



**NORTHERN ARIZONA UNIVERSITY**

**Comparison of Responses from the  
Higher Education Research Institute (HERI) Faculty Survey:**

**Northern Arizona University's Faculty and Academic Administrators**

*(Supplement to the 2004 – 2005 Faculty Survey Report)*

**Office of Planning, Budget & Institutional Research  
<http://www4.nau.edu/pair/>  
Northern Arizona University  
Fall 2005**

## Table of Contents:

<b>Overview:</b> .....	3
<b>Sample and Methodology:</b> .....	3
<b>Summary of Key Findings:</b> .....	4
<b>Do You to a Great Extent:</b> .....	9
<b>Personal Goals Noted as Very Important or Essential:</b> .....	10
<b>Issues of High or Highest Priority at Northern Arizona University:</b> .....	11
<b>Attributes Noted as Being Very Descriptive of NAU:</b> .....	13
<b>Aspects of Job Noted as Satisfactory or Very Satisfactory:</b> .....	14
<b>Sources of Stress During the Last Two Years:</b> .....	16
<b>Appendix A. Algorithms for Determining Respondent Type</b> .....	18
<b>Appendix B. List of Institutions Comprising the National Norm Group</b> .....	19
<b>Appendix C. HERI Classification of Participating Institutions</b> .....	20

**Overview:**

During the fall of 2004, Northern Arizona University's faculty was invited to participate in a national study conducted by the Higher Education Research Institute (HERI) at the University of California in Los Angeles. For the purpose of this study a full-time faculty member is defined as, "a full-time employee of an accredited college or university who spends at least some part of his or her time teaching undergraduates." Nationally 40,670 full-time faculty from 421 institutions participated in the study.

The HERI faculty survey is a triennial survey that focuses on the workload, teaching practices, job satisfaction, and professional activities of collegiate faculty. The survey includes a special emphasis on faculty-student interaction, undergraduate teaching, and curricular issues. Other items focus on current issues of interest to today's campus such as diversity and the role of community service.

This is a supplemental report that compares responses from NAU's full-time undergraduate (FTUG) faculty to NAU's academic administrators and NAU's academic administrators to a national norm group of administrators. A second supplemental report compares all respondents from the Mountain Campus to respondents at statewide sites. Both of these supplemental reports, along with the main report, *Job Satisfaction and Professional Priorities for the Faculty of Northern Arizona University* can be found at: <http://www4.nau.edu/pair/SurveysReport/SurveysReports.asp>. Also found at this web site are tables that summarize all responses to all questions and several national norm groups for comparison.

**Sample and Methodology:**

All faculty members that were on payroll during the fall 2004 semester were invited to participate in this survey. Six hundred thirty-two (632) responses were received from Northern Arizona University employees. This sample size yields an error rate below  $\pm 4$  percent<sup>1</sup>. Due to the unique reporting process of HERI, any respondents who did not provide their gender were not included in the final data. Respondents were classified as: full-time undergraduate (FTUG) faculty, part-time undergraduate (PTUG) faculty, full-time academic administrators (ADMIN), graduate faculty (GRAD), and other respondents. The "other" respondent category included all respondents not classified in one of the other four categories. Please refer to Appendix A for the algorithms used to group respondents.

This supplemental report analyzes responses of Northern Arizona University's full-time undergraduate (FTUG) faculty compared to the responses of the academic administrators at NAU. The academic administrators and faculty answered similarly to the majority of the questions. Percent differences of ten or greater between FTUG faculty and the administrators at NAU are highlighted. Additionally, percent differences of ten or greater between administrators at NAU and the national norm for all public universities is also highlighted. This ten percent difference is an arbitrary cut-off, but meaningful in highlighting large differences between the faculty and

---

<sup>1</sup> The sampling error describes the probable difference between interviewing everyone in the population versus interviewing a sample drawn from this population. For example, if 80% of the faculty respondents indicated satisfaction in a specific content area, the actual population parameter falls in the range of 76% - 84% (80% +/- 4%) satisfaction.

administrators at NAU. The national norm data for all public universities is also included as a point of comparison for both the FTUG faculty and administrators<sup>2</sup>.

## Summary of Key Findings:

### Northern Arizona University's Faculty Compared to Northern Arizona University's Administrators

This section of the report summarizes the results of 93 questions asked to faculty and administrators at NAU. Out of the 93 comparisons, FTUG faculty members differed significantly (when using a 10% difference as the cut-off) from the academic administrators on 38 specific questions that cover several areas. Generally the differences that exist between the NAU faculty and the academic administrators are differences that are also found in the national data with some notable differences:

- Overall NAU's academic administrators, compared to the national norm and NAU's faculty, were significantly less likely to indicate that they experience joy in their work or that they achieve a healthy balance between their personal life and professional lives.
- In the national norm data, the faculty respondents, when compared to the academic administrators, were significantly more likely to agree that the statement "the faculty are typically at odds with campus" was descriptive of their institutions – a difference that did not exist between NAU's faculty and administrators.
- In the national normed data, a difference exists between faculty and administrators when identifying "subtle discrimination" as a source of stress that is not found at NAU.

#### *Personal Goals*

Over 90% of the faculty and administrators at NAU identified "being a good teacher" and "being a good colleague" as personal goals that were very important. NAU administrators were more likely to identify "achieving congruence between my own values and institutional values," "being very well off financially," and "influencing the political structure" as important personal goals. The faculty were more likely to identify "integrating spirituality into my life" as an important personal goal when compared to the academic administrators.

#### *Institutional Priorities*

The vast majority of faculty and administrators agreed that a high priority for NAU was "to promote the intellectual development of students." There was considerable difference in identified priorities for the institution between faculty and administrators. The NAU faculty was more likely to identify increasing or maintaining institutional prestige as a priority for the institution when compared to the academic administrators. The administrators were more likely to identify the following priorities for NAU:

- "to create a diverse multi-cultural campus environment,"
- "to recruit more minority students,"
- "to enhance the institution's national image,"
- "to increase the representation of minorities in the faculty and administration,"
- "to promote gender equity among faculty,"

---

<sup>2</sup> It should be noted that the national norm group used in this supplemental report (all participating universities) is not the same national norm group that is used in the main report *Job Satisfaction and Professional Priorities for the Faculty of Northern Arizona University*. The national norm group for the main report is all participating low-selective universities.

- “to create and sustain partnerships with surrounding communities,” and
- “to mentor new faculty.”

### *Job Satisfaction*

The top two aspects of their jobs that are satisfactory for both the faculty and administrators at NAU were “autonomy and independent” and the “professional relationships with other faculty.”

The administrators were more likely to identify the below list as aspects of their job that were satisfactory:

- “teaching load,”
- “relationship with administration,”
- “prospects for career advancement,”
- “visibility for jobs at other institutions / organizations,” and
- “salary and fringe benefits.”

The faculty was more likely to identify “clerical / administrative support” as an aspect of their job that was satisfactory.

### *Sources of Stress*

The reported sources of stress for NAU faculty and academic administrators differed significantly. The area most likely identified as a source of stress for faculty was “self-imposed high expectations.” The areas most likely identified as sources of stress for academic administrators was “lack of personal time,” “institutional procedures and red tape,” and “self-imposed high expectations.”

In comparison to the academic administrators, the faculty was more likely to identify the following as sources of stress:

- “personal finances,”
- “working with underprepared students,”
- “teaching load,”
- “research or publishing demands,”
- “my physical health,”
- “review / promotion process,” and
- “job security.”

In comparison faculty, academic administrators were more likely to identify the following as sources of stress:

- “lack of personal time,”
- “institutional procedures and red tape,”
- “faculty meetings,”
- “change in work responsibilities,” and
- “being part of a dual career couple.”

### *Other*

When asked about a variety of behaviors and beliefs, the faculty and academic administrators at NAU replied differently on a variety of questions. The faculty respondents were more likely to indicate that to a great extent they:

- “experience close alignment between your work and your personal values,”
- “experience joy in your work,”

- “eat a well-balanced diet,”
- “achieve a healthy balance between your personal life and your professional life,” and
- “seek opportunities to grow spiritually.”

The faculty were more likely to think that “faculty here respect each other” and less likely to feel that “faculty are rewarded for their efforts to use instructional technology” when compared to the academic administrators at NAU.

## **Northern Arizona University's Administrators Compared to the National Norm for Administrators:**

This section of the report summarizes the results of 93 questions asked to academic administrators at NAU to the national norm for administrators comprised of all participating public universities (N=28). Out of the 93 comparisons, NAU's administrators differed significantly (when using a 10% difference as the cut-off) from the national norms in several areas.

### *Personal Goals*

Several of the personal goals identified as important by the academic administrators at NAU are indicative of a general commitment to the broader society and a desire to impact the social structure. Specifically, the NAU academic administrators, when compared to the national norm for academic administrators, were more likely to identify the below statements as important personal goals:

- "helping others who are in difficulty,"
- "achieving congruence between my own values and institutional values"
- "influencing social values," and
- "influencing the political structure."

They were also more likely to report "being very well off financially" as an important goal and less likely to indicate that "becoming an authority in my field" was important.

### *Institutional Priorities*

In comparison to the national norm group, NAU administrators were less likely to identify the following as priorities for NAU:

- "to enhance the institution's national image,"
- "to pursue extramural funding,"
- "to increase or maintain institutional prestige,"
- "to increase the representation of women in the faculty and administration," and
- "to hire faculty stars."

The NAU academic administrators were more likely to identify creating and sustaining partnerships with surrounding communities as a priority.

The NAU academic administrators were more likely to identify the statement "it is easy for students to see faculty outside of regular office hours" and "faculty are rewarded for their efforts to use instructional technology" as attributes of the University when compared to the national norm group. In comparison to the national norm group, NAU's administrators were less likely to identify the statement "faculty here respect each other" as descriptive of NAU.

### *Job Satisfaction*

In comparison to the national norm group, the administrators at NAU were less likely to identify the below aspects of their jobs as satisfactory:

- "opportunity to develop new ideas,"
- "overall job satisfaction,"
- "teaching load,"
- "clerical / administrative support,"
- "relationship with administration,"
- "opportunity for scholarly pursuits,"
- "prospects for career advancement,"
- "quality of students,"
- "visibility for jobs at other institutions / organizations,"

- “salary and fringe benefits,” and
- “availability of child car at this institution.”

Those respondents classified as academic administrators were significantly less likely to report that they experience joy in their work to a great extent when compared to the national norm group for administrators.

#### *Sources of Stress*

NAU administrators identified similar sources of stress when compared to the national norm group. The administrators from NAU were more likely to identify “lack of personal time,” “teaching load,” and “being part of a dual career couple,” and less likely to identify “research or publishing demands” as sources of stress when compared to the national norm group.

## Do You to a Great Extent:

- The faculty and academic administrators at NAU replied differently on questions when asked about a variety of behaviors and beliefs. Specifically, the NAU faculty respondents were more likely to indicate that to a great extent they:
  - “experience close alignment between your work and your personal values,”
  - “experience joy in your work,”
  - “eat a well-balanced diet,”
  - “achieve a healthy balance between your personal life and your professional life,” and
  - “seek opportunities to grow spiritually.”

Differences this pronounced were not found in the national norms between faculty and administration.

- Those respondents classified as academic administrators at NAU were significantly less likely to report that they experience joy in their work to a great extent when compared to the national norm group for administrators (comprised of all public universities) and in comparison to the faculty respondents at NAU.

<b>“Do you, to a great extent:” (in percentage)</b>	<b>NAU FTUG (N=329)</b>	<b>NAU Academic Admin (N=51)</b>	<b>Nat'l Norm FTUG</b>	<b>Nat'l Norm Academic Admin</b>
Engage in self-reflection?	71	65	67	63
Feel that your work adds meaning to your life?	65	62	65	70
Experience close alignment between your work and your personal values?	<b>64</b>	<b>54</b>	56	59
Experience joy in your work?	<b>62</b>	<b>44</b>	63	<b>64</b>
Feel good about the direction in which your life is headed?	60	62	61	68
Eat a well-balanced diet?	<b>54</b>	<b>44</b>	43	46
Engage in regular exercise?	50	46	41	43
Consider yourself a spiritual person?	50	46	44	38
Achieve a healthy balance between your personal life and your professional life?	<b>44</b>	<b>28</b>	39	35
Engage in academic work that spans multiple disciplines?	42	36	32	38
Get adequate amounts of sleep?	41	36	33	31
Feel that the training you received in graduate school prepared you well for your role as a faculty mentor?	37	46	40	40
Seek opportunities to grow spiritually?	<b>36</b>	<b>25</b>	27	21
Engage in prayer/meditation?	28	24	22	16
Consider yourself a religious person?	26	30	29	26
Feel that you have to work harder than your colleagues to be perceived as a legitimate scholar?	24	16	24	17

**Personal Goals Noted as Very Important or Essential:**

- Over 90% of the faculty and administrators at NAU identified “being a good teacher” and “being a good colleague” as personal goals that were very important.
- NAU’s academic administrators were more likely to identify “achieving congruence between my own values and institutional values,” “being very well off financially,” and “influencing the political structure” as important personal goals. The faculty respondents were more likely to identify “integrating spirituality into my life” as an important personal goal when compared to the academic administrators. Though not always to the same extent, these differences between NAU’s faculty and academic administrators are also found in the national norms between faculty and administration
- Several of the personal goals identified as important by the academic administrators at NAU are reflective of a general commitment to broader society and impacting the social structure. Specifically, the NAU academic administrators, when compared to the national norm for academic administrators, were more likely to identify the below statements as important personal goals:
  - “helping others who are in difficulty,”
  - “achieving congruence between my own values and institutional values”
  - “influencing social values,” and
  - “influencing the political structure.”

They were also more likely to report “being very well off financially” as an important goal and less likely to indicate that “becoming an authority in my field” was important.

<b>Personal goals noted "very important" or "essential:" (in percentage)</b>	<b>NAU FTUG (N=329)</b>	<b>NAU Academic Admin (N=51)</b>	<b>Nat'l Norm FTUG</b>	<b>Nat'l Norm Academic Admin</b>
Being a good teacher	99	98	91	95
Being a good colleague	93	94	87	88
Developing a meaningful philosophy of life	74	69	67	66
Helping others who are in difficulty	69	<b>77</b>	62	<b>65</b>
Raising a family	67	68	68	75
Helping to promote racial understanding	58	61	52	56
Achieving congruence between my own values and institutional values	<b>52</b>	<b>75</b>	49	<b>59</b>
Being very well off financially	<b>51</b>	<b>63</b>	43	<b>53</b>
Integrating spirituality into my life	<b>51</b>	<b>39</b>	43	34
Becoming an authority in my field	49	<b>41</b>	58	<b>64</b>
Influencing social values	44	<b>47</b>	33	<b>32</b>
Obtaining recognition from my colleagues for contributions to my special field	44	50	53	58
Becoming involved in programs to clean up the environment	42	37	30	28
Influencing the political structure	<b>24</b>	<b>35</b>	19	<b>22</b>

## Issues of High or Highest Priority at Northern Arizona University:

- The vast majority of faculty and administrators agreed that a high priority for NAU was “to promote the intellectual development of students.”
- There was considerable difference in identified priorities for the institution between NAU’s faculty and academic administrators. The NAU faculty was more likely to identify increasing or maintaining institutional prestige as a priority for the institution when compared to the academic administrators. The administrators were more likely to identify the following priorities for NAU:
  - “to create a diverse multi-cultural campus environment,”
  - “to recruit more minority students,”
  - “to enhance the institution’s national image,”
  - “to increase the representation of minorities in the faculty and administration,”
  - “to promote gender equity among faculty,”
  - “to create and sustain partnerships with surrounding communities,” and
  - “to mentor new faculty.”
- Interestingly, these differences that are noted between NAU’s faculty and academic administrators also exist in the national norm data between faculty and administrators (though not for “to create and sustain partnerships with surrounding communities”). For the national norm data there were several differences between the faculty and administration when identifying priorities that did not exist at NAU:
  - “to promote the intellectual development of students,”
  - “to develop leadership ability among students,”
  - “to develop a sense of community among students and faculty,” and
  - “to increase the representation of women in the faculty and administration.”
- In comparison to the national norm group, NAU administrators were less likely to identify the following as priorities for NAU:
  - “to enhance the institution’s national image,”
  - “to pursue extramural funding,”
  - “to increase or maintain institutional prestige,”
  - “to increase the representation of women in the faculty and administration,” and
  - “to hire faculty stars.”

The NAU administrators were more likely to identify creating and sustaining partnerships with surrounding communities as a priority.

“Issues you believe to be of "high" or "highest" priority at your institution:” (in percentage)	NAU FTUG (N=329)	NAU Academic Admin (N=51)	Nat'l Norm FTUG	Nat'l Norm Academic Admin
To promote the intellectual development of students	81	84	77	88
To create a diverse multi-cultural campus environment	<b>58</b>	<b>70</b>	55	68
To recruit more minority students	<b>56</b>	<b>76</b>	48	69
To enhance the institution's national image	<b>56</b>	<b>74</b>	68	<b>86</b>
To pursue extramural funding	53	<b>62</b>	71	<b>89</b>

<b>“Issues you believe to be of "high" or "highest" priority at your institution:” (in percentage)</b>	<b>NAU FTUG (N=329)</b>	<b>NAU Academic Admin (N=51)</b>	<b>Nat'l Norm FTUG</b>	<b>Nat'l Norm Academic Admin</b>
To increase the representation of minorities in the faculty and administration	<b>50</b>	<b>72</b>	46	68
To increase or maintain institutional prestige	<b>47</b>	<b>34</b>	60	<b>74</b>
To develop leadership ability among students	47	48	43	57
To develop a sense of community among students and faculty	46	52	41	51
To increase the representation of women in the faculty and administration	44	<b>52</b>	43	<b>63</b>
To promote gender equity among faculty	<b>42</b>	<b>63</b>	44	59
To create and sustain partnerships with surrounding communities	<b>41</b>	<b>62</b>	47	<b>44</b>
To mentor new faculty	<b>32</b>	<b>50</b>	39	57
To help students learn how to bring about change in American society	30	36	29	31
To provide resources for faculty to engage in community-based teaching or research	28	36	35	31
To hire faculty "stars"	14	<b>18</b>	30	<b>54</b>

### Attributes Noted as Being Very Descriptive of NAU:

- NAU’s faculty were more likely to think that “faculty here respect each other” and less likely to feel that “faculty are rewarded for their efforts to use instructional technology” when compared to NAU’s academic administrators. These differences between faculty and administrators do not exist in the national norm data. There was a significant difference between faculty and administrators in the national norms when evaluating the following statement “the faculty are typically at odds with campus” as descriptive of their institutions – a difference that did not exist at NAU.
- The NAU academic administrators were more likely to identify the statement “it is easy for students to see faculty outside of regular office hours” and “faculty are rewarded for their efforts to use instructional technology” as attributes of the University when compared to the national norm group. In comparison to the national norm group, NAU’s administrators were less likely to identify the statement “faculty here respect each other” as descriptive of NAU.

“Attributes noted as being very descriptive of your institution:” <i>(in percentage)</i>	NAU FTUG (N=329)	NAU Academic Admin (N=51)	Nat'l Norm FTUG	Nat'l Norm Academic Admin
It is easy for students to see faculty outside of regular office hours	57	<b>56</b>	45	<b>38</b>
Faculty here respect each other	<b>52</b>	<b>35</b>	45	<b>48</b>
There is respect for the expression of diverse values and beliefs	31	30	31	36
Faculty are rewarded for their efforts to use instructional technology	<b>28</b>	<b>48</b>	20	<b>20</b>
The faculty are typically at odds with campus administration	24	18	20	10
Faculty are rewarded for being good teachers	10	18	11	17
Faculty are rewarded for their efforts to work with underprepared students	5	8	4	4
Most students are treated like "numbers in a book"	3	2	6	4
Social activities are overemphasized	1	0	5	5

### Aspects of Job Noted as Satisfactory or Very Satisfactory:

- The top two aspects of their jobs that are satisfactory for both the faculty and administrators at NAU were “autonomy and independence” and the “professional relationships with other faculty.”
- The academic administrators at NAU were more likely than the faculty to identify the below list as aspects of their job that were satisfactory:
  - “teaching load,”
  - “relationship with administration,”
  - “prospects for career advancement,”
  - “visibility for jobs at other institutions / organizations,” and
  - “salary and fringe benefits.”

The faculty was more likely to identify “clerical / administrative support” as an aspect of their job that was satisfactory.

- The differences found between NAU’s faculty and administrators are also found in the national norm data. However, there are several other differences that exist between the national norms for faculty and academic administrators that did not exist at NAU:
  - “overall job satisfaction,”
  - “opportunity for scholarly pursuits,”
  - “quality of students,” and
  - “availability of child care at this institution”
- Of 16 possible comparisons between NAU’s academic administrators and the national norm for administrators, the NAU administrators were less likely to identify 11 aspects of their jobs as being satisfactory. Specifically, the administrators at NAU were less likely to identify the following aspects of their jobs as satisfactory:
  - “opportunity to develop new ideas,”
  - “overall job satisfaction,”
  - “teaching load,”
  - “clerical / administrative support,”
  - “relationship with administration,”
  - “opportunity for scholarly pursuits,”
  - “prospects for career advancement,”
  - “quality of students,”
  - “visibility for jobs at other institutions / organizations,”
  - “salary and fringe benefits,” and
  - “availability of child car at this institution.”

“Aspects of your job noted as very satisfactory or satisfactory:” <i>(in percentage)</i>	NAU FTUG (N=329)	NAU Academic Admin (N=51)	Nat'l Norm FTUG	Nat'l Norm Academic Admin
Autonomy and independence	89	90	85	89
Professional relationships with other faculty	<b>80</b>	<b>90</b>	76	84
Competency of colleagues	78	77	75	83
Opportunity to develop new ideas	78	<b>75</b>	76	<b>85</b>
Overall job satisfaction	75	<b>75</b>	72	<b>86</b>

<b>“Aspects of your job noted as very satisfactory or satisfactory:” (in percentage)</b>	<b>NAU FTUG (N=329)</b>	<b>NAU Academic Admin (N=51)</b>	<b>Nat'l Norm FTUG</b>	<b>Nat'l Norm Academic Admin</b>
Social relationships with other faculty	69	68	63	69
Office/lab space	64	66	65	75
Teaching load	<b>54</b>	<b>69</b>	57	<b>79</b>
Clerical/administrative support	<b>51</b>	<b>37</b>	50	<b>62</b>
Relationship with administration	<b>51</b>	<b>65</b>	48	<b>77</b>
Opportunity for scholarly pursuits	50	<b>44</b>	55	<b>66</b>
Prospects for career advancement	<b>49</b>	<b>61</b>	51	<b>71</b>
Quality of students	45	<b>54</b>	40	<b>64</b>
Visibility for jobs at other institutions/organizations	<b>44</b>	<b>54</b>	45	<b>72</b>
Salary and fringe benefits	<b>27</b>	<b>41</b>	43	<b>70</b>
Availability of child care at this institution	6	<b>11</b>	27	<b>38</b>

## Sources of Stress During the Last Two Years:

- The reported sources of stress for NAU faculty and academic administrators differed significantly. The area most likely identified as a source of stress for faculty was “self-imposed high expectations.” The areas most likely identified as sources of stress for administrators were “lack of personal time,” “institutional procedures and red tape,” and “self-imposed high expectations.”
- NAU’s faculty, when compared to NAU’s administrators, were more likely to identify the following as sources of stress:
  - “personal finances,”
  - “working with underprepared students,”
  - “teaching load,”
  - “research or publishing demands,”
  - “my physical health,”
  - “review / promotion process,” and
  - “job security.”
- In comparison to the faculty, NAU’s academic administrators were more likely to identify the following as sources of stress:
  - “lack of personal time,”
  - “institutional procedures and red tape,”
  - “faculty meetings,”
  - “change in work responsibilities,” and
  - “being part of a dual career couple.”
- While not always to the same extent, generally the same differences in sources of stress that exist between NAU’s faculty and administrators are also found in the national norm data. Areas where differences were not found in the national norm data includes: “lack of personal time,” “research or publishing demands,” “my personal health,” “faculty meetings,” and “being part of a dual career couple.” In the normed data, a difference exists between faculty and administrators when identifying “subtle discrimination” that is not found at NAU.
- NAU administrators identified similar sources of stress when compared to the national norm group. The administrators from NAU were more likely to identify “lack of personal time,” “teaching load,” and “being part of a dual career couple,” and less likely to identify “research or publishing demands” as sources of stress when compared to the national norm group

“Factors noted as a source of stress for you during the last two years:” <i>(in percentage)</i>	NAU FTUG (N=329)	NAU Academic Admin (N=51)	Nat’l Norm FTUG	Nat’l Norm Academic Admin
Self-imposed high expectations	79	78	79	82
Lack of personal time	<b>72</b>	<b>92</b>	73	<b>79</b>
Managing household responsibilities	70	65	70	68
Institutional procedures and "red tape"	<b>69</b>	<b>88</b>	72	82

<b>“Factors noted as a source of stress for you during the last two years:” (in percentage)</b>	<b>NAU FTUG (N=329)</b>	<b>NAU Academic Admin (N=51)</b>	<b>Nat'l Norm FTUG</b>	<b>Nat'l Norm Academic Admin</b>
Personal finances	<b>66</b>	<b>41</b>	60	43
Working with underprepared students	<b>61</b>	<b>35</b>	59	27
Keeping up with information technology	61	69	57	60
Teaching load	<b>58</b>	<b>41</b>	63	<b>31</b>
Research or publishing demands	<b>57</b>	<b>35</b>	67	<b>59</b>
My physical health	<b>55</b>	<b>45</b>	52	46
Committee work	55	61	60	66
Health of spouse/partner	43	34	35	36
Faculty meetings	<b>43</b>	<b>55</b>	50	55
Review/promotion process	<b>40</b>	<b>26</b>	48	27
Change in work responsibilities	<b>37</b>	<b>65</b>	42	56
Being part of a dual career couple	<b>35</b>	<b>45</b>	36	<b>31</b>
Care of elderly parent	32	33	31	40
Children's problems	31	37	30	35
Child care	29	29	29	22
Job security	<b>29</b>	<b>8</b>	33	12
Marital friction	21	20	22	21
Subtle discrimination (e.g., prejudice,	21	22	29	19

## **Appendix A. Algorithms for Determining Respondent Type**

### **Full-Time Undergraduate Faculty**

A respondent was included in one of three ways, if he or she:

1. indicated full-time employment at NAU **AND** noted teaching as his/her principal activity **AND** either taught at least one undergraduate-level course **OR** taught no classes at all in the most recent term (this condition is included for teachers on sabbatical leave or those currently engaged in a research project).
2. taught at least two courses in the last term, one of which was at the undergraduate level
3. did not indicate that he/she taught any specific types of courses, but did indicate spending at least 9 hours per week in scheduled teaching.

### **Part-Time Undergraduate Faculty**

A respondent was included in one of three ways, if he or she:

1. indicated part-time employment at NAU and noted teaching as his/her principal activity **AND** either taught at least one undergraduate-level course **OR** taught no classes at all in the most recent term.
2. taught at least one undergraduate-level course in the last term
3. did not indicate that he/she taught any specific types of courses, but did indicate spending 1-8 hours per week in scheduled teaching.

### **Full-Time Academic Administrators**

A respondent was included in this group if he or she indicated full-time employment at NAU **AND** a principal activity of academic administrators. Please note that respondents already judged to be full- or part-time undergraduate faculty might also be included in this group.

### **Graduate Faculty (Not Otherwise Characterized)**

A respondent was included in this group if he or she taught at least one graduate-level course **AND** was not already included in groups 1 – 3 above.

### **Other Respondents**

A “catch-all” group including all respondents not included in groups 1 – 4 above. This group includes research, service and other personnel not involved in instruction; part-time administrators; and respondents who did not answer question #'s 1, 2, 17 or 18.

## Appendix B. List of Institutions Comprising the National Norm Group

The national norm groups are comprised of the respondents from all participating public universities (N=28):

Colorado State University	CO
North Dakota State University	ND
Ohio State University	OH
Oregon State University	OR
U of Arkansas – Fayetteville	AR
U of Connecticut	CT
U of Idaho	ID
U of Oregon	OR
Utah State University	UT
Florida State University	FL
Miami University	OH
Texas A&M University	TX
U of California – Irvine	CA
U of Missouri – Kansas City	MO
U of North Carolina – Chapel Hill	NC
U of Virginia	VA
Cleveland State University	OH
East Carolina University	NC
South Dakota State University	SD
Texas A&M Uni – Corpus Cristi	TX
University of Alaska – Fairbanks	AK
University of Montana	MT
University of New Mexico	NM
University of North Dakota	ND
University of North Texas	TX
University of Southern Indiana	IN
University of Toledo	OH
Wayne State University	MI

**Appendix C. HERI Classification of Participating Institutions**  
**HERI STRATIFICATION CELL**

**Institution Average SAT Score for Entering Freshmen Determines Stratification Cell:**

**Public Universities**

- 01 low less than 1,085
- 02 medium 1,085 – 1,139
- 03 high 1,140 or more

**Private Universities**

- 04 medium less than 1,174
- 05 high 1,174 – 1,309
- 06 very high 1,310 or more

**Public Four-year Colleges**

- 07 low less than 985
- 08 medium 985 – 1,054
- 09 high 1,055 or more
- 10 unknown 3

**Nonsectarian Four-year Colleges**

- 11 low less than 1,015
- 12 medium 1,105 – 1,099
- 13 high 1,100 – 1,249
- 14 very high 1,250 or more
- 15 unknown

**Catholic Four-year Colleges**

- 16 low less than 1,020
- 17 medium 1,020 – 1,074
- 18 high 1,075 or more
- 19 unknown

**Other Religious Four-year Colleges**

- 20 very low less than 985
- 21 low 985 – 1,049
- 22 medium 1,050 – 1,099
- 23 high 1,100 or more
- 24 unknown

**Two-year Colleges 4**

- 25-29 public
- 30-33 private

**Historically Black Colleges & Universities 4**

- 34 public 4-year colleges/universities
- 35 private 4-year colleges/universities
- 36 public 2-year colleges
- 37 private 2-year colleges

**NOTES:**

**1** The broad categories of institutional type are defined as follows:

**University** an institution that awards a substantial number of doctoral-level degrees in at least five different disciplines. The HERI “university” is roughly equivalent to the Carnegie “Research” and “Doctoral” designations.

**Four-year College** an institution that awards master- and/or bachelor-level degrees. Corresponds equivalent to the Carnegie “Master’s (Comprehensive)” and “Baccalaureate (Liberal Arts)” designations.

**Two-year College** an institution that awards associate-level degrees.

**2** Selectivity is defined as the average SAT Composite Score of the entering class.

**3** Institutions with unknown selectivity are grouped with the low-selectivity when computing the National Norms.

**4** Two-year colleges and historically Black colleges & universities are not differentiated by selectivity.