree nor Disagree
    - 48%   Agree
    - 14%   Strongly Agree
- I am new so I am not sure if this is the case, but my impression is that our teaching is never directly observed as part of our performance review. That is, when someone goes up for a third-year review or a tenure review, the department chair or members of the review committee don't visit his classes to observe his teaching(?). It seems like direct observation of teaching would be important, if that's a really valued part of what we do.

- The heavy reliance on student evaluations perpetuates biases against minorities and women.

- The criteria are fine. The implementation sometimes is politically motivated.

- Once again, I've seen colleagues with terrible course evaluations and clearly very little interest in teaching move past tenure b/c their publications are sufficient. Whereas outstanding teachers who have produced a little less may have trouble getting tenure. This is discouraging for other faculty who deeply care about students, and see that the institution doesn't take the quality of teaching that happens here very seriously

- In my dept./unit there does not seem to be any uniform standard for what constitutes a criteria for tenure and promotion. I often heard people say "one book," without distinguishing the significance or length, presses, content (academic versus non-academic. Our process also seems to place very little importance on quality of teaching and service, especially advising, the quality of which can vary widely. These concerns get into the problem of grade inflation and the belief that higher grades will result in better student evaluations. This can also reflected in the amount of feedback given, with higher grades correlating to less the feedback. Some faculty simply aren't fulfilling their responsibilities in these areas and it affects the moral of students and their faculty in serious ways.

8. I receive/d adequate support to meet these criteria.
   6% Strongly Disagree
   13% Disagree
   24% Neither Agree nor Disagree
   39% Agree
   18% Strongly Agree

- There is no development aspect of the process; only evaluations of research and service. After the evaluation, you are just expected to continuing doing a great job or improve whatever the case may be.

- Until the University is willing to put real resources--and good ones--into supporting and mentoring faculty who have issues and doesn't have that fall to the chairs with no resources provided I fear that evaluation of faculty is unlikely to bring out the highest potential in each faculty member

9. These criteria take into account all important faculty contributions.
   6% Strongly Disagree
   21% Disagree
   16% Neither Agree nor Disagree
   45% Agree
   13% Strongly Agree

- Even within the same department, research practice and culture is different in each discipline (i.e., individual). It is impossible to define a standardized evaluation rubric for everyone and I don't think there is anything practical that we can do other than individualized annual reviews that we already practice. But even these reviews, because of the differences, may not mean much when performance is compared relatively among colleagues.

- How do we as a university incentive work for the collective good when what is rewarded in the annual review is generally personal performance? If we want collaboration and dedication to the public good we need to reward all the labor that goes into achieving it.

- The tenure process does not capture the whole academic: educator, mentor, researcher, and colleague

- I have been at DU for 30 years and have generally been very happy with the arch of my career. I have felt that the University underestimates service, mentoring and the amount of time many of us spend with students and other faculty in meetings, mentoring situations, etc.

10. What percentage of the range of your contributions do these criteria capture?
   1% 10

0%	20
3%	30
2%	40
5%	50
4%	60
14%	70
26%	80
30%	90
17%	100

Some faculty members are evaluated for purposes of promotion to full professor. The following questions pertain to the criteria and review process for attaining full professor.

11. I am aware of the criteria.

6%	Strongly Disagree
21%	Disagree
13%	Neither Agree nor Disagree
34%	Agree
26%	Strongly Agree

- I feel like the expectations and timeline for promotion from associate to full professor has not been well explained.

- I know nothing about what is required to advance to full professor in my department.

- No one has ever had a discussion with me about how to qualify for full professor promotion. There is no guidance.

  - Preparation for promotion to full professorship should systematically be made part of the review process after tenure has been granted.

12. I believe these criteria are fair.

2%	Strongly Disagree
8%	Disagree
39%	Neither Agree nor Disagree
36%	Agree
15%	Strongly Agree

- Point system gives the appearance of equity, but is subject to unaddressed institutional cultural problems with bias (ethnicity, gender, sexual orientation, etc.), limitations of all faculty to access and connect with decision-makers/evaluators, assumption about faculty contributions, and favoritism.

- If one really wanted to ask about fairness, one would have to consider salary, benefits, and support staff. Those questions would probably make fairness marginal at best.

13. I am confident the criteria promote high quality work.
    - 4%   Strongly Disagree
    - 11%   Disagree
    - 36%   Neither Agree nor Disagree
    - 37%   Agree
    - 11%   Strongly Agree

14. I receive/d adequate support to meet these criteria.
    - 8%   Strongly Disagree
    - 18%   Disagree
    - 40%   Neither Agree nor Disagree
    - 25%   Agree
    - 10%   Strongly Agree

- It seems that post tenure there is little consideration and support for developing an academic career.

- Service and the time involved as well as teaching--evaluated in a fair way, don't count. And the time involved in these activities means that one doesn't have an appropriate amount of time to do the research that promotion requires. it's a Catch-22. Were on a 9-month salary and expected, if we want promotion to full professor, to work 12 months and on the weekends to achieve this goal.

- It is challenging to have all the many functions of the review reside in one 45 minute interaction per year (after tenure).

15. What percentage of the range of your contributions do these criteria capture?
    - 0%   10
    - 1%   20
    - 3%   30
    - 2%   40
    - 11%   50
    - 8%   60
    - 12%   70
    - 23%   80
    - 24%   90
    - 16%   100

Traditional performance evaluation of tenure track and tenured faculty is 40% research, scholarship, and creative activities; 40% teaching; and 20% service. The

following questions pertain to your experiences with and opinions of this type of evaluation.

16. I am evaluated according to this formula.
- 9%   Strongly Disagree
- 25%   Disagree
- 19%   Neither Agree nor Disagree
- 37%   Agree
- 10%   Strongly Agree

17. This formula is an appropriate way to evaluate faculty pre-tenure.
- 4%   Strongly Disagree
- 16%   Disagree
- 20%   Neither Agree nor Disagree
- 48%   Agree
- 12%   Strongly Agree

18. This formula is an appropriate way to evaluate faculty post-tenure.
- 7%   Strongly Disagree
- 23%   Disagree
- 24%   Neither Agree nor Disagree
- 33%   Agree
- 12%   Strongly Agree

- With Teaching Professors, now all faculty are expected to do 20% service, but the math doesn't work out. Tenured faculty are evaluated for 20% service but teach 5 courses in my department (40% teaching) and do research (40% research). Teaching professors pend 80% on teaching, but teach 6 courses. Thus, how can the split actually be 20% for them also. Are we as tenured faculty somehow magically able to spend 40% of our time teaching 5 classes and yet it takes 80% of the time for Teaching Professors to teach 6 classes (note, the Provost stated that salary can't be taken into consideration). This must mean that Teaching faculty are expected to do more service, and yet I find that my service load has increased dramatically since getting tenure. I rarely have time to do much beyond teaching and service!

19. I would like the option to negotiate a shift in allocation of job responsibilities (from a traditional 40% research, scholarship, and creative activities; 40% teaching; and 20% service) post tenure.
- 4%   Strongly Disagree
- 14%   Disagree
- 19%   Neither Agree nor Disagree
- 39%   Agree
- 24%   Strongly Agree

- Once you receive tenure you become tapped for more administrative and service focused responsibilities yet you are expected to continue with the same level of publication. I strongly think that after tenure there should be more flexibility in carving out a path towards full whether that be research, teaching or administrative service.

- Tenured faculty should be able to negotiate a different blend than the conventional 40/40/20, but this should be flexible and related to career stage. There are years when I would want to focus more on research, other years when I'd want to focus on developing my pedagogy, and other years when I might be involved with a high level of service. 40/40/20 every year, or proposing a different but permanent shift, does not reflect the realities of a long career arc in academia. The current annual review process is out of balance between the high level of (busy) work that goes into it, and the low level of result that comes out, both tangibly in the amount of merit increase available, and, at deeper levels, the amount of useful feedback that results. This process is directly related to levels of morale.

20. I think the best performance evaluation formula post-tenure is:

Research, Scholarship, & Creative Activities

1%	10
3%	20
23%	30
44%	40
15%	50
14%	60
1%	70
0%	80
0%	90
0%	100

Teaching

0%	10
7%	20
38%	30
43%	40
10%	50
2%	60
0%	70
0%	80
0%	90
0%	100

Service

22%	10
43%	20
28%	30
7%	40
0%	50
0%	60
0%	70
0%	80
0%	90
0%	100

21. If you are an associate professor and plan to stay at that rank, what are your reasons for not going up to full professor? (Check all that apply)

- 56%   N/A
- 1%   My department/chair will not let me be (or has advised me against being) considered for promotion.
- 4%   I believe the benefits are not sufficient to motivate me to do the necessary work.
- 1%   I don't want to be evaluated by my colleagues.
- 0%   I do not want to have my work evaluated within my discipline.
- 3%   I want to do research that is not recognized in my discipline or department.
- 5%   I am concerned that I cannot meet the standards for promotion in my academic unit.
- 3%   I am not interested in publishing as much as I would need to.
- 5%   I am unsure what it takes to be promoted.
- 1%   By staying an associate professor I retain greater freedom.
- 1%   It is more lucrative to stay at the associate professor rank and consult/take out outside income opportunities.
- 7%   Other

- At DU associate professors are called upon to do a great deal of service at the departmental, divisional and university levels. This takes time away from research and makes it difficult to attain full professor. I am amazed at how much more service I have done post-tenure compared to other schools. I have colleagues at many universities who are not allowed to take on major service roles (chair, associate chair, director of grad studies, etc.) until they are full professors.

Some universities conduct developmental reviews where faculty receive professional development support over their career lifespan. The following questions will help us assess current developmental review practices at DU and gauge interest in modifying such practices.

**SURVEY OF FACULTY OPINION ABOUT PERFORMANCE EVALUATIONS
AND JOB RESPONSIBILITIES**

22. What type of professional development reviews have you received? (Check all
    that apply
    30%   Teaching
    29%   Research, Scholarship, and Creative Activities
    16%   Internal Funding
    14%   External Funding
    6%   Career Path Consultation
    17%   Other

23. I would like to receive direct professional development feedback not associated
    with pay, promotion, or contract.
    7%   Strongly Disagree
    12%   Disagree
    28%   Neither Agree nor Disagree
    40%   Agree
    13%   Strongly Agree

24. In general, professional development opportunities that already exist at DU are
    effective in promoting high quality faculty work.
    5%   Strongly Disagree
    25%   Disagree
    48%   Neither Agree nor Disagree
    19%   Agree
    3%   Strongly Agree

- more opportunities to think about career choices
  -feedback from colleagues of career choices
  -more cutting-edge teaching training and substantial DU community
  collaboration and national engagement with teaching development
  organizations
  -more funding for research
  -funded development opportunities

- Greater support and training for pursuit of realistically obtainable grant
  funding. Greater utilization of expertise within the university (successful grant
  getting faculty) for mentoring/training junior faculty.

- OTL provides excellent support for the development of teaching proficiencies.
  We do not have a comparable set of development opportunities related to
  research. We are especially lacking in support for grant development when
  compared with other universities. Our ORSP offices are understaffed and
  overtaxed. Our pool of internal grant opportunities is also woefully small.

- There is good support for teaching development. It's tougher for research,
  which matters more for promotion to full. There isn't the support we all need in

terms of financial resources and time. (I'll also note that the last time we had a discussion about trying to provide more support by increasing the amount of full-pay sabbatical time for faculty from one quarter to two, we ended up *not* doing that, but we started having to provide extensive reports on our previous sabbaticals to get new ones. So an effort to improve conditions for faculty ended up creating more paperwork and fostered a sense that we don't "deserve" our sabbaticals. I fear that this effort will similarly end up being punitive rather than supportive for post-tenure faculty.)

25. What motivates you, or could motivate you, to continue your professional development? (Check all that apply)
    - 49%   Expectation of tangible reward
    - 53%   Financial support for developmental activities
    - 74%   Increased time to devote to what I believe I do best
    - 35%   Greater feeling that I belong to a community of colleagues at DU
    - 26%   Opportunity to forge deeper connections with students
    - 39%   Evidence that such development would enable me to do a better job
    - 37%   Tools that would help me be more efficient at my job (e.g., grading papers, submitting publications)
    - 24%   Being mentored
    - 8%   Other

One reason faculty members might be evaluated is to identify unsatisfactory performance and determine whether remedial measures are necessary. The following questions pertain to evaluations related to remedial measures.

26. I think faculty should be reviewed for this purpose.
    - 4%   Strongly Disagree
    - 9%   Disagree
    - 17%   Neither Agree nor Disagree
    - 48%   Agree
    - 22%   Strongly Agree

- ▪ I think that for the most part the annual review captures how one is doing, and perhaps more importantly, allows a direct dialogue with the chair about how you are doing (and sometimes vice versa). I am in a large department and I believe that the work required for assessment of faculty by the chair is already considerable (for the chair...especially coming as the academic year is getting started). I don't believe that there is a need for additional assessment and I think that this may in fact have a negative impact on the Department due to the need for additional faculty/dept. chair time.

27. What should be the potential consequence for unsatisfactory performance in your academic unit? (Check all that apply)
    - 67%   Mentoring/coaching

61%	Negotiated development plan
50%	Negotiated development timeline
53%	Negotiated change in allocation of duties in current post (e.g., teaching, research/creation)
38%	Negotiated change of responsibilities within the university
46%	Lower or nonexistent pay raises
45%	In rare cases of chronic and remedied deficiencies: sterner measures.
9%	Other

- I strongly believe that any post-tenure review process should be geared towards promoting positive faculty development, and should not be used to punish faculty who do not produce a great deal of scholarship (this "productivity" should also be weighed against quality teaching and service work that these faculty perform, which enhances the university).

- [Use] measurable learning outcomes. [Do a] wholistic evaluation. Some faculty are tenured on a 40 40 20 model and have not published anything in decades. That is essentially a 0 for 40% of their performance. Convert them to teaching professors with tenure and increase their teaching load

- Again, I am strongly in favor for treating productive faculty better. This requires evaluation. However, I do think we need to this in a flexible manner. For example, if someone is able to teach well but not publish, that should be permitted. But they should teach more and/or be rewarded less.

The following items refer to your experience at DU.

28. I feel a sense of belonging in my academic unit.

7%	Strongly Disagree
12%	Disagree
11%	Neither Agree nor Disagree
40%	Agree
30%	Strongly Agree

29. I feel a sense of belonging at DU.

7%	Strongly Disagree
13%	Disagree
21%	Neither Agree nor Disagree
42%	Agree
18%	Strongly Agree

- As mentioned previously, the sense of community at DU is one of the weakest qualities. This seems related to a larger sense among faculty that we aren't valued for what we do, which is the core of what DU is. There seems to be a growing imbalance with between faculty and administration, and that faculty

> expertise is underutilized. That DU continues to lag behind peer institutions in compensation and has relatively shorter sabbatical allowances than other is a problem. This combined with raising housing pries is very problematic.

- I continue to be disappointed at the lack of interest in a place for faculty to "hang out". This could be as simple as somewhere to get a (good) coffee. I find that British and European institutes realize the value of common meeting areas much more thanUS institutions, and that there, t has become a significant consideration among architects. This is where there is a chance to form interdisciplinary collaborations, exchange teaching ideas, feel more connected, get to know others, etc. We don't even have a place for faculty in our rather large department to eat lunch or have a coffee together! I am not sure if this is intentional or just a long-standing oversight.

- I really don't feel a strong sense of community at DU, as compared with other institutions where I have worked. Colleagues are friendly and supportive but I rarely have much meaningful interaction with them.

- The reason I don't feel a sense of belonging is because I have too much service and teaching work to do that I don't have time to participate in activities that would allow me to feel as if I belong.

30. I feel on top of the latest developments in my field.
- 0%   Strongly Disagree
- 4%   Disagree
- 16% Neither Agree nor Disagree
- 45% Agree
- 34% Strongly Agree

31. I have the freedom to teach what I want.
- 2%   Strongly Disagree
- 10% Disagree
- 15% Neither Agree nor Disagree
- 47% Agree
- 26% Strongly Agree

32. I have the freedom to conduct research about what I want.
- 1%   Strongly Disagree
- 2%   Disagree
- 6%   Neither Agree nor Disagree
- 38% Agree
- 54% Strongly Agree

- We have the freedom to teach what we want, research what we want and how we use our non-teaching time, but there is a small window of what "counts" for those

activities in terms of promotion and merit. We have a very limited view of success for faculty a DU and it seems to be getting narrower each year.

33. I am able to control how I spend my nonteaching time in my job.
- 4% Strongly Disagree
- 14% Disagree
- 16% Neither Agree nor Disagree
- 43% Agree
- 23% Strongly Agree

34. The amount of service I am asked to do is fair.
- 10% Strongly Disagree
- 19% Disagree
- 20% Neither Agree nor Disagree
- 40% Agree
- 12% Strongly Agree

35. There is an unreasonable amount of documentation and reporting that I am asked to do (e.g., activity insight, assessment, administrative work) in order to assess my performance.
- 2% Strongly Disagree
- 16% Disagree
- 25% Neither Agree nor Disagree
- 30% Agree
- 27% Strongly Agree

- Decrease in staff funding has pushed an inordinate amount of administrative/clerical work onto faculty with service positions in departments. This is a terrible waste of resources in that faculty who could be using that service time to mentor undergraduates and support the professional development of graduate students are forced to use it to draft and track paperwork instead.

- The amount of service I do is too much. The amount of make-work and busy work the university requires me to do (assessment, activity insights, even now tracking my health on DU wellness) is insulting and a waste of my time.

- I think the required use of Activity Insight is absurd. The information is much more easily conveyed on a CV, and since we have to keep our CVs updated, doing the additional entry of this info into Activity Insight simply takes time away from more meaningful work.

36. I feel valued for the ways that I contribute to the university.
- 10% Strongly Disagree
- 18% Disagree

      20%   Neither Agree nor Disagree
      37%   Agree
      16%   Strongly Agree

- Because many of us are paid on average 20% less than the going rate, I don't feel valued. Especially given that in Denver the cost of living is significantly higher than it is in many other parts of the country where my colleagues are making 20% more than I am. What happened to the faculty senate salary review that was conducted a number of years ago!?!?! why has nothing been done about this incredibly unfair situation!!

- In the time that i have been at DU I have continually heard about budgets, fiscal conservativism, low salaries, low enrollments, etc. I feel that I hear much more about that than about any excellent work that is produced by my colleagues. Morale in my department is low because of high service and teaching loads (in comparison to other departments). I often feel that the university treats me more as a staff employee rather than as a faculty who makes an intellectual contribution. This culture needs to change. Faculty should not be constantly thinking about budgets and enrollments. That is not what we are hired to do.

37. Which of the following best fits how you describe your gender?
      55%   Male
      44%   Female
      1%   Other

38. Do you identify as a person of color?
      18%   Yes
      73%   No
      10%   Choose not to respond

39. Do you identify as an international faculty member
      15%   Yes
      78%   No
      7%   Choose not to respond.

40. What is your age?
      0%   20-29
      21%   30-39
      31%   40-49
      20%   50-59
      15%   60-69
      2%   70-79
      12%   Choose not to respond

41. How long have you been at DU?

SURVEY OF FACULTY OPINION ABOUT PERFORMANCE EVALUATIONS
AND JOB RESPONSIBILITIES

22% 0-5 years
22% 5-9 years
19% 10-14 years
8%   15-19 years
22% 20 years or longer
8%   Choose not to respond

42. What is your rank?
0%   N/A
19% Assistant
48% Associate
32% Full

43. What is your salary?
0%   20,000-29,999
0%   30,000-39,999
0%   40,000-49,999
2%   50,000-59,999
9%   60,000-69,999
16% 70,000-79,999
15% 80,000-89,999
11% 90,000-99,999
29% 100,000 or above
18% Choose not to respond

44. What is your college, school, or division?
4%   Daniel Felix Ritchie School of Engineering and Computer Science
10% Daniels College of Business
35% Divisions of Arts, Humanities and Social Sciences
16% Divisions of Natural Sciences and Mathematics
6%   Josef Korbel School of International Studies
2%   Graduate School of Professional Psychology (GSPP)
5%   Graduate School of Social Work (GSSW)
5%   Morgridge College of Education
3%   The Sturm College of Law
1%   Other
13% Choose not to report

**SURVEY OF FACULTY OPINION ABOUT PERFORMANCE EVALUATIONS
AND JOB RESPONSIBILITIES**

III. Complete Results for NON-TENURE LINE Faculty
(N = 103)

1. What are the reasons your performance has been and/or will be reviewed?
    (Check all that apply)
    - 88%   Merit-raise determination (e.g., annual review)
    - 7%   Progress toward tenure (e.g., 3rd year review)
    - 53%   Progress toward promotion
    - 52%   Contract review
    - 8%   Remediation (e.g., assessment of teacher/teaching effectiveness; assessment of publication record)
    - 15%   Professional Development outside of annual review (e.g, formal discussion about career progress).

2. One reason faculty are reviewed is to assess annual performance and determine merit raises. The following set of questions pertains to your experience with annual performance reviews used to determine merit raises.

    Who conducts your performance review? (Check all that apply)
    - 61%   Chair
    - 12%   Committee
    - 33%   Dean
    - 18%   Other

    How do you receive feedback?
    - 35%   Meeting
    - 11%   Letter
    - 44%   Both
    - 11%   Other

    How are you reviewed? (Check all that apply)
    - 86%   Activity Insight Report
    - 44%   Individual case-by-case qualitative feedback
    - 15%   Point system
    - 10%   Other

- My unit supervisor meets with us to give us what feels like the most significant feedback.

- Previously in meetings but this year I was given a draft letter and asked for feedback.

- Personal opinion regardless of fact or data.

- We write a multi page self summary.

**SURVEY OF FACULTY OPINION ABOUT PERFORMANCE EVALUATIONS
AND JOB RESPONSIBILITIES**

3. I believe this is a fair process for evaluating performance.
     8%   Not at all fair
     15%   Somewhat fair
     17%   Neither fair nor unfair
     54%   Fair
     6%   Very fair

- Whoever does the evaluation needs training to avoid all the pitfalls like bias or favoritism.

4. This performance review process takes into account all important faculty contributions.
     5%   Strongly Disagree
     19%   Disagree
     23%   Neither Agree nor Disagree
     38%   Agree
     15%   Strongly Agree

- Don't really get much feedback, the dean spends negligible time looking at activity insight or reading the multi page self summary we are required to do.

- Meeting with the Dean is pretty superficial and demonstrates little actual awareness of job tasks and/or performance.

- As a "clinical" (non-tenure, but on promotion track) we have a lot more student responsibilities and coordination of programs. This system seems to favor publications and standard university committee work, etc. It does not look at issues like the complexity of advising loads, or the relational aspects of the work we do with the students. Additionally, there is not a place to discuss the depth of contribution of activities such as doing an independent study (though you can note it) or of working in collaboration with peers on an internal process/changing the WAY we do our work--very hard to quantify in this technical system.

Non-tenure-line faculty members are often evaluated with regard to their contract renewal. The following questions pertain to the criteria for reviewing non-tenure-line faculty members.

5. I am aware of these criteria.
     7%   Strongly Disagree
     11%   Disagree
     17%   Neither Agree nor Disagree
     51%   Agree
     14%   Strongly Agree

- I am familiar with the process for contract review and the duties associated with the review, but I am unclear as to the specific factors that determine amount of salary increases.

- The draft that has been written hasn't been discussed broadly and it seems to make some assumptions about the new lines that may not apply to all faculty in them. Overall, the promotion process remains a black box.

- Not at all aware of how it works. I get my appointment letter from my Dean, and I'm off and running until the next appointment.

6. I believe these criteria are fair.
- 4%   Strongly Disagree
- 12%   Disagree
- 31%   Neither Agree nor Disagree
- 50%   Agree
- 4%   Strongly Agree

- Point system gives the appearance of equity, but is subject to unaddressed institutional cultural problems with bias (ethnicity, gender, sexual orientation, etc.), limitations of all faculty to access and connect with decision-makers/evaluators, assumption about faculty contributions, and favoritism.

7. I believe these criteria promote high quality work.
- 10%   Strongly Disagree
- 16%   Disagree
- 34%   Neither Agree nor Disagree
- 36%   Agree
- 5%   Strongly Agree

8. I receive adequate support to meet these criteria.
- 6%   Strongly Disagree
- 14%   Disagree
- 26%   Neither Agree nor Disagree
- 42%   Agree
- 13%   Strongly Agree

- This sounds too simplistic, but it would be so nice to have a conversation that felt like I got the chance to just share what I did, what I learned, where I feel I shined and where I want to improve, and where I would like support moving forward. Somehow it is all the boxes, and forms and there's no feeling of communication or support. I know we need a "record" of what we have done, but it feels so reductionist when the whole of it is so complex.

9. What percentage of the range of your contributions do these criteria capture?

4%	10
3%	20
1%	30
3%	40
11%	50
11%	60
17%	70
22%	80
18%	90
11%	100

- Activity insight is clearly designed for tenure track faculty and only a very small portion applies to clinical faculty.

- Activity insight makes it difficult to note department level service contributions -- faculty in our program spend a significant amount of time on "ad hoc" programming -- e.g., research shares, off campus activities, bringing speakers to campus, sponsoring student organizations, conferences.

Some universities conduct developmental reviews where faculty receive professional development support over their career lifespan. The following questions will help us assess current developmental review practices at DU and gauge interest in modifying such practices.

10. What type of professional development reviews have you received? (Check all that apply)
    - 50% Teaching
    - 20% Research, Scholarship, and Creative Activities
    - 10% Internal Funding
    - 1% External Funding
    - 7% Career Path Consultation
    - 18% Other

11. I would like to receive direct professional development feedback not associated with pay, promotion, or contract.
    - 2% Strongly Disagree
    - 4% Disagree
    - 23% Neither Agree nor Disagree
    - 53% Agree
    - 17% Strongly Agree

12. In general, professional development opportunities that already exist at DU are effective in promoting high quality faculty work.
    - 2% Strongly Disagree
    - 15% Disagree

SURVEY OF FACULTY OPINION ABOUT PERFORMANCE EVALUATIONS
AND JOB RESPONSIBILITIES

        43%   Neither Agree nor Disagree
        38%   Agree
        2%   Strongly Agree

- HERS leadership program

- I am not aware of what internal professional development opportunities exist in DU as a whole.

- I don't know of any opportunities to promote professional development.

13. What motivates you, or could motivate you, to continue your professional
        development? (Check all that apply)
        47%   Expectation of tangible reward
        59%   Financial support for developmental activities
        54%   Increased time to devote to what I believe I do best
        52%   Greater feeling that I belong to a community of colleagues at DU
        42%   Opportunity to forge deeper connections with students
        44%   Evidence that such development would enable me to do a better job
        47%   Tools that would help me be more efficient at my job (e.g., grading
        papers,   submitting publications)
        23%   Being mentored
        8%   Other

- Having professional development funds as were awarded this year will be vital to
  our continued excellence as teaching professors and they are VERY MUCH
  appreciated.

One reason faculty members might be evaluated is to identify unsatisfactory
performance and determine whether remedial measures are necessary. The
following questions pertain to evaluations related to remedial measures.

14. I think faculty should be reviewed for this purpose.
        1%   Strongly Disagree
        2%   Disagree
        13%   Neither Agree nor Disagree
        50%   Agree
        34%   Strongly Agree

15. What should be the potential consequence for unsatisfactory performance in
        your academic unit? (Check all that apply)
        73%   Mentoring/coaching
        75%   Negotiated development plan
        64%   Negotiated development timeline
        40%   Negotiated change in allocation of duties in current post (e.g.,
                    teaching, research/creation)

33%   Negotiated change of responsibilities within the university
38%   Lower or nonexistent pay raises
56%   In rare cases of chronic and remedied deficiencies: sterner measures.
8%   Other

The following items refer to your experience at DU.

16. I feel a sense of belonging in my academic unit.
    4%   Strongly Disagree
    7%   Disagree
    12%   Neither Agree nor Disagree
    48%   Agree
    28%   Strongly Agree

17. I feel a sense of belonging at DU.
    2%   Strongly Disagree
    14%   Disagree
    16%   Neither Agree nor Disagree
    52%   Agree
    16%   Strongly Agree

- I think DU is divided into silos. Men are treated differently than women. Every department is for itself. No one communicates outside of their silo. Men have more power in making decisions. It feel very isolating at times here at DU and there is little community or cross discipline interaction.

18. I feel on top of the latest developments in my field.
    0%   Strongly Disagree
    4%   Disagree
    15%   Neither Agree nor Disagree
    57%   Agree
    24%   Strongly Agree

19. I have the freedom to teach what I want.
    1%   Strongly Disagree
    15%   Disagree
    16%   Neither Agree nor Disagree
    52%   Agree
    16%   Strongly Agree

20. I have the freedom to conduct research about what I want.
    4%   Strongly Disagree
    8%   Disagree
    24%   Neither Agree nor Disagree
    40%   Agree

24%   Strongly Agree

21. I am able to control how I spend my nonteaching time in my job.
   - 5%   Strongly Disagree
   - 15%   Disagree
   - 14%   Neither Agree nor Disagree
   - 49%   Agree
   - 17%   Strongly Agree

22. The amount of service I am asked to do is fair.
   - 4%   Strongly Disagree
   - 3%   Disagree
   - 19%   Neither Agree nor Disagree
   - 63%   Agree
   - 11%   Strongly Agree

23. There is an unreasonable amount of documentation and reporting that I am asked to do (e.g., activity insight, assessment, administrative work) in order to assess my performance.
   - 1%   Strongly Disagree
   - 31%   Disagree
   - 26%   Neither Agree nor Disagree
   - 21%   Agree
   - 21%   Strongly Agree

24. I feel valued for the ways that I contribute to the university.
   - 3%   Strongly Disagree
   - 14%   Disagree
   - 22%   Neither Agree nor Disagree
   - 52%   Agree
   - 10%   Strongly Agree

25. Which of the following best fits how you describe your gender?
   - 39%   Male
   - 60%   Female
   - 1%   Other

26. Do you identify as a person of color?
   - 10%   Yes
   - 83%   No
   - 8%   Choose not to respond

27. Do you identify as an international faculty member
   - 7%   Yes
   - 85%   No

9%   Choose not to respond.

28. What is your age?
   - 0%   20-29
   - 21%   30-39
   - 25%   40-49
   - 21%   50-59
   - 19%   60-69
   - 3%   70-79
   - 12%   Choose not to respond

29. How long have you been at DU?
   - 29%   0-5 years
   - 22%   5-9 years
   - 21%   10-14 years
   - 16%   15-19 years
   - 5%   20 years or longer
   - 7%   Choose not to respond

30. If no, what is the length of your contract for the coming year?
   - 6%   N/A
   - 25%   One year
   - 67%   Multiple year
   - 2%   Other

31. What is your rank?
   - 13%   N/A
   - 39%   Assistant
   - 34%   Associate
   - 15%   Full

32. What is your salary?
   - 1%   20,000-29,999
   - 2%   30,000-39,999
   - 15%   40,000-49,999
   - 18%   50,000-59,999
   - 24%   60,000-69,999
   - 12%   70,000-79,999
   - 9%   80,000-89,999
   - 6%   90,000-99,999
   - 3%   100,000 or above
   - 10%   Choose not to respond

33. What is your college, school, or division?
   - 4%   Daniel Felix Ritchie School of Engineering and Computer Science

SURVEY OF FACULTY OPINION ABOUT PERFORMANCE EVALUATIONS
AND JOB RESPONSIBILITIES

12%   Daniels College of Business
16%   Divisions of Arts, Humanities and Social Sciences
9%   Divisions of Natural Sciences and Mathematics
4%   Josef Korbel School of International Studies
2%   Graduate School of Professional Psychology (GSPP)
7%   Graduate School of Social Work (GSSW)
5%   Morgridge College of Education
3%   The Sturm College of Law
19%   Other
18%   Choose not to respond