

**Characteristics and Views of Faculty at Cal State Northridge:  
A Comparative Perspective Based on  
Findings from the Spring 2008 HERI Survey**

by

Bettina J. Huber

November 2010

## Table of Contents

<a href="#">Introduction</a> .....	1
<a href="#">Distinctive Characteristics</a> and Views of Cal State Northridge Faculty.....	3
<i>Full-Time Tenured and Tenure Track Respondents</i>	
<i>Part-Time Adjunct Respondents</i>	
<a href="#">Key Subgroup Differences</a> Among the Northridge Respondents.....	13
<i>Differences Between Tenured or Tenure Track and Part-Time Adjunct Respondents</i>	
<i>Differences Between Tenured and Tenure Track Respondents</i>	
<i>Differences Between Recently Hired and Longer Term Adjunct Respondents</i>	
<i>Differences by Racial and Ethnic Background</i>	
<a href="#">Possible Lessons</a> for Cal State Northridge.....	19

### Overview of Major Findings

<a href="#">Respondents' Current Positions</a> .....	22
<a href="#">Respondent Characteristics</a> and Educational Background .....	24
<a href="#">Recent Career</a> Transitions and Mobility.....	26
<a href="#">Work Load</a> .....	27
<a href="#">Scholarly Activities</a> , Community Outreach, and Professional Development.....	30
<a href="#">Teaching</a> Patterns and Approaches.....	33
<a href="#">Views of the Campus</a> Environment.....	39
<a href="#">Respondents' Commitments</a> , Life Objectives, and Level of Satisfaction.....	46
<a href="#">Sources of Stress</a> .....	52
<a href="#">Subgroup Differences</a> : Tenured vs. Tenure-Track Respondents .....	55
<a href="#">Subgroup Differences</a> : Part-Time Adjuncts Differing by Length of Appointment.....	59
<a href="#">Appendix A</a> : Data Collection Procedures and Sample Representativeness.....	63
<a href="#">Appendix B</a> : Inconsistencies in the Way the CSUN and Comparison Responses Are Summarized.....	67
<a href="#">Appendix C</a> : The Questionnaire for the 2007-08 HERI Faculty Survey.....	68

<a href="#">Tables 1-50</a> .....	<i>following Appendix C</i>
-----------------------------------	-----------------------------

## **Characteristics and Views of Faculty at Cal State Northridge: A Comparative Perspective Based on Findings from the Spring 2008 HERI Survey**

The Higher Education Research Institute (HERI) at UCLA has been mounting a national survey of faculty characteristics and opinions since 1969. The survey instrument used, which is reproduced in Appendix C, is wide-ranging, dealing with issues such as workload, teaching practices and research activities, interaction with students and colleagues, job satisfaction, and campus climate. Since 1989-90, the survey has been undertaken triennially, with 2007-08 marking the seventh administration in the series. Cal State Northridge participated in this most recent survey, as did faculty members from 88 other public, four-year colleges.<sup>1</sup> In addition to one other CSU campus (i.e., San Jose), this group of comparison institutions includes a geographically diverse array of public institutions (e.g., four SUNY colleges; two of the regional campuses in the University of North Carolina and Wisconsin systems).

After multiple e-mail invitations were sent out at the very end of 2007 and the beginning of 2008, 319 tenured and tenure track faculty members at CSUN had completed the HERI survey, as had 219 adjunct faculty members. The 50% response rate for the full-time grouping is somewhat greater than the 44% response rate at other public four-year institutions; no comparison data are available to judge the typicality of the 35% response rate for the Northridge adjunct faculty members. Although the available data suggest that the Northridge subsamples are representative of the larger groups from which they are drawn, the comparison data are too limited to allow any firm conclusions on this score. (Both data-collection procedures and sample representativeness are discussed in more detail in Appendix A.)

The following pages summarize the responses of the full- and part-time faculty members at Cal State Northridge who participated in the Spring 2008 HERI faculty survey. The responses of the first are compared with those of similar respondents at other public, four-year, colleges (N=8,473), while the

---

<sup>1</sup> The participating institutions also included 286 private colleges and universities, 12 public universities, and 41 two-year colleges. Four-year colleges are defined by HERI as institutions that offer an array of bachelor's degree programs and may offer post-baccalaureate programs, but few, if any, doctoral programs.

responses of the part-time adjuncts at Northridge are compared with those of similarly situated colleagues at the comparison institutions. In addition, the responses of the full- and part-time respondents from Northridge are compared with each other, with the statistically significant differences highlighted in the text. Finally, two sets of subgroup comparisons relying exclusively on the CSUN data are summarized: differences between tenure track assistant professors and tenured faculty respondents (i.e., full and associate professors) and differences between recently hired and longer term adjunct respondents (i.e., respondents hired in 2001 or later vs. those hired before 2001). By and large, only the statistically significant differences emerging from these subgroup comparisons are presented. In each section or subsection of the report, related survey items are considered together, with respondent characteristics and activity patterns considered before their views of the campus setting and their career trajectories.

In an effort to control for a number of the CSUN respondents' inexact responses regarding their current positions,<sup>2</sup> the CSUN data summaries shown here are restricted to tenured and tenure-track respondents with full-time appointments during 2007-08 (n=303) and adjunct respondents with part-time appointments during the same time period (n=174). A small number of respondents were excluded from consideration as a result, but the remaining data are more robust, with the basis for observed differences more clear-cut.<sup>3</sup> These procedures are at variance with those adopted by HERI, which simply distinguishes between respondents with full- and part-time appointments, regardless of their tenure status (see the first section of Table 1). Thus, the full-time comparison data shown include a fair number of respondents with full-time adjunct appointments. The part-time comparison data also include a number of respondents with tenured or tenure track positions, but they account for less than 5% of the respondents.

---

<sup>2</sup> A few adjunct respondents, for example, stated that CSUN had no tenure system.

<sup>3</sup> Among the 319 tenured and tenure-track CSUN respondents, 16 (5%) were excluded from consideration because they said they had less than full-time or administrative appointments. Among the 219 adjuncts, 45 (21%) were excluded because of their full-time status during 2007-08.

Although much of the HERI survey deals with relatively fixed matters, such as respondent background, workload, and scholarly activities, questions dealing with the campus environment and job satisfaction are more context-specific. Thus, in assessing the findings summarized below, it is well to bear in mind that CSUN enjoyed strong enrollment growth during the 2007-08 academic year, enrolling approximately 35,500 students during the Fall term. These students were taught by just over 1,800 full- and part-time faculty members, with a student-faculty ratio of 20:1. During the Fall term, key campus concerns included campus security in the aftermath of the shootings at Virginia Tech, planning for the April groundbreaking of the Valley Performing Arts Center, and the initial phase of the WASC reaccreditation process. The 2007-08 academic year followed a year marked by contentious faculty contract negotiations and preceded the economic meltdown at the end of 2008. In short, the late Fall-early Spring period proved to be a propitious time to administer a wide-ranging survey of how faculty perceive the opportunities and challenges integral to life on our campus.

### **Distinctive Characteristics and Views of Cal State Northridge Faculty**

The discussion in this section briefly outlines key characteristics and views of the two major groups of faculty respondents: those with tenured and tenure track positions and those with adjunct positions. In each of the two subsections, clear-cut differences between the CSUN respondents and those at the comparison institutions are highlighted. The findings emerging from the HERI survey data are summarized in more detail in the Overview of Major Findings that appears below and in the summary tables accompanying this report.

#### *Full-Time Tenured and Tenure Track Respondents*

Just over half of the full-time CSUN faculty members responding to the HERI survey hold tenured positions, with full professors predominating. They work in diverse CSUN colleges and most came to the university after 1990. These respondents are more likely than those at the comparison institutions to hold the rank of full professor.

The full-time respondents tended to be between 40 and 59 years of age at the time of the survey, and are evenly divided between men and women. Most are white, married, U.S. citizens, native speakers of English, and have completed a doctorate or equivalent degree. The majority received these degrees during the 1981-2000 period. The majority of the full-time respondents also claim liberal political views and union membership. As one might expect, the CSUN full-timers are more likely than respondents at the comparison institutions to claim this last. They are also less likely than others to be native English speakers, but more likely to have PhDs in hand and stem from Latina/o or Asian backgrounds.

The detailed workload question included in the HERI survey indicates that the majority of the tenured and tenure track respondents from CSUN devote *at least* 9 hours per week to teaching scheduled classes, another 9 hours to preparing for these classes, 1-4 hours to advising students, and at least 5 hours to committee and other administrative activities. In addition, the majority spend *at least* 5 hours each week on research and scholarly writing. They are more likely than respondents at the comparison institutions to spend more than 12 hours per week in class. In addition, they tend to spend more time than their counterparts elsewhere commuting to campus and communicating via e-mail.

The majority of the tenured and tenure track respondents report having published at least five articles in academic or professional journals and one or more chapters in edited volumes. Most have also had professional writings accepted for publication during the two years preceding the HERI survey. Although the majority have not published books or monographs, they are more likely to have done so than respondents at the comparison institutions. They are also more likely than others to have published articles and book chapters, both in the recent past and more long term. Finally, the CSUN respondents are disproportionately likely to have received institutional grants for research and to have been granted sabbatical leaves. Close to two-thirds report the former and two-fifths the latter. In addition, four in five report receiving institutional travel funds.

Close to three-fifths of the respondents report using their scholarship to address local needs or to assist community groups pro bono, with such activities often intertwined with their teaching. The majority also report involving undergraduates in research during the recent past. Although close to two-thirds of the CSUN respondents report having participated in on-campus teaching workshops at some point, they are less likely than respondents at the comparison institutions to report having participated in a “teaching enhancement workshop” in the recent past.

The majority of the tenured and tenure track respondents reported teaching two to three undergraduate courses during the term underway at the time of the survey, with close to seven-tenths teaching no more than 100 students. One half reported teaching at least one graduate course. They are less likely than respondents at the comparison institutions to be teaching four or more undergraduate courses, but more likely to report teaching graduate courses. Although close to two-fifths of the CSUN respondents report teaching GE courses, they are less likely to teach them than respondents elsewhere.

During the two years preceding the HERI survey, very few CSUN respondents taught a fully online course, though the majority posted course materials on the Internet. The majority also reported developing a new course during the recent past. Although relatively few respondents did either, those from CSUN are less likely than those at the comparison institutions to report teaching a fully online course or a first-year seminar; only one in ten of the CSUN respondents reported doing this last.

Class discussion is an important feature of most full-time respondents’ approaches to classroom teaching. In addition, the majority make use of cooperative or small group learning and real-life problems relevant to class content; they also use student inquiry to drive learning. The types of assignments respondents give to their students vary, with two used by close to half: student presentations and term papers. The majority report relying on competency-based grading in assessing student work.

Respondents’ goals for undergraduate education appear to be widely agreed upon, with almost everyone considering four intellectual skills essential or very important: thinking critically, mastering

knowledge in a discipline, evaluating the quality of information, and writing effectively. Four in five also consider the development of creative capacities vital, with a similar percentage stressing the importance of preparing students for employment or graduate study. Similar consensus prevails around goals for students' personal and civic development, with four in five respondents considering respect and tolerance for different beliefs essential or very important. Another three-quarters stress the importance of an understanding of other racial and ethnic groups, civil discourse on controversial issues, and a basic appreciation of the liberal arts. Finally, close to two-thirds consider it vital to develop students' moral character, self-understanding, and personal values.

The types of behavior tenured and tenure track respondents strive to encourage in undergraduates are also widely shared. The vast majority encourage students to ask questions in class, to support their opinions with logical arguments, and to share solutions to common problems with their classmates. Close to three-quarters also encourage students to seek feedback on their academic work, to search for alternate solutions to problems, and to evaluate the quality of information.

Seven-tenths or more of the tenured and tenure track respondents say that the following statements are at least somewhat descriptive of CSUN: there is respect for the expression of diverse values and beliefs, the administration is open about its policies, faculty are typically at odds with the campus administration, faculty are rewarded for their efforts to use instructional technology, and students can easily see faculty outside of regular office hours. In a similar vein, seven-tenths or more also agree with the following statements about the campus climate: faculty are committed to the welfare of CSUN, Student Affairs staff have the support and respect of faculty, there are clear criteria for advancement and promotion, and there is adequate support for integrating technology into teaching. The respondents are less likely to agree with this last than respondents at the comparison institutions.

Finally, the perception that faculty are treated equitably at CSUN is widespread, with four-fifths or more of the tenured and tenure track respondents agreeing that women, faculty of color, and gay and

lesbian faculty are treated fairly. At the same time, close to three-quarters of the respondents agree that the university should hire more faculty of color. In contrast to the broad agreement about campus conditions, opinions are more diverse about which of a range of possibilities have high priority at the university. Only one garners support from more than 65% of the tenured and tenure track respondents, with four-fifths saying that promotion of the intellectual development of students is a high campus priority.

When attention shifts to the departmental level, statements about colleagues' support for respondents' teaching and research garner widespread support from the full-time respondents. There is also considerable agreement that faculty are interested in students' academic and personal problems, but that most of the students taught lack the basic skills for college-level work. CSUN respondents are more likely than those at the comparison institutions to agree with this last statement, but less likely to agree that students are well-prepared academically or that faculty are interested in their personal problems.<sup>4</sup>

Close to nine in ten of the tenured and tenure track respondents say that they would still become college professors if starting their careers anew, while three-fifths say they would most likely still wish to come to CSUN. Virtually all say that teaching is essential or very important to them personally. Four in five full-time respondents also say the same thing about their research activities, with close to two-thirds considering service activities essential or very important. The CSUN respondents' commitments to teaching and service are typical, but a strong commitment to research is more widespread than at the comparison institutions.

In a detailed question about job satisfaction, two-thirds of the tenured and tenure track respondents said that they were satisfied or very satisfied with their overall job conditions. When it came to more specific aspects of their jobs, four-fifths or more expressed full satisfaction with six: freedom to determine

---

<sup>4</sup> The CSUN respondents are also less likely than those at the comparison institutions to agree that students are strongly committed to community service.

course content, job security, health benefits, retirement benefits, course assignments, and autonomy and independence. In contrast, no more than a third are satisfied with their salaries, their teaching loads, and the availability of campus child care. The CSUN respondents are less likely than those at the comparison institutions to be satisfied with campus child care or their teaching loads, but more likely to be satisfied with their health and retirement benefits.

When asked about objectives that they consider essential or very important, three-quarters of the tenured and tenure track HERI respondents identified development of a meaningful philosophy of life. Close to two-thirds also pointed to raising a family, or helping others in difficulty, as important personal objectives. In another question, three-quarters or more of the full-time respondents reported experiencing at least some stress during the preceding two years in five areas: self-imposed high expectations, lack of personal time, teaching loads, committee work, and working with underprepared students.

#### *Part-Time Adjunct Respondents*

Most of the adjunct faculty members from CSUN who responded to the HERI survey hold the title of “lecturer,” a title that appears to be less widely used at the comparison institutions. They work in the full array of CSUN colleges, with the majority beginning their university employment after 2000. Nonetheless, they are less likely than the respondents at the comparison institutions to have begun working at their current colleges in 2006-07, the year immediately preceding the current HERI survey. Like their counterparts elsewhere, close to two-fifths of the adjunct respondents report teaching at more than one institution during the term under study. At CSUN, most receive an e-mail account and access to shared office space. About half are also able to use a personal computer and a telephone or voicemail account. They are more likely than respondents at the comparison institutions to have access to shared office space, a relative benefit, since the survey findings suggest that part-timers are rarely allotted private offices.

Close to three-fifths of the adjunct respondents are women, 50 years of age or older, women, and recipients of a Master's degree or its equivalent. These degrees were generally received no earlier than 1991. Almost all of the CSUN adjuncts are U.S. citizens, while most are white, married, and native English speakers. The majority claim liberal political views and union membership. The CSUN respondents are more likely than the respondents from comparison institutions to stem from Latina/o or Asian backgrounds.<sup>5</sup>

Responses to the detailed HERI question about workload suggest that the majority of the adjunct respondents from CSUN, none of whom were carrying a full-time teaching load, devote *at least* 5 hours each week to teaching scheduled classes, another 5 hours to preparing for these classes, and 1-4 hours to advising students. In addition, the majority spend time each week on their scholarly and creative activities.

Like their counterparts elsewhere, most of CSUN's part-time adjunct respondents do not report having published book chapters or books, either in the short- or longer-term. Close to half do report having published at least one article in a scholarly journal, with one-third having items accepted for publication in the two years preceding the HERI survey. The majority also report having used their scholarship to address local needs or to assist community groups. As one might expect, few have participated in campus-sponsored activities designed to foster research productivity, though two-fifths have been involved in teaching workshops.

The majority of the adjunct respondents at CSUN report teaching at least three undergraduate courses during the term underway at the time of the HERI survey, though they tend not to deal with more than 100 students. Close to two-fifths reported teaching GE courses, while three-tenths taught one or more graduate courses. They are more likely than respondents at the comparison institutions to be

---

<sup>5</sup> The adjunct respondents at CSUN are also more likely to be union members, but, as noted above, this is to be expected.

teaching graduate courses, but also more likely to be carrying heavy undergraduate teaching loads.

During the two years preceding the HERI survey, the majority of the adjunct respondents posted course material on the Internet, while just over a quarter developed a new course. They are less likely to report having done either than respondents at the comparison institutions.

Almost all of the adjunct respondents report that class discussion is an important part of their approach to teaching. In addition, close to seven-tenths rely on cooperative or small-group learning and deal with real-life problems that are relevant to class content. A similar proportion uses student inquiry to drive learning and competency-based grading to assess student work. Two types of required assignments are favored by half of the respondents: student presentations and term papers. Close to three-tenths also give essay exams, though they are less likely to do so than their counterparts at the comparison institutions.

Adjunct respondents' goals for undergraduate education are very similar to those of their full-time counterparts, with almost everyone considering four intellectual skills essential or very important: thinking critically, mastering knowledge in a discipline, evaluating the quality of information, and writing effectively. Like their full-time counterparts, four in five adjunct respondents also consider the development of creative capacities vital, with a similar percentage stressing the importance of preparing students for employment or graduate study. Similar consensus prevails around goals for students' personal and civic development, with four in five respondents considering three matters essential or very important: respect and tolerance for different beliefs, appreciation of other racial and ethnic groups, and moral character. Close to three-quarters also consider the development of personal values and self-understanding vital, along with civil discourse on controversial issues. Finally, seven in ten say that a basic appreciation of the liberal arts is an essential or very important component of undergraduate education.

The types of behavior adjunct respondents strive to encourage in undergraduates are also widely shared and similar to those espoused by their full-time counterparts. At least four in five encourage students to ask questions in class, support their opinions with logical arguments, search for and share solutions to common problems with their classmates, seek feedback on academic work, and evaluate the quality of information. Approximately three-quarters also encourage students to search for alternate solutions to problems.

Much like their full-time counterparts, at least seven-tenths of the adjunct respondents say that the following statements are at least somewhat descriptive of CSUN: there is respect for the expression of diverse values and beliefs, the administration is open about its policies, faculty are rewarded for their efforts to use instructional technology, and students can easily see faculty outside of regular office hours. Seven-tenths or more also agree with the following statements about the campus climate: faculty are committed to the welfare of CSUN, Student Affairs staff have the support and respect of faculty, and there is adequate support for faculty development and for integrating technology into teaching.

The perception that certain types of faculty are treated fairly at CSUN is even more widespread among the adjunct respondents than among the full-timers, with almost everyone agree that women, faculty of color, and gay and lesbian faculty are treated fairly. Although two-fifths of the CSUN adjuncts also agree that the university should hire more faculty of color, they are less likely to say this than respondents at the comparison institutions. Once again, there is less widespread agreement about priorities than about campus conditions. Of the array of possibilities posed in the HERI survey, nine in ten of the adjunct respondents say that promoting the intellectual development of students has high priority at CSUN, as does the creation of a multi-cultural campus environment, according to close to three-quarters. They are more likely to see this last as a high campus priority than respondents at the comparison institutions.

Most of the CSUN adjunct respondents agree that their teaching is valued by their departmental colleagues, while three-quarters affirm that their values are congruent with dominant institutional values. A similar proportion also says that faculty are interested in students' personal problems. Although the adjunct respondents are somewhat less likely than their full-time colleagues to believe that the students they teach lack the basic skills for college work – just over three-fifths express this view -- they are more likely to agree with this statement than respondents at the comparison institutions, but less likely to agree that students are well-prepared academically.<sup>6</sup>

When asked about the treatment of part-time faculty at CSUN, almost all of the adjunct respondents agree that they are respected by students. Three-quarters also say that they have good working relationships with the administration, while seven-tenths believe they are respected by the full-time faculty. Much like their counterparts elsewhere, most agree that part-time faculty have no guarantee of secure employment at CSUN and rarely get hired into full-time positions. At the same time, most agree that part-time faculty have access to support services.

Nine in ten of the adjunct respondents said that they would probably or definitely want to become college professors if they were again at the start of their careers, while four in five would still want to come to CSUN. Like their full-time counterparts, virtually all consider their teaching essential or very important, while close to three-fifths express a similar view about their research and service activities. Finally, close to two-thirds of the adjunct respondents say that, if given the choice, they would prefer to work full-time at CSUN. They are typical of their counterparts elsewhere in this regard.

Despite the widespread desire for full-time employment, just over three-quarters of the adjunct respondents say that they are satisfied or very satisfied with their overall job conditions. At least three-quarters also said that they were fully satisfied with four of the specific job conditions considered in the

---

<sup>6</sup> Like their full-time counterparts, the adjunct respondents from CSUN are also less likely than those at the comparison institutions to agree that students are strongly committed to community service.

HERI survey: the freedom to determine course content, their autonomy and independence, their departmental leadership, and the clerical and administrative support they receive. In contrast, less than a third are satisfied with the opportunities for scholarly pursuits, their job security, their salaries, and their prospects of career advancement. The CSUN adjunct respondents are more likely than those at the comparison institutions to be satisfied with their health benefits, but less likely to be satisfied with the quality of the students.

When asked, four in five of the adjunct respondents agreed with their full-time counterparts that the development of a meaningful philosophy of life is essential or very important. Close to two-thirds expressed similar sentiments about raising a family and helping others in difficulty. Responses to another question revealed that two-thirds or more of the adjunct respondents at CSUN agreed about several matters that had caused them at least some stress during the last two years: working with underprepared students, self-imposed high expectations, managing household responsibilities, personal finances, and job security. They are more likely than respondents at the comparison institutions to mention the difficulty of working with underprepared students as a source of recent stress.

### **Key Subgroup Differences Among the Northridge Respondents**

The discussion above has treated the full- and part-time faculty respondents from CSUN independently of each other in an effort to more effectively highlight the characteristics and views that they do or do not share with comparable respondents at other similar institutions. The discussion in the Overview section below, however, also summarizes the ways in which the two groups differ, both internally and from each other. These are important considerations, since members of both groups share responsibility for student learning at a single institution.

#### *Differences Between Tenured or Tenure Track and Part-Time Adjunct Respondents*

In most cases, clear differences between the survey responses of the full- and part-time CSUN respondents are a function of the distinct expectations attached to their positions. Thus, for example, the

full-time respondents are more likely than the adjunct respondents to have tenure, to hold administrative positions, and to have doctorate degrees. The part-timers, in contrast, are more likely than the full-time respondents to be teaching courses at multiple institutions or to be employed outside of academia, to hold a Master's degree at the time of survey, and to be working on a doctorate. Less expected are the differences in degree field, though these, too, may reflect differing hiring patterns: the full-timers are more likely than the adjuncts to hold degrees in Science and Mathematics, while the latter are more likely than the full-timers to have earned degrees in Health and Human Development fields.

Largely expected as well are differences in workload and publishing patterns. The tenured and tenure track respondents are more likely than the adjunct respondents to report spending at least 5 hours per week advising students and to regularly spend time on committee work or other administrative duties. At the same time, they are more likely than the part-timers to take advantage of the campus's professional development activities, which, after all, the university provides primarily for them (i.e., institutional travel and research funds, sabbatical leaves, and training for administrative positions). The tenured and tenure track respondents are also more likely than the adjunct respondents to report spending significant time each week on research and scholarly writing. As a result, and in keeping with their job conditions, the full-time respondents are more likely than part-timers to report publishing articles or book chapters, both in the short and long term. During the two years preceding the survey, they are also more likely than the part-timers to have engaged in community outreach and involved students in research activities. The adjunct respondents, in contrast, are somewhat more likely than full-timers to report mounting exhibitions or performances, suggesting that part-time academic employment is sometimes a good fit for people pursuing careers in the arts.

A few of the observed differences relating to teaching are less fully expected than most of those mentioned thus far. As one might expect, the adjunct respondents were more likely than full-time respondents to be teaching four or more undergraduate courses in Spring 2008 and less likely to have

developed a new course during the two years preceding the HERI survey. What is more unexpected is that they are less likely than the full-timers to be dealing with more than 50 students and to report spending more than eight hours preparing for class. Finally, the adjunct respondents report spending more variable amounts of time than their full-time counterparts teaching their scheduled classes. That is, they tend to cluster at the two extremes, spending both more and less time in class than the tenured and tenure track respondents, whose teaching obligations may be more uniform.

Some respondents' views of the CSUN setting and their place in it differ in some typical ways. Thus, the tenured and tenure track respondents are more likely than the adjunct respondents to say that CSUN has clear criteria for advancement, that they at least sometimes mentor new faculty, and that their research activities are essential or very important to them. Further, the full-time respondents more frequently express full satisfaction with their job security, retirement benefits, available office or lab space, and prospects for career advancement. On the flip side, they more frequently mention several sources of recent stress that adjunct respondents, given the nature of their positions, are rarely expected to deal with: committee work, faculty meetings, teaching loads, colleagues, and research and publishing demands. The part-time respondents, in contrast, are more likely than the full-timers to point to job security as a source of recent stress.

Less expected is the finding that the adjunct respondents are more likely than the full-timers to be fully satisfied with the availability of campus child care and with the clerical and administrative support they receive. They are also more likely than the full-timers to agree that most students arrive at CSUN well-prepared academically, though only one-quarter believe that this is the case, and to say that they would definitely or probably come to CSUN, if they were beginning their careers again. These findings suggest that the adjunct respondents are relatively satisfied with the limited support they receive at CSUN, perhaps because a good many of them teach at other institutions where they may be treated even less well. The experience elsewhere may also explain why the adjunct respondents are less likely than the

tenured and tenure track respondents to say that “faculty are typically at odds with the administration” at CSUN, though this difference may just reflect differences in administrative levels typically dealt with (i.e., department or college vs. university-wide).<sup>7</sup>

#### *Differences Between Tenured and Tenure Track Respondents*

A systematic analysis of how the background and views of the tenured respondents differ from those of the tenure track assistant professors revealed a range of distinctions between the two groups. None of the clear-cut differences that emerged are unexpected, however, with all a function of differences in the nature of the positions occupied by members of the two subgroups. Thus, the tenured respondents are more likely than the assistant professors to hold administrative positions, with a fair number serving as department chairs. Further, most of the assistant professors tend to be younger than their tenured counterparts, to have earned their doctorate degrees more recently (i.e., after 2000), and to have come to CSUN more recently. The average length of employment is 4 and 16 years respectively. Finally, the tenured respondents were more likely than the assistant professors to be U.S. citizens at the time of the HERI survey and to have considered early retirement during the two years preceding it.

Although the two groups of respondents have similar teaching loads, the tenured respondents tend to spend more time than the assistant professors on committee work and other administrative duties. They are also more likely than the assistant professors to have published multiple articles in professional journals and one or more books, to have taken sabbatical leaves, and to say that they mentor new faculty. Finally, in another expected finding, the tenured respondents are more likely than the assistant professors to be satisfied or very satisfied with their job security.

---

<sup>7</sup> One last difference among the full- and part-time respondents focuses on faculty of color, with the full-timers more likely to agree that the institution should hire more of them.

*Differences Between Recently Hired and Longer Term Adjunct Respondents*

Adjunct respondents who have been at CSUN since at least 2000 are more likely than those who have worked at the university for a shorter period (i.e., the recent hires) to be employed in Humanities or Arts, Media, and Communication departments. The recent hires, in contrast, are somewhat more likely to work in departments in the Colleges of Education or Science & Mathematics. Although these two respondent subgroups differ in terms of background and workload, their views of CSUN and their place in it are remarkably similar. This lack of marked differentiation may simply reflect the small size of the two respondent subgroups under study or it may reflect the uniformity of their treatment by the university. The responses by the adjunct respondents to a question about the resources available to them while they are teaching at CSUN certainly favor the second explanation. These resources are limited – consistently involving only an e-mail account and shared office space – and are the same regardless of respondents' length of service.

The HERI survey responses indicate that most of the longer term adjunct respondents work primarily at CSUN, while the recent hires more frequently rely on another source of income, derived either from teaching at another institution or from a non-academic primary occupation. As one might expect, the recent hires tend to be younger than the longer term adjuncts – under 50 rather than over -- and to have earned their highest degrees more recently (i.e., after 1990 rather than before). Differences in degree fields mirror those in home college noted above: longer term respondents are more likely than recent hires to have degrees in humanities or arts, media, and communications fields.

The longer term adjuncts were more likely than the recent hires to be teaching three or more undergraduate courses in Spring 2008 and more likely to be responsible for more than 100 students. They are also more likely than the recent hires to have published at least one book or monograph, though neither subgroup tends to publish articles or chapters in edited collections. Finally, the longer term

adjuncts report spending more time, on average, on childcare and family responsibilities than the recent hires, an added burden that may help explain why they persist in unchanging part-time work.

*Differences by Racial and Ethnic Background*

In addition to the subgroup differences discussed here, the Spring 2008 HERI data served as the basis for a separate report on the degree to which respondent characteristics and views vary by racial and ethnic background.<sup>8</sup> This additional report provides a picture of the characteristics and views of the minority faculty responding to the survey, as well as highlighting their distinct features vis-à-vis the white respondents and each other -- four distinct subgroups could be meaningfully distinguished (i.e., African American, Latina/o, Asian, and white). Particularly striking is the concentration of the minority respondents in the College of Humanities is, where the majority are housed in the ethnic studies departments in that college.

Despite broad areas of agreement, a good many of the characteristics and views of the CSUN faculty participants, differ by racial and ethnic background, with most differences revolving around intellectual concerns relating to race and ethnicity. Thus, minority respondents are more likely than white respondents to teach ethnic studies courses, to do research focusing on race and ethnicity, to employ readings dealing with race and ethnicity in their classes, and to consider an appreciation of other racial and ethnic groups an important goal of undergraduate education. In addition, they are more likely than white respondents to say that racial and ethnic diversity should be a more prominent part of the curriculum and that promoting racial understanding is an important personal goal. Further they are more likely than white respondents to report that they experienced at least some recent stress due to subtle discrimination.

---

<sup>8</sup> The full report is entitled “The Impact of Racial and Ethnic Background on Tenure-Line Faculty Views of Cal State Northridge: Findings from the 2007-08 HERI Faculty Survey” (December 2008) and is available on request from the Office of Institutional Research at CSUN. In addition to the survey data considered here, this report also summarizes responses to a small set of campus-specific questions focusing on the treatment of faculty of color that were added to the end of the HERI survey at the request of the CSUN Faculty Senate’s Equity Committee.

Interestingly, a number of minority-white differences in perception and practice are not directly related to race and ethnicity. Some are closely related, of course: thus, minority respondents are more likely than white respondents to do research focusing on gender and to use readings dealing with gender issues in their courses. Other differences in perception are more unexpected, with minority respondents more likely than whites to use their scholarship to address community needs and to “use student inquiry to drive learning.” Minority respondents are also more likely than white respondents to stress three goals for undergraduate education: foreign language study, training students to foster social change, and developing a commitment to community service. Finally, minority respondents are more likely than whites to consider four life objectives very important: integrating spirituality into one’s life, helping others in difficulty, promoting racial understanding, and influencing social values.

### **Possible Lessons for Cal State Northridge**

Three clusters of findings discussed in this report deserve special mention for their policy implications. One set of responses by the tenured and tenure track CSUN faculty members adds substance to something that has been evident for a while: the real and abiding commitment to research at the university. The HERI data document not only this commitment, but its atypicality. When asked about their weekly activities, most full-time HERI respondents reported spending at least some time on research and scholarly writing, but the CSUN respondents are somewhat more likely than those at the comparison institutions to report such activities (92% vs. 85%). They are also more well-published than their counterparts elsewhere, being consistently more likely to have authored multiple articles in scholarly journals (i.e., five or more), one or more chapters in edited collections, and one or more books or monographs. Finally, when asked about their personal views of the three key elements of academic work, four-fifths of the CSUN full-timers said that research was essential or very important to them. This view is less widely shared at the comparison institutions, where two-thirds of the respondents say that research is essential or very important to them. In recent years, the university has responded to the faculty’s

evident commitment to research and scholarly activity through increased support of external funding requests and establishment of a Research Fellows program that makes annual awards to faculty in each of the university's Colleges.

One aspect of the adjunct data also deserves special mention. Although the adjunct respondents from CSUN are slightly more likely than their full-time counterparts to express satisfaction with their overall job conditions (78% vs. 67%), and considerably more likely to say that they would again return to CSUN if they were starting over (82% vs. 59%), those employed for longer periods of time are no more likely to articulate either of these views than the more recently hired. Moreover, the additional HERI data summarized above suggest that part-time faculty teaching at CSUN gain little by longer service. Since such instructors are likely to remain an important part of the university's teaching staff in the foreseeable future, and the institution is well-served by the continued service of proven teachers, the university's policy of treating all part-timers alike may need to be re-examined. More specifically, it might be worthwhile to devote some time and energy to identifying privileges that might provide well-deserved recognition to long-term part-time faculty members without imposing unaffordable obligations on the institution.

The third set of findings meriting special attention relates to respondents' views of undergraduates' ability to do college-level work. As the responses summarized on the next page indicate, a healthy majority of the full- and part-time respondents from CSUN think that our incoming undergraduates are unprepared for college work and are dissatisfied with students' academic preparation. In addition, close to three-quarters reported that working with underprepared students had been a source of recent stress for them.

The unsettling element in these responses is that almost all are significantly more prevalent at CSUN than at the comparison institutions. Thus, they suggest an underlying belief that today's CSUN students

are more poorly prepared for college-level work than those at comparable universities, a belief that can adversely affect the treatment of these students, as well as complicate faculty work, as is evident from the

**Responses to Survey Items Dealing with CSUN Students' Academic Preparation**

	<u>Full Time</u>		<u>Part Time</u>	
	CSUN	Public 4 year	CSUN	Public 4 year
<b>Percent Agreeing That:</b> Faculty feel that most students are well-prepared academically <hr/> (No. of responses on which percentages are based)	10.9 (302)	30.6	27.5 (171)	41.4
Most of the students I teach lack the basic skills for college level work <hr/> (No. of responses on which percentages are based)	71.8 (301)	49.7	63.0 (173)	43.5
<b>Percent Saying They Are Satisfied or Very Satisfied with:</b> Quality of students <hr/> (No. of responses on which percentages are based)	37.2 (301)	46.8	47.7 (174)	59.4
<b>Percent Experiencing at Least Some Stress About:</b> Working with underprepared students <hr/> (No. of respondents)	74.2 (302)	70.4	79.2 (173)	67.4

levels of stress associated with the perceived presence of underprepared students. Although today's undergraduates may be less well prepared for college-level work than they used to be, available evidence (e.g., the annual Freshman Survey) suggests that CSUN's entering students are much like those at comparable colleges and universities. Perhaps it would be worthwhile to weave such evidence more forcefully into ongoing campus conversations about student abilities and to consider whether more could be done to help instructors deal effectively with the students in their non-remedial classes who may require special help.

## OVERVIEW OF MAJOR FINDINGS

The following pages summarize, in a fair amount of detail, the HERI survey data presented in the 50 data tables accompanying this report. Much of the text is devoted to the 24 tables that summarize the responses of the full- and part-time respondents to individual HERI survey items. The discussion is organized by topic, with seven of the ten item clusters dealing with respondents' background and institutional activities: their current positions, background characteristics and postgraduate training, recent career transitions and mobility, workload, scholarly activities and professional development, and teaching patterns and approaches. The remaining three item clusters deal with respondents' perceptions of academic life and their role in it (i.e., the campus environment; commitments, life objectives, and satisfaction; and sources of recent stress).

Within each subsection, three different sets of responses are considered in turn: those of the tenured and tenure track respondents at CSUN and the comparison institutions, those of the adjunct respondents at CSUN and the comparison institutions, and distinct response patterns among the full- and part-time respondents at CSUN. The last pages of this overview report on the statistically significant differences between subgroups of full- and part-time CSUN respondents (i.e., tenured vs. tenure track assistant professors and recent hires vs. longer term adjuncts). The topics used to organize the initial discussion also inform this concluding discussion.

### Respondents' Current Positions (Table 1)

#### *Full-Time Tenured and Tenure Track Respondents*

- Just under three-fifths of the full-time faculty respondents (54%) from Cal State Northridge hold tenured positions, while one-third have tenure track positions. The remaining 13% held full-time adjunct positions during 2007-08. The full-time respondents from CSUN are somewhat less likely than those at the comparison institutions to hold adjunct positions (13% vs. 20%). As noted in the introduction, the CSUN full-time adjunct respondents are not considered in any of the other data summaries considered in this report.

- Of the full-time tenured and tenure track respondents at CSUN, two-fifths are full professors and one-quarter are associate professors. The remaining one-third (34%) are assistant professors. The percentage of full professors at CSUN is somewhat higher than the percentage at the comparison institutions (40% vs. 28%).<sup>9</sup>

- Three-tenths of the tenured and tenure track respondents from CSUN hold administrative positions, with most not specifying their positions in any detail. Approximately three in ten of the respondents with administrative positions are department chairs.

- One-fifth of the tenured and tenure track respondents from CSUN are in the College of Science and Mathematics, while another 12%-15% work in one of three other disciplinary areas: Humanities; Social

---

<sup>9</sup> If one ignores the respondents with lecturer or instructor positions, 34% of the remaining comparison respondents are full professors.

and Behavioral Sciences; or Arts, Media, and Communication. Taken together, these respondents account for three-fifths of the total.

- The majority of the full-time faculty respondents (56%) were appointed to their CSUN positions during the 1991-2005 period while almost one-third (29%) were first appointed before 1991. On average, they have held their positions for eight years.

### ***Part-Time Adjunct Respondents***

- Almost all of the part-time respondents from Cal State Northridge have adjunct positions. As noted in the introduction, the few part-time CSUN respondents with permanent positions are excluded from all subsequent data summaries considered in this report.

- Almost four-fifths of the part-time respondents from CSUN (79%) have lecturer positions. This title is used considerably less frequently at the comparison institutions.

- Very few of the part-time adjunct respondents from CSUN hold administrative positions.

- Close to three-fifths of the adjunct respondents work in one of four Colleges: Humanities (17%); Social and Behavioral Sciences (14%); Science and Mathematics (14%), and Arts, Media, and Communication (13%).

- Close to two-thirds of the part-time adjunct respondents (65%) were first appointed to their CSUN positions during the 1991-2005 period, while close to a quarter began to work at the university in 2006-07. Nonetheless, their average CSUN service is 7 years. The CSUN adjunct respondents are less likely than their counterparts at the comparison institutions to have first assumed their positions as recently as 2006-07 (23% vs. 34%).

- As one might expect, almost two-fifths of the adjunct respondents from CSUN (39%) were teaching courses at more than one institution at the time of the HERI survey (see section 7 of Table 1).

- Virtually all of the CSUN adjunct respondents report having an on-campus e-mail account (95%) while teaching at the university during 2007-08 and three-quarters had access to shared office space (see section 8 of Table 1). In addition, one-half of the respondents reported having access to two other items: a telephone and/or voicemail account (51%) and a personal computer (49%). Very few of the adjunct respondents had access to teaching assistants (13%) or a private office (7%). They are somewhat less likely to have access to this last than respondents at the comparison institutions (7% vs. 13%), but more likely to have shared office space (76% vs. 64%).

### ***Differences Between Tenured and Tenure Track and Adjunct Respondents from Northridge***

- The full-time respondents from Cal State Northridge are much more likely than the part-time respondents to hold tenured or tenure-track positions (87% vs. 5%). This difference is largely true by definition.

- As one would expect, the full-time tenured and tenure track respondents are more likely than the part-time adjunct respondents to hold administrative positions (30% vs. 6%).
- The full-time faculty respondents are more likely than the adjunct respondents to be long-term employees (see sections 5 and 6 of Table 1). Of the full-timers, 29% assumed their positions at CSUN in 1990 or earlier compared to 13% of the part-timers. The latter, in contrast, are more likely than the full-timers to have been initially hired after 2000 (57% vs. 44%).
- As is evident from the seventh section of Table 1, the adjunct respondents are more likely than the full-time respondents to be in the process of teaching courses at multiple institutions (39% vs. 5%). Clearly, such a difference is unexceptional.

## **Respondent Characteristics and Educational Background (Tables 2-3)**

### ***Full-Time Tenured and Tenure Track Respondents***

- The tenured and tenure track faculty respondents from CSUN are fairly evenly split by gender (52% women and 48% men), while three-fifths were between 40 and 59 at the time of the HERI survey (see the first two sections of Table 2). In addition, according to the fourth section of Table 2, three quarters of the full-time respondents are married or living with a partner. The CSUN respondents are somewhat more likely than those at the comparison institutions to be women (52% vs. 43%).
- Seven-tenths of the CSUN full-time faculty respondents are white, while 16% stem from backgrounds traditionally underserved by higher education (see the third section of Table 2). They are less likely than those at the comparison institutions to be white (70% vs. 87%) and somewhat more likely to stem from Asian and Latina/o backgrounds (11% and 9% vs. 5% and 4%).
- Close to three-quarters of the tenured and tenure track respondents from CSUN were born in the United States (74%) and are native English speakers (78%). In addition, almost nine-in-ten (87%) are U.S. citizens (see section 6 of Table 2). They are more likely than respondents at the comparison institutions to speak English as a second language (22% vs. 10%) and somewhat more likely to have been born in countries other than the United States (26% vs. 20%). Finally, the CSUN full-time respondents are somewhat less likely than those at the comparison institutions to be U.S. citizens (87% vs. 94%).
- One-third of the tenured and tenure track respondents from CSUN have spouses or partners who are academics, while approximately one in ten have either mothers or fathers who are academics (see sections 8 and 9 of Table 2).
- The tenth section of Table 2 indicates that just over three-fifths of the full-time respondents characterize their political views as “liberal,” a response that they give somewhat more frequently than respondents at the comparison institutions (63% vs. 55%).
- Two-thirds of the tenured and tenure track respondents report belonging to a faculty union (see section 11 of Table 2). As one might expect, they are more likely than respondents at the comparison institutions to report such union membership (69% vs. 40%).

- Very few of the tenured and tenure track respondents from CSUN (8%) report that they have “been sexually harassed” at this university (see section 12 of Table 2). Three-quarters of the few who responded positively (23 out of 302) are women. Among them, one in ten full-time respondents reported experiencing sexual harassment.

- Nine in ten of the full-time faculty respondents from CSUN had earned a doctorate degree or the equivalent at the time of the Spring 2008 HERI survey (see section 1 of Table 3). They are more likely to hold such degrees than their counterparts at the comparison institutions (90% vs. 71%).

- The majority of the tenured and tenure track CSUN respondents (58%) received their highest degrees between 1981 and 2000, with one-quarter receiving them more recently. The CSUN respondents are somewhat more likely than those at the comparison institutions to have received their highest degrees before 1990 (48% vs. 41%).

- According to the fourth section of Table 3, just over a fifth of the CSUN respondents received their highest degree in a Science and Mathematics field. Another 16%-18% received degrees in Humanities or Social and Behavioral Science fields.

### ***Part-Time Adjunct Respondents***

- Close to three-fifths of the part-time adjunct respondents from CSUN are women (56%) and were at least 50 years of age at the time of the HERI survey (59%). In addition, two-thirds reported being married or living with a partner (see the fourth section of Table 2), something they are somewhat less likely to report than respondents at the comparison institutions (69% vs. 77%).

- Three-quarters of the Northridge adjunct respondents are white, while one in ten stems from a background traditionally underserved by higher education (see the third section of Table 2). They are less likely to be white than the respondents at the comparison institutions (75% vs. 87%), in part because the CSUN part-timers are somewhat more likely to report Asian or “other” racial and ethnic backgrounds (16% vs. 8%).

- Four in five of the CSUN part-time respondents were born in the United States and 86% are native speakers of English (see sections 5-6 of Table 2). Almost all (96%) are U.S. citizens. They are somewhat more likely than respondents at the comparison institutions to be born in countries other than the United States (21% vs. 12%).

- One-quarter of the adjunct respondents at CSUN report having spouses or partners who are academics, while 13%-17% report having mothers or fathers who are academics (see section 8-9 of Table 2).

- According to the tenth section of Table 2, the majority of the part-time respondents from CSUN have “liberal” political views (54%). They are somewhat less likely than respondents at the comparison institutions to describe their political views as conservative (13% vs. 19%).

- Just over three-fifths of the adjunct respondents from CSUN belong to a faculty union (see section 11 of Table 2). Not unexpectedly, they are more likely to be union members than respondents at the comparison institutions (62% vs. 39%).

- Only one in twenty of the adjunct respondents reported experiencing sexual harassment at CSUN (see section 12 of Table 2). Of these 9 respondents, 7 are women. Even among them, however, only 7% of the adjunct respondents replied in the affirmative to the question about whether they had been “sexually harassed at this institution.”

- Just over three-fifths of the adjunct respondents from CSUN (62%) held a Master’s degree or the equivalent at the time of the HERI survey, with a quarter holding a doctorate degree (see section 1 of Table 3). Approximately one-tenth were in the process of completing a doctorate degree; they are somewhat less likely to be doing so than respondents at the comparison institutions (11% vs. 17%). Three-fifths of the CSUN adjuncts received their highest degree after 1990.

- The part-time faculty respondents From CSUN are most likely to have degrees in two fields (see the last section of Table 3): Humanities (18%) and Social and Behavioral Sciences (16%). In addition, 13%-14% have degrees from a Science and Mathematics, Education, or Arts/Media/Communication field.

### ***Differences Between Tenured and Tenure Track and Adjunct Respondents from Northridge***

- According to the sixth section of Table 2, the full-time tenured and tenure track respondents from Northridge are somewhat less likely than the part-time adjunct respondents to be U.S. citizens (87% vs. 96%).

- The full-time respondents are more likely than the part-time respondents to have already earned doctorate degrees or the equivalent (90% vs. 25%), but less likely to be in the process of pursuing such an advanced degree (1% vs. 11%). Neither of these differences, which are summarized in the first and second sections of Table 3, is unexpected.

- The full-time respondents from CSUN are somewhat more likely than the part-timers to have received their highest degree in a Science and Mathematics field (21% vs. 14%), but less likely to have received it in a Health and Human Development field (3% vs. 11%).

### **Recent Career Transitions and Mobility (Table 4)**

#### ***Full-Time Tenured and Tenure Track Respondents***

- Of the tenured and tenure track respondents at CSUN at least a quarter considered two professional changes during the two years preceding the HERI survey: leaving the university for another (45%) and accepting at least one firm job offer (25%). Fewer sought an early promotion or actually changed their academic institutions. The CSUN respondents were somewhat more likely to seek early promotions, however, than their counterparts at the comparison institutions (15% vs. 8%).

- At least one-quarter of the full-time CSUN respondents considered two career transitions during the two years preceding the HERI survey: leaving academia for another job or early retirement. Fewer planned to retire within the next few years or interrupted their careers for more than a year for family reasons.

### ***Part-Time Adjunct Respondents***

- During the two years preceding the HERI survey, close to one-third of the part-time adjuncts from CSUN considered leaving this university for another (33%) or received at least one firm job offer (36%). One-fifth also considered changing academic institutions.

- Close to one-third of the CSUN respondents (32%) considered leaving academia for another job during the two years preceding the HERI survey. Very few considered the three other career transitions examined in the survey. The CSUN respondents are somewhat less likely than those at the comparison institutions to have considered early retirement during the preceding two years (13% vs. 19%) or to have plans to retire in the near future (6% vs. 13%).

### ***Differences Between Tenured and Tenure Track and Adjunct Respondents from Northridge***

- The full-time tenured and tenure track respondents from CSUN are somewhat less likely than the part-time adjunct respondents to have received a least one firm job offer during the two years preceding the HERI survey (25% vs. 36%), but more likely to have requested an early promotion (15% vs. 6%).

- The full-time faculty respondents are somewhat more likely than the part-time respondents to have considered early retirement during the two years preceding the HERI survey (26% vs. 13%), but somewhat less likely to have interrupted their careers for more than a year for family reasons (11% vs. 23%).

## **Work Load (Table 5)**

### ***Full-Time Tenured and Tenure Track Respondents***

- Seven-tenths of the tenured and tenure track respondents from CSUN (71%) spend 5-12 hours per week teaching their scheduled classes, while close to two-thirds (64%) spend at least 9 hours preparing for these classes (see part I of Table 5). More than four-in-five (83%) also spend up to 8 hours per week advising students. The CSUN respondents are less likely than those at the comparison institutions to spend more than 12 hours teaching scheduled classes (14% vs. 24%).

- Four in five of the tenured and tenure track respondents from CSUN devote no more than eight hours per week to committee work and meetings, while only 29% spend more than four hours on other administrative activities (see part II of Table 5). The CSUN respondents are somewhat more likely than those from the comparison institutions to spend at least five hours per week on committee work (51% vs. 42%) and to handle other administrative duties (75% vs. 68%).

- Close to three-fifths of the full-time CSUN respondents engage in community or public service on a regular basis (60%) and spend no more than eight hours per week communicating via e-mail (57%). They are somewhat less likely than respondents at the comparison institutions to engage in community service (60% vs. 66%), but more likely to spend at least nine hours per week on e-mail (43% vs. 31%).

- According to part III of Table 5, just over three-fifths of the tenured and tenure track respondents from CSUN (63%) spend between one and eight hours per week on research and scholarly writing, while

half in other creative activities. They are somewhat more likely than respondents at the comparison institutions to spend more than eight hours per week on research and scholarly writing (30% vs. 24%).

- The majority of full-time CSUN respondents spend no more than 8 hours per week on housework and childcare (54%) and at least five hours per week commuting to campus (52%). Part IV of Table 5 indicates that they are more likely than respondents at the comparison institutions to do the second (52% vs. 33%).

- Four in ten of the tenured and tenure track respondents engage in paid consulting outside of CSUN, with most serving as consultants rather than working with patients (see part V of Table 5). Very few respondents (11%) engage in other employment outside of academia.

- Taken together, the data summarized in Table 5 indicate that the majority of the tenured and tenure track respondents from CSUN devote *at least* 9 hours each week to teaching scheduled classes, another 9 hours to preparing for these classes, 1-4 hours to advising students, and at least 5 hours to committee and other administrative activities. In addition, the majority spend *at least* 5 hours each week on research and scholarly writing.

### ***Part-Time Adjunct Respondents***

- According to part I of Table 5, just over half of the part-time adjunct respondents from CSUN spend no more than 8 hours teaching their scheduled classes (54%) or preparing for them (52%). In addition, close to three-quarters (74%) spend between one and four hours per week advising students. The CSUN adjuncts are somewhat more likely than those at the comparison institutions to spend more than 12 hours teaching their scheduled classes (26% vs. 18%) and to be involved in student advising on a weekly basis (89% vs. 79%).

- Just over three-fifths of the part-time respondents from CSUN (62%) have no regular committee responsibilities, while close to three-quarters (72%) have no other administrative responsibilities (see part II of Table 5). If they do either, it is for no more than four hours per week.

- Half of the CSUN adjunct respondents participate in community service on a regular basis, while two-thirds spend no more than eight hours per week communicating via e-mail. They are somewhat less likely than adjuncts at the comparison institutions to participate in community service (50% vs. 58%) and somewhat more likely to spend more than eight hours per week on e-mail (33% vs. 25%).

- Part III of Table 5 indicates that just over half of the adjunct respondents from CSUN regularly engage in research and scholarly writing (51%) or other creative work (56%).

- According to part IV of Table 5, close to three-fifths of the part-time CSUN respondents spend no more than eight hours per week on housework or childcare (56%) and no more than four hours per week commuting to campus (68%). They are somewhat more likely than respondents at the comparison institutions, however, to spend five or more hours per week commuting (32% vs. 25%).

- Four in ten of the adjunct respondents engage in paid consulting outside of their work at CSUN, with freelance work a more frequent choice than working with patients (see Part V of Table 5). Close to half of the CSUN adjuncts also engage in other outside employment (47%).

- Taken together, the data summarized in Table 5 indicate that the majority of the adjunct respondents from CSUN, none of whom were carrying a full-time teaching load at the time of the survey, devote *at least* 5 hours each week to teaching scheduled classes, another 5 hours to preparing for these classes, and 1-4 hours to advising students. In addition, the majority regularly spend time on their scholarly and creative activities.

### ***Differences Between Tenured and Tenure Track and Adjunct Respondents from Northridge***

- The full-time tenured and tenure track respondents from CSUN are more likely than the part-time adjuncts to spend 9-12 hours each week teaching their scheduled classes (43% vs. 20%). The part-timers, in contrast, are more likely their full-time counterparts to spend both more and less time teaching: that is, fewer than 9 hours (52% vs. 39%) or more than 12 hours (26% vs. 14%). These differences, which are evident in part I of Table 5, may indicate that part-timers' teaching loads are more variable than those of full-time faculty members.

- The full-time respondents are more likely than the part-time respondents to spend at least nine hours preparing for their classes (64% vs. 48%) and to spend more than four hours each week advising students (45% vs. 15%).

- According to part II of Table 5, the tenured and tenure track respondents are much more likely than the part-time adjuncts to do regular committee work (98% vs. 38%) or have other administrative responsibilities (75% vs. 28%). Needless to say, these differences are a consequence of the differing ways in which the two groups' appointments are defined.

- The full-time respondents are somewhat more likely than the part-time respondents to participate in community service on a regular basis (61% vs. 50%) and more likely to spend more than eight hours per week on e-mail (43% vs. 32%).

- As one might expect, the tenured and tenure track respondents are more likely than the part-time adjuncts to spend time on research and scholarly activity on a weekly basis (92% vs. 51%). This is evident from part III of Table 5.

- Part IV of Table 5 indicates that the full-time respondents are more likely than the part-time respondents to spend more than four hours per week commuting to campus (52% vs. 32%).

- As one might expect, the part-time respondents are more likely than the tenured and tenure track respondents to engage in freelance or other non-academic employment (44% and 53% vs. 30% and 11%). These differences are summarized in part V of Table 5.

## **Scholarly Activities, Community Outreach, and Professional Development (Tables 6-8)**

### ***Full-Time Tenured and Tenure Track Respondents***

- Almost all of the tenured and tenure track faculty respondents from CSUN have published one or more articles in academic or professional journals (see section 1 of Table 6), with the majority (58%) publishing at least five. In addition, the majority have published chapters in edited volumes, with one quarter publishing three or more. Finally, more than two-fifths have published one or more books, monographs, or manuals. The CSUN respondents are more likely than those at the comparison institutions to have published these last (44% vs. 33%), as well as one or more book chapters (58% vs. 43%) and at least five scholarly articles (58% vs. 42%).
- Most of the full-time CSUN respondents, like those elsewhere, have not published op-ed pieces, created computer software, or filed patent applications (see sections 4-5 of Table 6). No more than one-fifth have done any one of these.
- During the last two years, four in five of the full-time CSUN respondents have had professional writings accepted for publication, with two-fifths reporting three or more items in the process of being published during that period (see section 6-7 of Table 6). They are more likely than the respondents at the comparison institutions to have professional publications underway (80% vs. 67%). Relatively few respondents have mounted fine arts exhibitions or given performances during the two years preceding the HERI survey; only 16% of the CSUN respondents have done so.
- During the last two years, according to the eighth section Table 6, a good many of the tenured and tenure track respondents from CSUN have received some sort of funding for their research. Approximately three-tenths have received state or federal funding, almost a quarter have received foundation funding, and one in ten has received funding from business or industry.
- Various forms of community outreach, especially during the two years preceding the HERI survey, were relatively frequent among the respondents (see section 9 of Table 6). Three-fifths used their scholarship to address local community needs, just over three-fifths (62%) engaged in pro bono public service or professional consulting, and another two-fifths engaged in paid consulting. The CSUN respondents were somewhat more likely than respondents at the comparison institutions to report using their scholarship to address local community needs (59% vs. 53%).
- According to the first part of Table 7, two professional development activities were reported by the majority of the tenured and tenure track CSUN respondents: receipt of institutional travel funds (79%) and university-provided funding for research (66%). Another two-fifths (39%) reported taking sabbatical leaves and close to a quarter received training for administrative positions (23%). Finally, one-fifth had dues for professional memberships covered by the university and one in ten received tuition remission. The CSUN respondents are more likely than those from the comparison institutions to report sabbatical leaves (39% vs. 22%) and research funding (66% vs. 45%). They are also somewhat more likely than others to report receiving administrative training (23% vs. 13%).
- Approximately two-thirds of the full-time CSUN respondents (66%) reported participating in teaching workshops offered on campus (see the bottom part of Table 7), while 22% participated in off-campus workshops. They are somewhat less likely to report doing the second than respondents at the comparison institutions (22% vs. 28%).

- Almost half of the tenured and tenure track CSUN respondents participated in a teaching enhancement workshop during the two years preceding the HERI survey (see the first row of Table 8). Nonetheless, they are less likely to have done so than respondents at other public four-year institutions (48% vs. 61%).

- During the two years preceding the HERI survey, a third of the tenured and tenure track respondents from CSUN undertook research dealing with international and global issues or racial and ethnic minorities (see the middle section of Table 8). Another one-fifth undertook research dealing with women or gender issues during the same period. They were more likely than respondents at the comparison institutions to undertake research dealing with minorities (33% vs. 21%) and somewhat more likely to do work on international or global issues (33% vs. 26%).

- Over half of the full-time CSUN respondents (56%) undertook some form of collaboration with local community groups during the two years preceding the HERI survey, while 45% advised student groups involved in service or volunteer work (see the bottom part of Table 8). In addition, the majority reported working with undergraduates on some sort of research during the same two-year period (53%), with two-fifths involving them in respondents' own research.

### ***Part-Time Adjunct Respondents***

- The majority of the adjunct CSUN respondents reported no scholarly publishing activities (see sections 1-3 of Table 6). They are most likely to report publishing articles in academic or professional journals (48%), followed by books or monographs (32%), and book chapters (24%); only 11%-13% report publishing more than two items in any one of these categories. Nonetheless, they are somewhat more likely than respondents at the comparison institutions to report having written books or monographs (32% vs. 26%).

- One in four of the adjunct respondents at CSUN reported having written an op-ed piece, while only 13% have created computer software or filed a patent application (see sections 4-5 of Table 6).

- Close to two-fifths of the adjunct respondents from CSUN (37%) reported publishing one or more professional articles during the two years preceding the HERI survey, while one-fourth (26%) reported mounting a fine arts exhibition or performance (see sections 6-7 of Table 6).

- Very few of the adjunct CSUN respondents reported receiving funding for their research during the two years preceding the HERI survey (see section 8 of Table 6), with 15% reporting state or federal funding and 11% reporting foundation funding. They are typical of their counterparts elsewhere in this respect.

- According to the last section of Table 6, half of the adjunct respondents at CSUN have used their scholarship to address community needs, while 56% have engaged in pro bono public service or professional consulting during the last two years. In addition, two-fifths report having engaged in paid consulting during the recent past.

- Very few of the adjunct respondents from CSUN report having access to any of the professional development opportunities considered in Table 7. More than one-tenth report having access to only two: institutional travel funds (18%) and research funds (11%). These levels of participation are similar to those found at the comparison institutions.
- Two-fifths of the adjunct respondents from CSUN report having participated in campus-sponsored teaching workshops, while 15% have participated in off-campus workshops (see the bottom part of Table 7).
- Just over a third of the adjunct respondents from CSUN participated in a teaching enhancement workshop during the two years preceding the HERI survey (see the first row of Table 8), something they are somewhat less likely to have done than respondents from the comparison institutions (35% vs. 43%).
- During the two-year period preceding the HERI survey, according to the middle part of Table 8, 15%-20% of the adjunct CSUN respondents undertook research dealing with international or global issues (19%), racial and ethnic minorities (17%), or women and gender issues (15%).
- Three-tenths of the adjunct respondents from CSUN engaged in some sort of collaborative activity with community partners during the two years preceding the HERI survey (see the bottom part of Table 8), while close to a quarter advised student groups engaged in similar activities (23%) or worked with them on research projects (22%). Approximately one in seven (15%) involved undergraduates in their own research during the same time period.

### ***Differences Between Tenured and Tenure Track and Adjunct Respondents from Northridge***

- Tenured and tenure-track respondents at CSUN are more likely than their adjunct counterparts to report most types of publishing activities (see sections 1-6 of Table 6). In particular, they are more likely to report publishing five or more scholarly articles (58% vs. 13%) and one or more book chapters (58% vs. 24%) overall. They are also more likely to report recent publishing activities (80% vs. 37%). But, when it comes to exhibitions and performances, according to section 7 of Table 6, the part-timers are more likely to report such activity during the two years preceding the HERI survey than are the full-timers (26% vs. 16%).
- The eighth section of Table 6 indicates that the tenured and tenure-track respondents at CSUN are more likely than their part-time counterparts to have received either state and federal (29% vs. 15%) or foundation (23% vs. 11%) funding for their research.
- As one might expect, the tenured and tenure track respondents are more likely than the adjunct respondents at CSUN to report participating in all but one of the professional development activities considered in the top part of Table 7: receipt of institutional travel funds (79% vs. 18%), internal funding for their research (66% vs. 11%), sabbatical leaves (39% vs. 0%), administrative training (23% vs. 4%), and reimbursement of professional membership dues (20% vs. 6%).
- According to the bottom part of Table 7, the tenured and tenure-track CSUN respondents are more likely than the adjunct respondents to report having participated in teaching workshops offered on campus (66% vs. 41%). Members of the two groups are equally likely to report participating in off-campus workshops, though no more than a quarter appear to have done so.

- The first row of Table 8 indicates that the full-time respondents are somewhat more likely than the adjunct respondents to have participated in a teaching enhancement workshop during the two years preceding the HERI survey (48% vs. 35%).
- The full-time respondents from CSUN are more likely than the adjunct respondents to have engaged in research on two topics during the two years preceding the HERI survey (see the middle part of Table 8): international and global issues (33% vs. 19%) or racial and ethnic minorities (33% vs. 17%).
- During the two years preceding the HERI survey, the tenured and tenure track respondents from CSUN are more likely than their adjunct counterparts to report undertaking the various collaborative and research activities considered in the bottom part of Table 8: collaboration with local community groups (56% vs. 31%), advising student groups involved in service work (45% vs. 23%), working with undergraduates on some sort of research (53% vs. 22%), and involving undergraduates in one's own research (39% vs. 15%).

## **Teaching Patterns and Approaches (Tables 9-14)**

The responses summarized in this section cover the full range of teaching activities: the number and type of courses taught by respondents during 2007-08 (Tables 9 and 10); the types of assignments given, along with approaches to grading them (Table 11); instructional techniques used (Table 12); undergraduate educational goals deemed important (Table 13), and student behaviors encouraged (Table 14).

### ***Full-Time Tenured and Tenure Track Respondents***

- Virtually none of the full-time tenured and tenure track respondents from CSUN were teaching at an institution other than Northridge at the time of the HERI survey (see section 1 of Table 9).
- According to the second and third sections of Table 9, close to half of the tenured and tenure track CSUN respondents (48%) taught three or more undergraduate courses during Spring 2008 and dealt with 51 to 100 students. Another three-tenths dealt with more than 100 students. The CSUN respondents are less likely than respondents at the comparison institutions to be teaching as many as four undergraduate courses in a single term (18% vs. 33%).
- Although very few of the full-time CSUN respondents report teaching remedial courses during 2007-08, close to three-fifths taught a GE course and seven-tenths are teaching other types of undergraduate courses (see section 4 of Table 9). In addition, half report teaching a graduate course. They are more likely to be teaching the last than the respondents from the comparison institutions (50% vs. 33%), but less likely to be teaching GE courses (38% vs. 49%) or other undergraduate courses (71% vs. 84%).
- Much like their counterparts elsewhere, almost two-fifths of the CSUN tenured and tenure track respondents (38%) report receiving an award for outstanding teaching (see section 5 of Table 9).
- During the two years preceding the HERI survey, more than three-fifths of the full-time respondents at CSUN placed material on the Internet (64%), though less than one-tenth taught a course

entirely online during that period (see Table 10).<sup>10</sup> They were less likely to report doing the second than their counterparts at the comparison institutions (8% vs. 20%) and somewhat less likely to place assignments on the Internet (64% vs. 73%).

- Almost three-fifths of full-time CSUN respondents (58%) reported developing a new course during the two years preceding the HERI survey (see Table 10), while three-tenths taught an interdisciplinary course and approximately one-fifth team-taught a course (22%) or taught a service-learning course (20%). The CSUN respondents are less likely than those at the comparison institutions to report having recently taught a seminar for first-year students (11% vs. 21%), while they are somewhat less likely to have taught several types of courses: a new course that they have developed (58% vs. 65%), an interdisciplinary course (30% vs. 36%), and a team-taught course (22% vs. 28%).

- Approximately half of the full-time CSUN respondents ask students in most or all of their classes to give presentations (50%) or to prepare term papers (49%), while one-fifth ask them to complete weekly essay assignments (see the first part of Table 11). Another 40%-45% regularly give exams relying on short-answer (45%) and/or essay (44%) questions, along with periodic quizzes (40%). Finally, a third of the CSUN respondents use multiple-choice questions in their examinations. The CSUN respondents are somewhat more likely than those at the comparison institutions to assign term papers in most or all of their classes (49% vs. 43%) and somewhat less likely to use multiple-choice questions in their examinations (33% vs. 39%).

- According to the bottom part of Table 11, three-fifths of the tenured and tenure track respondents at CSUN report relying on “competency-based grading” in most or all of their courses and close to a fifth grade on a curve (22%). In addition, just over a fourth ask students to undertake peer evaluations of each other’s work (27%). The CSUN respondents are somewhat more likely than those at the comparison institutions to report generally basing their grades on a curve (22% vs. 15%) and relying on competency-based grading (61% vs. 55%).

- Almost nine in ten of the tenured and tenure track respondents from CSUN report relying on class discussions in most or all of their courses (see section 1 of Table 12); they are somewhat more likely to do so than respondents at the comparison institutions (88% vs. 83%). In addition, close to two thirds generally employ small group work in their classes (65%) or rely on real-life problems to inform class content (62%), while 47% rely on extensive lecturing. Another 30%-35% use experiential learning approaches (33%) and recitals or demonstrations (29%) in most or all of their classes.

- Well over half of the full-time CSUN respondents report using student inquiry to drive learning in most or all of their classes, while two-fifths rely on group projects (see section 2 of Table 12). In addition, a third make use of student-developed activities (e.g., assignments, exams), and a fifth rely on student-selected topics to help define course content. The CSUN respondents are somewhat more likely than those at the comparison institutions to use student inquiry to drive learning (57% vs. 49%).

- The third section of Table 12 indicates that close to three-tenths of the tenured and tenure track CSUN respondents build a focus on writing into some or all of their courses, with 29% requiring multiple drafts of written work and 27% relying on reflective writing or student journals.

---

<sup>10</sup> Most probably, if the survey were conducted today, both of these percentages would be higher.

- Between 25% and 35% of the full-time CSUN respondents build readings focusing on racial and ethnic issues (34%) or women and gender issues (25%) into most or all of their classes (see section 4 of Table 12). A focus on race and ethnicity is somewhat more often built into the CSUN respondents' courses than is the case at the comparison institutions (34% vs. 25%).

- Like their counterparts elsewhere, more than nine in ten of the tenured and tenure track respondents at CSUN consider four intellectual goals essential or very important for their undergraduate students (see section 1 of Table 13): the ability to think critically (100%), mastery of disciplinary knowledge (97%), evaluation of the quality and reliability of information (97%), and the ability to write effectively (96%). At least four-fifths also consider preparation for post-college employment (84%) and the development of students' creative capacities (82%) very important or essential educational goals, while close to three-quarters attach equal importance to preparing students for graduate study (73%).

- Close to half of the full-time respondents from CSUN say that study of a foreign language is an essential or very important goal of undergraduate education. They are somewhat less likely to place a high value on this goal than the respondents at the comparison institutions (46% vs. 51%).

- Close to two-thirds of the tenured and tenure track respondents from CSUN consider three elements of personal development essential or very important goals of undergraduate education (see section 2 of Table 13): the development of moral character (72%), development of self-understanding (68%), and development of personal values (67%). In addition, half consider support for emotional development an essential or very important educational goal.

- Between three-quarters and four-fifths of the tenured and tenure track respondents at CSUN consider four elements of civic involvement essential or very important goals of undergraduate education (see section 3 of Table 13): tolerance and respect for others with differing views (82%), enhanced appreciation of other racial and ethnic groups (75%), civil discourse around controversial issues (73%), and basic appreciation of the liberal arts (73%). A clear majority also believe that key educational goals include encouraging students to become agents of social change (62%) and develop a commitment to community service (57%).

- Table 14 summarizes the frequency with which respondents encourage a range of selected behaviors in their students. Like their counterparts elsewhere, almost all of the tenured and tenure track respondents from CSUN frequently encourage students to ask questions in class (95%), while at least four-fifths frequently encourage two other behaviors: supporting one's opinions with logical arguments (86%) and seeking solutions to problems and explaining them to others (81%). In addition, close to three-quarters of the respondents frequently encourage students' efforts to seek feedback on their academic work (77%), to find alternate solutions to problems (72%), and to evaluate the quality of the information they receive (73%).

- Close to three-fifths of the full-time respondents from CSUN frequently encourage their students to repeatedly revise their papers (62%) and seek out research materials, and they are somewhat more likely to frequently encourage this second than respondents at the comparison institutions (64% vs. 57%). Finally, the majority of respondents frequently encourage students to explore topics on their own (58%) and view failure as a necessary part of the learning process (57%).

### ***Part-Time Adjunct Respondents***

- Much like their counterparts elsewhere, approximately two-fifths of the adjunct respondents at CSUN (39%) were teaching at more than one institution at the time of the Spring 2008 HERI survey (see section 1 of Table 9).
- The majority of the adjunct respondents at CSUN taught three or more undergraduate courses during Spring 2008 and generally taught 100 or fewer students (see sections 2-3 of Table 9). The CSUN respondents are more likely than those at the comparison institutions to report teaching no undergraduate courses in Spring 2008 (13% vs. 0%), though they would have been teaching at least one graduate course, and more likely to report teaching three or more undergraduate courses (54% vs. 43%).
- Just over four-tenths of the adjunct respondents from CSUN taught or expect to teach a GE course during 2007-08, while six-tenths also report teaching other types of undergraduate course (see section 4 of Table 9). Less than a third are teaching graduate courses, but they are more likely to do so than respondents at the comparison institutions (31% vs. 16%). In contrast, they are somewhat less likely others to report teaching GE courses (43% vs. 51%).
- A little over one-tenth of the adjunct respondents from CSUN report teaching a remedial course during 2007-08, something they are somewhat more likely to be doing than their counterparts at the comparison institutions (13% vs. 8%). Close to one-fifth of the CSUN respondents also report teaching remedial reading and writing skills on a regular basis (see section 5 of Table 9). Again, they are somewhat more likely to report doing so than respondents at the comparison institutions (16%-20% vs. 7%-15%).
- Much like their counterparts elsewhere, one-third of the CSUN adjunct respondents report receiving an award for outstanding teaching (see section 6 of Table 9).
- Close to three-fifths of the adjunct respondents at CSUN report having posted course material on the Internet during the two years preceding the administration of the HERI survey (see the top row of Table 10). They are less likely than their counterparts at the comparison institutions to have posted such material (57% vs. 68%).
- Although just over a fourth of the adjunct respondents from CSUN developed a new course in the recent past (see Table 10), they are less likely to have done so than their counterparts at the comparison institutions (28% vs. 39%). Close to a fifth of the CSUN respondents taught an interdisciplinary course during recent years (22%), while 10%-16% taught several other types of courses: a first-year seminar (16%), a team-taught course (14%), a service-learning course (12%), and a fully online course (11%).
- The top part of Table 11 indicates that close to half of the adjunct respondents at CSUN report asking the students in most or all of their classes to give presentations (53%) or to prepare term papers (49%). Another 24% give weekly essay assignments. In addition, 35%-40% use short-answer (36%) or multiple-choice (41%) questions in their examinations and give periodic quizzes (39%). Finally, 28% report giving essay exams in most or all of their classes. The CSUN respondents are less likely than their counterparts at the comparison institutions to rely on these last (28% vs. 40%) and somewhat less likely to regularly give two other types of assignments: weekly essay assignments (24% vs. 30%) and short-answer exams (36% vs. 42%).

- Approximately seven in ten of the adjunct respondents at CSUN rely on “competency-based grading” in most or all of their classes (see the bottom part of Table 11), something they are somewhat more likely to do than their counterparts at the comparison institutions (69% vs. 63%). Another 18% report grading on a curve, while 28% ask students to undertake peer evaluations of each other’s work.
- According to the first section of Table 12, more than nine in ten of the adjunct respondents at CSUN report building class discussion into most or all of their courses (92%). Close to three-quarters also rely on cooperative or small group learning approaches (73%) and class content informed by real-life problems (70%). Another two-fifths build extensive lecturing and/or experiential learning into their courses, while three-tenths rely on recitals or demonstrations. The CSUN respondents are somewhat more likely than their counterparts at the comparison institutions to use cooperative learning approaches in some or all of their courses (73% vs. 65%).
- Seven-tenths of the adjunct respondents at CSUN use student inquiry to drive learning in most or all of their courses (see section 2 of Table 12), while 40%-45% make use of group projects or other student-developed activities (e.g., assignments, exams). Finally, a third allow student-selected topics to inform course content. The CSUN respondents are somewhat more likely than their counterparts at the other public four-year institutions to let student inquiry drive learning (71% vs. 65%) and to make group projects integral to their courses (45% vs. 38%).
- Between 30% and 40% of the adjunct respondents at CSUN build a focus on writing into some or all of their courses (see section 3 of Table 12). They are somewhat more likely than respondents at the comparison institutions to require students to prepare multiple drafts of written work (32% vs. 27%) or engage in some form of reflective writing (41% vs. 35%).
- Close to one quarter of the adjunct respondents at CSUN incorporate readings dealing with racial and ethnic issues (28%) or gender and women’s issues (24%) into most or all of their courses (see section 4 of Table 12).
- At least nine in ten of the adjunct respondents at CSUN indicated that, in their view, four educational goals were essential or very important for undergraduate education (see section 1 of Table 13): the ability to think critically (100%), write effectively (97%), evaluate the quality and reliability of information (96%), and master disciplinary knowledge (91%). In addition, close to four-fifths of the adjunct respondents consider preparation for post-college employment (86%), the development of students’ creative abilities (86%), and preparation for graduate study (83%) essential or very important to a solid undergraduate education. Finally, a slim majority (52%) considers foreign language study a key goal for undergraduate education. The CSUN adjunct respondents are somewhat more likely than those at the comparison institutions to stress the importance of creative development for undergraduate education (86% vs. 80%).
- Close to four-fifths of the adjunct respondents at CSUN consider three aspects of personal development essential or very important goals for undergraduate education (see section 2 of Table 13): development of moral character (84%), enhancement of students’ self-understanding (78%), and development of personal values (76%). Close to two-thirds also consider emotional development an essential or very important educational goal (64%). The CSUN respondents are somewhat more likely than those at the comparison institutions to consider the development of moral character an essential or very important educational goal (84% vs. 78%).

- More than four-fifths of the adjunct respondents at CSUN consider two aspects of civic engagement essential or very important educational goals (see section 3 of Table 13): tolerance for people with different beliefs (86%) and greater appreciation of other racial and ethnic groups (84%). In addition, three-quarters of the respondents think civil discourse around controversial issues is an essential or very important educational goal, while 70% place a similar value on acquisition of a basic appreciation of the liberal arts. Finally 60%-65% say that key educational goals include encouraging students to become agents of social change (65%) and instilling a commitment to community service (60%).

- Among a range of behaviors that faculty members might encourage in their interactions with undergraduates (see Table 14), the adjunct respondents at CSUN are most likely to frequently encourage students to ask questions in class (95%). More than four-fifths also report frequently encouraging four other behaviors: supporting one's opinions with logical arguments (87%), seeking feedback on one's academic work (83%), seeking solutions to problems and explaining them to others (82%), and evaluating the quality of information (80%). The CSUN respondents are somewhat more likely than those at the comparison institutions to frequently encourage students to seek feedback on their academic work (83% vs. 77%).

- The majority of CSUN's adjunct HERI respondents frequently encourage four other student behaviors (see Table 14). Approximately three-fifths frequently encourage undergraduates to repeatedly revise and improve their papers (62%) or explore topics on their own (64%), while the majority frequently encourage students to seek out research materials (54%) and accept occasional failure as integral to the learning process (54%).

### ***Differences Between Tenured and Tenure Track and Adjunct Respondents from Northridge***

- According to the first section of Table 9, the adjunct respondents at CSUN were significantly more likely than the tenured and tenure track respondents to be teaching at more than one institution during Spring 2008 (39% vs. 5%).

- Although the adjunct respondents at CSUN tend to be teaching more courses than their tenured and tenure track counterparts, they are not necessarily dealing with more students (see sections 2-3 of Table 9). They are more likely than the full-timers to be teaching four or more undergraduate courses (35% vs. 18%), but less likely to be teaching more than 50 students (61% vs. 76%).

- The adjunct respondents at CSUN are more likely than their tenured and tenure track counterparts of report teaching one or more remedial courses during 2007-08 (13% vs. 3%), but less likely to be teaching one or more graduate courses (31% vs. 50%). The adjunct respondents are also more likely than the full-time faculty members to regularly teach remedial reading (16% vs. 5%). Such differences, which are summarized in the fourth and fifth sections of Table 9, are not unexpected.

- According to Table 10, the full-time respondents at CSUN are more likely than the adjunct respondents to report having developed a new course during the two years preceding the HERI survey (58% vs. 28%).

- Table 11 indicates that the tenured and tenure track respondents at CSUN are more likely than their part-time peers to give students essay exams in one or more of their classes (44% vs. 28%).

- The part time respondents at CSUN are somewhat more likely than the tenured and tenure track respondents to rely on two forms of student-centered learning in most or all of their classes (see section 2 of Table 12): using student inquiry to drive learning (71% vs. 57%) and course content informed by student-selected topics (34% vs. 21%).

- CSUN's part-timers are somewhat more likely than its full-time respondents to routinely build reflective writing or student journals into their courses (41% vs. 27%). This difference is evident from the fourth section of Table 12.

- According to the second section of Table 13, the adjunct respondents at CSUN are somewhat more likely than the full-time respondents to consider two aspects of personal development key educational goals: the development of moral character (84% vs. 72%) and support for emotional development (64% vs. 50%).

### **Views of the Campus Environment (Tables 15-18)**

The three questions summarized in this section adopt somewhat different approaches to asking respondents about various elements of their institutional setting. The question underlying Table 15 asked whether respondents believed that a series of statements were very or somewhat descriptive of selected aspects of their campus environment. Because the comparison data provided by HERI dealt only with respondents who say that the statements presented are “very descriptive” of their institutions, they are not shown in the table (they do appear in Appendix B, however). The question underlying Table 16 also relies on a series of statements about aspects of respondents' institutional setting, but, in this case, respondents were asked to agree or disagree with each. The same approach was used for the question underlying Table 17, which was posed for the first time in the 2007-08 HERI survey and administered exclusively to respondents stating that they taught part-time at the current time. The table summarizes agreement with a set of 10 statements about the conditions under which part-time instructors work. Finally, Table 18 indicates whether respondents think that a set of institutional commitments are high priorities at their institutions.

#### ***Full-Time Tenured and Tenure Track Respondents***

- Four of the statements presented to respondents in the first section of Table 15 deal with various aspects of institutional functioning. Responses to them indicate that just over nine in ten of the full-time CSUN respondents (92%) concur that there is respect for the expression of diverse values and beliefs at CSUN. Three-quarters (73%) also believe that the administration is open about its policies, while a little over three-fifths (63%) concur that campus administrators consider faculty concerns in making policy. Finally, less than one-fifth of the CSUN respondents consider the campus emphasis on social activities excessive.

- Nine in ten of the full-time respondents from CSUN believe that faculty respect each other on this campus, while three-quarters say that the claim that “faculty are typically at odds with the campus administration” is at least somewhat descriptive of the campus (see the second section of Table 15). Between half and three-quarters of the respondents also concur that faculty are rewarded for: their efforts to use instructional technology (73%), for being good teachers (63%), and for their efforts to work with underprepared students (49%).

- Almost nine in ten of the tenured and tenure track faculty respondents concur with the statement that “it is easy for students to see faculty outside of regular office hours” (88%). Half also think that there “is a great deal of conformity among students,” (51%), while just over two-fifths claim that students are treated quite impersonally at CSUN (i.e., like numbers in a book).

- The responses summarized in the first table in Appendix B suggest that, in most respects, the sentiments expressed by the full-time respondents at CSUN are typical of those found at other public four-year institutions. They differ in only three respects: the full-time respondents at CSUN are less likely than those elsewhere to think that it is easy for students to see faculty outside of their office hours and that there is “a great deal of conformity” among them. In contrast, the CSUN respondents appear to be somewhat more likely than others to be certain that there is respect for the expression of diverse values on their campus.

- Table 16 presents the percentage of respondents agreeing strongly or somewhat with a series of statements about various aspects of their institutions. The first section of the table indicates that close to four in five of the tenured and tenure track respondents at CSUN agree with three statements about the campus’s institutional climate: faculty are committed to the welfare of the institution (83%), Student Affairs staff have the support and respect of the faculty (78%), and the criteria for advancement and promotion decisions are clear (79%). Seven in ten also agree that there is adequate support for integrating technology into teaching, while just over half agree that “faculty are sufficiently involved in campus decision-making” (54%). Only one-fifth agree that it is a bad idea for the institution to offer remedial education (22%).

- The full-time CSUN respondents are less likely than those at the comparison institutions to agree that the support for integrating technology into teaching is adequate (71% vs. 82%). They are also somewhat less likely than others to agree that faculty are committed to the welfare of the institution (83% vs. 90%), but somewhat more likely to think that the criteria for advancement and promotion are clear (79% vs. 70%).

- As the second section of Table 16 indicates, almost nine in ten of the tenured and tenure track respondents from CSUN agree that their teaching is valued by faculty in their departments (89%), while approximately three-quarters say that their research is similarly valued (74%). Close to two-thirds also agree that their values are congruent with those of the institution (66%) and that their “department does a good job of mentoring new faculty” (65%).

- Only one in ten of the full-time CSUN respondents agrees that “faculty feel that most students are well-prepared academically” (11%), while seven-tenths agree that most of the students they teach “lack the basic skills for college-level work” (72%). At the same time, close to three-quarters also feel that faculty are strongly interested in undergraduates’ academic problems (80%) and personal difficulties (72%) and close to two-thirds agree that the institution takes responsibility for educating underprepared students” (64%). The CSUN respondents are less likely than those at the comparison institutions to agree that students are well-prepared academically (11% vs. 31%), but more likely to agree that students lack the basic skills for college-level work (72% vs. 50%). The CSUN respondents are also less likely than those elsewhere to say that faculty members are interested in students’ personal problems (72% vs. 84%) and somewhat less likely to agree that they are strongly interested in students’ academic problems (80% vs. 88%).

- Although only one-quarter of the full-time CSUN respondents contend that students are strongly committed to community service (26%), close to half agree that “many courses involve students in community service” (48%). They are less likely to agree that students are committed to community service than respondents at the comparison institutions (26% vs. 38%).

- The third section of Table 16 indicates that between two-fifths and just over half of the full-time respondents from CSUN agree that racial and ethnic diversity should be more central to the curriculum (54%), while concurring that “many courses include feminist perspectives” (42%).

- More than four-fifths of the tenured and tenure track respondents from CSUN agree that faculty of color are treated fairly (84%), though white respondents are more likely to support this statement than those from minority backgrounds (90% vs. 71%). Moreover, very few agree that “there is a lot of campus racial conflict here” (9%). At the same time, the last section of Table 16 also indicates that a clear majority of full-time respondents agree that CSUN should hire more faculty of color (73%).<sup>11</sup> They are somewhat more likely to agree with the last than respondents at the comparison institutions (73% vs. 68%).

- Close to nine-tenths of the tenured and tenure track respondents from CSUN agree that women faculty are treated fairly (85%), as are gay and lesbian faculty (87%). Women respondents, however, are less likely than the men to concur that women receive equitable treatment (79% vs. 92%). The majority of full-time respondents also agree that CSUN should hire more women faculty (55%), with women respondents more frequent advocates than the men (62% vs. 47%).

- Close to three-fifths of the tenured and tenure track respondents from CSUN believe that the university places a high priority on three aspects of its reputation (see the first section of Table 18): the pursuit of extramural funding (64%), enhancement of its national image (62%), and increasing its prestige (57%). One-quarter also believe that the campus is highly committed to hiring faculty stars. The CSUN respondents are somewhat more likely than those at the comparison institutions to see the recruitment of stars as a high priority (25% vs. 19%). They are also somewhat more likely than others to see the pursuit of extramural funding as a high priority (64% vs. 55%).

- Close to three-fifths of the full-time CSUN respondents believe that the creation of a diverse multicultural environment is a high campus priority, as is development of an appreciation for multiculturalism (see the second section of Table 18). Both of these views are somewhat more widely articulated by the CSUN respondents than by those at the comparison institutions (64% vs. 55% and 59% vs. 54%). Close to half of the CSUN respondents also say that two other matters are high campus priorities: increasing the representation of minorities on the faculty and administration (47%), and recruiting more minority students (44%). They are somewhat less likely to see this last as a high priority than respondents at the comparison institutions (44% vs. 49%).

---

<sup>11</sup> Minority respondents are somewhat more likely than white respondents to advocate increased hiring (82% vs. 71%), but the difference is not statistically significant.

- Approximately half of the full-time respondents at CSUN say that a high campus priority is promoting gender equity among faculty (51%). Just over a third also see increasing the representation of women among members of the faculty and administration as a high priority (36%).<sup>12</sup>

- The second section of Table 18 indicates the close to three-fifths of the tenured and tenure track respondents from CSUN believe that two aspects of a more general commitment to strengthening community partnerships receive high priority on the campus: creating and sustaining partnerships with the surrounding community and strengthening links with the for-profit corporate sector. The CSUN respondents are somewhat more likely than those at the comparison institutions to articulate these views (63% and 57% vs. 55% and 50%).

- Between 44% and 46% of the full-time respondents from CSUN see three additional aspects of creating community among the campus's high priorities (see second section of Table 18): facilitating student involvement in community services, providing resources for faculty to engage in community-based teaching and research, and developing a sense of community among students and faculty. The CSUN respondents are somewhat less likely than those at the comparison institutions to identify this last as a high priority (46% vs. 51%).

- Like their counterparts elsewhere, four-fifths of the tenured and tenure track respondents from CSUN claim that "promoting the intellectual development of students" is a high priority at the university, making it far and away the priority for which there is the greatest consensus about its importance to the campus (see last section of Table 18).

- Of the full-time respondents from CSUN, 45%-47% say that three other priorities related to the development of student capacities receive high priority at CSUN (see last section of Table 18): helping students examine and understand their personal values, developing a sense of community among them, and developing their leadership abilities. The CSUN respondents are somewhat less likely to say that these last two are high campus priorities than respondents at the comparison institutions (46% vs. 51% and 45% vs. 53% respectively). Finally, 36% of the full-time CSUN respondents say that helping students learn how to bring about change in American society is a high campus priority.

### ***Part-Time Adjunct Respondents***

- Of the statements shown in Table 15, the first four focus on institutional functioning.<sup>13</sup> The responses to them suggest that more than nine in ten of the adjunct HERI respondents at CSUN concur that respect for the expression of diverse values and beliefs is descriptive of their campus (94%). In addition, 70%-80% say that the administration is open about its policies (78%) and that administrators consider faculty concerns when making policy (70%). Relatively few adjunct respondents concur that an over-emphasis on social activities characterizes CSUN (27%).

---

<sup>12</sup> Views of the priority given by CSUN to the promotion of gender equity, minority representation, and multiculturalism do not vary significantly by full-time respondents' gender or racial and ethnic background.

<sup>13</sup> The percentages in the table combine two sets of respondents: those who say the statements in question are very and somewhat descriptive of the CSUN environment.

- Nine in ten of the adjunct respondents concur that faculty respect each other at CSUN (91%), while a bare majority (54%) believe that it is accurate to say that “faculty are typically at odds with the campus administration” (see the middle section of Table 15). The percentage concurring that faculty are rewarded for their efforts varies. Close to three-quarters think they rewarded for making use of instructional technology (73%), while 46%-49% say they are rewarded for being good teachers or working with underprepared students.

- Most of the adjunct respondents from CSUN (89%) believe that “it is easy for students to see faculty members outside of regular office hours”. Just over three-fifths also concur that there is a lot of conformity among students (62%). Only a third say that “students are treated like numbers in a book at CSUN.”

- Because the comparison data provided by HERI deal only with respondents who say that the statements presented in Table 15 are “very descriptive” of their institutions, they are not shown. They appear in Appendix B, however, and suggest that, in most respects, the sentiments expressed by the adjunct respondents at CSUN are typical of those found at other public four-year institutions. They differ in only three respects: the adjunct respondents at CSUN are less likely than those elsewhere to think that there is “a great deal of conformity” among students and that “faculty here respect each other.” They are also somewhat less likely than others to be certain that “it is easy for students to see faculty outside of their office hours.”

- As noted above, Table 16 presents the percentage of respondents agreeing strongly or somewhat with a series of statements about various aspects of their institutions. The figures in the middle column of the table indicate that just over nine-tenths of the adjunct respondents from CSUN agree that “faculty are committed to the welfare of this institution.” Four-fifths also agree that Student Affairs staff have the support of faculty, though they are somewhat less likely to say this than respondents at the comparison institutions (79% vs. 84%).

- The first section of Table 16 also indicates that close to three-quarters of the adjunct respondents from CSUN agree that there is adequate support for integrating technology into one’s teaching (82%) and for faculty development (70%). Further, one-half agree that the criteria for advancement and promotion are clear and that faculty are sufficiently involved in campus decision-making. Once again, they are somewhat less likely to articulate this last than respondents at the comparison institutions (52% vs. 58%). Only one-fifth of the adjunct respondents from CSUN agree that the campus should not offer remedial education.

- Almost four in five of the adjunct respondents from CSUN agree that their teaching is valued by their departmental colleagues, but only three-fifths agree that their research is similarly valued (see the second section of Table 16). Close to three-fifths agree that their department “does a good job of mentoring new faculty” (58%), while three-quarters agree that their values are congruent with those of the institution. The CSUN adjuncts are somewhat less likely to express this second sentiment than respondents at the comparison institutions (75% vs. 80%).

- A little over one-quarter of the adjunct respondents from CSUN agree that most students are well-prepared academically, while over three-fifths say that most of the students they teach “lack the basic skills for college-level work” (see second section of Table 16). They are less likely than respondents at the comparison institutions to agree that students arrive academically prepared (28% vs. 41%), but more likely to agree that they lack the skills for college-level work (63% vs. 44%).

- At the same time, three-quarters to four-fifths of the adjunct respondents from CSUN agree that faculty are strongly interested in students' academic problems (85%), as well as interested in their personal problems (74%). Finally 62% agree that their institution "takes responsibility for educating underprepared students." They are somewhat less likely to articulate this last than respondents at the comparison institutions (74% vs. 82%) and to agree that faculty are interested in students' personal problems (62% vs. 69%).

- Although only one quarter of the adjunct respondents from CSUN agree that students are strongly committed to community service, one-half believe that "many courses involve students in community service" (51%). They are less likely than respondents at the comparison institutions to agree that students are committed to community service (24% vs. 35%).

- According to the third section of Table 16, close to half of the adjunct respondents from CSUN agree that racial and ethnic diversity should feature more prominently in the curriculum (44%) and that "many courses include feminist perspectives" (55%).

- The last section of Table 16 indicates that more than nine in ten of the adjunct respondents from CSUN agree that faculty of color are treated fairly (94%). In addition, virtually none agree that "there is a lot of campus racial conflict here." In keeping with these views, only two-fifths say that the institution should hire more faculty of color. The CSUN adjuncts are less likely to say this last than respondents at the comparison institutions (40% vs. 50%). As one might expect, minority respondents from CSUN are more likely than their white counterparts to favor increased hiring of faculty of color (57% vs. 35%).

- More than nine in ten of the adjunct respondents from CSUN agree that women faculty are treated fairly (95%), as are gay and lesbian faculty (91%). In keeping with these views, only two-fifths say that the institution should hire more women faculty (44%), with women respondents more likely than the men to agree that increased hiring would be desirable (54% vs. 33%).

- The first section of Table 17 indicates that just over three-fifths of the CSUN respondents agree, either strongly or somewhat, that part-time instructors are primarily responsible for introductory classes, though they are somewhat less likely to say this than respondents at the comparison institutions (62% vs. 68%). No more than a third of the adjunct respondents agree that part-time instructors are compensated for advising students (20%) or that they "are required to attend meetings" (34%).

- Between seven- and eight-tenths of the adjunct respondents from CSUN agree that part-time instructors "rarely get hired into full-time positions" (71%) and have no employment security (79%), but that they do have access to support services (84%). Only a third agree that part-time instructors "are given specific training before teaching" (34%). The CSUN respondents are somewhat less likely than those at the comparison institutions to agree that part-timers lack employment security (79% vs. 85%).

- According to the bottom rows of Table 17, almost all of the adjunct respondents from CSUN believe that part-time instructors are respected by students (96%), while three-quarters agree that they "have good working relationships with the administration" (77%). In addition, seven-tenths say that part-time instructors "are respected by full-time faculty" (71%), though the CSUN respondents are somewhat less likely to agree with this statement than comparable respondents elsewhere (71% vs. 79%). These responses suggest that dealing with full-time faculty members may be more of a challenge for CSUN's adjunct instructors than working with the administration.

- Close to half of the adjunct part-time respondents from CSUN indicated that the university places a high priority on three aspects of its reputation (see the first section of Table 18): the pursuit of extramural funding (49%), enhancement of its national image (53%), and increasing its prestige (54%). Close to a quarter also believe that the campus is highly committed to hiring faculty stars (23%). The CSUN respondents are somewhat less likely than those at the comparison institutions to consider enhancing institutional prestige a high campus priority (54% vs. 61%).

- Close to three-quarters of the part-time respondents from CSUN believe that creating a diverse multi-cultural campus environment is a high priority for the university (see section 2 of Table 18), a belief that they are more likely to express than respondents at the comparison institutions (73% vs. 62%). Another three-fifths say that developing an appreciation for multiculturalism is a high campus priority (61%), while just over two-fifths say that high priority is given to increasing the representation of minorities among members of the faculty and administration (42%).

- Promoting gender equity among faculty is said to be a high priority for CSUN by 56% of the adjunct respondents, while close to two-fifths think increasing the representation of women in the faculty and administration receives high priority (38%).<sup>14</sup>

- Close to half of the adjunct respondents from CSUN believe that the five-community-related commitments shown in the second section of Table 18 are considered high campus priorities: creating and sustaining partnerships with local communities (53%), strengthening links with the for-profit sector (49%), facilitating student involvement in community service (46%), providing resources for faculty to engage in community-based teaching and research (47%), and developing a sense of community among students and faculty (53%). The CSUN respondents are somewhat less likely than their counterparts at the comparison institutions to consider creating and sustaining community partnerships a high campus priority (53% vs. 59%).

- The last section of Table 18 indicates that nine in ten of the adjunct respondents from CSUN consider promoting the intellectual development of students a high campus priority, making it, along with the commitment to creating a diverse multi-campus environment (see section 2 of Table 18), one of the two priorities for which there is the greatest consensus among the adjunct respondents about their importance to the campus.

- Approximately three-fifths of the adjunct respondents from CSUN consider two student-related commitments high campus priorities (see last section of Table 18): helping students examine and understand their personal values (62%) and developing their leadership abilities (61%). In addition, 48% see helping students learn how to bring about change in American society as a high campus priority.

### ***Differences Between Tenured and Tenure Track and Adjunct Respondents from Northridge***

- According to the second section of Table 15, the full-time tenured and tenure-track HERI respondents from CSUN are more likely than their adjunct counterparts to concur that the statement, “faculty are typically at odds with the campus administration,” is at least somewhat descriptive of CSUN

---

<sup>14</sup> Views of the priority given by CSUN to the promotion of gender equity, minority representation, and multiculturalism do not vary significantly by adjunct respondents’ gender or racial and ethnic background.

(75% vs. 54%). They are also more likely than the adjunct respondents to believe that “faculty are rewarded for being good teachers (63% vs. 49%).”

- As is evident from the first two sections of Table 16, the tenured and tenure track respondents from CSUN are more likely than the adjunct respondents to agree that the criteria for advancement and promotion are clear (79% vs. 51%). They are also somewhat less likely to say that there is adequate support for integrating technology into teaching (71% vs. 82%), but somewhat more likely to agree that their research is valued by their departmental colleagues (74% vs. 61%).

- The third section of Table 16 indicates that the adjunct respondents from CSUN are more likely than the full-timers to agree that faculty feel that most students are well-prepared academically (28% vs. 11%).

- The tenured and tenure track respondents from CSUN are considerably more likely than the adjunct respondents to agree that the campus should hire more faculty of color (73% vs. 40%), but somewhat less likely to concur that faculty of color are treated fairly (84% vs. 94%). These differences are evident from the last section of Table 16.

- The adjunct respondents from CSUN are somewhat more likely than the full-timers to agree that women faculty are treated fairly (95% vs. 85%) and that many courses include feminist perspectives (55% vs. 41%).

- According to the first section of Table 18, the tenured and tenure track respondents from CSUN are somewhat more likely than the adjunct respondents to say that the pursuit of extramural funding is a high campus priority (64% vs. 49%).

- The third section of Table 18 indicates that the adjunct respondents from CSUN are somewhat more likely than their full-time counterparts to consider three student-related commitments high campus priorities: developing students' leadership ability (61% vs. 45%), promoting their intellectual development (91% vs. 80%), and helping them to examine and understand their personal values (62% vs. 47%).

## **Respondents' Commitments, Life Objectives, and Level of Satisfaction (Tables 19-22)**

The survey items summarized in this section deal with respondents' personal objectives and levels of satisfaction with their occupational circumstances. Table 19 summarizes respondents' commitment to key aspects of their academic careers, while the next two tables examine respondents' views of their personal and professional circumstances and commitments. Finally, Table 22 summarizes satisfaction with an array of job conditions.

Table 20 differs from the others in this section because the comparison data provided by HERI include only the respondents reporting that the experiences described apply to them to “a great extent”. Thus, they appear in Appendix B rather than in the table, whose percentages are more comprehensive (i.e., they combine respondents saying that the experiences in question apply to them to some extent or to a great extent).

### ***Full-Time Tenured and Tenure Track Respondents***

- Almost three-fifths of the tenured and tenure track respondents from CSUN say that they would definitely or probably want to come to this university if they were beginning their careers again (see section 1 of Table 19). They are somewhat less likely than their counterparts at the comparison institutions to give such positive responses (59% vs. 65%). The CSUN full-timers are typical, however, in saying that they would probably or definitely become college professors again – 86% gave these responses.
- When asked about the personal importance of key aspects of an academic career, virtually all of the tenured and tenure track respondents from CSUN said that teaching was essential or very important to them (see the bottom section of Table 19). Four-fifths also say that research is essential or very important to them and close to two-thirds say the same thing about service. They are like their counterparts at the comparison institutions in terms of their commitment to teaching and service, but they are more likely than those others to say that research is essential or very important to them (80% vs. 68%).
- When asked whether selected statements about their personal and professional circumstances applied to them, to at least some extent, nine-tenths or more of the tenured and tenure track respondents from CSUN answered in the affirmative in two instances (see Table 20): my work and personal values are closely aligned (97%) and my academic work spans multiple disciplines (91%). The figures shown in Table B-2 in Appendix B suggest that the CSUN respondents are somewhat more likely than those at the comparison institutions to indicate that this last applies to them.
- Approximately four-fifths of the CSUN full-time respondents reported that three other statements shown in Table 20 applied to them: the training I received in graduate school prepared me well for my role as a faculty member (83%), I achieve a healthy balance between my personal and professional lives (82%), and I mentor new faculty (80%).
- The majority of the full-time CSUN respondents (57%) said that, at least to some extent, they felt that they had to work harder than their colleagues “to be perceived as a legitimate scholar” (see last row of Table 20); only one-quarter said this last was true to a great extent, however. The women among the full-time CSUN respondents are more likely than the men to feel that they have to work harder than their colleagues to be perceived as legitimate (64% vs. 49%).<sup>15</sup>
- According to the responses summarized in Table 21, developing a meaningful philosophy of life is the essential or very important objective most frequently mentioned by the tenured and tenure track respondents from CSUN, one that they are somewhat more likely to value highly than respondents at the comparison institutions (77% vs. 72%).
- The remainder of the items appearing in the first section of Table 21 indicate that between three-fifths and two-thirds of the full-time respondents from CSUN consider two other personal or professional objectives essential or very important: raising a family (67%) and becoming an authority in my field (61%). Between 36% and 46% also said that obtaining recognition from colleagues (46%), becoming well-off financially (36%), and integrating spirituality into their lives (40%) were very important or

---

<sup>15</sup> Minority respondents are somewhat more likely than white respondents to feel that they have to work harder to be perceived as legitimate (65% vs. 55%), but the difference is not statistically significant.

essential objectives to them. The CSUN respondents are somewhat more likely than others to mention becoming an authority as an important objective (61% vs. 55%), but somewhat less likely to mention integrating spirituality into their lives (40% vs. 46%).

- The second section of Table 21 indicates that 60% to 65% of the tenured and tenure track respondents from CSUN include helping others who are in difficulty and promoting racial understanding in their essential or very important objectives. They are somewhat more likely than respondents at the comparison institutions to be committed to fostering racial understanding (60% vs. 53%). In addition, 40% to 47% of the full-time respondents are seriously committed to becoming involved in programs to clean up the environment and influencing social values. They are somewhat more likely than respondents elsewhere to mention the second and to consider influencing the political structure essential or very important (25% vs. 19%).

- Table 22 shows the percentage of respondents who say that they are satisfied or very satisfied with an array of job conditions. The top row of the table indicates that two-thirds of the full-time CSUN respondents are fully satisfied with their overall job conditions. The frequency of overall satisfaction among the CSUN respondents is somewhat lower than that found at the comparison institutions (67% vs. 72%).

- Of the institutionally-defined job conditions shown in the first section of Table 22, four-fifths or more of the full-time respondents at CSUN are satisfied or very satisfied with three of them: job security (87%), health benefits (84%), and retirement benefits (81%). In addition, 56% are satisfied with their relationship with the administration. The CSUN respondents are more likely than those at the comparison institutions to be satisfied with the institution's health (84% vs. 71%) and retirement (81% vs. 69%) benefits and somewhat more likely to be satisfied with their job security (87% vs. 77%).

- One-third to two-fifths of the tenured and tenure track respondents from CSUN are satisfied with three additional aspects of their jobs (see section 1 of Table 22): the opportunity for scholarly pursuits (40%), the quality of the students (37%), and their salaries (33%). In contrast, only 17% of the CSUN full-time respondents are satisfied with the availability of child care at the university. They are less likely to be satisfied with this last than respondents at the comparison institutions (17% vs. 35%) and somewhat less likely to be satisfied with their salaries (33% vs. 42%) or student quality (37% vs. 47%).

- According to the second section of Table 22, four-fifths or more of the full-time respondents from CSUN are satisfied or very satisfied with two departmentally-set job conditions: freedom to determine course content (93%) and their course assignments (80%). In addition, a clear majority are satisfied with the leadership of their departments (65%), available office and lab space (63%), and the clerical and administrative support the department provides (54%). Finally, three-tenths express satisfaction with their teaching loads, something they are less likely to say than respondents at the comparison institutions (31% vs. 47%). The CSUN respondents are also somewhat less likely than others to be satisfied with the clerical support they receive (54% vs. 62%).

- Four-fifths of the tenured and tenure track respondents from CSUN expressed satisfaction with their autonomy and independence (see section 3 of Table 22), while 50%-55% say they are satisfied or very satisfied with their prospects for career advancement (54%) and their visibility for jobs elsewhere (51%).

- According to the last section of Table 22, close to two-thirds of the tenured and tenure track respondents from CSUN are satisfied or very satisfied with each of the three aspects of collegial interaction considered: professional relationships with other faculty (70%), the competency of colleagues (66%), and social relationships with other faculty (63%). The CSUN respondents are somewhat less likely than those at the comparison institutions to be satisfied with their professional relationships with colleagues (70% vs. 76%) and the competency of these colleagues (66% vs. 74%).

- Taken together, four-fifths or more of the tenured and tenure track respondents from CSUN say that they are satisfied or very satisfied with six of the specific job conditions considered in the HERI survey: freedom to determine course content (93%), job security (87%), health benefits (84%), retirement benefits (81%), course assignments (80%), and autonomy and independence (80%). In contrast, no more than 40% are satisfied with the opportunities for scholarly pursuits (40%), the quality of the students (37%), their salaries (33%), their teaching loads (31%), and the availability of campus child care (17%).

### ***Part-Time Adjunct Respondents***

- Like their counterparts elsewhere, just over four-fifths of the adjunct respondents from CSUN say that they would definitely or probably come to this university if they were beginning their careers again (see top part of Table 19). Nine in ten provide the same responses when asked if they would still want to become college professors.

- Almost all of the adjunct respondents from CSUN say that teaching is an essential or very important part of their academic careers, while 61% say the same thing about service activities (see second section of Table 19). In addition, the majority say that research is essential or very important to them (55%). These responses are typical of those given at the comparison institutions.

- Like their counterparts elsewhere, close to two-thirds of the adjunct respondents from CSUN (65%) say that, if given the choice, they “would prefer to work full-time at this institution” (see last row of Table 19).

- When asked whether selected statements about their personal and professional circumstances applied to them, to at least some extent, nine-tenths or more of the adjunct respondents from CSUN replied in the affirmative in two instances (see Table 20): my work and personal values are closely aligned (99%) and I achieve a healthy balance between my personal and professional lives (93%). Approximately four-fifths also reported that two of the other statements shown in Table 20 applied to them to at least some extent: the training I received in graduate school prepared me well for my role as a faculty member (83%) and my academic work spans multiple disciplines (80%).

- According to Table 20, 45% of the adjunct respondents from CSUN report that they attempt to mentor new faculty, at least sometimes. In addition 63% said that, at least to some extent, they felt that they had to work harder than their colleagues “to be perceived as a legitimate scholar;” only one-quarter said this last was true to a great extent, however.<sup>16</sup>

---

<sup>16</sup> Adjunct responses to the item about feeling legitimate as a scholar do not vary significantly by gender or racial and ethnic background.

- According to the first section of Table 21, four in five of the adjunct respondents from CSUN consider developing a meaningful philosophy of life a very important or essential objective, making it the most frequently mentioned objective considered. Another 60%-65% say that raising a family (64%) and becoming an authority in their fields (59%) are key objectives. Other personal and professional objectives considered vital by at least one-third of the CSUN adjuncts include integrating spirituality into one's life (46%), obtaining recognition from my colleagues (39%), and becoming well off financially (37%). The CSUN respondents are somewhat less likely than those at the comparison institutions to mention integrating spirituality as a key objective (46% vs. 52%).

- Seven-tenths of the adjunct respondents from CSUN say that helping others in difficulty is an essential or very important objective (see second section of Table 21). In addition, at least half include helping to promote racial understanding (56%) or influencing social values (50%) among their vital objectives. Finally, 46% of the part-time CSUN respondents say that becoming involved in programs to clean up the environment is a key objective, while 27% mention influencing the political structure in the same vein. The commitment to cleaning up the environment is somewhat more frequently mentioned by the CSUN respondents than by their counterparts at the comparison institutions (46% vs. 41%).

- As noted above, Table 22 shows the percentage of respondents who say that they are satisfied or very satisfied with an array of job conditions. The top row of the table indicates that, like their counterparts elsewhere, approximately three-quarters of the CSUN adjunct respondents (78%) express satisfaction with their overall job conditions.

- Of the institutionally-defined job conditions shown in the first section of Table 22, close to two-thirds of the adjunct respondents at CSUN are satisfied or very satisfied with two of them: health benefits (68%) and their relationship with the administration (63%). In addition, 39%-48% are satisfied with their retirement benefits (43%), the quality of the students (48%), and the availability of campus child care (39%). The CSUN respondents are more likely than those at the comparison institutions to be satisfied with their health benefits (68% vs. 52%), but less likely to be satisfied with the quality of the students (48% vs. 59%).

- No more than three-tenths of CSUN's adjunct respondents express full satisfaction with three of the job conditions shown in the first section of Table 22: existing opportunities for scholarly pursuits (31%), job security (28%), and salaries (26%). They are somewhat less likely to be satisfied with their job security than other comparable respondents (28% vs. 35%).

- Seven-tenths or more of the adjunct respondents from CSUN express satisfaction with four of the departmentally-set job conditions considered (see section 2 of Table 22): the freedom to determine course content (86%), departmental leadership (78%), the clerical and administrative support provided (78%) and their course assignments (70%). Approximately half also express satisfaction with their teaching loads and 35% say the same thing about their office or lab space. The CSUN respondents are somewhat less likely than those at the comparison institutions to be satisfied with three of the job conditions considered: course assignments (70% vs. 80%), teaching loads (49% vs. 57%), and allotted office space (35% vs. 43%).

- The third section of Table 22 indicates that more than four-fifths of the adjunct respondents from CSUN are satisfied or very satisfied with their autonomy and independence (83%), while half are satisfied with their visibility for jobs at other institutions. In contrast, only 18% are fully satisfied with their

prospects for career advancement, something they are somewhat less likely to say than the respondents at the comparison institutions (18% vs. 26%).

- Close to seven-tenths of the adjunct respondents from CSUN express satisfaction with the three of the features of collegiality considered (see the last section of Table 22): professional relationships with other faculty (73%), the competency of colleagues (74%), and social relationships with other faculty (62%). The CSUN respondents are somewhat less likely than those at the comparison institutions to be satisfied with the competence of their colleagues (74% vs. 82%).

- Taken together, at least three-quarters of the adjunct respondents from CSUN are satisfied or very satisfied with four of the specific job conditions considered in the HERI survey: the freedom to determine course content (86%), their autonomy and independence (83%), their departmental leadership (78%), and the clerical and administrative support received (78%). In contrast, less than a third are satisfied with the opportunities for scholarly pursuits (31%), their job security (28%), their salaries (26%), and their prospects for career advancement (18%).

### ***Differences Between Tenured and Tenure Track and Adjunct Respondents from Northridge***

- According to the first section of Table 19, the adjunct respondents are more likely than the full-time tenured and tenure track respondents to say that would definitely or probably come to CSUN if they were beginning their careers again (82% vs. 59%).

- As is evident from the bottom section of Table 19, the tenured and tenure track respondents from CSUN are substantially more likely than their adjunct counterparts to say that their research activities are essential or very important to them personally (80% vs. 55%).

- The full-time respondents from CSUN are more likely than the adjunct respondents to say that they mentor new faculty, at least in some instances (80% vs. 45%). According to Table 20, they are also somewhat more likely to report that their academic work spans multiple disciplines (91% vs. 80%), but somewhat less likely to think that they are able to achieve a healthy balance between their personal and professional lives (82% vs. 93%).

- The tenured and tenure track respondents from CSUN are more likely than the adjunct respondents to be satisfied or very satisfied with several of the job conditions considered in Table 22: job security (87% vs. 28%), health benefits (84% vs. 68%), retirement benefits (81% vs. 43%), their prospects for career advancement (54% vs. 18%), and available office and lab space (63% vs. 35%). Needless to say, a good many of these differences in satisfaction can be attributed to respondents' differing job conditions.

- The adjunct respondents from CSUN are more likely than the full-time respondents to be fully satisfied with the available clerical and administrative support (78% vs. 54%), the available campus childcare (39% vs. 17%), and their teaching loads (49% vs. 31%). They are also somewhat more likely to express satisfaction with their departmental leadership (78% vs. 65%).

## Sources of Stress (Tables 23-24)

The two tables summarized in this section rely on responses to a detailed question about the extent to which a series of professional and personal challenges may have been sources of stress for respondents during the two years preceding the HERI survey. For each item considered, respondents were asked to indicate whether they had experienced extensive stress, some stress, or none at all. Table 24 summarizes the percentage of respondents providing either of the first two responses (i.e., extensive and somewhat).

Not all sources of stress considered apply equally to all respondents,<sup>17</sup> and thus, a “not relevant” response was provided. Since the differing relevance of sources of stress is interesting in and of itself, Table 23 summarizes the percentage of CSUN respondents saying that given items are not relevant to them. The table does not include comparison data because the HERI summaries did not distinguish between respondents who felt that something did not cause them stress and those who said it was not relevant to their situations.

As a result of the ambiguity in the comparison data, Table 24 presents two sets of percentages for the CSUN respondents, one of which permits comparison with responses from other institutions and one of which permits more precise comparison of the relevant responses provided by the two CSUN subgroups. This second set of percentages is cited in the text below when the CSUN data are being summarized, while the comparative differences highlighted rely on the percentages based on the more inclusive base. In both tables, the specific stressors considered are arranged in three subgroups of work-related stress (e.g., job security, dealing with colleagues) and three subgroups of personal stress (e.g., lack of personal time, managing household responsibilities).

### *Full-Time Tenured and Tenure Track Respondents*

- The first part of Table 23 indicates that almost none of the tenured and tenure track respondents from CSUN consider the work-related stressors irrelevant to their lives during the two years preceding the HERI survey. There are two partial exceptions to the general pattern: 14% appear not to have dealt with promotion issues during the period under study (14%) or to consider subtle discrimination an issue relevant to them. In contrast, a good many of the full-time CSUN respondents are unaffected by certain types of family responsibilities (see second part of Table 23). Close to a third consider spousal issues irrelevant to them, while 40% to 50% are unaffected by issues surrounding dependent care.

- Close to two-thirds of the tenured and tenure track respondents from CSUN reported feeling stress in recent years in four areas related to professional advancement (see the first section of Table 24): committee work (75%), research or publishing demands (70%), keeping up with information technology (62%), and the promotion process (53%). Just over a quarter worried about their job security (28%). The CSUN respondents were somewhat more likely than those at the comparison institutions to report stress about committee work (73% vs. 67%), publishing demands (70% vs. 62%), and the changing nature of information technology (62% vs. 55%), but less likely to feel stress about their job security (26% vs. 34%).

---

<sup>17</sup> Unmarried respondents do not, for example, experience stress due to a spouse's health problems, while respondents with adult children do not have to cope with childcare issues.

- The second section of Table 24 indicates that two-thirds of the full-time respondents from CSUN cited students in general as a source of stress during the preceding two years, while three-quarters pointed to working with underprepared students and 27% to classroom conflict. Interaction with colleagues also caused stress to a good many respondents, with two-thirds citing colleagues in general and 59% faculty meetings. Finally, just over a third of the full-time respondents highlighted subtle discrimination as a source of stress during recent years (35%).

- Four in five of the tenured and tenure track respondents cited teaching load as a source of stress during the preceding two years, while close to three-quarters pointed to institutional red tape (73%), with changes in work responsibilities singled out by 53% (see section 3 of Table 24). The CSUN respondents are somewhat more likely than those at the comparison institutions to mention work load as a stressor (78% vs. 69%).

- Turning now to the personal sources of stress, just over four-fifths of the tenured and tenure track respondents from CSUN mention two (see section 4 of Table 24): self-imposed high expectations (82%) and lack of personal time (81%). Close to three-quarters also mention the stress caused by management of household responsibilities (72%), while 66% cite personal finances. The CSUN respondents are somewhat more likely than respondents at the comparison institutions to mention limited personal time as a source of stress (80% vs. 74%), but otherwise their perceived stress levels are fairly typical.

- According to the fifth section of Table 24, just over half of the full-time respondents from CSUN (52%) have experienced recent stress about their own health, while two-fifths have worried about the health of a spouse. In addition, close to three-fifths of those with such issues have experienced stress related to being part of a dual career couple (59%), while 34% pointed to friction with partners or spouses (see section 6 of Table 24).

- The last section of Table 24 indicates that close to three-fifths of the tenured and tenure track respondents for whom dependent care is an issue have experienced recent stress around the following: child care (65%), care of an elderly parent (61%), and children's problems (53%). Such levels of stress appear to be typical of those experienced by respondents at the comparison institutions.

- Taken together, the responses summarized in Table 24 indicate that three-quarters or more of the tenured and tenure track respondents from CSUN point to five common matters that have been causes of stress during the last two years: self-imposed high expectations (82%), lack of personal time (81%), their teaching loads (80%), committee work (75%), and working with underprepared students (75%).

### ***Part-Time Adjunct Respondents***

- The first part of Table 23 indicates that a good many of the work-related stressors considered are not relevant to the adjunct respondents from CSUN, generally because of the nature of their teaching positions. Thus, between a quarter and a half say that they are unaffected by the potential adverse consequences of committee work (44%), faculty meetings (39%), research or publishing demands (33%), and the promotion process (27%).

- As was the case for the full-time respondents, a good many of the adjunct respondents from CSUN are unaffected by the stress that some family responsibilities can impose (see second part of Table 23).

Thus, 25%-28% are unaffected by spousal issues and 43%-57% do not appear to have to deal with dependent care issues.

- The first section of Table 24 indicates that only one of the professional advancement issues considered caused stress for a large majority of the adjunct respondents from CSUN: job security, an issue that they were more concerned about than respondents at the comparison institutions (67% vs. 57%). In addition, like their counterparts elsewhere, close to half of the CSUN adjuncts mentioned keeping up with information technology (51%) and the promotion process (46%) as recent sources of stress. Just over a third expressed concern about the adverse consequences of research or publishing demands (35%), while 16% mentioned committee work as a source of stress.

- Among the interpersonal stressors considered, working with underprepared students was mentioned by 81% of the adjunct respondents at CSUN as a source of recent stress, while 64% pointed to students generally (see second section of Table 24). The other sources of interpersonal stress considered are viewed as problematic by no more than a third of the respondents: colleagues (33%), classroom conflict (24%), subtle discrimination (22%), and faculty meetings (13%). The CSUN adjunct respondents are more likely than their counterparts at the comparison institutions to point to their work with underprepared students as a source of stress (79% vs. 67%).

- Close to half of the adjunct respondents from CSUN identify institutional procedures and red tape (55%) or a change in work responsibilities (47%) as sources of recent stress for them (see section 3 of Table 24). Another two-fifths identify their teaching loads as problematic.

- According to the fourth section of Table 24, close to seven-tenths of the adjunct respondents from CSUN see the life management issues considered as sources of recent stress: managing household responsibilities (73%), personal finances (71%), self-imposed high expectations (70%), and lack of personal time (65%).

- Between 45% and 50% of the adjunct respondents from CSUN pointed to recent worries about their own health (49%) or that of a spouse's (46%) as sources of stress. The majority of those in committed relationships also identified dual career tensions (52%) as stressors, while spousal frictions were singled out by 33%. The fifth and sixth sections of Table 24 indicate that these levels of stress are similar to those seen at the comparison institutions.

- Among the adjunct respondents for whom the issues are relevant, 63% of those from CSUN say that child care issues were a source of stress during the preceding two years (see section 6 of Table 24). Three-fifths also mention an elderly parent's need for care as problematic, while 46% single out children's problems more generally as sources of stress.

- Taken together, the responses summarized in Table 24 indicate that two-thirds or more of the adjunct respondents from CSUN point to five matters that have been causes of stress during the last two years: working with underprepared students (81%), self-imposed high expectations (70%), managing household responsibilities (73%), personal finances (71%), and job security (69%).

### ***Differences Between Tenured and Tenure Track and Adjunct Respondents from Northridge***

- Given the differences in the character of their positions, several of the sources of work-related stress considered in Table 23 are less relevant to the adjunct respondents from CSUN than to the full-time respondents. Thus, it is not surprising that the part-timers are more likely than the full-timers to report that the potential adverse consequences of the following are not relevant to their situations: committee work (44% vs. 2%), faculty meetings (39% vs. 1%), and research or publishing demands (33% vs. 1%). They are also somewhat more likely to say that they are unaffected by the promotion process (27% vs. 14%). Finally, the adjunct respondents are more likely than the full-time respondents to consider institutional procedures and red tape irrelevant to their situations (12% vs. 2%). Why this should be the case is not immediately clear.

- The percentage of CSUN respondents highlighting the sources of stress shown in the first section of Table 24 differs quite dramatically for the full- and part-timers. Thus, in keeping with the differing character of their positions, the full-time respondents are more likely than the adjuncts to point to recent stress related to committee work (75% vs. 16%), research or publishing demands (70% vs. 35%), and the promotion process (63% vs. 46%). In contrast, the part-time respondents are more likely than the full-timers to be worried about job security (69% vs. 28%). Only the stress created by needing to keep up with information technology is more or less equivalent.

- Of the interpersonal challenges considered (see section 2 of Table 24), two present more stress to the full-time than to the part-time respondents: faculty meetings (59% vs. 13%) and relationships with colleagues (68% vs. 33%). In addition, the full-timers are somewhat more likely to point to subtle discrimination as a source of stress (35% vs. 22%). Further, both teaching loads (80% vs. 40%) and institutional red tape (73% vs. 55%) are more likely to be identified as sources of stress by the full-time respondents than by the part-time respondents (see section 3 of Table 24). The differential importance of both teaching loads and faculty meetings as sources of stress are likely consequences of differences in respondents' positions.

- According to the second part of Table 24, only one source of personal stress is clearly more often highlighted by the full-time than by the part-time respondents from CSUN: lack of personal time (81% vs. 65%). In addition, the full-timers are somewhat more likely than the part-timers to point to self-imposed high expectations as a source of stress (82% vs. 70%). The remaining sources of recent personal stress considered appear to have approximately equal impact on both the full- and part-time respondents.

### **Subgroup Differences: Tenured vs. Tenure-Track Respondents**

Thus far, the full-time tenured and tenure track respondents from CSUN have been treated as a unified whole for the purposes of comparing them to respondents at other public four-year colleges and to the adjunct respondents from CSUN. But the respondent group contains faculty members with quite different positions: the *tenured* full and associate professors (n=197) have different responsibilities and privileges than the *tenure track* assistant professors (n=106). The two respondent subgroups are large enough to allow examination of the degree to which these positional differences give rise to differing perceptions of the CSUN environment and respondents' place within it. The text below summarizes the differing characteristics and perceptions emerging from more detailed analysis of the Northridge HERI data. The

discussion relies on Tables 25-37, which highlight the statistically significant differences between the respondents who hold tenured positions and those who are tenure track assistant professors.<sup>18</sup>

### ***Respondents' Current Positions (Table 25)***

- In keeping with the way the two subgroups are defined above, the tenured and tenure track respondents clearly differ by academic rank and tenure status. As expected, the tenured respondents are more likely than the assistant professors to hold administrative positions, with just over a third of the former serving as department chairs at the time of the HERI survey. Differences by college are largely absent, though the assistant professors are more likely than the tenured respondents to be in departments housed in Social and Behavioral Sciences, while they are least likely to be in Engineering and Computer Science or Health and Human Development.

- Not unexpectedly, virtually all of the assistant professors have come to CSUN since 2001 compared to only 15% of the tenured respondents. Of the latter, 44% percent have been on campus since at least 1990. Thus, they are the longer term employees, with an average tenure at the university of 16 years. The assistant professors, in contrast, have been on campus for four years, on average.

### ***Respondent Characteristics and Educational Background (Tables 26-28)***

- In keeping with their longer tenure at CSUN the tenured respondents tend to be older than the assistant professors; only 24% of the latter are 50 years of age or older compared to 72% of the tenured respondents (see Table 26). Although both groups are equally likely to be men or women or members of traditionally underserved groups, the tenured respondents are more likely than the assistant professors to be U.S. citizens (94% vs. 74%). In keeping with this difference, the assistant professors also appear to be somewhat more likely to have been born outside the U.S. and to have a native tongue other than English. These last two differences are not statistically significant, however.

- According to the last two sections of Table 26, the tenured respondents are somewhat more likely than the assistant professors to have spouses or partners who are academics (38% vs. 26%) and somewhat less likely to have mothers who are academics (6% vs. 13%).

- Although nine in ten of both the tenured and tenure track respondents have earned doctorate degrees or their equivalent, the assistant professors have generally earned their highest degrees more recently. Thus, as the second section of Table 27 indicates, 66% earned them in 2001 or later compared to only 4% of the tenured respondents. Of the latter, 68% earned their highest degrees before 1991. Disciplinary differences in degree field are limited, with the assistant professors somewhat more likely to have Education degrees and the tenured respondents somewhat more likely to have degrees in Science and Mathematics fields (see last section of Table 27).

- Not surprisingly, assistant professors are somewhat more likely than their tenured counterparts to report two recent professional transitions (see Table 28): receiving at least one firm job offer during the last two years (33% vs. 20%) and changing academic institutions during the same period (22% vs. 11%). In contrast, the tenured respondents are more likely than the assistant professors to have recently

---

<sup>18</sup> Given the relatively small size of the two subgroups, differences significant at the .05 level are flagged in the summary tables.

considered early retirement (34% vs. 10%). They were also somewhat more likely to be planning to retire during the next three years (17% vs. 5%).

### ***Work Load (Table 29)***

- The first section of Table 29 suggests that the tenured and tenure track HERI respondents differ not so much in average teaching load, but in terms of who teaches a great deal and who teaches very little. Although the bulk of the respondents spend between 5 and 12 hours per week in scheduled classes, the tenured respondents are more likely than the assistant professors to teach less than four hours per week (19% vs. 8%) or more than 12 hours (16% vs. 10%). Close to three-quarters of the respondents spend between 5 and 20 hours per week preparing for their scheduled classes, with the tenured respondents more likely than the assistant professors to spend fewer hours preparing (15% vs. 7%) and less likely to spend more time preparing for class (8% vs. 19%). Pretty much everyone, regardless of rank, tends to spend between one and 8 hours per week advising students.

- As one might expect, tenured respondents are more likely than assistant professors to spend at least five hours per week on committee work (58% vs. 38%) or other administrative duties (37% vs. 14%). The second section of Table 29 also indicates that most respondents spend no more than 12 hours per week communicating via e-mail. Those who spend more time, however, are more likely to be tenured respondents (25% vs. 11% for the assistant professors).

### ***Publishing Activities and Professional Development (Tables 30-31)***

- As one would expect, the tenured respondents are more likely than the assistant professors to have published five or more articles in academic or professional journals (70% vs. 36%), three or more chapters in edited volumes (32% vs. 12%), and one or more books (53% vs. 27%). But, according to Table 30, the assistant professors are somewhat more likely than the tenured respondents to have had 5 or more articles accepted for publication during the last two years (19% vs. 12%).

- The first section of Table 31 indicates that the tenured respondents are more likely than the assistant professors to have taken sabbatical leaves (54% vs. 0%) or to have received training for administrative leadership (29% vs. 10%). In contrast, the latter are somewhat more likely than the tenured respondents to report having association membership dues paid for them (29% vs. 16%) or to have received internal grants for research (75% vs. 62%). By and large, such differences are what one would expect.

- The bottom part of Table 31 indicates that, during the past two years, the assistant professors are somewhat more likely than the tenured respondents to have developed a new course (69% vs. 53%) or participated in a teaching enhancement workshop (58% vs. 43%).

### ***Teaching Patterns and Approaches (Table 32)***

- Assistant professors appear to be more likely than the tenured respondents to use several student-centered approaches to learning (see the top section of Table 32). In particular, they are somewhat more likely than their tenured counterparts to use student inquiry to drive learning (66% vs. 52%), to assign group projects (51% vs. 34%), and to rely on student-selected topics for course content (30% vs. 16%).

- The bottom section of Table 32 indicates that the assistant professors are somewhat more likely than the tenured respondents to require students to prepare multiple drafts of their written work (37% vs. 24%).

### ***Views of the Campus Community (Table 33)***

- By and large, both groups of tenured and tenure track respondents have similar views of the CSUN community.

- The assistant professors are more likely than the tenured respondents to feel that the statement “faculty here respect each other” is descriptive of CSUN (47% vs. 26%). They are also more likely to agree that their values are congruent with dominant CSUN values (75% vs. 61%).

- Assistant professors are more likely than the tenured respondents to agree that most students are strongly committed to community service (35% vs. 22%).

### ***Respondents’ Commitments, Life Objectives, and Level of Satisfaction (Tables 34-36)***

- When asked whether they would again become college professors, if they were beginning their careers over again, more than four-fifths of both the tenured and tenure track respondents answered in the affirmative (see Table 34). The assistant professors, however, are more likely than the tenured respondents to say that they would definitely or probably come to CSUN (69% vs. 53%).

- Although virtually all of the respondents in both subgroups consider teaching essential or very important to them, the assistant professors are somewhat more likely than the tenured respondents to view research in the same terms (88% vs. 76%). Respondents’ views about the importance of service are similar, with three-fifths to two-thirds considering it essential or very important.

- The top part of Table 35 indicates that assistant professors are more likely than the tenured respondents to consider two related professional objectives essential or very important: obtaining recognition from colleagues in my special field (61% vs. 38%) and becoming an authority in my field (72% vs. 55%). They are also somewhat more likely than their tenured counterparts to consider it essential or very important to become very well off financially (44% vs. 32%).

- As one might expect, the tenured respondents are more likely than the assistant professors to say that, at least to some extent, they make a practice of mentoring new faculty (91% vs. 71%).

- The assistant professors are more likely than the tenured respondents to consider two educational objectives for undergraduates essential or very important (see bottom part of Table 35): preparing students for employment after college (92% vs. 81%) and encouraging them to become agents of social change (71% vs. 57%).

- Table 36 indicates that levels of satisfaction with two of the institutionally-defined job conditions considered in the HERI survey varies by tenure status. As one might expect, the tenured respondents are more likely than the assistant professors to be satisfied or very satisfied with their job security (96% vs. 71%). They are also somewhat more likely than their untenured counterparts to express satisfaction with their salaries (38% vs. 24%).

### ***Sources of Stress (Table 37)***

- Of the five areas of professional advancement considered in a lengthy HERI question about sources of recent stress, four are viewed differently by the two groups of full-time respondents. The first section of Table 37 indicates that assistant professors are more likely than the tenured respondents to report that they had experienced at least some recent stress with relation to job security (54% vs. 13%), the demands of keeping up with information technology (86% vs. 48%), and research or publishing demands (85% vs. 62%). In contrast, the tenured respondents are more likely than the assistant professors to report that the promotion process has been a source of stress during the preceding two years (71% vs. 47%).

- As one might expect, personal finances are a more frequently mentioned source of recent stress among assistant professors than among the tenured respondents (82% vs. 57%). In addition, according to the middle section of Table 37, the challenges of managing household responsibilities appear somewhat more likely to prove stressful to assistant professors than to the tenured respondents (80% vs. 68%).

- Of the family-related sources of stress considered (see last section of Table 37), care of an elderly parent is more likely to be mentioned as a source of at least some recent stress by tenured respondents than by the assistant professors (66% vs. 47%), while the latter are more likely than their tenured counterparts to report stress resulting from friction with a spouse or partner (44% vs. 29%).

### **Subgroup Differences: Part-Time Adjuncts Differing by Length of Appointment**

Like the full-time respondents, the adjunct respondents from CSUN were treated as a unified whole for the purposes of comparing them to respondents at other public four-year colleges and to their full-time counterparts at CSUN. But the larger adjunct group also contains subgroups that may be distinct enough in character to give rise to differing perceptions of the CSUN environment and respondents' place within it. Since the respondent group is relatively small, more detailed analysis of this second subset of HERI data focused on two relatively equal subgroups that differed by the length of their CSUN employment: the 95 relatively *recently hired* respondents (i.e., in 2001 or later) and the 72 respondents who are *longer-term* employees (i.e., initial hire precedes 2001). The discussion below relies on Tables 38-50, which highlight the statistically significant differences between the setwo adjunct subgroups.<sup>19</sup> Given the small sample size, such differences are more limited than might be the case for a larger respondent set.

### ***Respondents' Current Positions (Table 38)***

- In keeping with the way the two adjunct subgroups were defined, the average CSUN tenure of the recently hired respondents is considerably shorter than that of the longer term respondents (3 years vs. 13 years). According to the first section of Table 38, three-fifths of the recent hires first came to the university during the 2001-05 period. In contrast, seven-tenths of the longer term respondents were first hired during the 1991-2000 period.

---

<sup>19</sup> Differences significant at the .05 level are flagged in the summary tables, a relatively high standard for a small sample.

- Section 3 of Table 38 indicates that respondents in the two adjunct subgroups tend to cluster in somewhat different colleges. Approximately half of the longer term adjuncts, but only one-fifth of the recent hires, cluster in two CSUN colleges: Humanities or Arts, Media, and Communication. In contrast, the latter are somewhat more likely than the longer term adjuncts to be in Education or Science and Mathematics (35% vs. 22%).

- Although a fair number of adjunct respondents were teaching at more than one institution at the time of the HERI survey, seven-tenths of the longer-term respondents taught primarily at CSUN (see sections 5-6 of Table 38). The recent hires, in contrast, are more likely than their longer term counterparts to teach at one or more other institutions (25% vs. 11%) or to be employed outside of higher education (28% vs. 18%).

- Length of tenure appears to make little difference in the resources provided to the part-time faculty at CSUN (see section 7 of Table 38). Most of the adjunct respondents report that they can rely on receiving an e-mail account and access to shared office space, while approximately half say they can use personal computers and a telephone or voicemail. The same resources appear to be provided to all part-timers; length of CSUN service plays no role.

### ***Respondent Characteristics and Educational Background (Tables 39-41)***

- As one might expect, the recently hired adjunct respondents tend to be younger than the longer term respondents (see first sections of Table 39). Just over half (52%) are under 50 years of age compared to 27% of the longer term respondents. The two sets of respondents are similar in terms of gender and racial and ethnic background: close to three-quarters are white and the majority are women.

- The recently hired adjunct respondents are somewhat more likely than the longer term respondents to have been born outside the United States (26% vs. 12%). In consequence, they were slightly less likely to be U.S. citizens at the time of the survey (see sections 4-5 of Table 39).

- According to sections 7 and 8 of Table 39, the two sets of respondents are equally likely to have spouses or partners who are academics – approximately one-quarter do -- with the longer term adjuncts somewhat more likely than the recent hires to report having mothers who were academics (18% vs. 7%).

- The first section of Table 40 indicates that seven-tenths of the recent hires have a Master's degree as their highest earned degree, as do half of the longer term adjunct respondents. The latter are somewhat more likely than the recent hires to have earned doctorate degrees (33% vs. 19%).

- As one might expect, close to three-quarters of the recent hires (73%) earned their highest degrees after 1990. The same applies to only 44% on the longer term adjuncts, the majority of whom earned their highest degrees before 1990 (see third section of Table 40).

- As is evident from the bottom section of Table 40, the degree fields of respondents' highest degrees differ, with the longer term adjuncts more likely than the recent hires to hold degrees in two fields: Arts, Media, and Communication or Humanities (43% vs. 20%). The recent hires, in contrast, are more likely than the longer term adjuncts to have degrees in Health and Human Development or Science and Mathematics (31% vs. 17%). To a large degree, these differences are a function of the disciplinary areas in which respondents teach.

- As one might expect, recently hired respondents are more likely than the longer term adjuncts to have received at least one firm job offer during the two years preceding the HERI survey (44% vs. 25%). As Table 41 indicates, they are also somewhat more likely to have changed academic institutions during the same period (24% vs. 13%).

### ***Work Load (Table 42)***

- Tenure at CSUN does not affect adjunct respondents' teaching activities in any significant way. A few differences are evident in other areas of their lives and work, however. As Table 42 indicates, the most marked difference is in terms of household and childcare duties, with longer term respondents more likely than recent hires to report devoting at least 9 hours per week to these activities (56% vs. 36%).

- The longer term respondents are also more likely than the recent hires to report consulting activities, either pro bono (67% vs. 50%) or for pay (53% vs. 33%). In addition, they are also somewhat more likely than their more recently hired counterparts to report "outside consulting or freelance work" (53% vs. 38%).

### ***Publishing Activities, Community Outreach, and Professional Development (Tables 43-44)***

- As one might expect, longer term adjuncts are more likely than recent hires to have published one or more chapters in edited books (32% vs. 17%) and one or more books (51% vs. 20%). The degree to which members of the two subgroups have published articles in academic journals, however, is more or less equivalent.

- As Table 44 indicates, relatively few adjunct respondents completing the HERI survey reported participating in the selected professional development activities sponsored by the university. The longer term respondents, however, are significantly more likely than the recent hires to report receiving internal funds for research (19% vs. 6%).

### ***Teaching Patterns and Approaches (Tables 45-46)***

- The longer term respondents are considerably more likely than the recent hires to be teaching three or more courses at CSUN during Spring 2008 (58% vs. 20%). According to the second section of Table 45, they are also more likely than the recent hires to be responsible for more than 100 students (57% vs. 20%).

- The longer term respondents are more likely than the recent hires to report teaching remedial reading and writing skills (22% and 26% vs. 8% and 13%). They are also more likely than their more recently hired counterparts to report involving students in research projects during the preceding two years, either their own (23% vs. 11%) or someone else's (30% vs. 16%).

- As one might expect, the last section of Table 45 indicates that the longer term respondents are somewhat more likely than the recent hires to have received an award for outstanding teaching (42% vs. 27%).

- Table 46 indicates that the recent hires are more likely than the longer term respondents to rely on two types of assignments: multiple choice exams (47% vs. 31%) and quizzes (45% vs. 30%).

***Views of the Campus Community, Treatment of Part-Time Faculty, and University Priorities (Tables 47-48)***

- By and large, both groups of adjunct respondents have similar views of the CSUN community and the treatment of part-time faculty.
- The recent hires have more positive views than the longer term respondents of a number of related features of the CSUN environment (see top section of Table 47). They are more likely than the longer term respondents to agree that: their values are congruent with the university's dominant values (81% vs. 65%), their research is valued by faculty in their departments (70% vs. 51%), and faculty feel that most students are well-prepared academically (36% vs. 14%). In keeping with this last, they are less likely than their longer term counterparts to agree that the institution should not offer remedial education (57% vs. 72%) and that most students lack the basic skills for college level work (57% vs. 72%).
- The recent hires also tend to see several aspects of the situation of part-time faculty more positively than the longer term respondents (see the bottom parts of Table 47). More specifically, they are more likely than the longer term respondents to agree that part-time faculty are respected by the full-time faculty (81% vs. 59%), are given specific training before teaching (39% vs. 25%), and are compensated for advising students (25% vs. 13%).
- Table 48 indicates that recent hires are more likely than longer term respondents to say that the items listed are high priorities at CSUN. These differences are statistically significant in only a few instances, however. In particular, the recent hires more frequently than their longer term counterparts say that the following are high priorities at CSUN: pursuing extramural funding (56% vs. 38%), strengthening links with the for-profit sector (55% vs. 39%), developing an appreciation of multiculturalism (68% vs. 53%), and recruiting more minority students (57% vs. 33%).

***Respondents' Life Objectives and Level of Satisfaction (Tables 49-50)***

- Table 49 indicates that the two subgroups of adjunct respondents have largely similar personal and professional objectives. Only one significant difference is apparent, with the recent hires more likely than the longer term respondents to consider it essential or very important to become very well off financially (44% vs. 25%).
- Of the institutionally- defined job conditions considered in the HERI survey, only one differs significantly by length of CSUN tenure (see middle section of Table 50). Recent hires are more likely than longer term respondents to be satisfied or very satisfied with their relationship with the administration (70% vs. 52%). They are also more likely than their longer term counterparts to be fully satisfied with two aspects of their collegial relationships (see bottom section of Table 50): their professional relationships with other faculty (80% vs. 65%) and their social relationships with their colleagues (70% vs. 54%).

## **Appendix A.**

### **Data Collection Procedures and Sample Representativeness**

The data discussed in the main body of this report were collected during the last months of 2007 and the first months of 2008. They stem from the seventh triennial administration of the Higher Education Research Institute's (HERI) Faculty Survey. The survey questionnaire inquires into a range of issues affecting college and university faculty members, including the character of their teaching and research activities, job satisfaction, goals for undergraduate education, and views of the university's priorities.

#### **Data Collection Procedures**

The distribution and collection of the survey questionnaires was undertaken jointly by the Office of Institutional Research (IR) here on campus and HERI staff. In late November 2007, IR staff used the Web portal for the HERI faculty survey to upload a list of the names and campus e-mail addresses of the teaching faculty to be surveyed. The list included 686 tenured and tenure track faculty members in residence during the Fall 2007 term, as well as the 1,065 adjunct faculty members teaching one or more classes during that semester.<sup>20</sup> The initial survey mailing went out at the beginning of December, with all faculty receiving an e-mail invitation from CSUN's Provost, Harry Hellenbrand, asking them to use a customized link to complete an on-line version of the HERI survey. Non-respondents received three follow-up e-mail messages from the Provost, each of which again invited them to complete the survey, using the customized URL provided. The first reminder was sent out in mid-December 2007, the second in mid-January 2008, and the third in early February 2008, shortly after Spring term classes had begun.

Since surveys were completed via the World Wide Web, no one at CSUN handled the individual responses in any way. Although identifiers were used to track non-respondents, they did not appear in the

---

<sup>20</sup> The survey administration focused on teaching faculty because this was the focus of the national survey. Thus, adoption of this approach insured that the CSUN responses were similar to the comparison data provided by HERI.

data file forwarded to the campus. To further insure the confidentiality of responses, no HERI or campus reports include subgroups of fewer than five faculty members.

By late March 2008, 313 full-time tenured and tenure track faculty members had completed the on-line survey, as had 217 part-time adjunct faculty members.<sup>21</sup> These respondents represent 50% of the full-time faculty members teaching at Cal State Northridge in Fall 2007 and 24% of the adjunct instructors, for an overall response rate of 35%. The response rate for the tenured and tenure track faculty members is a bit higher than that for permanent faculty members at comparable institutions (44%).

### **Representativeness of the Response Sample**

In the light of the anonymity of the survey data, the representativeness of the response sample is difficult to assess. Still, by combining some of the questionnaire data with available information for the larger group from which the respondents were drawn, it proved possible to compare both respondents and non-respondents on four to five characteristics. Table A-1 shows these characteristics for the tenured and tenure track faculty members completing the HERI survey and for the comparable instructors teaching one or more courses in Fall 2007. Table A-2 shows the same characteristics and equivalent comparison figures for the adjunct faculty respondents. The figures indicate that, by and large, the two subsamples are very similar to the larger groups from which they are drawn in terms of discipline, academic rank, gender, and racial and ethnic background.

A comparison of the first two columns of Table A-1 suggests that men and respondents over 50 are somewhat under-represented among the tenured and tenure track respondents. Minority respondents also appear to be somewhat under-represented in the tenured and tenure track subsample, though this difference is more apparent than real. If one excludes the Unknown group, the under-representation becomes insignificant: 28% minorities among the respondents compared to 31% in the faculty grouping

---

<sup>21</sup> These response numbers differ from those shown in the main body of the report because of variation in the way employment status (full-time vs. part-time) and tenure status were defined.

as a whole. Modest disproportions by College are also evident within the tenured and tenure track subsample. Respondents from Education and Social and Behavioral Sciences are somewhat over-represented in the subsample, while respondents from three Colleges tend to be under-represented: Business and Economics, Engineering and Computer Science, and Health and Human Development.

Comparing the first two columns of Table A-2 reveals modest irregularities in two aspects of the adjunct subsample. Respondents from Science and Math and Social and Behavioral Sciences tend to be somewhat over-represented in the adjunct subsample, while respondents from Engineering and Computer Science and Health and Human Development tend to be somewhat under-represented. The modest differences by racial and ethnic background in Table A-2 are again more apparent than real. If one excludes the Unknown group from consideration, minority representation is almost identical for both the subsample and larger adjunct grouping (21% vs. 23%).

The modest observed differences between the two subsamples and the larger groups from which they are drawn seem unlikely to bias the responses. The figures in the third columns of Tables A-1 and A-2 reveal this most clearly. These figures show the percentage of all faculty in a given sub-group that the tenured and tenure track or adjunct respondents represent. Thus, for example, faculty respondents who are women represent 56% of all tenured and tenure-track faculty members teaching at CSUN in Fall 2007. Whether this figure, and the others shown, is high or low can be assessed by comparing it to the percentage of tenured and tenure track instructors included in their entire subsample: 50%.

Using this percentage as a benchmark indicates that tenured and tenure track respondents who are women are well-represented in the sample, as are all but five of the other meaningfully-sized subgroups identified. The inadequately represented subgroups are tenured and tenure track faculty who are 60 and over, stem from Latina/o backgrounds, and teach in one of three Colleges: Business and Economics, Health and Human Development., and. Engineering and Computer Science. With the exception of the last College, the observed inadequacies are not pronounced.

Within the adjunct grouping, subgroup representation rarely falls significantly below the benchmark percentage of 24%. Only two subgroups appear to be inadequately represented in terms of this criterion: Latina/o adjunct faculty and those teaching in Engineering and Computer Science. As was the case for the tenured and tenure track grouping, the observed inadequacy is marginal.

The data summarized in Tables A-1 and A-2 are too sparse to allow one to conclude that the two subsamples are representative of all faculty teaching at Cal State Northridge in Fall 2007, especially since they are flawed in a number of respects (e.g., discipline and racial and ethnic background are unknown for a good many respondents). Nonetheless, nothing in the available data suggests that the two respondent subgroups are unrepresentative of the larger groups from which they are drawn.

**Table A-1. Characteristics of HERI Survey Respondents and all CSUN Faculty in Tenured and Tenure Track Positions (Percentages; Fall 2007)**

Characteristic	Faculty Completing Survey	All Faculty	Percentage of Respondents Among All Faculty	(No. of faculty on which percentage based)
<b>All Respondents</b>			49.5	645
<b>1. Gender</b>				
Women	50.8	43.7	56.4	282
Men	49.2	56.3	42.4	363
Total (No. of faculty members)	100.0 (313)	100.0 (645)		
<b>2. Age</b>				
Less than 40	19.5	19.1	48.0	123
40 - 49	24.8	24.5	47.5	158
50 - 59	35.1	32.4	50.7	209
60 or more	20.5	24.0	40.0	155
Total (No. of faculty members)	100.0 (302)	100.0 (645)		
<b>3. Racial and Ethnic Background</b>				
Minority	25.7	30.7	41.4	198
<i>African American/Black</i>	5.0	5.6	44.4	36
<i>American Indian /Native American</i>	1.3	0.9	--	6
<i>Asian American/Pacific Islander</i>	10.7	13.0	40.5	84
<i>Latina/o</i>	8.8	11.2	38.9	72
White/Caucasian	66.5	68.4	48.1	441
Unknown (includes Other)	7.8	0.9		
Total (No. of faculty members)	100.0 (319)	100.0 (645)		
<b>4. Academic Rank</b>				
Professor	40.4	42.0	40.0	271
Associate Professor	24.8	24.2	51.4	156
Assistant Professor	33.5	32.2	50.6	208
Lecturer	1.3	1.6	47.6	10
Total (No. of faculty members)	100.0 (319)	100.0 (645)		

Table A-1 cont'd.

Characteristic	Faculty Completing Survey	All Faculty	Percentage of Respondents Among All Faculty	(No. of faculty on which percentage based)
<b>4. College</b>				
Arts, Media and Communication	16.0	8.6	44.9	78
Business and Economics	11.4	8.0	34.2	73
Education	20.5	7.9	62.5	72
Engineering and Computer Science	6.4	5.3	29.2	48
Health and Human Development	12.8	8.3	37.3	75
Humanities	20.5	10.6	46.9	96
Science and Mathematics	19.2	10.3	45.2	93
Social and Behavioral Science	30.6	12.1	60.9	110
Other and Unknown	8.2	0.0		
Total	145.7	71.1		
(No. of faculty members)	(319)	(645)		

**Table A-2. Characteristics of HERI Survey Respondents and all CSUN Faculty in Adjunct Positions (Percentages; Fall 2007)**

Characteristic	Faculty Completing Survey	All Faculty	Percentage of Respondents Among All Faculty	(No. of faculty on which percentage based)
<b>All Respondents</b>			24.1	907
<b>1. Gender</b>				
Women	52.1	50.7	24.6	460
Men	47.9	49.3	23.3	447
Total (No. of faculty members)	100.0 (217)	100.0 (907)		
<b>2. Age</b>				
Less than 40	17.8	20.6	20.3	187
40 - 49	23.4	22.5	24.5	204
50 - 59	32.2	29.3	25.9	266
60 or more	26.6	27.6	22.8	250
Total (No. of faculty members)	100.0 (214)	100.0 (907)		
<b>3. Racial and Ethnic Background</b>				
Minority	19.2	23.0	20.1	209
<i>African American/Black</i>	4.1	4.6	21.4	42
<i>American Indian /Native American</i>	1.8	0.4	--	4
<i>Asian American/Pacific Islander</i>	5.9	7.5	19.1	68
<i>Latina/o</i>	7.3	10.5	16.8	95
White/Caucasian	70.3	75.3	22.5	683
Unknown (includes Other)	10.5	1.7		
Total (No. of faculty members)	100.0 (219)	100.0 (907)		
<b>4. College</b>				
Arts, Media and Communication	16.0	16.9	22.9	153
Business and Economics	5.0	5.2	23.4	47
Education	16.4	17.8	22.4	161
Engineering and Computer Science	4.6	6.4	17.2	58
Health and Human Development	11.0	14.2	18.6	129
Humanities	15.5	16.9	22.2	153
Science and Mathematics	13.7	8.9	37.0	81
Social and Behavioral Science	15.5	12.9	29.1	117
Other and Unknown	2.3	0.9		
Total (No. of faculty members)	100.0 (219)	100.0 (907)		

## **Appendix B:**

### **Inconsistencies in the Way the CSUN and Comparison Responses Are Summarized**

Two of the questions included in the 2007-08 HERI faculty survey, both of which had three response categories, could be summarized in two ways: by considering only the most extreme category (e.g., to a great extent or very descriptive) or by combining two of the three responses. The latter approach made most sense for the CSUN data, but adopting it meant that the comparison data, which were summarized in terms of the most extreme response only, could not be meaningfully presented in the tables underlying the discussion in the main text. Thus, this appendix presents the single-category CSUN and comparison data. Each of the two questions that gave rise to inconsistencies is described in a bit more detail below.

The 2007-08 faculty survey included a series of statements about various aspects of the institutional environment. Respondents were asked to indicate how descriptive each was of their college or university and could provide one of three responses: very descriptive, somewhat descriptive, and not descriptive. Considering only the first seemed unduly narrow and, thus, the summary table discussed in the main text presents combined percentages for the first two. But since the comparison data provided by HERI are restricted to the percentage of respondents saying each statement was “very descriptive,” they are presented in Table B-1 rather than in Table 15.

A second question in the 2007-08 faculty survey contained six statements about the interrelationship of several aspects of respondents’ personal and professional lives. They were asked to indicate the extent to which each applied to their circumstances and could provide one of three responses: to a great extent, to some extent, and not at all. Considering only the first, again, seemed unduly narrow and, thus, the summary table discussed in the main text presents combined percentages for the first two responses. Since the comparison data provided by HERI only deal with the percentage of respondents saying each statement applied “to a great extent,” they are presented in Table B-2 rather than in Table 20.

**Table B-1. Percentage of HERI Respondents Saying That Statements About Aspects of the CSUN Environment Are "Very Descriptive" of It by Employment Status and Comparison Group (Percentages, Spring 2008)**

	<u>Full Time</u>		<u>Part Time</u>	
	CSUN	Public 4 year	CSUN	Public 4 year
<b>Statements About Institutional Functioning</b>				
There is respect for the expression of diverse values and beliefs (No. of respondents)	<b>41.6</b> (303)	<b>35.5</b>	47.6 (170)	51.0
The administration is open about its policies (No. of respondents)	19.6 (301)	15.9	16.6 (169)	21.5
Administrators consider faculty concerns when making policy (No. of respondents)	10.3 (301)	11.7	9.5 (168)	12.2
Social activities are overemphasized (No. of respondents)	3.0 (301)	5.8	4.1 (169)	3.3
<b>Statements About Faculty Roles and Rewards</b>				
Faculty here respect each other (No. of respondents)	<b>33.7</b> (303)	<b>42.8</b>	<b>33.7</b> (172)	<b>47.0</b>
Faculty are typically at odds with the campus administration (No. of respondents)	20.5 (303)	25.1	8.3 (169)	10.2
Faculty are rewarded for their efforts to use instructional technology (No. of respondents)	20.4 (299)	21.8	<b>14.3</b> (168)	<b>20.4</b>
Faculty are rewarded for being good teachers (No. of respondents)	11.6 (303)	14.9	5.9 (169)	10.8
Faculty are rewarded for their efforts to work with underprepared students (No. of respondents)	7.0 (298)	6.3	9.0 (167)	8.2
<b>Statements About Students</b>				
It is easy for students to see faculty outside of regular office hours (No. of respondents)	<b>34.0</b> (303)	<b>58.9</b>	<b>33.7</b> (172)	<b>40.6</b>
There is a great deal of conformity among the students (No. of respondents)	<b>9.0</b> (301)	<b>24.1</b>	<b>6.5</b> (170)	<b>16.8</b>
Most students are treated like numbers in a book (No. of respondents)	7.6 (301)	3.7	3.6 (168)	4.5

Note: figures in bold indicate that a pair of percentages is moderately different, while bolded figures in a shaded cell denote a significantly different pair of percentages.

**Table B-2. Percentage of HERI Respondents Saying That Selected Statements About Their Personal and Professional Circumstances Apply to Them "To a Great Extent" by Employment Status and Comparison Group (Percentages, Spring 2008)**

	<u>Full Time</u>		<u>Part Time</u>	
	CSUN	Public 4 year	CSUN	Public 4 year
Experience close alignment between your work and your personal values (No. of respondents)	61.9 (302)	63.7	72.3 (173)	73.3
Engage in academic work that spans multiple disciplines (No. of respondents)	<b>44.9</b> (303)	<b>35.2</b>	33.9 (171)	30.9
Feel that the training you received in graduate school prepared you well for your role as a faculty mentor (No. of respondents)	40.6 (303)	41.1	41.6 (173)	40.4
Achieve a healthy balance between your personal life and your professional life (No. of respondents)	28.7 (303)	33.3	46.2 (173)	50.1
Mentor new faculty (No. of respondents)	27.7 (303)	23.1	5.2 (172)	6.5
Feel that you have to work harder than your colleagues to be perceived as a legitimate scholar (No. of respondents)	24.0 (300)	27.6	25.0 (172)	24.8

Note: figures in bold indicate that a pair of percentages is moderately different, while bolded figures in a shaded cell denote a significantly different pair of percentages.

**Appendix C:**

**The Questionnaire for the 2007-08 HERI Faculty Survey**

2007-2008 HERI FACULTY SURVEY

**NOTE: The 2007-2008 HERI Faculty Survey is a web-based survey and therefore this document does not reflect the web-based formatting.**

1. What is your principal activity in your current position at this institution? (Mark one)

- Administration
- Teaching
- Research
- Services to clients and patients
- Other

2. Are you considered a full-time employee of your institution for at least nine months of the current academic year? (Mark one)

*(Responses: Yes, No)*

PART-TIME FACULTY

*These questions will only be included for part-time faculty.*

2a. If given the choice, I would prefer to work full-time at this institution. (Mark one)

*(Responses: Yes, No)*

2b. Mark all institutional resources available to you in your last term as part-time faculty. (Mark all that apply)

- Use of private office
- Shared office space
- A personal computer
- An email account
- A phone/voicemail
- Teaching assistance

2c. Please indicate your agreement with the following statements:

*(Responses: Agree Strongly, Agree Somewhat, Disagree Somewhat, Disagree Strongly)*

Part-time instructors at this institution:

- Are given specific training before teaching
- Rarely get hired into full-time positions
- Receive respect from students
- Are primarily responsible for introductory classes
- Have no guarantee of employment security
- Have access to support services
- Are compensated for advising/counseling students
- Are required to attend meetings
- Have good workshop relationships with the administration
- Are respected by full-time faculty

2007-2008 HERI FACULTY SURVEY

3. What is your present academic rank? (Mark one)

- Professor
- Associate Professor
- Assistant Professor
- Lecturer
- Instructor

4. What is your tenure status at this institution? (Mark one)

- Tenured
- On tenure track, but not tenured
- Not on tenure track, but institution has tenure system
- Institution has no tenure system

COMMUNITY COLLEGE

*These questions will only be included for community colleges, and will replace questions 3 and 4 when the survey is used by community colleges.*

3. What is your current status at this institution? (Mark one)

- Probationary, Tenure Track....
- Probationary, Non-Tenure Track
- Renewable Contract Instructor
- Non-Probationary
- Tenured

4. What is your tenure status at this institution? (Mark one):

- Acting Instructor
- Instructor
- Assistant Professor
- Associate Professor
- Professor
- Emeritus

5. Are you currently serving in an administrative position as: (Mark all that apply)

- Department chair
- Dean (Associate or Assistant)
- President
- Vice-President
- Provost
- Other
- Not Applicable

6. My primary place of employment in the last year was: (Mark one)

- In higher education, at this institution
- In higher education, at a different institution
- In higher education, at more than one institution
- Not in higher education
- Not employed

7. Personally, how important to you is: (Mark one for each item)

*(Responses: Essential, Very Important, Somewhat Important, Not Important)*

- Research
- Teaching
- Service

2007-2008 HERI FACULTY SURVEY

8. On the following list, please mark one in each column:

- Highest Degree Earned
- Degree Currently Working On
  - Bachelor's (B.A., B.S., etc.)
  - Master's (M.A., M.S., M.F.A., M.B.A., etc.)
  - LL.B., J.D.
  - M.D., D.D.S. (or equivalent)
  - Other first professional degree beyond B.A. (e.g., D.D., D.V.M.)
  - Ed.D.
  - Ph.D.
  - Other degree
  - None

9. From what higher education institution did you receive your Bachelor's Degree? (Please enter complete name, city, state of institution)

- Institution Name \_\_\_\_\_
- City \_\_\_\_\_
- State (*Drop down*) \_\_\_\_\_
- Country \_\_\_\_\_

10. From what higher education institution did you receive your highest degree? (Please enter complete name, city, state of institution)

- Institution Name \_\_\_\_\_
- City \_\_\_\_\_
- State (*Drop down*) \_\_\_\_\_
- Country \_\_\_\_\_

11. During the past two years, have you engaged in any of the following activities? (Mark Yes or No for each item)

(Responses: *Yes, No*)

- Taught an honors course
- Taught an interdisciplinary course
- Taught an ethnic studies course
- Taught a women's studies course
- Team-taught a course
- Taught a service learning course
- Placed or collected assignments on the Internet
- Taught a course exclusively on the Internet
- Participated in a teaching enhancement workshop
- Advised student groups involved in service/volunteer work
- Collaborated with the local community in research/teaching
- Developed a new course
- Conducted research or writing focused on:
  - International/global issues
  - Racial or ethnic minorities
  - Women and gender issues
- Taught a seminar for first-year students
- Engaged undergraduates on your research project
- Worked with undergraduates on a research project

**2007-2008 HERI FACULTY SURVEY**

12. During the present term, how many hours per week on average do you actually spend on each of the following activities? (Mark one for each activity)

*(Responses: None, 1-4, 5-8, 9-12, 13-16, 17-20, 21-34, 35-44, 45+)*

- Scheduled teaching (give actual, not credit hours)
- Preparing for teaching (including reading student papers and grading)
- Advising and counseling of students
- Committee work and meetings
- Other administration
- Research and scholarly writing
- Other creative products/performances
- Consultation with clients/patients
- Community or public service
- Outside consulting/freelance work
- Household/childcare duties
- Communicating via email
- Commuting to campus
- Other employment, outside of academia

13. Including all institutions at which you teach, how many undergraduate courses are you teaching this term? (write in the numerical amount e.g. 1, 2, 3, etc.)

How many students are enrolled in these courses? (*NESTED*)

Course 1: \_\_\_\_\_

Course 2: \_\_\_\_\_

Etc. (depending on answer given in #12)

14. How many of the following courses are you teaching this academic year? (Mark one for each activity)

*(Responses: 0, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5+)*

- General education courses
- Developmental/remedial courses
- Other undergraduate credit courses
- Graduate courses
- Vocational or technical courses
- Non-credit courses (other than above)

15. Do you teach remedial/developmental skills in any of the following areas? (Mark all that apply)

- Reading
- Writing
- Mathematics
- ESL
- General academic skills
- Other subject areas

16. Have you engaged in any of the following professional development opportunities at your institution? (Mark one for each item)

*(Responses: Yes, No, Not eligible, Not available)*

- Paid workshops outside the institution focused on teaching
- Workshops focused on teaching in the classroom
- Paid workshops outside the institution focused on teaching
- Paid sabbatical leave
- Travel funds paid by the institution
- Association membership/dues paid by the institution
- Tuition remission
- Internal grants for research
- Training for administrative leadership

**2007-2008 HERI FACULTY SURVEY**

17. Indicate the importance to you of each of the following education goals for undergraduate students: (Mark one for each item)

*(Responses: Essential, Very Important, Somewhat Important, Not important)*

- Develop ability to think critically
- Prepare students for employment after college
- Prepare students for graduate or advanced education
- Develop moral character
- Provide for students' emotional development
- Prepare students for family living
- Teach students the classic works of Western civilization
- Help students develop personal values
- Enhance students' self-understanding
- Instill in students a commitment to community service
- Enhance students' knowledge of and appreciation for other racial/ethnic groups
- Study a foreign language
- Help master knowledge in a discipline
- Develop creative capacities
- Instill a basic appreciation of the liberal arts
- Promote ability to write effectively
- Help students evaluate the quality and reliability of information
- Engage students in civil discourse around controversial issues
- Teach students tolerance and respect for different beliefs
- Encourage students to become agents of social change

18. How many of the following have you published?

*(Responses: None, 1-2, 3-4, 5-10, 11-20, 21-50, 51+)*

- Articles in academic or professional journals
- Chapters in edited volumes
- Books, manuals, or monographs
- Other, such as patents, or computer software products

19. How many exhibitions or performances in the fine or applied arts have you presented in the last two years? (Mark one)

*(Responses: None, 1-2, 3-4, 5-10, 11-20, 21-50, 51+)*

20. How many of your professional writings have been published or accepted for publication in the last two years? (Mark one)

*(Responses: None, 1-2, 3-4, 5-10, 11-20, 21-50, 51+)*

21. For each of the following items, please mark either Yes or No:

- Are you a member of a faculty union?
- Are you a U.S. citizen?
- Were you born in the U.S.A.?
- Do you plan to retire within the next three years?
- Do you use your scholarship to address local community needs?
- Have you been sexually harassed at this institution?
- Have you ever interrupted your professional career for more than one year for family reasons?
- Have you ever received an award for outstanding teaching?
- Have you published op-ed pieces or editorials?
- Is (or was) your father an academic?
- Is (or was) your mother an academic?
- Is (or was) your spouse/partner an academic?
- Are you currently teaching courses at more than one institution?

**2007-2008 HERI FACULTY SURVEY**

22. During the past two years, have you? (Mark Yes or No for each item)

*(Responses: Yes, No)*

Considered early retirement

Considered leaving academe for another job?

Considered leaving this institution for another?

Changed academic institutions?

Engaged in paid consulting outside of your institution?

Engaged in public service/professional consulting without pay?

Received at least one firm job offer

Received funding for your work from:

Foundations?

State or federal government?

Business or industry?

Requested/sought an early promotion?

23. If you were to begin your career again, would you: (Mark one for each item)

*(Responses: Definitely yes, Probably yes, Not sure, Probably no, Definitely no)*

Still want to come to this institution?

Still want to be a college professor?

24. Indicate how well each of the following describes your college or university: (Mark one for each item)

*(Responses: Very Descriptive, Somewhat Descriptive, Not Descriptive)*

It is easy for students to see faculty outside of regular office hours

There is a great deal of conformity among the students

The faculty are typically at odds with campus administration

Faculty here respect each other

Most students are treated like "numbers in a book"

Social activities are overemphasized

Faculty are rewarded for being good teachers

There is respect for the expression of diverse values and beliefs

Faculty are rewarded for their efforts to use instructional technology

Faculty are rewarded for their efforts to work with underprepared students

Administrators consider faculty concerns when making policy

The administration is open about its policies

25. Please indicate the extent to which you: (Mark one for each item)

*(Responses: To a Great Extent, To Some Extent, Not at All)*

Engage in academic work that spans multiple disciplines

Feel that the training you received in graduate school prepared you well for your role as a faculty mentor

Achieve a healthy balance between your personal life and your professional life

Experience close alignment between your work and your personal values

Feel that you have to work harder than your colleagues to be perceived as a legitimate scholar

Mentor new faculty

**2007-2008 HERI FACULTY SURVEY**

26. How satisfied are you with the following aspects of your job? (Mark one for each item)

*(Responses: Very Satisfied, Satisfied, Marginally Satisfied, Not Satisfied, Not Applicable)*

Salary  
Health benefits  
Retirement benefits  
Opportunity for scholarly pursuits  
Teaching load  
Quality of students  
Office/lab space  
Autonomy and independence  
Professional relationships with other faculty  
Social relationships with other faculty  
Competency of colleagues  
Visibility for jobs at other institutions/organizations  
Job security  
Relationship with administration  
Departmental leadership  
Course assignments  
Freedom to determine course content  
Availability of child care at this institution  
Prospects for career advancement  
Clerical/administrative support  
Overall job satisfaction

27. Below are some statements about your college or university. Indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with each of the following: (Mark one for each item)

*(Responses: Agree Strongly, Agree Somewhat, Disagree Somewhat, Disagree Strongly, Not applicable)*

Faculty are interested in students' personal problems  
Racial and ethnic diversity should be more strongly reflected in the curriculum  
Faculty feel that most students are well-prepared academically  
This institution should hire more faculty of color  
Student Affairs staff have the support and respect of faculty  
Faculty are committed to the welfare of this institution  
Faculty here are strongly interested in the academic problems of undergraduates  
There is a lot of campus racial conflict here  
Most students are strongly committed to community service  
My research is valued by faculty in my department  
My teaching is valued by faculty in my department  
Many courses include feminist perspectives  
Faculty of color are treated fairly here  
Women faculty are treated fairly here  
Many courses involve students in community service  
This institution should hire more women faculty  
Gay and lesbian faculty are treated fairly here  
My department does a good job of mentoring new faculty  
Faculty are sufficiently involved in campus decision making  
My values are congruent with the dominant institutional values  
There is adequate support for integrating technology in my teaching  
This institution takes responsibility for educating underprepared students  
The criteria for advancement and promotion decisions are clear  
Most of the students I teach lack the basic skills for college level work  
There is adequate support for faculty development  
This institution should not offer remedial/developmental education

**2007-2008 HERI FACULTY SURVEY**

28. Indicate how important you believe each priority listed below is at your college or university: (Mark one for each activity)

*(Responses: Highest Priority, High Priority, Medium Priority, Low Priority)*

- To promote the intellectual development of students
- To help students examine and understand their personal values
- To develop a sense of community among students and faculty
- To facilitate student involvement in community service
- To help students learn how to bring about change in American society
- To increase or maintain institutional prestige
- To hire faculty "stars"
- To recruit more minority students
- To enhance the institution's national image
- To create a diverse multi-cultural campus environment
- To promote gender equity among faculty
- To provide resources for faculty to engage in community-based teaching or research
- To create and sustain partnerships with surrounding communities
- To pursue extramural funding
- To increase the representation of minorities in the faculty and administration
- To strengthen links with the for-profit, corporate sector
- To develop leadership ability among students
- To increase the representation of women in the faculty and administration
- To develop an appreciation for multiculturalism

29. Please indicate your agreement with each of the following statements: (Mark one for each item)

*(Responses: Agree Strongly, Agree Somewhat, Disagree Somewhat, Disagree Strongly)*

- Western civilization and culture should be the foundation for the undergraduate curriculum
- College officials have the right to ban persons with extreme views from speaking on campus
- The chief benefit of a college education is that it increases one's earning power
- Promoting diversity leads to the admission of too many underprepared students
- Colleges should be actively involved in solving social problems
- Tenure is an outmoded concept
- Colleges should encourage students to be involved in community service activities
- Community service should be given weight in college admissions decisions
- A racially/ethnically diverse student body enhances the educational experience of all students
- Realistically, an individual can do little to bring about changes in society
- Colleges should be concerned with facilitating undergraduate students' spiritual development
- Colleges have a responsibility to work with their surrounding communities to address local issues
- Private funding sources often prevent researchers from being completely objective in the conduct of their work

**2007-2008 HERI FACULTY SURVEY**

30. Please indicate the extent to which each of the following has been a source of stress for you during the last two years:

(Mark one for each item)

*(Responses: Extensive, Somewhat, Not at All, Not Applicable)*

- Managing household responsibilities
- Child care
- Care of elderly parent
- My physical health
- Health of spouse/partner
- Review/promotion process
- Subtle discrimination (e.g., prejudice, racism, sexism)
- Personal finances
- Committee work
- Faculty meetings
- Colleagues
- Students
- Research or publishing demands
- Institutional procedures and “red tape”
- Teaching load
- Children’s problems
- Friction with spouse/partner
- Lack of personal time
- Keeping up with information technology
- Job security
- Being part of a dual career couple
- Working with underprepared students
- Classroom conflict
- Self-imposed high expectations
- Change in work responsibilities

31. Indicate the importance to you personally of each of the following: (Mark one for each item)

*(Responses: Essential, Very Important, Somewhat Important, Not important)*

- Becoming an authority in my field
- Influencing the political structure
- Influencing social values
- Raising a family
- Becoming very well off financially
- Helping others who are in difficulty
- Becoming involved in programs to clean up the environment
- Developing a meaningful philosophy of life
- Helping to promote racial understanding
- Obtaining recognition from my colleagues for contributions to my special field
- Integrating spirituality into my life

32. In your interactions with undergraduates, how often do you encourage them to: (Mark one for each item)

*(Responses: Frequently, Occasionally, Not at all)*

- Ask questions in class
- Support their opinions with a logical argument
- Seek solutions to problems and explain them to others
- Revise their papers to improve their writing
- Evaluate the quality or reliability of information they receive
- Take risks for potential gains
- Seek alternative solutions to a problem
- Look up scientific research articles and resources
- Explore topics on their own, even though it was not required for a class
- Acknowledge failure as a necessary part of the learning process
- Seek feedback on their academic work

2007-2008 HERI FACULTY SURVEY

33. In how many of the courses that you teach do you use each of the following? (Mark one for each item)  
(Responses: All, Most, Some, None)

Evaluation Methods

- Multiple-choice exams
- Essay exams
- Short-answer exams
- Quizzes
- Weekly essay assignments
- Student presentations
- Term/research papers
- Student evaluations of each others' work
- Grading on a curve
- Competency-based grading

Instructional Techniques/Methods

- Class discussions
- Cooperative learning (small groups)
- Experiential learning/Field studies
- Teaching assistants
- Recitals/Demonstrations
- Group projects
- Extensive lecturing
- Multiple drafts of written work
- Readings on racial and ethnic issues
- Readings on women and gender issues
- Student-developed activities (assignments, exams, etc.)
- Student-selected topics for course content
- Reflective writing/journaling
- Community service as part of coursework
- Electronic quizzes with immediate feedback in class
- Using real-life problems
- Using student inquiry to drive learning

34. Please enter your base institutional salary, rounded to the nearest \$1,000 (e.g., for \$56,000 write in 56000).  
\$ \_\_\_\_\_

35. Your base institutional salary reported above is based on: (Mark one)  
9/10 months  
11/12 months

36. What percentage of your current year's income comes from: (enter the amount on scale of 0-100%)  
Income from this institution \_\_\_\_\_ %  
Other academic income \_\_\_\_\_ %  
Non-academic income \_\_\_\_\_ %

37. Please enter the four-digit year that each of the following occurred (e.g., 1944, 2001, etc.):  
Year of birth \_\_\_\_\_  
Year of highest degree now held \_\_\_\_\_  
Year of appointment at present institution \_\_\_\_\_  
If tenured, year tenure was awarded \_\_\_\_\_

38. Please select the most appropriate code from the disciplinary fields listed below: (see Appendix A)  
a. Major of highest degree held \_\_\_\_\_  
b. Department of current faculty appointment \_\_\_\_\_

**2007-2008 HERI FACULTY SURVEY**

39. How many children do you have in the following age ranges? (Mark one for each item)

*(Responses: 0, 1, 2, 3, 4+)*

Under 18 years old

18 years or older

40. How would you characterize your political views? (Mark one)

Far Left

Liberal

Middle of the Road

Conservative

Far Right

41. Are you currently: (Mark one)

Single

Married

Unmarried, living with partner

Divorced

Widowed

Separated

42. Your sex: (Mark one)

Male

Female

43. Is English your native language? (Mark one)

*(Responses: Yes, No)*

44. Are you: (Mark all that apply)

White/Caucasian

African American/Black

American Indian/Alaska Native

Asian American/Asian

Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander

Mexican American/Chicano

Puerto Rican

Other Latino

Other

45. Do you give the Higher Education Research Institute (HERI) permission to retain your contact information (i.e., your email address and name) for possible follow-up research? HERI will not release this information to anyone and has secured a NIH Certificate of Confidentiality to protect identifiable research data from forced disclosure.

*(Responses: Yes, No)*

If "Yes," please confirm your email address: \_\_\_\_\_

46 to 65. Local Optional Questions (20 total)

*(Responses: A, B, C, D, E)*

**Tables 1 - 50**

**Table 1. Characteristics of Positions Currently Held By HERI Respondents by Employment Status and Comparison Group  
(Percentages; Spring 2008)**

	<u>Full Time</u>		<u>Part Time</u>		<u>CSUN Respondents</u>	
	CSUN	Public 4 year	CSUN	Public 4 year	Full- Time	Part- Time
<b>1. Tenure Status *</b>						
Tenured	54.3	54.4	2.2	3.5	54.3	2.2
Not tenured	32.8	26.1	2.7	0.6	32.8	2.7
Adjunct	<b>12.9</b>	<b>19.5</b>	95.1	95.8	12.9	95.1
Total (No. of respondents)	100.0 (348)	100.0	100.0 (183)	100.0	100.0 (348)	100.0 (183.0)
<b>2. Academic Rank</b>						
Professor	40.3	28.2	0.0	7.3	40.3	0.0
Associate professor	24.8	25.6	0.0	3.3	24.8	0.0
Assistant professor	34.3	29.5	0.0	3.9	34.3	0.0
Lecturer	0.7	8.4	78.7	46.2	0.7	78.7
Instructor	0.0	8.3	21.3	39.2	0.0	21.3
Total (No. of respondents)	100.0 (303)	100.0	100.0 (174)	100.0	100.0 (303)	100.0 (174)
<b>3. Currently Holds an Administrative Position</b>						
Yes	29.7	30.8	5.7	5.5	29.7	5.7
No	70.3	69.2	94.3	94.5	70.3	94.3
Total (No. of respondents)	100.0 (303)	100.0	100.0 (174)	100.0	100.0 (303)	100.0 (174)
Department Chair	28.9	33.1	0.0	5.4	28.9	0.0
Other	50.0	50.6	40.0	36.3	50.0	40.0
Not Specified	21.1	16.3	60.0	58.3	21.1	60.0
Total (No. of respondents)	100.0 (90)	100.0	100.0 (10)	100.0	100.0 (90)	100.0 (10)

Chi-square= 331.85 (.001); df=2  
Cramer's V=.792

Chi-square= 38.28 (.001); df=1  
Cramer's V=.283

\* Among the CSUN respondents, full-time respondents with adjunct positions are not included in the remainder of this table or in those that follow. The same applies to the few part-time respondents with tenured and tenure track positions.

Table 1 cont'd. - 2

	<u>Full Time</u>		<u>Part Time</u>		<u>CSUN Respondents</u>	
	CSUN	Public 4 year	CSUN	Public 4 year	Full- Time	Part- Time
<b>4. Discipline Area of Current Position</b>						
Arts, Media, and Communication	12.3	9.3	12.6	11.8	12.3	12.6
Business	8.6	8.0	6.6	8.4	8.6	6.6
Education	6.4	10.8	11.4	13.8	6.4	11.4
Engineering and Computer Science	5.8	5.4	3.0	2.4	5.8	3.0
Health and Human Development	6.1	7.1	10.2	6.9	6.1	10.2
Humanities	15.0	19.2	16.8	22.2	15.0	16.8
Science and Mathematics	20.2	20.4	13.8	12.6	20.2	13.8
Social and Behavioral Sciences	14.2	12.9	14.4	12.6	14.2	14.4
Other	11.4	6.9	11.2	9.3	11.4	11.2
Total (No. of respondents)	100.0 (295)	100.0	100.0 (173)	100.0	100.0 (295)	100.0 (173)
<b>5. Appointed at Current Institution between</b>						
2006 - 2007	15.5	13.5	22.8	34.1	15.5	22.8
2001 - 2005	28.2	29.6	34.1	31.1	28.2	34.1
1991 - 2000	27.5	29.9	30.5	21.8	27.5	30.5
1981 - 1990	19.2	17.3	9.0	7.9	19.2	9.0
Before 1980	9.6	9.7	3.6	5.1	9.6	3.6
Total (No. of respondents)	100.0 (291)	100.0	100.0 (167)	100.0	100.0 (291)	100.0 (167)
<b>6. Average Number of Years at Cal State Northridge</b>						
Mean	12.1		8.4		12.1	8.4
Median	8.0		7.0		8.0	7.0
Interquartile range	4 - 18		3 - 11		4 - 18	3 - 11

Chi-square=14.08 (.007); df=4  
Cramer's V=.174

Table 1 cont'd. - 3

	<u>Full Time</u>		<u>Part Time</u>		<u>CSUN Respondents</u>	
	CSUN	Public 4 year	CSUN	Public 4 year	Full- Time	Part- Time
<b>7. Currently teaching courses at more than one institution</b>						
Yes	5.0	4.6	38.5	35.4	5.0	38.5
No	95.0	95.4	61.5	64.6	95.0	61.5
Total (No. of respondents)	100.0 (302)	100.0	100.0 (174)	100.0	100.0 (302)	100.0 (174)
<b>8. Resources Available to Part-Time Respondents During 2007-08</b>						
An e-mail account			95.4	97.1		
Shared office space			<b>75.9</b>	<b>63.7</b>		
A phone/voicemail			51.2	46.5		
A personal computer			49.4	46.7		
Teaching assistance			13.2	13.5		
Use of private office			<b>6.9</b>	<b>13.3</b>		
(No. of respondents on which percentage is based)			(174)			

Chi-square=87.09(.001); df=1  
Cramer's V=.428

Note: figures in bold indicate that a pair of percentages is moderately different, while bolded figures in a shaded cell denote a significantly different pair of percentages.

**Table 2. Selected Characteristics of HERI Respondents by Employment Status and Comparison Group (Percentages; Spring 2008)**

Characteristic	<u>Full Time</u>		<u>Part Time</u>		<u>CSUN Respondents</u>	
	CSUN	Public 4 year	CSUN	Public 4 year	Full- Time	Part- Time
<b>1. Gender</b>						
Female	<b>51.7</b>	<b>42.5</b>	56.4	56.4	51.7	56.4
Male	48.3	57.5	43.6	43.6	48.3	43.6
Total (No. of respondents)	100.0 (298)	100.0	100.0 (172)	100.0	100.0 (298)	100.0 (172)
<b>2. Age</b> (as of Fall, 2007)						
Under 40	20.5	20.0	16.0	21.7	20.5	16.0
40-49	25.0	26.9	24.9	21.8	25.0	24.9
50-59	35.4	34.2	33.1	32.1	35.4	33.1
60 and over	19.1	19.0	26.0	24.3	19.1	26.0
Total (No. of respondents)	100.0 (288)	100.0	100.0 (169)	100.0	100.0 (288)	100.0 (169)
<b>3. Racial and Ethnic Identity *</b>						
Traditionally Underserved	<b>15.5</b>	<b>9.2</b>	11.5	9.4	15.5	11.5
<i>American Indian</i>	1.7	1.9	1.7	2.5	1.7	1.7
<i>Pacific Islander</i>	0.3	0.2	1.1	0.4	0.3	1.1
<i>African American</i>	5.0	3.5	2.9	2.6	5.0	2.9
<i>Latina/o</i>	<b>8.6</b>	<b>3.6</b>	5.7	3.9	8.6	5.7
Asian	<b>11.2</b>	<b>4.8</b>	6.3	3.5	11.2	6.3
White	<b>69.6</b>	<b>87.2</b>	<b>75.3</b>	<b>87.1</b>	69.6	75.3
Other	4.3	2.9	9.2	4.4	4.3	9.2
Unknown	3.6	--	2.9	--	3.6	2.9
Total (No. of respondents)	104.3 (303)	104.1	105.2 (174)	104.4	104.3 (303)	105.2 (174)

\* These percentages sum to more than 100.0 because respondents could mark multiple categories. Unknown numbers not provided for respondents from other public four-year institutions.

Table 2 cont'd. - 2

Characteristic	<u>Full Time</u>		<u>Part Time</u>		<u>CSUN Respondents</u>	
	CSUN	Public 4 year	CSUN	Public 4 year	Full- Time	Part- Time
<b>4. Marital Status</b>						
Single	13.3	12.0	18.0	12.8	13.3	18.0
Currently married, or living with partner	75.4	78.6	<b>68.6</b>	<b>77.3</b>	75.4	68.6
Previously married (divorced, separated, widowed)	11.3	9.4	13.4	9.9	11.3	13.4
Total (No. of respondents)	100.0 (301)	100.0	100.0 (172)	100.0	100.0 (301)	100.0 (172)
<b>5. Country of Birth</b>						
USA	74.3	79.9	79.3	88.1	74.3	79.3
Other	<b>25.7</b>	<b>20.1</b>	<b>20.7</b>	<b>11.9</b>	25.7	20.7
Total (No. of respondents)	100.0 (303)	100.0	100.0 (174)	100.0	100.0 (303)	100.0 (174)
<b>6. Country of Citizenship</b>						
USA	87.1	94.3	96.0	96.4	87.1	96.0
Other	<b>12.9</b>	<b>5.7</b>	4.0	3.6	12.9	4.0
Total (No. of respondents)	100.0 (303)	100.0	100.0 (174)	100.0	100.0 (303)	100.0 (174)
<b>7. Is English Your Native Language?</b>						
Yes	78.3	89.7	86.0	90.9	78.3	86.0
No	<b>21.7</b>	<b>10.3</b>	14.0	9.1	21.7	14.0
Total (No. of respondents)	100.0 (300)	100.0	100.0 (172)	100.0	100.0 (300)	100.0 (172)
<b>8. Is/Was Your Spouse or Partner an Academic?</b>						
(No. of respondents on which percentage is based)	33.8 (302)	31.4	25.9 (174)	28.1	33.8 (302)	25.9 (174)
<b>9. Is/Was Your</b>						
Father an academic?	11.9	12.4	16.7	13.6	11.9	16.7
Mother an academic?	8.6	9.1	12.6	13.3	8.6	12.6
(No. of respondents on which percentage is based)	(303)		(174)		(303)	(174)

Chi-square= 9.93 (.002); df=1  
Cramer's V=.144

Table 2 cont'd. - 3

Characteristic	<u>Full Time</u>		<u>Part Time</u>		<u>CSUN Respondents</u>	
	CSUN	Public 4 year	CSUN	Public 4 year	Full- Time	Part- Time
<b>10. Nature of Political Views*</b>						
Conservative	10.2	12.7	<b>13.1</b>	<b>18.6</b>	10.2	13.1
Middle of the Road	26.4	32.9	32.7	32.0	26.4	32.7
Liberal	<b>63.4</b>	<b>54.5</b>	54.2	49.4	63.4	54.2
Total (No. of respondents)	100.0 (295)	100.0	100.0 (168)	100.0	100.0 (295)	100.0 (168)
<b>11. Respondent Belongs to a Faculty Union</b>	<b>68.9</b>	<b>40.2</b>	<b>62.1</b>	<b>39.0</b>	68.9	62.1
(No. of respondents on which percentage is based)	(302)		(174)		(302)	(174)
<b>12. Respondents Experienced Sexual Harassment at Current Institution</b>	7.6	6.1	5.2	4.1	7.6	5.2
(No. of respondents on which percentage is based)	(302)		(174)		(302)	(174)

Note: figures in bold indicate that a pair of percentages is moderately different, while bolded figures in a shaded cell denote a significantly different pair of percentages.

\* The Conservative category includes respondents with "Far Right" political views.

**Table 3. Educational Background of HERI Respondents by Employment Status and Comparison Group (Percentages; Spring 2008)**

	<u>Full Time</u>		<u>Part Time</u>		<u>CSUN Respondents</u>	
	CSUN	Public 4 year	CSUN	Public 4 year	Full- Time	Part- Time
<b>1. Highest Degree Earned</b>						
Doctorate or equivalent (PhD, Ed D)	90.3	70.8	25.4	24.9	90.3	25.4
Professional degree (e.g., LLB, JD, DVM)	2.0	5.7	3.5	4.6	2.0	3.5
Master's or equivalent (MA, MS, MFA, MBA, etc.)	7.3	22.2	62.4	61.6	7.3	62.4
Bachelor's or equivalent	0.3	0.6	8.7	6.2	0.3	8.7
Total (No. of respondents)	100.0 (300)	100.0	100.0 (173)	100.0	100.0 (300)	100.0 (173)
<b>2. Degree Currently in Progress</b>						
None	97.7	92.4	86.2	75.5	97.7	86.2
Doctorate or equivalent (PhD, Ed D)	1.3	6.2	10.9	17.1	1.3	10.9
Master's or equivalent (MA, MS, MFA, MBA, etc.)	1.0	0.7	2.9	4.1	1.0	2.9
Total (No. of respondents)	100.0 (303)	100.0	100.0 (174)	100.0	100.0 (303)	100.0 (174)
<b>3. Year Highest Degree Earned</b>						
Before 1980	17.1	18.0	25.7	22.8	17.1	25.7
1981 to 1990	30.8	22.5	13.5	18.0	30.8	13.5
1991 to 2000	26.7	33.3	33.3	27.5	26.7	33.3
2001 to present	25.3	26.1	27.5	31.6	25.3	27.5
Total (No. of respondents)	100.0 (292)	100.0	100.0 (171)	100.0	100.0 (292)	100.0 (171)

Chi-square=214.06 (.001); df=3  
Cramer's V=.673

Chi-square=25.02 (.001); df=4  
Cramer's V=.229

Table 3 cont'd. - 2

	<b>Full Time</b>		<b>Part Time</b>		<b>CSUN Respondents</b>	
	CSUN	Public 4 year	CSUN	Public 4 year	Full- Time	Part- Time
<b>4. Broad Discipline of Highest Degree</b>						
Arts, Media and Communication	11.5	8.9	13.8	12.7	11.5	13.8
Business and Economics	6.9	6.6	4.8	7.8	6.9	4.8
Education	13.1	14.8	13.2	17.1	13.1	13.2
Engineering and Computer Science	4.4	4.8	2.4	2.3	4.4	2.4
Health and Human Development	2.7	5.7	10.9	6.5	2.7	10.9
Humanities	17.5	19.8	18.1	20.4	17.5	18.1
Science and Mathematics	21.1	19.6	14.4	11.2	21.1	14.4
Social and Behavioral Sciences	16.3	13.4	16.2	13.3	16.3	16.2
Other	6.5	6.4	6.2	8.7	6.5	6.2
Total (No. of respondents)	100.0 (298)	100.0	100.0 (173)	100.0	100.0 (298)	100.0 (173)

Chi-square=20.29 (.016); df=9  
Cramer's V=.206

Note: figures in bold indicate that a pair of percentages is moderately different, while bolded figures in a shaded cell denote a significantly different pair of percentages.

**Table 4. Career Transitions of HERI Respondents By Employment Status and Comparison Group (Percentages, Spring 2008)**

	<u>Full Time</u>		<u>Part Time</u>		<u>CSUN Respondents</u>		
	CSUN	Public 4 year	CSUN	Public 4 year	Full- Time	Part- Time	
<b>Recent Professional Mobility: Percentage of Respondents Who, During the Last Two Years,</b>							
Considered leaving this institution for another (No. of responses on which percentages are based)	44.9 (303)	48.0	33.3 (174)	36.8	44.9 (303)	33.3 (174)	
Received at least one firm job offer (No. of responses on which percentages are based)	24.6 (301)	24.6	36.4 (173)	34.5	24.6 (301)	36.4 (173)	Chi-square=7.48 (.006); df=1 Cramer's V=.126
Requested/sought an early promotion (No. of responses on which percentages are based)	<b>15.2</b> (302)	<b>8.4</b>	6.3 (174)	6.1	15.2 (302)	6.3 (174)	Chi-square=8.31 (.004); df=1 Cramer's V=.132
Changed academic institutions (No. of responses on which percentages are based)	14.5 (303)	12.2	19.0 (174)	17.6	14.5 (303)	19.0 (174)	
<b>Career Transitions: Percentage of Respondents Who</b>							
Considered leaving academe for another job during the last two years (No. of responses on which percentages are based)	<b>29.7</b> (303)	<b>35.6</b>	31.6 (174)	33.2	29.7 (303)	31.6 (174)	
Considered early retirement during the last two years (No. of responses on which percentages are based)	25.7 (303)	23.6	<b>12.6</b> (174)	<b>18.8</b>	25.7 (303)	12.6 (174)	Chi-square=11.45 (.001); df=1 Cramer's V=.155
Plan to retire within the next three years (No. of responses on which percentages are based)	12.9 (303)	13.3	<b>6.4</b> (173)	<b>13.3</b>	12.9 (303)	6.4 (173)	
Interrupted their professional careers for more than one year for family reasons (No. of responses on which percentages are based)	10.6 (303)	13.2	23.0 (174)	24.3	10.6 (303)	23.0 (174)	Chi-square=13.32 (.001); df=1 Cramer's V=.167

Note: figures in bold indicate that a pair of percentages is moderately different, while bolded figures in a shaded cell denote a significantly different pair of percentages.

**Table 5. Number of Hours Per Week Spent on Various Activities by HERI Respondents by Employment Status and Comparison Group (Percentages; Spring 2008)**

Activity	<u>Full Time</u>		<u>Part Time</u>		<u>CSUN Respondents</u>	
	CSUN	Public 4 year	CSUN	Public 4 year	Full- Time	Part- Time
<b>I. Teaching Activities</b>						
<b>Scheduled Teaching</b>						
None	3.6	0.5	1.7	1.3	3.6	1.7
1 to 4 hours	11.3	8.4	27.0	31.0	11.3	27.0
5 to 8 hours	28.1	22.6	25.3	30.8	28.1	25.3
9 to 12 hours	43.0	43.9	20.1	19.2	43.0	20.1
13- 20 hours	12.9	21.4	21.3	14.2	12.9	21.3
21 or more hours	1.0	3.2	4.6	3.5	1.0	4.6
Total (No. of respondents)	100.0 (302)	100.0	100.0 (174)	100.0	100.0 (302)	100.0 (174)
<b>Preparing for Teaching</b>						
None	2.6	0.1	1.1	0.6	2.6	1.1
1 to 4 hours	9.3	8.3	20.1	23.1	9.3	20.1
5 to 8 hours	23.8	23.0	30.5	31.1	23.8	30.5
9 to 12 hours	22.8	24.0	14.9	17.7	22.8	14.9
13- 20 hours	29.5	30.9	22.4	20.0	29.5	22.4
21 or more hours	11.9	13.7	10.9	7.5	11.9	10.9
Total (No. of respondents)	100.0 (302)	100.0	100.0 (174)	100.0	100.0 (302)	100.0 (174)
<b>Advising/Counseling Students</b>						
None	2.0	4.1	11.5	21.1	2.0	11.5
1 to 4 hours	52.6	53.5	73.6	66.0	52.6	73.6
5 to 8 hours	30.5	29.2	9.2	9.4	30.5	9.2
9 to 12 hours	9.3	8.5	4.0	2.1	9.3	4.0
13- 20 hours	4.6	3.6	1.7	0.9	4.6	1.7
21 or more hours	1.0	1.1	0.0	0.5	1.0	0.0
Total (No. of respondents)	100.0 (302)	100.0	100.0 (174)	100.0	100.0 (302)	100.0 (174)

Chi-square=45.59 (.001); df=5  
Cramer's V=.309

Chi-square=18.427 (.002); df=5  
Cramer's V=.197

Chi-square=56.77 (.001); df=5  
Cramer's V=.345

Table 5 cont'd. - 2

Activity	<u>Full Time</u>		<u>Part Time</u>		<u>CSUN Respondents</u>	
	CSUN	Public 4 year	CSUN	Public 4 year	Full- Time	Part- Time
<b>II. Other University Activities</b>						
<b>Committee work and meetings</b>						
None	2.3	3.7	62.1	64.5	2.3	62.1
1 to 4 hours	<b>47.0</b>	<b>54.8</b>	32.8	31.4	47.0	32.8
5 to 8 hours	32.1	28.6	4.0	3.1	32.1	4.0
9 to 12 hours	11.3	8.5	1.1	0.6	11.3	1.1
13 to 20 hours	6.0	3.9	0.0	0.3	6.0	0.0
21 or more hours	1.3	0.5	0.0	0.0	1.3	0.0
Total (No. of respondents)	100.0 (302)	100.0	100.0 (174)	100.0	100.0 (302)	100.0 (174)
<b>Other Administration</b>						
None	<b>25.2</b>	<b>32.0</b>	72.3	71.1	25.2	72.3
1 to 4 hours	45.5	37.2	23.7	24.5	45.5	23.7
5 to 8 hours	10.6	14.4	2.9	2.6	10.6	2.9
9 or more hours	18.6	16.4	1.2	1.8	18.6	1.2
Total (No. of respondents)	100.0 (301)	100.0	100.0 (173)	100.0	100.0 (301)	100.0 (173)
<b>Community or Public Service</b>						
None	<b>39.5</b>	<b>34.4</b>	<b>50.0</b>	<b>41.8</b>	39.5	50.0
1 to 4 hours	46.5	51.9	35.5	43.0	46.5	35.5
5 to 8 hours	10.6	13.7	8.1	15.2	10.6	8.1
9 or more hours	3.3	0.0	6.4	0.0	3.3	6.4
Total (No. of respondents)	100.0 (301)	100.0	100.0 (172)	100.0	100.0 (301)	100.0 (172)

Chi-square=235.98 (.001); df=5  
Cramer's V=.704

Chi-square=106.93 (.001); df=3  
Cramer's V=.475

Chi-square=8.94 (.030); df=3  
Cramer's V=.137

Table 5 cont'd. - 3

Activity	<u>Full Time</u>		<u>Part Time</u>		<u>CSUN Respondents</u>	
	CSUN	Public 4 year	CSUN	Public 4 year	Full- Time	Part- Time
<b>Communicating via E-mail</b>						
None	0.7	0.3	0.6	0.5	0.7	0.6
1 to 4 hours	<b>21.0</b>	<b>29.2</b>	<b>26.4</b>	<b>40.8</b>	21.0	26.4
5 to 8 hours	<b>35.0</b>	<b>39.7</b>	<b>40.8</b>	<b>34.2</b>	35.0	40.8
9 to 12 hours	23.3	18.0	16.7	12.2	23.3	16.7
13- 20 hours	16.7	10.4	12.1	9.8	16.7	12.1
21 or more hours	3.3	2.4	3.4	2.5	3.3	3.4
Total (No. of respondents)	100.0 (300)	100.0	100.0 (174)	100.0	100.0 (300)	100.0 (174)
<b>III. Scholarly Activities</b>						
<b>Research and Scholarly Writing</b>						
None	<b>7.6</b>	<b>15.4</b>	48.9	52.7	7.6	48.9
1 to 4 hours	34.9	37.6	24.7	23.2	34.9	24.7
5 to 8 hours	27.9	22.9	13.2	10.2	27.9	13.2
9 to 12 hours	12.0	11.5	6.3	5.9	12.0	6.3
13- 20 hours	11.6	9.2	3.4	5.1	11.6	3.4
21 or more hours	6.0	3.4	3.4	2.9	6.0	3.4
Total (No. of respondents)	100.0 (301)	100.0	100.0 (174)	100.0	100.0 (301)	100.0 (174)
<b>Other creative products/performances</b>						
None	50.0	48.8	44.2	48.8	50.0	44.2
1 to 4 hours	28.1	30.4	25.6	27.7	28.1	25.6
5 to 8 hours	13.2	11.7	15.7	10.8	13.2	15.7
9 or more hours	8.6	9.1	14.5	12.7	8.6	14.5
Total (No. of respondents)	100.0 (302)	100.0	100.0 (172)	100.0	100.0 (302)	100.0 (172)

Chi-square=110.06 (.001); df=3  
Cramer's V=.481

Table 5 cont'd. - 4

Activity	<u>Full Time</u>		<u>Part Time</u>		<u>CSUN Respondents</u>	
	CSUN	Public 4 year	CSUN	Public 4 year	Full- Time	Part- Time
<b>IV. Other Weekly Activities</b>						
<b>Commuting to Campus</b>						
None	4.7	5.6	4.6	7.5	4.7	4.6
1 to 4 hours	43.2	61.7	63.8	67.1	43.2	63.8
5 to 8 hours	35.9	23.3	23.6	19.3	35.9	23.6
9 or more hours	16.3	9.4	8.0	6.1	16.3	8.0
Total (No. of respondents)	100.0 (301)	100.0	100.0 (174)	100.0	100.0 (301)	100.0 (174)
<b>Household/Childcare Duties</b>						
None	13.1	12.3	17.8	14.8	13.1	17.8
1 to 4 hours	16.8	17.9	17.8	18.0	16.8	17.8
5 to 8 hours	23.8	25.4	20.7	23.9	23.8	20.7
9 to 12 hours	16.1	16.7	16.7	14.8	16.1	16.7
13 - 20 hours	17.1	15.5	9.8	14.1	17.1	9.8
21 or more hours	13.1	12.2	17.2	14.4	13.1	17.2
Total (No. of respondents)	100.0 (298)	100.0	100.0 (174)	100.0	100.0 (298)	100.0 (174)
<b>V. Outside Consulting</b>						
<b>Engaged in paid consulting outside College/University</b>						
Yes	39.6	36.5	40.8	38.4	39.6	40.8
No	60.4	63.5	59.2	61.6	60.4	59.2
Total (No. of respondents)	100.0 (303)	100.0	100.0 (174)	100.0	100.0 (303)	100.0 (174)
<b>Consultation with clients/patients</b>						
None	82.3	79.4	72.7	71.8	82.3	72.7
1 or more hours	17.7	20.6	27.3	28.2	17.7	27.3
Total (No. of respondents)	100.0 (299)	100.0	100.0 (172)	100.0	100.0 (299)	100.0 (172)

Chi-square=20.19 (.001); df=3  
Cramer's V=.206

Table 5 cont'd. - 5

Activity	<u>Full Time</u>		<u>Part Time</u>		<u>CSUN Respondents</u>	
	CSUN	Public 4 year	CSUN	Public 4 year	Full- Time	Part- Time
<b>Outside consulting/freelance work</b>						
None	69.7	68.3	55.7	56.5	69.7	55.7
1 or more hours	30.3	31.7	44.3	43.5	30.3	44.3
Total (No. of respondents)	100.0 (300)	100.0	100.0 (174)	100.0	100.0 (300)	100.0 (174)
<b>Other employment, outside of academia</b>						
None	89.0	86.2	47.1	47.0	89.0	47.1
1 or more hours	11.0	13.8	52.9	53.0	11.0	52.9
Total (No. of respondents)	100.0 (299)	100.0	100.0 (174)	100.0	100.0 (299)	100.0 (174)

Chi-square=9.33 (.002); df=1  
Cramer's V=.140

Chi-square=99.02 (.001); df=1  
Cramer's V=.458

Note: figures in bold indicate that a pair of percentages is moderately different, while bolded figures in a shaded cell denote a significantly different pair of percentages.

**Table 6. Research Publications, Funding Sources, and Community Outreach of HERI Respondents by Employment Status and Comparison Group (Percentages; Spring 2008)**

	<u>Full Time</u>		<u>Part Time</u>		<u>CSUN Respondents</u>	
	CSUN	Public 4 year	CSUN	Public 4 year	Full- Time	Part- Time
<b>1. Articles published in academic or professional journals</b>						
None	7.6	20.1	52.3	53.9	7.6	52.3
1-2	16.5	21.7	23.6	24.9	16.5	23.6
3-4	18.2	16.6	10.9	8.8	18.2	10.9
5-10	28.1	19.9	5.7	6.5	28.1	5.7
11-20	15.8	11.2	5.7	3.3	15.8	5.7
21 or more	13.9	10.4	1.7	2.5	13.9	1.7
Total (No. of respondents)	100.0 (303)	100.0	100.0 (174)	100.0	100.0 (303)	100.0 (174)
<b>2. Chapters published in edited volumes</b>						
None	42.3	56.8	76.3	80.6	42.3	76.3
1-2	32.7	26.9	12.7	12.0	32.7	12.7
3-4	13.0	9.3	7.5	4.8	13.0	7.5
5 - 10	8.7	5.6	1.7	1.8	8.7	1.7
11 or more	3.3	1.4	1.7	0.8	3.3	1.7
Total (No. of respondents)	100.0 (300)	100.0	100.0 (173)	100.0	100.0 (300)	100.0 (173)
<b>3. Books, manuals, or monographs published</b>						
None	56.3	66.7	67.6	74.1	56.3	67.6
1-2	30.0	24.0	22.0	18.6	30.0	22.0
3-4	8.0	5.8	6.4	4.0	8.0	6.4
5 - 10	4.3	2.6	2.9	2.5	4.3	2.9
11 or more	1.3	0.9	1.2	0.8	1.3	1.2
Total (No. of respondents)	100.0 (300)	100.0	100.0 (173)	100.0	100.0 (300)	100.0 (173)
<b>4. Op-ed pieces or editorials published</b>						
None	79.5	77.1	76.4	77.3	79.5	76.4
One or more	20.5	22.9	23.6	22.7	20.5	23.6
Total (No. of respondents)	100.0 (302)	100.0	100.0 (174)	100.0	100.0 (302)	100.0 (174)

Chi-square=153.19 (.001); df=5  
Cramer's V=.567

Chi-square=52.96 (.001); df=4  
Cramer's V=.335

Table 6 cont'd. - 2

	<u>Full Time</u>		<u>Part Time</u>		<u>CSUN Respondents</u>	
	CSUN	Public 4 year	CSUN	Public 4 year	Full- Time	Part- Time
<b>5. Other, such as patents or computer software products</b>						
None	85.9	88.1	87.3	89.5	85.9	87.3
1 or more	14.1	11.9	12.7	10.5	14.1	12.7
Total (No. of respondents)	100.0 (298)	100.0	100.0 (173)	100.0	100.0 (298)	100.0 (173)
<b>6. Professional writings published or accepted for publication <i>in the last two years</i></b>						
None	19.8	33.3	63.2	67.8	19.8	63.2
1-2	38.9	36.7	24.7	22.7	38.9	24.7
3-4	27.1	20.0	6.3	6.3	27.1	6.3
5 - 10	11.9	8.2	4.0	2.0	11.9	4.0
11 or more	2.3	1.9	1.7	1.2	2.3	1.7
Total (No. of respondents)	100.0 (303)	100.0	100.0 (174)	100.0	100.0 (303)	100.0 (174)
<b>7. Exhibitions or performances in the fine or applied arts presented <i>in the last two years</i></b>						
None	84.1	80.3	74.1	75.2	84.1	74.1
1-2	4.3	6.0	12.1	9.7	4.3	12.1
3-4	6.3	5.0	4.0	5.1	6.3	4.0
5 - 10	3.7	4.3	4.6	4.8	3.7	4.6
11 or more	1.7	4.4	5.2	5.2	1.7	5.2
Total (No. of respondents)	100.0 (301)	100.0	100.0 (174)	100.0	100.0 (301)	100.0 (174)

Chi-square=97.23 (.001); df=4  
Cramer's V=.451

Chi-square=16.51 (.002); df=4  
Cramer's V=.186

Table 6 cont'd. - 3

	<u>Full Time</u>		<u>Part Time</u>		<u>CSUN Respondents</u>	
	CSUN	Public 4 year	CSUN	Public 4 year	Full- Time	Part- Time
<b>8. Percentage of respondents receiving funding for their research during the last two years from:</b>						
State or federal government (No. of responses on which percentages are based)	28.6 (301)	26.0	14.5 (173)	11.9	28.6 (301)	14.5 (173)
Foundations (No. of responses on which percentages are based)	22.9 (301)	17.5	10.9 (174)	10.4	22.9 (301)	10.9 (174)
Business or industry (No. of responses on which percentages are based)	10.3 (301)	11.5	7.5 (174)	8.6	10.3 (301)	7.5 (174)
<b>9. Community Outreach: Percentage of Respondents Who</b>						
Use their scholarship to address local community needs (No. of responses on which percentages are based)	<b>58.6</b> (302)	<b>53.2</b>	50.6 (174)	49.2	58.6 (302)	50.6 (174)
Engaged in public service/professional consulting without pay <i>during the past two years</i> (No. of responses on which percentages are based)	62.3 (302)	61.6	55.7 (174)	53.0	62.3 (302)	55.7 (174)
Engaged in paid consulting outside college/ university <i>during the past two years</i> (No. of responses on which percentages are based)	39.6 (303)	36.5	40.8 (174)	38.4	39.6 (303)	40.8 (174)

Chi-square=12.21 (.001); df=1  
Cramer's V=.161

Chi-square=10.53 (.001); df=1  
Cramer's V=.149

Note: figures in bold indicate that a pair of percentages is moderately different, while bolded figures in a shaded cell denote a significantly different pair of percentages.

**Table 7. Percentage of HERI Respondents Participating in Professional Development Activities by Employment Status and Comparison Group (Spring 2008)**

	<u>Full Time</u>		<u>Part Time</u>		<u>CSUN Respondents</u>		
	CSUN	Public 4 year	CSUN	Public 4 year	Full- Time	Part- Time	
<b>Professional Development Activities</b>							
Received institutional travel funds (No. of responses on which percentages are based)	79.3 (299)	80.3	18.2 (121)	17.9	79.3 (299)	18.2 (121)	Chi-square=135.96 (.001); df=1 Cramer's V=.569
Received internal grants for research (No. of responses on which percentages are based)	<b>66.3</b> (300)	<b>44.8</b>	11.2 (143)	7.4	66.3 (300)	11.2 (143)	Chi-square=117.89 (.001); df=1 Cramer's V=.516
Took sabbatical leave (No. of responses on which percentages are based)	<b>38.9</b> (262)	<b>22.0</b>	0.0 (98)	2.4	38.9 (262)	0.0 (98)	Chi-square=53.24 (.001); df=1 Cramer's V=.385
Received training for administrative leadership (No. of responses on which percentages are based)	<b>22.7</b> (286)	<b>13.4</b>	3.6 (138)	3.3	22.7 (286)	3.6 (138)	Chi-square=24.65 (.001); df=1 Cramer's V=.241
Assoc. membership/dues paid by the institution (No. of responses on which percentages are based)	20.3 (256)	21.3	5.5 (110)	5.4	20.3 (256)	5.5 (110)	Chi-square=12.74 (.001); df=1 Cramer's V=.187
Received tuition remission (No. of responses on which percentages are based)	9.8 (285)	11.9	6.3 (128)	6.7	9.8 (285)	6.3 (128)	
<b>Participated in Teaching Workshops</b>							
Workshops on campus (No. of responses on which percentages are based)	65.8 (301)	70.7	40.9 (164)	45.0	65.8 (301)	40.9 (164)	Chi-square=26.91 (.001); df=1 Cramer's V=.241
Workshops outside the institution (No. of responses on which percentages are based)	<b>22.1</b> (294)	<b>27.5</b>	15.1 (139)	11.7	22.1 (294)	15.1 (139)	

Note: figures in bold indicate that a pair of percentages is moderately different, while bolded figures in a shaded cell denote a significantly different pair of percentages.

**Table 8. Percentage of HERI Respondents Engaging in Selected Research, Professional Development, and Outreach Activities During the Past Two Years by Employment Status and Comparison Group (Spring 2008)**

	<u>Full Time</u>		<u>Part Time</u>		<u>CSUN Respondents</u>		
	CSUN	Public 4 year	CSUN	Public 4 year	Full- Time	Part- Time	
Participated in a teaching enhancement workshop (No. of responses on which percentages are based)	<b>48.2</b> (301)	<b>60.8</b>	<b>35.1</b> (174)	<b>42.6</b>	48.2 (301)	35.1 (174)	Chi-square=7.72 (.005); df=1 Cramer's V=.128
<b>Research Activities - Conducted research or writing focused on:</b>							
International/global issues (No. of responses on which percentages are based)	<b>32.9</b> (301)	<b>26.5</b>	18.5 (173)	18.2	32.9 (301)	18.5 (173)	Chi-square=11.38 (.001); df=1 Cramer's V=.155
Racial or ethnic minorities (No. of responses on which percentages are based)	<b>33.3</b> (300)	<b>21.1</b>	17.3 (173)	15.8	33.3 (300)	17.3 (173)	Chi-square=14.08 (.001); df=1 Cramer's V=.173
Women or gender issues (No. of responses on which percentages are based)	20.9 (301)	18.6	15.0 (173)	16.2	20.9 (301)	15.0 (173)	
<b>Collaboration with Others, especially undergraduates</b>							
Collaborated with the local community in research/ teaching (No. of responses on which percentages are based)	56.0 (302)	51.6	30.5 (174)	34.1	56.0 (302)	30.5 (174)	Chi-square=28.85 (.001); df=1 Cramer's V=.246
Advised student groups involved in service/volunteer work (No. of responses on which percentages are based)	45.2 (301)	45.0	23.1 (173)	22.4	45.2 (301)	23.1 (173)	Chi-square=22.91 (.001); df=1 Cramer's V=.220
Worked with undergraduates on a research project (No. of responses on which percentages are based)	52.5 (301)	55.7	22.0 (173)	26.9	52.5 (301)	22.0 (173)	Chi-square=42.21 (.001); df=1 Cramer's V=.298
Engaged undergraduates on <i>your</i> research project (No. of responses on which percentages are based)	38.7 (302)	38.7	15.0 (173)	11.7	38.7 (302)	15.0 (173)	Chi-square=29.39 (.001); df=1 Cramer's V=.249

Note: figures in bold indicate that a pair of percentages is moderately different, while bolded figures in a shaded cell denote a significantly different pair of percentages.

**Table 9. Current Teaching Patterns of HERI Respondents by Employment Status and Comparison Group (Percentages; Spring 2008)**

	<u>Full Time</u>		<u>Part Time</u>		<u>CSUN Respondents</u>	
	CSUN	Public 4 year	CSUN	Public 4 year	Full- Time	Part- Time
<b>1. Currently teaching in more than one institution</b>	5.0	4.6	38.5	35.4	5.0	38.5
(No. of respondents on which percentages are based)	(302)		(174)		(302)	(174)
<b>2. Number of Undergraduate Courses Taught During the Current Term</b>						
None	15.8	0.0	12.6	0.0	15.8	12.6
One	13.5	12.8	16.7	29.8	13.5	16.7
Two	22.4	24.4	17.2	27.3	22.4	17.2
Three	30.7	29.8	19.0	14.8	30.7	19.0
Four or more	17.5	33.0	34.5	28.1	17.5	34.5
Total (No. of respondents)	100.0 (303)	100.0	100.0 (174)	100.0	100.0 (303)	100.0 (174)
Mean	2.3		2.9		2.3	2.9
Median	2.0		3.0		2.0	3.0
Interquartile range	1 - 3		1 - 4		1 - 3	1 - 4
<b>3. Number of Students Taught During the Current Term *</b>						
50 or fewer	24.3		39.3		24.3	39.3
51 - 75	23.4		10.1		23.4	10.1
76 - 100	24.3		13.5		24.3	13.5
101 - 150	20.5		20.2		20.5	20.2
More than 150	7.5		16.9		7.5	16.9
Total (No. of respondents)	100.0 (239)		100.0 (89)		100.0 (239)	100.0 (89)
Mean	83.5		85.1		83.5	85.1
Median	78.0		76.0		78.0	76.0
Interquartile range	52 - 105		30 - 128		52 - 105	30 - 128

Chi-square=87.09 (.001); df=1  
Cramer's V=.428

Chi-square=22.19 (.001); df=4  
Cramer's V=.216

Chi-square=20.13 (.001); df=4  
Cramer's V=.248

\* The data for the comparison institutions are summarized in a way that did not allow calculation of the total number of undergraduates taught.

Table 9 cont'd. - 2

	<u>Full Time</u>		<u>Part Time</u>		<u>CSUN Respondents</u>		
	CSUN	Public 4 year	CSUN	Public 4 year	Full- Time	Part- Time	
<b>4. Percentage of Respondents Teaching One or More of the Following During the Current Academic Year</b>							
Developmental/remedial courses (No. of responses on which percentages are based)	3.4 (294)	5.7	13.3 (173)	8.1	3.4 (294)	13.3 (173)	Chi-square=16.56 (.001); df=1 Cramer's V=.188
GE Courses (No. of responses on which percentages are based)	38.1 (299)	49.3	43.3 (171)	51.4	38.1 (299)	43.3 (171)	
Other Undergraduate Credit Courses (No. of responses on which percentages are based)	71.2 (299)	84.4	61.2 (170)	64.7	71.2 (299)	61.2 (170)	
Graduate Courses (No. of responses on which percentages are based)	50.3 (298)	33.1	31.0 (171)	16.0	50.3 (298)	31.0 (171)	Chi-square=16.23 (.001); df=1 Cramer's V=.186
Vocational or technical courses (No. of responses on which percentages are based)	2.0 (294)	2.8	3.5 (172)	4.1	2.0 (294)	3.5 (172)	
Non-credit courses (other than above) (No. of responses on which percentages are based)	5.1 (292)	4.4	2.9 (171)	3.5	5.1 (292)	2.9 (171)	
<b>5. Percentage of Respondents Teaching Remedial Skills in</b>							
Reading	5.0	4.3	16.1	7.0	5.0	16.1	Chi-square=16.73 (.001); df=1 Cramer's V=.187
Writing	13.5	10.4	20.1	14.9	13.5	20.1	
Mathematics	3.3	4.6	5.2	4.7	3.3	5.2	

Table 9 cont'd. - 3

	<b>Full Time</b>		<b>Part Time</b>		<b>CSUN Respondents</b>	
	CSUN	Public 4 year	CSUN	Public 4 year	Full- Time	Part- Time
<b>Percentage Teaching Remedial Courses (cont'd.)</b>						
ESL	1.0	1.0	2.3	1.9	1.0	2.3
General academic skills	13.5	8.6	12.6	10.6	13.5	12.6
Other subject areas	4.3	5.4	8.6	9.0	4.3	8.6
(No. of responses on which percentages are based)	(303)		(174)		(303)	(174)
<b>6. Percentage of Respondents Who Have Received an award for outstanding teaching</b>	37.7	39.9	33.3	31.2	37.7	33.3
(No. of responses on which percentages are based)	(303)		(174)		(303)	(174)

Note: figures in bold indicate that a pair of percentages is moderately different, while bolded figures in a shaded cell denote a significantly different pair of percentages.

**Table 10. Percentage of HERI Respondents Engaging in Selected Teaching Activities During the Past Two Years by Employment Status and Comparison Group (Spring 2008)**

	<u>Full Time</u>		<u>Part Time</u>		<u>CSUN Respondents</u>	
	CSUN	Public 4 year	CSUN	Public 4 year	Full- Time	Part- Time
Placed or collected assignments on the Internet (No. of responses on which percentages are based)	<b>63.8</b> (301)	<b>73.3</b>	<b>56.6</b> (173)	<b>67.8</b>	63.8 (301)	56.6 (173)
Developed a new course (No. of responses on which percentages are based)	<b>58.3</b> (302)	<b>64.6</b>	<b>27.9</b> (172)	<b>38.9</b>	58.3 (302)	27.9 (172)
Taught an interdisciplinary course (No. of responses on which percentages are based)	<b>30.0</b> (300)	<b>35.8</b>	22.0 (173)	26.7	30.0 (300)	22.0 (173)
Team-taught a course (No. of responses on which percentages are based)	<b>22.1</b> (299)	<b>27.8</b>	13.8 (174)	14.3	22.1 (299)	13.8 (174)
Taught a service learning course (No. of responses on which percentages are based)	19.5 (297)	20.9	12.1 (173)	10.9	19.5 (297)	12.1 (173)
Taught an honors course (No. of responses on which percentages are based)	12.8 (297)	17.1	6.9 (173)	7.0	12.8 (297)	6.9 (173)
Taught a seminar for first-year students (No. of responses on which percentages are based)	<b>11.0</b> (300)	<b>21.1</b>	16.3 (172)	18.1	11.0 (300)	16.3 (172)
Taught a course exclusively on the Internet (No. of responses on which percentages are based)	<b>8.0</b> (299)	<b>19.9</b>	10.5 (172)	14.6	8.0 (299)	10.5 (172)
Taught an ethnic studies course (No. of responses on which percentages are based)	12.0 (299)	10.6	7.5 (173)	7.1	12.0 (299)	7.5 (173)
Taught a women's studies course (No. of responses on which percentages are based)	4.4 (298)	7.2	5.8 (173)	5.5	4.4 (298)	5.8 (173)

Chi-square=40.56 (.001); df=1  
Cramer's V=.293

Note: figures in bold indicate that a pair of percentages is moderately different, while bolded figures in a shaded cell denote a significantly different pair of percentages.

**Table 11. Percentage of HERI Respondents Using Selected Evaluation Methods in Most or All of Their Courses by Employment Status and Comparison Group (Spring 2008)**

	<u>Full Time</u>		<u>Part Time</u>		<u>CSUN Respondents</u>	
	CSUN	Public 4 year	CSUN	Public 4 year	Full- Time	Part- Time
<b>Types of Assignments Given</b>						
Student presentations (No. of responses on which percentages are based)	49.5 (301)	45.8	52.6 (173)	50.8	49.5 (301)	52.6 (173)
Term/research papers (No. of responses on which percentages are based)	<b>48.8</b> (301)	<b>43.2</b>	48.9 (174)	46.8	48.8 (301)	48.9 (174)
Short-answer exams (No. of responses on which percentages are based)	44.8 (299)	46.3	<b>35.6</b> (174)	<b>42.1</b>	44.8 (299)	35.6 (174)
Essay exams (No. of responses on which percentages are based)	44.3 (298)	42.5	<b>28.3</b> (173)	<b>39.6</b>	44.3 (298)	28.3 (173)
Quizzes (No. of responses on which percentages are based)	39.9 (301)	42.8	39.0 (172)	41.5	39.9 (301)	39.0 (172)
Multiple-choice exams (No. of responses on which percentages are based)	<b>33.3</b> (300)	<b>39.0</b>	40.8 (174)	44.8	33.3 (300)	40.8 (174)
Weekly essay assignments (No. of responses on which percentages are based)	21.1 (299)	20.2	<b>24.3</b> (173)	<b>30.0</b>	21.1 (299)	24.3 (173)
<b>Approaches to Grading</b>						
Competency-based grading (No. of responses on which percentages are based)	<b>61.1</b> (298)	<b>54.7</b>	<b>69.0</b> (174)	<b>62.6</b>	61.1 (298)	69.0 (174)
Grading on a curve (No. of responses on which percentages are based)	<b>22.1</b> (299)	<b>15.1</b>	17.9 (173)	15.9	22.1 (299)	17.9 (173)
Student evaluations of each others' work (No. of responses on which percentages are based)	27.1 (299)	23.8	27.6 (174)	30.5	27.1 (299)	27.6 (174)

Chi-square=11.80 (.001); df=1  
Cramer's V=.158

Note: figures in bold indicate that a pair of percentages is moderately different, while bolded figures in a shaded cell denote a significantly different pair of percentages.

**Table 12. Percentage of HERI Respondents Using Selected Instructional Techniques in Most or All Courses Taught by Employment Status and Comparison Group (Spring 2008)**

	<u>Full Time</u>		<u>Part Time</u>		<u>CSUN Respondents</u>	
	CSUN	Public 4 year	CSUN	Public 4 year	Full- Time	Part- Time
<b>1. Approaches to Teaching and Learning</b>						
Class discussions (No. of responses on which percentages are based)	<b>88.0</b> (301)	<b>83.0</b>	92.0 (174)	88.0	88.0 (301)	92.0 (174)
Cooperative learning (small groups) (No. of responses on which percentages are based)	64.8 (301)	60.8	<b>73.0</b> (174)	<b>64.6</b>	64.8 (301)	73.0 (174)
Class content informed by real-life problems (No. of responses on which percentages are based)	61.8 (301)	58.5	70.1 (174)	66.1	61.8 (301)	70.1 (174)
Extensive lecturing (No. of responses on which percentages are based)	47.2 (301)	47.9	39.1 (174)	44.0	47.2 (301)	39.1 (174)
Experiential learning/Field studies (No. of responses on which percentages are based)	33.3 (300)	31.7	39.7 (174)	34.9	33.3 (300)	39.7 (174)
Recitals/Demonstrations (No. of responses on which percentages are based)	29.3 (300)	22.1	31.2 (173)	28.4	29.3 (300)	31.2 (173)
Community service as part of coursework (No. of responses on which percentages are based)	8.6 (301)	8.9	13.9 (173)	8.7	8.6 (301)	13.9 (173)
<b>2. Student-Centered Learning</b>						
Using student inquiry to drive learning (No. of responses on which percentages are based)	<b>57.1</b> (301)	<b>48.9</b>	<b>71.3</b> (174)	<b>65.4</b>	57.1 (301)	71.3 (174)
Group projects (No. of responses on which percentages are based)	40.0 (300)	36.3	<b>44.8</b> (174)	<b>37.8</b>	40.0 (300)	44.8 (174)
Student-developed activities (e.g., assignments, exams) (No. of responses on which percentages are based)	32.9 (301)	28.0	41.4 (174)	40.1	32.9 (301)	41.4 (174)
Student-selected topics for course content (No. of responses on which percentages are based)	21.0 (300)	18.2	33.9 (174)	30.7	21.0 (300)	33.9 (174)

Chi-square=9.36 (.002); df=1  
Cramer's V=.140

Chi-square=9.60 (.002); df=1  
Cramer's V=.142

Table 12 cont'd. - 2

	<u>Full Time</u>		<u>Part Time</u>		<u>CSUN Respondents</u>	
	CSUN	Public 4 year	CSUN	Public 4 year	Full- Time	Part- Time
<b>3. Focus on Writing</b>						
Multiple drafts of written work (No. of responses on which percentages are based)	28.7 (300)	24.6	<b>31.6</b> (174)	<b>26.7</b>	28.7 (300)	31.6 (174)
Reflective writing/journaling (No. of responses on which percentages are based)	27.2 (301)	23.2	<b>40.5</b> (173)	<b>34.8</b>	27.2 (301)	40.5 (173)
<b>4. Types of Readings Used</b>						
Readings on racial and ethnic issues (No. of responses on which percentages are based)	<b>34.0</b> (300)	<b>24.7</b>	28.2 (174)	29.8	34.0 (300)	28.2 (174)
Readings on women and gender issues (No. of responses on which percentages are based)	25.6 (301)	21.6	24.1 (174)	27.1	25.6 (301)	24.1 (174)
<b>5. Other</b>						
Teaching assistants (No. of responses on which percentages are based)	6.3 (301)	6.1	8.0 (174)	5.0	6.3 (301)	8.0 (174)
Electronic quizzes with immediate feedback in class (No. of responses on which percentages are based)	5.3 (301)	8.5	5.2 (172)	9.2	5.3 (301)	5.2 (172)

Chi-square=8.81 (.003); df=1  
Cramer's V=.136

Note: figures in bold indicate that a pair of percentages is moderately different, while bolded figures in a shaded cell denote a significantly different pair of percentages.

**Table 13. Educational Goals Considered Essential or Very Important for Undergraduate Students by HERI Respondents by Employment Status and Comparison Group (Percentages, Spring 2008)**

Educational Goals	<u>Full Time</u>		<u>Part Time</u>		<u>CSUN Respondents</u>	
	CSUN	Public 4 year	CSUN	Public 4 year	Full- Time	Part- Time
<b>1. Develop Students' Intellectual Skills</b>						
Develop the ability to think critically (No. of responses on which percentages are based)	99.7 (302)	99.6	100.0 (174)	99.9	99.7 (302)	100.0 (174)
Help master knowledge in a discipline (No. of responses on which percentages are based)	96.7 (300)	96.0	90.8 (174)	93.1	96.7 (300)	90.8 (174)
Help students evaluate the quality and reliability of information (No. of responses on which percentages are based)	97.0 (300)	97.0	96.0 (174)	97.2	97.0 (300)	96.0 (174)
Promote the ability to write effectively (No. of responses on which percentages are based)	95.7 (300)	96.2	97.1 (174)	96.3	95.7 (300)	97.1 (174)
Develop creative capacities (No. of responses on which percentages are based)	82.4 (301)	80.3	<b>85.6</b> (174)	<b>80.4</b>	82.4 (301)	85.6 (174)
Prepare students for employment after college (No. of responses on which percentages are based)	84.4 (302)	84.8	86.2 (174)	86.5	84.4 (302)	86.2 (174)
Prepare students for graduate or advanced education (No. of responses on which percentages are based)	72.8 (302)	74.7	82.8 (174)	79.1	72.8 (302)	82.8 (174)
Study a foreign language (No. of responses on which percentages are based)	<b>46.0</b> (300)	<b>51.1</b>	51.7 (174)	48.8	46.0 (300)	51.7 (174)
Teach students the classic works of Western civilization (No. of responses on which percentages are based)	37.5 (301)	33.8	37.4 (174)	37.8	37.5 (301)	37.4 (174)

Table 13 cont'd. - 2

Educational Goals	<u>Full Time</u>		<u>Part Time</u>		<u>CSUN Respondents</u>	
	CSUN	Public 4 year	CSUN	Public 4 year	Full- Time	Part- Time
<b>2. Foster Personal Development</b>						
Develop moral character (No. of responses on which percentages are based)	71.8 (301)	68.1	<b>83.9</b> (174)	<b>78.1</b>	71.8 (301)	83.9 (174)
Enhance students' self-understanding (No. of responses on which percentages are based)	68.4 (301)	71.8	78.2 (174)	80.2	68.4 (301)	78.2 (174)
Help students develop personal values (No. of responses on which percentages are based)	66.8 (301)	64.6	76.4 (174)	72.9	66.8 (301)	76.4 (174)
Provide for students' emotional development (No. of responses on which percentages are based)	49.8 (301)	46.8	63.8 (174)	60.1	49.8 (301)	63.8 (174)
Prepare students for family living (No. of responses on which percentages are based)	21.8 (298)	20.9	32.8 (174)	31.0	21.8 (298)	32.8 (174)
<b>3. Prepare Students for Civic Participation</b>						
Teach students tolerance and respect for different beliefs (No. of responses on which percentages are based)	81.7 (301)	82.7	86.2 (174)	85.2	81.7 (301)	86.2 (174)
Enhance students' knowledge of and appreciation for other racial/ethnic groups (No. of responses on which percentages are based)	75.4 (301)	75.6	84.4 (173)	80.0	75.4 (301)	84.4 (173)
Engage students in civil discourse around controversial issues (No. of responses on which percentages are based)	73.4 (301)	72.6	74.7 (174)	74.4	73.4 (301)	74.7 (174)
Instill a basic appreciation of the liberal arts (No. of responses on which percentages are based)	73.1 (301)	71.8	69.9 (173)	71.2	73.1 (301)	69.9 (173)

Chi-square=8.97 (.003); df=1  
Cramer's V=.137

Chi-square=8.68 (.003); df=1  
Cramer's V=.135

Table 13 cont'd. - 3

Educational Goals	<u>Full Time</u>		<u>Part Time</u>		<u>CSUN Respondents</u>	
	CSUN	Public 4 year	CSUN	Public 4 year	Full- Time	Part- Time
<b>Prepare Students for Civic Participation (cont'd.)</b>						
Encourage students to become agents of social change	<b>61.7</b>	<b>59.3</b>	<b>64.9</b>	<b>64.4</b>	<b>61.7</b>	<b>64.9</b>
(No. of responses on which percentages are based)	(300)		(174)		(300)	(174)
Instill a commitment to community service	<b>57.3</b>	<b>57.3</b>	<b>59.8</b>	<b>61.3</b>	<b>57.3</b>	<b>59.8</b>
(No. of responses on which percentages are based)	(300)		(174)		(300)	(174)

Note: figures in bold indicate that a pair of percentages is moderately different, while bolded figures in a shaded cell denote a significantly different pair of percentages.

**Table 14. Percentage of HERI Respondents Frequently Encouraging Selected Behavior in Their Interaction with Undergraduate Students by Employment Status and Comparison Group (Spring 2008)**

	<u>Full Time</u>		<u>Part Time</u>		<u>CSUN Respondents</u>	
	CSUN	Public 4 year	CSUN	Public 4 year	Full- Time	Part- Time
Ask questions in class (No. of responses on which percentages are based)	95.3 (295)	95.1	94.7 (171)	96.5	95.3 (295)	94.7 (171)
Support their opinions with a logical argument (No. of responses on which percentages are based)	85.7 (293)	83.8	86.5 (171)	86.9	85.7 (293)	86.5 (171)
Seek solutions to problems and explain them to others (No. of responses on which percentages are based)	80.6 (294)	76.6	81.2 (170)	80.7	80.6 (294)	81.2 (170)
Seek feedback on their academic work (No. of responses on which percentages are based)	77.3 (291)	75.4	<b>82.5</b> (171)	<b>76.9</b>	77.3 (291)	82.5 (171)
Seek alternative solutions to a problem (No. of responses on which percentages are based)	71.8 (294)	68.0	74.3 (171)	70.7	71.8 (294)	74.3 (171)
Evaluate the quality or reliability of information they receive (No. of responses on which percentages are based)	73.0 (293)	75.1	79.5 (171)	77.3	73.0 (293)	79.5 (171)
Look up scientific research articles and resources (No. of responses on which percentages are based)	<b>64.0</b> (292)	<b>56.7</b>	54.4 (171)	53.8	64.0 (292)	54.4 (171)
Revise their papers to improve their writing (No. of responses on which percentages are based)	62.6 (294)	60.0	62.0 (171)	59.7	62.6 (294)	62.0 (171)
Explore topics on their own, even though it was not required for a class (No. of responses on which percentages are based)	58.0 (293)	53.3	63.7 (171)	60.0	58.0 (293)	63.7 (171)

Table 14 cont'd.

	<b>Full Time</b>		<b>Part Time</b>		<b>CSUN Respondents</b>	
	CSUN	Public 4 year	CSUN	Public 4 year	Full- Time	Part- Time
Acknowledge failure as a necessary part of the learning process	<b>57.3</b>	52.4	<b>53.8</b>	53.6	<b>57.3</b>	<b>53.8</b>
(No. of responses on which percentages are based)	(293)		(171)		(293)	(171)
Take risks for potential gains	40.4	<b>37.6</b>	45.6	41.4	40.4	45.6
(No. of responses on which percentages are based)	(292)		(171)		(292)	(171)

Note: figures in bold indicate that a pair of percentages is moderately different, while bolded figures in a shaded cell denote a significantly different pair of percentages.

**Table 15. Percentage of HERI Respondents Saying That Statements About Aspects of Their Institutional Environment Are "Descriptive" of It by Employment Status  
(Percentages, Spring 2008) \***

	<u>Full Time</u>		<u>Part Time</u>	
	CSUN	Public 4 year	CSUN	Public 4 year
<b>Statements About Institutional Functioning</b>				
There is respect for the expression of diverse values and beliefs (No. of respondents)	92.1 (303)		93.5 (170)	
The administration is open about its policies (No. of respondents)	73.1 (301)		78.1 (169)	
Administrators consider faculty concerns when making policy (No. of respondents)	63.1 (301)		69.6 (168)	
Social activities are overemphasized (No. of respondents)	17.6 (301)		27.2 (169)	
<b>Statements About Faculty Roles and Rewards</b>				
Faculty here respect each other (No. of respondents)	89.8 (303)		91.3 (172)	
Faculty are typically at odds with the campus administration (No. of respondents)	74.9 (303)		54.4 (169)	
Faculty are rewarded for their efforts to use instructional technology (No. of respondents)	72.6 (299)		72.6 (168)	
Faculty are rewarded for being good teachers (No. of respondents)	63.4 (303)		48.5 (169)	
Faculty are rewarded for their efforts to work with underprepared students (No. of respondents)	49.0 (298)		45.5 (167)	

Chi-square=20.77 (.001); df=1  
Cramer's V=.210

Chi-square=9.82 (.002); df=1  
Cramer's V=.210

Table 15 cont'd.

	<u>Full Time</u>		<u>Part Time</u>	
	CSUN	Public 4 year	CSUN	Public 4 year
<b>Statements About Students</b>				
It is easy for students to see faculty outside of regular office hours (No. of respondents)	88.4 (303)		89.0 (172)	
There is a great deal of conformity among the students (No. of respondents)	50.8 (301)		62.4 (170)	
Most students are treated like numbers in a book (No. of respondents)	42.2 (301)		33.9 (168)	

\* The percentages in this table combine respondents who deem the statements in question very and somewhat descriptive of CSUN. The data for the comparison institutions include only the "very descriptive" responses and thus are not shown here. They are summarized in Appendix B, however.

**Table 16. Percentage of HERI Respondents Agreeing with Selected Statements About Their Institutions by Employment Status and Comparison Group (Spring 2008) \***

	<u>Full Time</u>		<u>Part Time</u>		<u>CSUN Respondents</u>	
	CSUN	Public 4 year	CSUN	Public 4 year	Full- Time	Part- Time
<b>Institutional Climate</b>						
Faculty are committed to the welfare of this institution (No. of responses on which percentages are based)	<b>83.0</b> (300)	<b>89.5</b>	91.7 (169)	92.7	83.0 (300)	91.7 (169)
Student Affairs staff have the support and respect of faculty (No. of responses on which percentages are based)	77.9 (289)	75.7	<b>79.0</b> (162)	<b>84.4</b>	77.9 (289)	79.0 (162)
The criteria for advancement and promotion decisions are clear (No. of responses on which percentages are based)	<b>78.7</b> (301)	<b>70.1</b>	50.9 (169)	55.5	78.7 (301)	50.9 (169)
There is adequate support for integrating technology in my teaching (No. of responses on which percentages are based)	<b>70.5</b> (302)	<b>82.0</b>	82.0 (172)	85.8	70.5 (302)	82.0 (172)
There is adequate support for faculty development (No. of responses on which percentages are based)	62.1 (298)	62.1	70.2 (168)	68.9	62.1 (298)	70.2 (168)
Faculty are sufficiently involved in campus decision making (No. of responses on which percentages are based)	53.5 (297)	51.8	<b>51.6</b> (161)	<b>58.4</b>	53.5 (297)	51.6 (161)
This institution should not offer remedial/developmental education (No. of responses on which percentages are based)	21.9 (301)	26.0	20.2 (168)	20.2	21.9 (301)	20.2 (168)
<b>My Place in the Department and Institution</b>						
My teaching is valued by faculty in my department (No. of responses on which percentages are based)	88.7 (301)	89.5	87.9 (173)	89.3	88.7 (301)	87.9 (173)
My research is valued by faculty in my department (No. of responses on which percentages are based)	73.7 (300)	71.6	61.4 (158)	59.2	73.7 (300)	61.4 (158)

Chi-square=39.06 (.001); df=1  
Cramer's V=.288

Chi-square=7.60 (.006); df=1  
Cramer's V=.127

Chi-square=7.35 (.007); df=1  
Cramer's V=.127

Table 16 cont'd. - 2

	<u>Full Time</u>		<u>Part Time</u>		<u>CSUN Respondents</u>	
	CSUN	Public 4 year	CSUN	Public 4 year	Full- Time	Part- Time
My values are congruent with the dominant institutional values (No. of responses on which percentages are based)	66.2 (296)	70.3	<b>74.7</b> (166)	<b>79.7</b>	66.2 (296)	74.7 (166)
My department does a good job of mentoring new faculty (No. of responses on which percentages are based)	65.4 (301)	67.6	58.0 (169)	60.8	65.4 (301)	58.0 (169)
<b>Commitment to Student Welfare</b>						
Faculty feel that most students are well-prepared academically (No. of responses on which percentages are based)	<b>10.9</b> (302)	<b>30.6</b>	<b>27.5</b> (171)	<b>41.4</b>	10.9 (302)	27.5 (171)
Most of the students I teach lack the basic skills for college level work (No. of responses on which percentages are based)	<b>71.8</b> (301)	<b>49.7</b>	<b>63.0</b> (173)	<b>43.5</b>	71.8 (301)	63.0 (173)
Faculty here are strongly interested in the academic problems of undergraduates (No. of responses on which percentages are based)	<b>80.0</b> (300)	<b>87.8</b>	85.3 (170)	87.8	80.0 (300)	85.3 (170)
Faculty are interested in students' personal problems (No. of responses on which percentages are based)	<b>72.0</b> (300)	<b>84.2</b>	<b>74.3</b> (171)	<b>82.1</b>	72.0 (300)	74.3 (171)
This institution takes responsibility for educating underprepared students (No. of responses on which percentages are based)	63.5 (301)	63.5	<b>62.3</b> (167)	<b>69.3</b>	63.5 (301)	62.3 (167)
Most students are strongly committed to community service (No. of responses on which percentages are based)	<b>26.4</b> (296)	<b>38.0</b>	<b>23.8</b> (168)	<b>34.7</b>	26.4 (296)	23.8 (168)

Chi-square=21.30 (.001); df=1  
Cramer's V=.212

Table 16 cont'd. - 3

	<u>Full Time</u>		<u>Part Time</u>		<u>CSUN Respondents</u>		
	CSUN	Public 4 year	CSUN	Public 4 year	Full- Time	Part- Time	
<b>Curricular Emphases</b>							
Many courses involve students in community service (No. of responses on which percentages are based)	48.3 (296)	47.3	50.6 (164)	49.1	48.3 (296)	50.6 (164)	
Racial and ethnic diversity should be more strongly reflected in the curriculum (No. of responses on which percentages are based)	54.2 (299)	57.8	44.0 (168)	47.5	54.2 (299)	44.0 (168)	
Many courses include feminist perspectives (No. of responses on which percentages are based)	41.4 (295)	43.0	54.9 (164)	54.2	41.4 (295)	54.9 (164)	Chi-square=7.75 (.005); df=1 Cramer's V=.130
<b>Equity Issues</b>							
Faculty of color are treated fairly here (No. of responses on which percentages are based)	84.0 (293)	88.8	93.9 (164)	94.0	84.0 (293)	93.9 (164)	Chi-square=9.52 (.002); df=1 Cramer's V=.144
Gay and lesbian faculty are treated fairly here (No. of responses on which percentages are based)	87.1 (287)	85.5	91.3 (161)	90.2	87.1 (287)	91.3 (161)	
Women faculty are treated fairly here (No. of responses on which percentages are based)	85.1 (296)	86.4	95.3 (169)	92.4	85.1 (296)	95.3 (169)	Chi-square=11.18 (.001); df=1 Cramer's V=.155
There is a lot of campus racial conflict here (No. of responses on which percentages are based)	9.1 (298)	8.8	4.2 (168)	5.7	9.1 (298)	4.2 (168)	
This institution should hire more faculty of color (No. of responses on which percentages are based)	<b>73.1</b> (297)	<b>67.6</b>	<b>39.6</b> (164)	<b>49.8</b>	73.1 (297)	39.6 (164)	Chi-square=49.71 (.001); df=1 Cramer's V=.328
This institution should hire more women faculty (No. of responses on which percentages are based)	55.2 (288)	50.9	44.2 (163)	43.0	55.2 (288)	44.2 (163)	

\* The percentages in this table combine respondents who agree strongly and somewhat with the statements in question.

Note: figures in bold indicate that a pair of percentages is moderately different, while bolded figures in a shaded cell denote a significantly different pair of percentages.

**Table 17. Percentage of HERI Respondents Agreeing with Selected Statements About Part-Time Faculty Status at Their Institutions by Employment Status and Comparison Group (Spring 2008) \***

<i>Part-Time Faculty Members at This Institution:</i>	<u>Full Time</u>		<u>Part Time</u>	
	CSUN	Public 4 year	CSUN	Public 4 year
<b>Duties</b>				
Are primarily responsible for introductory classes (No. of responses on which percentages are based)			<b>61.8</b> (170)	<b>68.3</b>
Are compensated for advising/counseling students (No. of responses on which percentages are based)			20.1 (169)	18.1
Are required to attend meetings (No. of responses on which percentages are based)			33.5 (173)	32.3
<b>Treatment</b>				
Rarely get hired into full-time positions (No. of responses on which percentages are based)			70.8 (168)	68.2
Have no guarantee of employment security (No. of responses on which percentages are based)			<b>79.2</b> (173)	<b>84.7</b>
Have access to support services (No. of responses on which percentages are based)			83.9 (174)	85.0
Are given specific training before teaching (No. of responses on which percentages are based)			34.5 (174)	38.9
Receive respect from students (No. of responses on which percentages are based)			96.0 (173)	95.7
Have good working relationships with the admin. (No. of responses on which percentages are based)			76.9 (173)	75.8
Are respected by full-time faculty (No. of responses on which percentages are based)			<b>71.4</b> (171)	<b>78.5</b>

\* The percentages in this table combine respondents who agree strongly and somewhat with the statements in question. These questions were posed exclusively to HERI respondents who identified themselves as part-time employees.

Note: figures in bold indicate that a pair of percentages is moderately different, while bolded figures in a shaded cell denote a significantly different pair of percentages.

**Table 18. Percentage of HERI Respondents Asserting That Selected Commitments Have High Priority at Their Institutions by Employment Status and Comparison Group (Spring 2008)**

	<u>Full Time</u>		<u>Part Time</u>		<u>CSUN Respondents</u>	
	CSUN	Public 4 year	CSUN	Public 4 year	Full- Time	Part- Time
<b>Importance of Institutional Priorities</b>						
To pursue extramural funding (No. of responses on which percentages are based)	<b>64.1</b> (301)	<b>54.7</b>	49.4 (162)	49.9	64.1 (301)	49.4 (162)
To enhance the institution's national image (No. of responses on which percentages are based)	62.3 (300)	59.7	53.0 (166)	57.8	62.3 (300)	53.0 (166)
To increase or maintain institutional prestige (No. of responses on which percentages are based)	57.3 (300)	55.3	<b>53.8</b> (169)	<b>60.7</b>	57.3 (300)	53.8 (169)
To hire faculty stars (No. of responses on which percentages are based)	<b>25.2</b> (302)	<b>18.7</b>	22.9 (166)	25.4	25.2 (302)	22.9 (166)
<b>Attention Given to Equity Issues</b>						
To create a diverse multi-cultural campus environ. (No. of responses on which percentages are based)	<b>64.0</b> (300)	<b>54.7</b>	<b>73.2</b> (168)	<b>61.6</b>	64.0 (300)	73.2 (168)
To develop an appreciation for multiculturalism (No. of responses on which percentages are based)	<b>59.2</b> (299)	<b>54.1</b>	61.3 (168)	63.9	59.2 (299)	61.3 (168)
To promote gender equity among faculty (No. of responses on which percentages are based)	50.8 (299)	49.9	55.7 (167)	56.7	50.8 (299)	55.7 (167)
To increase the representation of minorities in the faculty and administration (No. of responses on which percentages are based)	47.0 (298)	44.6	42.4 (165)	43.9	47.0 (298)	42.4 (165)
To recruit more minority students (No. of responses on which percentages are based)	<b>44.0</b> (300)	<b>49.0</b>	45.7 (164)	44.0	44.0 (300)	45.7 (164)
To increase the representation of women in the faculty and administration (No. of responses on which percentages are based)	36.0 (297)	34.6	38.0 (163)	40.7	36.0 (297)	38.0 (163)

Chi-square=9.45 (.002); df=1  
Cramer's V=.143

Table 18 cont'd. - 2

	<u>Full Time</u>		<u>Part Time</u>		<u>CSUN Respondents</u>	
	CSUN	Public 4 year	CSUN	Public 4 year	Full- Time	Part- Time
<b>Strengthening Community Partnerships</b>						
To create and sustain partnerships with surrounding communities (No. of responses on which percentages are based)	<b>62.7</b> (300)	<b>54.8</b>	<b>53.3</b> (169)	<b>58.5</b>	62.7 (300)	53.3 (169)
To strengthen links with the for-profit, corporate sector (No. of responses on which percentages are based)	<b>57.2</b> (299)	<b>49.7</b>	49.1 (167)	52.9	57.2 (299)	49.1 (167)
To facilitate student involvement in community service (No. of responses on which percentages are based)	43.7 (300)	42.2	45.8 (168)	45.8	43.7 (300)	45.8 (168)
To provide resources for faculty to engage in community-based teaching or research (No. of responses on which percentages are based)	43.5 (299)	39.1	47.3 (169)	48.3	43.5 (299)	47.3 (169)
<b>Developing Student Capacities</b>						
To promote the intellectual development of students (No. of responses on which percentages are based)	80.1 (302)	82.6	90.6 (171)	88.2	80.1 (302)	90.6 (171)
To help students examine and understand their personal values (No. of responses on which percentages are based)	47.2 (299)	48.9	62.4 (170)	60.1	47.2 (299)	62.4 (170)
To develop a sense of community among students and faculty (No. of responses on which percentages are based)	<b>45.7</b> (300)	<b>50.9</b>	53.3 (169)	57.3	45.7 (300)	53.3 (169)
To develop leadership ability among students (No. of responses on which percentages are based)	<b>45.1</b> (297)	<b>53.4</b>	61.3 (168)	65.1	45.1 (297)	61.3 (168)
To help students learn how to bring about change in American society (No. of responses on which percentages are based)	35.8 (299)	33.7	48.2 (168)	43.7	35.8 (299)	48.2 (168)

Chi-square=8.94 (.003); df=1  
Cramer's V=.138

Chi-square=10.04 (.002); df=1  
Cramer's V=.146

Chi-square=11.26 (.001); df=1  
Cramer's V=.156

Note: figures in bold indicate that a pair of percentages is moderately different, while bolded figures in a shaded cell denote a significantly different pair of percentages.

**Table 19. Commitment to Various Aspects of an Academic Career by HERI Respondents by Employment Status and Comparison Group (Percentages; Spring 2008)**

	<u>Full Time</u>		<u>Part Time</u>		<u>CSUN Respondents</u>	
	CSUN	Public 4 year	CSUN	Public 4 year	Full- Time	Part- Time
<b><i>If Respondents Were Beginning Their Careers Again, Would they still want to come to current institution?</i></b>						
Definitely yes	29.9	31.6	46.2	48.4	29.9	46.2
Probably yes	28.9	33.6	35.8	31.2	28.9	35.8
Not sure	21.6	18.0	13.3	13.9	21.6	13.3
Probably no	13.3	10.8	3.5	4.0	13.3	3.5
Definitely no	6.3	6.0	1.2	2.5	6.3	1.2
Total (No. of respondents)	100.0 (301)	100.0	100.0 (173)	100.0	100.0 (301)	100.0 (173)
<b><i>Would they still want to become college professors?</i></b>						
Definitely yes	63.4	62.9	62.1	62.9	63.4	62.1
Probably yes	22.4	24.8	28.7	25.4	22.4	28.7
Not sure	8.6	8.7	6.9	9.1	8.6	6.9
Probably no	4.3	2.8	2.3	2.2	4.3	2.3
Definitely no	1.3	0.8	0.0	0.4	1.3	0.0
Total (No. of respondents)	100.0 (303)	100.0	100.0 (174)	100.0	100.0 (303)	100.0 (174)
<b><i>Importance to Respondents of:</i></b>						
<b>Teaching</b>						
Essential or very important (No. of respondents)	99.3 (303)	98.2	97.7 (174)	98.3	99.3 (303)	97.7 (174)
<b>Research</b>						
Essential or very important (No. of respondents)	79.8 (302)	68.4	54.7 (172)	52.5	79.8 (302)	54.7 (172)
<b>Service</b>						
Essential or very important (No. of respondents)	65.6 (302)	64.7	60.5 (172)	64.9	65.6 (302)	60.5 (172)

Chi-square=31.45 (.001); df=1  
Cramer's V=.258

Chi-square=33.45 (.001); df=1  
Cramer's V=.266

Table 19 cont'd.

	<b>Full Time</b>		<b>Part Time</b>		<b>CSUN Respondents</b>	
	CSUN	Public 4 year	CSUN	Public 4 year	Full- Time	Part- Time
<b>If given the choice, I would prefer to work full-time at this institution (for part-time respondents only)</b>						
Yes			64.7	61.8		
No			35.3	38.2		
Total (No. of respondents)			100.0 (173)	100.0		

Note: figures in bold indicate that a pair of percentages is moderately different, while bolded figures in a shaded cell denote a significantly different pair of percentages.

**Table 20. Percentage of HERI Respondents Saying That Selected Statements About Their Personal and Professional Circumstances Apply to Them to at Least Some Extent by Employment Status (Percentages, Spring 2008) \***

	<u>Full Time</u>		<u>Part Time</u>		
	CSUN	Public 4 year	CSUN	Public 4 year	
Experience close alignment between your work and your personal values (No. of respondents)	97.0 (302)		98.8 (173)		
Engage in academic work that spans multiple disciplines (No. of respondents)	90.8 (303)		80.1 (171)		Chi-square=10.89 (.001); df=1 Cramer's V=.152
Feel that the training you received in graduate school prepared you well for your role as a faculty mentor (No. of respondents)	82.8 (303)		83.2 (173)		
Achieve a healthy balance between your personal life and your professional life (No. of respondents)	81.8 (303)		92.5 (173)		Chi-square=10.18 (.001); df=1 Cramer's V=.146
Mentor new faculty (No. of respondents)	79.9 (303)		45.3 (172)		Chi-square=59.47 (.001); df=1 Cramer's V=.354
Feel that you have to work harder than your colleagues to be perceived as a legitimate scholar (No. of respondents)	56.7 (300)		63.4 (172)		

\* The percentages in this table combine respondents who said that the statements in question apply to them to some extent or to a great extent. The data for the comparison institutions include only the "to a great extent" responses and thus are not shown here. They are summarized in Appendix B, however.

**Table 21. Objectives Considered Essential or Very Important by HERI Respondents by Employment Status and Comparison Group (Percentages; Spring 2008)**

	<u>Full Time</u>		<u>Part Time</u>		<u>CSUN Respondents</u>	
	CSUN	Public 4 year	CSUN	Public 4 year	Full- Time	Part- Time
<b>Personal and Professional Objectives</b>						
Developing a meaningful philosophy of life (No. of responses on which percentages are based)	<b>76.7</b> (301)	<b>71.6</b>	80.3 (173)	76.9	76.7 (301)	80.3 (173)
Raising a family (No. of responses on which percentages are based)	66.6 (299)	65.9	64.2 (173)	65.5	66.6 (299)	64.2 (173)
Becoming an authority in my field (No. of responses on which percentages are based)	<b>60.6</b> (302)	<b>55.4</b>	59.0 (173)	58.0	60.6 (302)	59.0 (173)
Obtaining recognition from my colleagues for contributions to my special field (No. of responses on which percentages are based)	46.2 (301)	42.7	39.3 (173)	35.9	46.2 (301)	39.3 (173)
Becoming very well off financially (No. of responses on which percentages are based)	36.1 (302)	34.0	37.0 (173)	36.5	36.1 (302)	37.0 (173)
Integrating spirituality into my life (No. of responses on which percentages are based)	<b>39.9</b> (301)	<b>45.5</b>	<b>46.2</b> (173)	<b>52.3</b>	39.9 (301)	46.2 (173)
<b>Fostering Societal Change</b>						
Helping others who are in difficulty (No. of responses on which percentages are based)	65.2 (302)	65.3	69.2 (172)	71.9	65.2 (302)	69.2 (172)
Helping to promote racial understanding (No. of responses on which percentages are based)	<b>60.1</b> (301)	<b>53.3</b>	56.4 (172)	59.0	60.1 (301)	56.4 (172)
Influencing social values (No. of responses on which percentages are based)	<b>47.0</b> (302)	<b>39.0</b>	49.7 (173)	48.6	47.0 (302)	49.7 (173)

Table 21 cont'd.

	<u>Full Time</u>		<u>Part Time</u>		<u>CSUN Respondents</u>	
	CSUN	Public 4 year	CSUN	Public 4 year	Full- Time	Part- Time
Becoming involved in programs to clean up the environment	39.9	36.1	<b>46.2</b>	<b>41.2</b>	39.9	46.2
(No. of responses on which percentages are based)	(301)		(173)		(301)	(173)
Influencing the political structure	<b>24.5</b>	<b>19.2</b>	26.6	24.6	24.5	26.6
(No. of responses on which percentages are based)	(302)		(173)		(302)	(173)

Note: figures in bold indicate that a pair of percentages is moderately different, while bolded figures in a shaded cell denote a significantly different pair of percentages.

**Table 22. Percentage of HERI Respondents Who Are Satisfied or Very Satisfied with Various Aspects of Their Jobs by Employment Status and Comparison Group (Spring 2008)**

	<u>Full Time</u>		<u>Part Time</u>		<u>CSUN Respondents</u>	
	CSUN	Public 4 year	CSUN	Public 4 year	Full- Time	Part- Time
<b>Overall job satisfaction</b>	<b>67.2</b>	<b>72.2</b>	77.5	76.1	67.2	77.5
(No. of responses on which percentages are based)	(302)		(173)		(302)	(173)
<b>Institutionally Defined Job Conditions</b>						
Job security	<b>87.0</b>	<b>77.1</b>	<b>28.0</b>	<b>35.0</b>	87.0	28.0
(No. of responses on which percentages are based)	(299)		(164)		(299)	(164)
Health benefits	<b>84.1</b>	<b>70.6</b>	<b>68.0</b>	<b>52.4</b>	84.1	68.0
(No. of responses on which percentages are based)	(301)		(122)		(301)	(122)
Retirement benefits	<b>80.5</b>	<b>68.9</b>	42.9	44.5	80.5	42.9
(No. of responses on which percentages are based)	(293)		(147)		(293)	(147)
Relationship with administration	56.1	54.6	62.7	61.2	56.1	62.7
(No. of responses on which percentages are based)	(301)		(158)		(301)	(158)
Opportunity for scholarly pursuits	39.7	44.0	31.4	33.6	39.7	31.4
(No. of responses on which percentages are based)	(300)		(137)		(300)	(137)
Quality of students	<b>37.2</b>	<b>46.8</b>	<b>47.7</b>	<b>59.4</b>	37.2	47.7
(No. of responses on which percentages are based)	(301)		(174)		(301)	(174)
Salary	<b>33.0</b>	<b>42.0</b>	26.2	29.6	33.0	26.2
(No. of responses on which percentages are based)	(303)		(172)		(303)	(172)
Availability of child care at this institution	<b>17.3</b>	<b>34.6</b>	39.1	41.1	17.3	39.1
(No. of responses on which percentages are based)	(75)		(23)		(75)	(23)
<b>Departmentally Set Job Conditions</b>						
Freedom to determine course content	93.3	91.4	86.2	88.7	93.3	86.2
(No. of responses on which percentages are based)	(299)		(167)		(299)	(167)
Course assignments	80.0	81.8	<b>69.8</b>	<b>79.6</b>	80.0	69.8
(No. of responses on which percentages are based)	(300)		(172)		(300)	(172)

Chi-square=163.99 (.001); df=1  
Cramer's V=.595

Chi-square=13.64 (.001); df=1  
Cramer's V=.180

Chi-square=63.85 (.001); df=1  
Cramer's V=.381

Chi-square=4.80 (.028); df=1  
Cramer's V=.221

Table 22 cont'd. - 2

	<u>Full Time</u>		<u>Part Time</u>		<u>CSUN Respondents</u>		
	CSUN	Public 4 year	CSUN	Public 4 year	Full- Time	Part- Time	
Departmental leadership (No. of responses on which percentages are based)	64.8 (301)	67.8	77.5 (169)	76.5	64.8 (301)	77.5 (169)	Chi-square=8.25 (.004); df=1 Cramer's V=.133
Office/lab space (No. of responses on which percentages are based)	63.0 (300)	61.9	<b>34.9</b> (152)	<b>42.5</b>	63.0 (300)	34.9 (152)	Chi-square=32.10 (.001); df=1 Cramer's V=.266
Clerical/administrative support (No. of responses on which percentages are based)	<b>53.7</b> (296)	<b>60.9</b>	78.0 (168)	74.9	53.7 (296)	78.0 (168)	Chi-square=26.91 (.001); df=1 Cramer's V=.241
Teaching load (No. of responses on which percentages are based)	<b>30.9</b> (301)	<b>47.3</b>	<b>49.4</b> (172)	<b>57.4</b>	30.9 (301)	49.4 (172)	Chi-square=16.00 (.001); df=1 Cramer's V=.184
<b>Career Advancement</b>							
Autonomy and independence (No. of responses on which percentages are based)	80.1 (302)	81.7	83.0 (171)	86.6	80.1 (302)	83.0 (171)	
Prospects for career advancement (No. of responses on which percentages are based)	54.2 (277)	52.4	<b>18.4</b> (136)	<b>25.5</b>	54.2 (277)	18.4 (136)	Chi-square=47.79 (.001); df=1 Cramer's V=.340
Visibility for jobs at other institutions/organizations* (No. of responses on which percentages are based)	50.5 (222)	47.6	50.0 (128)	45.5	50.5 (222)	50.0 (128)	
<b>Collegial Interaction</b>							
Professional relationships with other faculty (No. of responses on which percentages are based)	<b>69.8</b> (301)	<b>76.4</b>	73.4 (173)	74.9	69.8 (301)	73.4 (173)	
Competency of colleagues (No. of responses on which percentages are based)	<b>65.9</b> (299)	<b>73.9</b>	<b>73.5</b> (166)	<b>82.3</b>	65.9 (299)	73.5 (166)	
Social relationships with other faculty (No. of responses on which percentages are based)	62.8 (293)	66.1	62.2 (148)	64.0	62.8 (293)	62.2 (148)	

Note: figures in bold indicate that a pair of percentages is moderately different, while bolded figures in a shaded cell denote a significantly different pair of percentages.

**Table 23. Percentage of HERI Respondents Identifying Selected Sources of Stress as Not Relevant to Their Lives by Employment Status and Comparison Group (Spring 2008)\***

Source of stress	<u>Full Time</u>		<u>Part Time</u>		
	CSUN	Public 4 year	CSUN	Public 4 year	
<b>Sources of Work-Related Stress</b>					
<b>1. Professional Advancement</b>					
Committee work	2.0		43.9		Chi-square=135.91 (.001); df=1 Cramer's V = .534
Research or publishing demands	0.7		32.9		
Keeping up with information technology	1.0		2.9		Chi-square=105.40 (.001); df=1 Cramer's V = .471
Review/promotion process	14.2		26.7		
Job security	7.0		2.9		
<b>2. Interpersonal Interaction</b>					
Working with underprepared students	1.3		2.3		Chi-square=11.24 (.001); df=1 Cramer's V = .154
Students	0.7		1.7		
Classroom conflict	3.0		4.6		
Colleagues	1.3		4.6		
Faculty meetings	1.3		38.7		
Subtle discrimination (e.g., prejudice, racism, sexism)	13.6		15.6		
<b>3. Other Work-Related Issues</b>					
Teaching load	1.7		2.9		Chi-square=121.043 (.001); df=1 Cramer's V = .505
Institutional procedures and red tape	2.0		11.6		
Change in work responsibilities	8.3		11.6		
					Chi-square=19.49 (.001); df=1 Cramer's V = .203

Table 23 cont'd.

Source of stress	<u>Full Time</u>		<u>Part Time</u>	
	CSUN	Public 4 year	CSUN	Public 4 year
<b>Sources of Personal Stress</b>				
<b>4. Life Management Issues</b>				
Self-imposed high expectations	1.0		2.3	
Lack of personal time	1.3		1.7	
Managing household responsibilities	3.0		6.9	
Personal finances	2.6		6.4	
<b>5. Health Issues</b>				
My physical health	5.0		7.5	
Health of spouse/partner	19.9		26.2	
<b>6. Family Responsibilities</b>				
Being part of a dual career couple	23.8		28.3	
Friction with spouse/partner	22.6		25.4	
Child care	52.3		56.6	
Care of elderly parent	42.7		42.8	
Children's problems	42.2		43.9	
(No. of responses on which percentages are based)	(302)		(173)	

\* The summary tables provided by HERI do not provide the "not relevant" percentages for the respondents at the comparison institutions, and thus, they are not shown in the table.

**Table 24. Percentage of HERI Respondents Reporting Recent Stress in Selected Areas of Their Professional and Personal Lives by Employment Status and Comparison Group (Percentages; Spring 2008) \***

Source of stress	<u>Full Time</u>		<u>Part Time</u>		<u>CSUN Data</u> (Not relevant excluded)		
	CSUN	Public 4 year	CSUN	Public 4 year	Full Time	Part Time	
<b>Sources of Work-Related Stress</b>							
<b>1. Professional Advancement</b>							
Committee work (No. of respondents)	<b>73.3</b> (303)	<b>66.8</b>	8.7 (173)	13.5	74.7 (297)	15.5 (97)	Chi-square= 107.212 (.000); df=1 Cramer's V=.522
Research or publishing demands (No. of respondents)	<b>69.9</b> (302)	<b>62.4</b>	23.7 (173)	23.7	70.3 (300)	35.3 (116)	Chi-square= 42.882 (.000); df=1 Cramer's V=.321
Keeping up with information technology (No. of respondents)	<b>61.5</b> (299)	<b>55.2</b>	49.4 (172)	52.1	62.2 (296)	50.9 (167)	
Review/promotion process (No. of respondents)	54.3 (302)	54.7	33.7 (172)	31.4	63.3 (259)	46.0 (126)	Chi-square=10.378 (.001); df=1 Cramer's V=.164
Job security (No. of respondents)	<b>26.2</b> (302)	<b>34.1</b>	<b>66.5</b> (173)	<b>56.9</b>	28.1 (281)	68.5 (168)	Chi-square= 69.720 (.000); df=1 Cramer's V=.394
<b>2. Interpersonal Interaction</b>							
Working with underprepared students (No. of respondents)	74.2 (302)	70.4	<b>79.2</b> (173)	<b>67.4</b>	75.2 (298)	81.1 (169)	
Students (No. of respondents)	68.2 (302)	67.4	62.4 (173)	59.7	68.7 (300)	63.5 (170)	
Colleagues (No. of respondents)	67.3 (303)	68.0	31.8 (173)	31.7	68.2 (299)	33.3 (165)	Chi-square= 52.496 (.000); df=1 Cramer's V=.336
Faculty meetings (No. of respondents)	58.3 (302)	56.5	8.1 (173)	13.6	59.1 (298)	13.2 (106)	Chi-square= 65.989 (.000); df=1 Cramer's V=.404
Subtle discrimination (e.g., prejudice, racism, sexism) (No. of respondents)	29.8 (302)	28.5	18.5 (173)	18.3	34.5 (261)	21.9 (146)	Chi-square= 7.042 (.008); df=1 Cramer's V=.132
Classroom Conflict (No. of respondents)	25.9 (301)	23.3	23.1 (173)	20.9	26.7 (292)	24.2 (165)	

Table 24 cont'd. - 2

Source of stress	<u>Full Time</u>		<u>Part Time</u>		<u>CSUN Data</u>	
	CSUN	Public 4 year	CSUN	Public 4 year	(Not relevant excluded) Full Time Part Time	
<b>3. Other Work-Related Issues</b>						
Teaching load (No. of respondents)	<b>78.1</b> (302)	<b>68.9</b>	39.0 (172)	37.0	79.5 (297)	40.1 (167)
Institutional procedures and red tape (No. of respondents)	71.9 (302)	76.3	48.6 (173)	45.1	73.3 (296)	54.9 (153)
Change in work responsibilities (No. of respondents)	48.3 (302)	48.6	41.3 (172)	42.1	52.7 (277)	46.7 (152)
<b>Sources of Personal Stress</b>						
<b>4. Life Management Issues</b>						
Self-imposed high expectations (No. of respondents)	80.8 (302)	79.9	68.8 (173)	72.5	81.6 (299)	70.4 (169)
Lack of personal time (No. of respondents)	<b>79.7</b> (300)	<b>74.3</b>	64.2 (173)	63.1	80.7 (296)	65.3 (170)
Managing household responsibilities (No. of respondents)	70.2 (302)	73.0	67.6 (173)	69.4	72.4 (293)	72.7 (161)
Personal finances (No. of respondents)	63.9 (302)	65.6	66.5 (173)	67.6	65.6 (294)	71.0 (162)
<b>5. Health Issues</b>						
My physical health (No. of respondents)	49.7 (302)	51.1	45.7 (173)	48.6	52.3 (287)	49.4 (160)
Health of spouse/partner (No. of respondents)	32.1 (302)	36.4	33.7 (172)	33.1	40.1 (242)	45.7 (127)

Chi-square= 73.017 (.000); df=1  
Cramer's V=.397

Chi-square= 15.469 (.000); df=1  
Cramer's V=.186

Chi-square= 7.771 (.005); df=1  
Cramer's V=.129

Chi-square= 13.785 (.000); df=1  
Cramer's V=.172

Table 24 cont'd. - 3

Source of stress	<u>Full Time</u>		<u>Part Time</u>		<u>CSUN Data</u>	
	CSUN	Public 4 year	CSUN	Public 4 year	(Not relevant excluded) Full Time Part Time	
<b>6. Family Responsibilities</b>						
Being part of a dual career couple (No. of respondents)	44.7 (302)	43.2	37.6 (173)	39.5	58.7 (230)	52.4 (124)
Friction with spouse/partner (No. of respondents)	26.6 (301)	25.9	24.9 (173)	22.2	34.3 (233)	33.3 (129)
Child care (No. of respondents)	30.8 (302)	30.4	27.2 (173)	24.7	64.6 (144)	62.7 (75)
Care of elderly parent (No. of respondents)	34.8 (302)	34.2	34.1 (173)	32.1	60.7 (173)	59.6 (99)
Children's problems (No. of respondents)	30.9 (301)	31.4	26.0 (173)	25.7	53.4 (174)	46.4 (97)

\* The percentages in this table combine respondents who said any given source of stress had affected them "somewhat" or "extensively" during the preceding two years. The other possible response was "not at all". The CSUN percentages in the first and third columns of the table include respondents who said items were not relevant to them, to conform to the comparison data format, while the percentages in the two columns on the right exclude them.

Note: figures in bold indicate that a pair of percentages is moderately different, while bolded figures in a shaded cell denote a significantly different pair of percentages.

**Table 25. Characteristics of Positions Currently Held by Tenured and Tenure Track HERI Respondents by Academic Rank (Percentages; Spring 2008)**

Characteristic	Tenured (Full & Associate Professors)	Tenure Track (Assistant Professors)
<b>1. Tenure Status</b>		
Tenured	94.9	1.9
On tenure track	5.1	98.1
Total (No. of respondents)	100.0 (197)	100.0 (106)
<b>2. Academic Rank</b>		
Professor	61.9	0.0
Associate Professor	38.1	0.0
Assistant Professor	0.0	98.1
Lecturer	0.0	1.9
Total (No. of respondents)	100.0 (197)	100.0 (106)
<b>3. Currently Holds an Administrative Position</b>		
Yes	35.5	18.9
No	64.5	81.1
Total (No. of respondents)	100.0 (197)	100.0 (106)
Department Chair	37.1	0.0
Other	48.6	55.0
Not Specified	14.3	45.0
Total (No. of respondents)	100.0 (70)	100.0 (20)
<b>4. Respondents' Current Home College</b>		
Arts, Media, and Communication	11.2	10.6
Business	6.6	9.6
Education	13.7	14.4
Engineering and Computer Science	5.6	1.9
Health and Human Development	10.2	3.8
Humanities	13.2	17.3
Science and Mathematics	14.7	11.5
Social and Behavioral Sciences	18.3	26.0
Other	6.6	4.8
Total (No. of respondents)	100.0 (197)	100.0 (104)

Chi-square= 9.17 (.002); df=1  
Cramer's V=.174

Chi-square= 10.45 (.001); df=1  
Cramer's V=.341

Table 25 cont'd.

Characteristic	Tenured (Full & Associate Professors)	Tenure Track (Assistant Professors)
<b>5. Appointed at CSUN between</b>		
2006 - 2007	3.2	38.2
2001 - 2005	11.6	58.8
1991 - 2000	41.3	2.0
1981 - 1990	29.1	1.0
Before 1980	14.8	0.0
Total (No. of respondents)	100.0 (189)	100.0 (102)
<b>6. Average Number of Years at CSUN</b>		
Mean	16.6	3.8
Median	16.0	4.0
Interquartile range	8 - 22	2 - 5

Chi-square= 184.57 (.001); df=4  
Cramer's V=.796

**Table 26. Selected Characteristics of Tenured and Tenure Track HERI Respondents by Academic Rank (Percentages; Spring 2008)**

Characteristic	Tenured (Full & Associate Professors)	Tenure Track (Assistant Professors)
<b>1. Gender</b>		
Female	51.8	51.4
Male	48.2	48.6
Total (No. of respondents)	100.0 (193)	100.0 (105)
<b>2. Age</b> (as of Fall, 2007)		
Under 40	5.9	47.1
40-49	22.6	29.4
50-59	44.6	18.6
60 and over	26.9	4.9
Total (No. of respondents)	100.0 (186)	100.0 (102)
<b>3. Racial and Ethnic Identity</b>		
Traditionally Underserved	13.7	18.9
<i>American Indian</i>	2.0	0.9
<i>Pacific Islander</i>	0.0	0.9
<i>African American</i>	2.0	10.4
<i>Latina/o</i>	9.6	6.6
Asian	8.1	17.0
White	70.6	67.9
Other	5.6	1.9
Unknown	4.6	1.9
Total (No. of respondents)	102.5 (197)	107.5 (106)
<b>4. Country of Birth</b>		
USA	78.2	67.0
Other	21.8	33.0
Total (No. of respondents)	100.0 (197)	100.0 (106)
<b>5. Country of Citizenship</b>		
USA	94.4	73.6
Other	5.6	26.4
Total (No. of respondents)	100.0 (197)	100.0 (106)
<b>6. Is English Your Native Language?</b>		
Yes	82.0	71.7
No	18.0	28.3
Total (No. of respondents)	100.0 (194.0)	100.0 (106.0)

Chi-square= 84.90 (.000); df=3  
Cramer's V=.543

Chi-square= 26.67 (.000); df=1  
Cramer's V=.297

Table 26 cont'd.

Characteristic	Tenured (Full & Associate Professors)	Tenure Track (Assistant Professors)	
<b>7. Is/Was Your Spouse or Partner an Academic?</b>	38.3	25.5	Chi-square= 5.03 (.025); df=1 Cramer's V=.129
(No. of respondents on which percentage is based)	(196)	(106)	
<b>8. Is/Was Your</b>			
Father an academic?	10.2	15.1	Chi-square= 4.45 (.035); df=1 Cramer's V=.121
Mother an academic?	6.1	13.2	
(No. of respondents on which percentage is based)	(197)	(106)	

**Table 27. Educational Background of Tenured and Tenure Track HERI Respondents by Academic Rank (Percentages; Spring 2008)**

Characteristic	Tenured (Full & Associate Professors)	Tenure Track (Assistant Professors)
<b>Highest Degree Earned</b>		
Doctorate or equivalent (PhD, Ed D)	91.8	87.7
Professional degree (e.g., LLB, JD, DVM)	2.6	0.9
Master's or equivalent (MA, MS, MFA, MBA, etc.)	5.7	10.4
Bachelor's or equivalent	0.0	0.9
Total (No. of respondents)	100.0 (194)	100.0 (106)
<b>Year Highest Degree Earned</b>		
Before 1980	23.7	4.9
1981 to 1990	44.2	5.9
1991 to 2000	28.4	23.5
2001 to present	3.7	65.7
Total (No. of respondents)	100.0 (190)	100.0 (102)
<b>Broad Discipline of Highest Degree</b>		
Arts, Media, and Communication	10.2	9.4
Business	5.6	9.4
Education	15.2	24.5
Engineering and Computer Science	5.1	1.9
Health and Human Development	5.1	2.8
Humanities	10.7	12.3
Science and Mathematics	17.3	11.3
Social and Behavioral Sciences	24.9	25.5
Other	6.1	2.8
Total (No. of respondents)	100.0 (197)	100.0 (106)

Chi-square=146.58 (.001); df=3  
Cramer's V=.709

**Table 28. Career Transitions of Tenured and Tenure Track HERI Respondents By Academic Rank (Percentages; Spring 2008)**

	Tenured (Full & Associate Professors)	Tenure Track (Assistant Professors)	
<b><u>Recent Professional Mobility: Percentage of Respondents Who, During the Last Two Years,</u></b>			
Considered leaving this institution for another (No. of responses on which percentages are based)	42.6 (197)	49.1 (106)	
Received at least one firm job offer (No. of responses on which percentages are based)	19.9 (196)	33.3 (105)	Chi-square=6.66 (.010); df=1 Cramer's V=.149
Requested/sought an early promotion (No. of responses on which percentages are based)	17.9 (196)	10.4 (106)	
Changed academic institutions (No. of responses on which percentages are based)	10.7 (197)	21.7 (106)	Chi-square=6.77 (.009); df=1 Cramer's V=.149
<b><u>Career Transitions: Percentage of Respondents Who</u></b>			
Considered leaving academe for another job during the last two years (No. of responses on which percentages are based)	26.9 (197)	34.9 (106)	
Considered early retirement during the last two years (No. of responses on which percentages are based)	34.0 (197)	10.4 (106)	Chi-square=20.14 (.001); df=1 Cramer's V=.258
Plan to retire within the next three years (No. of responses on which percentages are based)	17.3 (197)	4.7 (106)	Chi-square=9.67 (.002); df=1 Cramer's V=.179
Interrupted their professional careers for more than one year for family reasons (No. of responses on which percentages are based)	11.2 (197)	9.4 (106)	

**Table 29. Number of Hours Per Week Spent on Various Activities by Tenured and Tenure Track HERI Respondents by Academic Rank (Percentages; Spring 2008)**

Activity	Tenured (Full & Associate Professors)	Tenure Track (Assistant Professors)
<b>I. Teaching Activities</b>		
<b>Scheduled Teaching</b>		
None	5.1	0.9
1 to 4 hours	13.8	6.6
5 to 8 hours	24.5	34.9
9 to 12 hours	40.8	47.2
13- 20 hours	14.8	9.4
21 + hours	1.0	0.9
Total (No. of respondents)	100.0 (196)	100.0 (106)
<b>Preparing for Teaching</b>		
None	4.1	0.0
1 to 4 hours	10.7	6.6
5 to 8 hours	23.5	24.5
9 to 12 hours	23.5	21.7
13- 20 hours	30.1	28.3
21+ hours	8.2	18.9
Total (No. of respondents)	100.0 (196)	100.0 (106)
<b>Advising/Counseling Students</b>		
None	1.5	2.8
1 to 4 hours	48.0	61.3
5 to 8 hours	32.7	26.4
9 to 12 hours	11.7	4.7
13- 20 hours	5.1	3.8
21+ hours	1.0	0.9
Total (No. of respondents)	100.0 (196)	100.0 (106)
<b>II. Other University Activities</b>		
<b>Committee work and meetings</b>		
None	2.0	2.8
1 to 4 hours	40.3	59.4
5 to 8 hours	35.2	26.4
9 to 12 hours	13.8	6.6
13 to 20 hours	7.7	2.8
21 +hours	1.0	1.9
Total (No. of respondents)	100.0 (196)	100.0 (106)

Chi-square=11.242 (.047); df=5  
Cramer's V=.193

Chi-square=12.396 (.030); df=5  
Cramer's V=.203

Chi-square=13.410 (.020); df=5  
Cramer's V=.211

Table 29 cont'd.

Activity	Tenured (Full & Associate Professors)	Tenure Track (Assistant Professors)
<b>Other Administration</b>		
None	22.1	31.1
1 to 4 hours	40.5	54.7
5 to 8 hours	11.8	8.5
9 + hours	25.6	5.7
Total (No. of respondents)	100.0 (195)	100.0 (106)
<b>Community or Public Service</b>		
None	41.0	36.8
1 to 4 hours	45.6	48.1
5 to 8 hours	11.3	9.4
9 or more hours	2.1	5.7
Total (No. of respondents)	100.0 (195)	100.0 (106)
<b>Communicating via E-mail</b>		
None	0.5	1.0
1 to 4 hours	23.1	17.1
5 to 8 hours	29.2	45.7
9 to 12 hours	22.1	25.7
13- 20 hours	20.5	9.5
21+ hours	4.6	1.0
Total (No. of respondents)	100.0 (196)	100.0 (106)

Chi-square=20.728 (.000); df=3  
Cramer's V=.262

Chi-square=14.725 (.012); df=5  
Cramer's V=.222

**Table 30. Publishing Activities of Tenured and Tenure Track HERI Respondents  
by Academic Rank (Percentages; Spring 2008)**

	Tenured (Full & Associate Professors)	Tenure Track (Assistant Professors)
<b>Articles published in academic or professional journals</b>		
None	3.6	15.1
1-2	11.7	25.5
3-4	15.2	23.6
5-10	31.5	21.7
11-20	19.8	8.5
21 or more	18.3	5.7
Total (No. of respondents)	100.0 (197)	100.0 (106)
<b>Chapters published in edited volumes</b>		
None	36.9	52.4
1-2	31.3	35.2
3-4	15.9	7.6
5 - 10	10.8	4.8
11 or more	5.1	0.0
Total (No. of respondents)	100.0 (195)	100.0 (105)
<b>Books, manuals, or monographs published</b>		
None	47.2	73.3
1-2	32.3	25.7
3-4	11.8	1.0
5 - 10	6.7	0.0
11 or more	2.1	0.0
Total (No. of respondents)	100.0 (195)	100.0 (105)
<b>Op-ed pieces or editorials published</b>		
None	20.9	19.8
One or more	79.1	80.2
Total (No. of respondents)	100.0 (196)	100.0 (106)

Chi-square=38.51 (.001); df=5

Cramer's V=.357

Chi-square=16.00 (.003); df=4

Cramer's V=.231

Chi-square=28.46 (.001); df=4

Cramer's V=.308

Table 30 cont'd.

	Tenured (Full & Associate Professors)	Tenure Track (Assistant Professors)
<b>Professional writings published or accepted for publication <i>in the last two years</i></b>		
None	23.4	13.2
1-2	38.6	39.6
3-4	26.4	28.3
5 - 10	8.6	17.9
11 or more	3.0	0.9
Total (No. of respondents)	100.0 (197)	100.0 (106)
<b>Exhibitions or performances in the fine or applied arts presented <i>in the last two years</i></b>		
None	84.1	84.0
1-2	4.1	4.7
3-4	6.7	5.7
5 - 10	3.1	4.7
11 or more	2.1	0.9
Total (No. of respondents)	100.0 (195)	100.0 (106)

Chi-square=10.02 (.040); df=4  
Cramer's V=.182

**Table 31. Percentage of Tenured and Tenure Track HERI Respondents Participating in Professional Development Activities by Academic Rank (Percentages; Spring 2008)**

	Tenured (Full & Associate Professors)	Tenure Track (Assistant Professors)	
<b>Professional Development Activities</b>			
Received institutional travel funds (No. of responses on which percentages are based)	79.4 (194)	79.0 (105)	
Received internal grants for research (No. of responses on which percentages are based)	61.5 (195)	75.2 (105)	Chi-square=5.74 (.017); df=1 Cramer's V=.138
Took sabbatical leave (No. of responses on which percentages are based)	54.0 (189)	0.0 (73)	Chi-square=65.51 (.001); df=1 Cramer's V=.496
Received training for administrative leadership (No. of responses on which percentages are based)	29.4 (187)	10.1 (99)	Chi-square=13.75 (.001); df=1 Cramer's V=.219
Association membership/dues paid by the institution (No. of responses on which percentages are based)	15.9 (170)	29.1 (86)	Chi-square=6.14 (.013); df=1 Cramer's V=.155
Received tuition remission (No. of responses on which percentages are based)	11.2 (187)	7.1 (98)	
<b>Participated in Teaching Workshops</b>			
Workshops on campus (No. of responses on which percentages are based)	65.3 (196)	66.7 (105)	
Workshops outside the institution (No. of responses on which percentages are based)	21.5 (191)	23.3 (103)	
Participated in a teaching enhancement workshop during the past years (No. of responses on which percentages are based)	43.1 (195)	57.5 (106)	Chi-square=5.76 (.016); df=1 Cramer's V=.138
<b>Pedagogical Innovation: Developed a new course</b> (No. of responses on which percentages are based)	52.6 (196)	68.9 (106)	Chi-square=7.53 (.006); df=1 Cramer's V=.158

**Table 32. Percentage of Tenured and Tenure Track HERI Respondents Using Selected Instructional Techniques in Most or All Courses Taught by Academic Rank (Percentages; Spring 2008)**

	Tenured (Full & Associate Professors)	Tenure Track (Assistant Professors)	
<b>Student-Centered Learning</b>			
Using student inquiry to drive learning (No. of responses on which percentages are based)	52.3 (195)	66.0 (106)	Chi-square=5.29 (.021); df=1 Cramer's V=.133
Group projects (No. of responses on which percentages are based)	34.4 (195)	50.5 (105)	Chi-square=7.39 (.007); df=1 Cramer's V=.157
Student-developed activities (No. of responses on which percentages are based)	30.8 (195)	36.8 (106)	
Student-selected topics for course content (No. of responses on which percentages are based)	16.0 (194)	30.2 (106)	Chi-square=8.34 (.004); df=1 Cramer's V=.167
<b>Focus on writing</b>			
Reflective writing/journaling (No. of responses on which percentages are based)	25.1 (195)	31.1 (106)	
Multiple drafts of written work (No. of responses on which percentages are based)	24.2 (194)	36.8 (106)	Chi-square=5.29 (.021); df=1 Cramer's V=.133

**Table 33. Tenured and Tenure Track HERI Respondents' Views of Selected Aspects of the CSUN Environment by Academic Rank (Percentages; Spring 2008)**

	Tenured (Full & Associate Professors)	Tenure Track (Assistant Professors)	
<b>Percentage of Respondents Saying Statements Are Descriptive of CSUN</b>			
Faculty here respect each other (No. of respondents)	26.4 (197)	47.2 (106)	Chi-square=13.32 (.000); df=1 Cramer's V=.210
<b>Percentage of Respondents Agreeing That</b>			
My values are congruent with the dominant institutional values (No. of responses on which percentages are based)	61.3 (191)	75.2 (105)	Chi-square=5.92 (.015); df=1 Cramer's V=.141
Most students are strongly committed to community service (No. of responses on which percentages are based)	21.5 (191)	35.2 (105)	Chi-square=6.62 (.010); df=1 Cramer's V=.150

**Table 34. Tenured and Tenure Track HERI Respondents' Commitment to Various Aspects of an Academic Career by Academic Rank (Percentages; Spring 2008)**

	Tenured (Full & Associate Professors)	Tenure Track (Assistant Professors)
<b>If Respondents Were Beginning Their Careers Again, Would they still want to come to CSUN?</b>		
Definitely yes	27.2	34.9
Probably yes	26.2	34.0
Not sure	22.1	20.8
Probably no	15.9	8.5
Definitely no	8.7	1.9
Total (No. of respondents)	100.0 (195)	100.0 (106)
<b>Would they still want to become college professors?</b>		
Definitely yes	63.5	63.2
Probably yes	21.3	24.5
Not sure	9.1	7.5
Probably no	5.6	1.9
Definitely no	0.5	2.8
Total (No. of respondents)	100.0 (197)	100.0 (106)
<b>Importance to Respondents of:</b>		
<b>Teaching</b>		
Essential or very important (No. of respondents)	99.5 (197)	99.1 (106)
<b>Research</b>		
Essential or very important (No. of respondents)	75.5 (196)	87.7 (106)
<b>Service</b>		
Essential or very important (No. of respondents)	67.9 (196)	61.3 (106)

Chi-square=8.83 (.003); df=1  
Cramer's V=.171

Chi-square=6.38 (.012); df=1  
Cramer's V=.145

**Table 35. Objectives Considered Essential or Very Important by Tenured and Tenure Track HERI Respondents by Academic Rank (Percentages; Spring 2008)**

	Tenured (Full & Associate Professors)	Tenure Track (Assistant Professors)	
<b>Personal and Professional Objectives</b>			
Developing a meaningful philosophy of life (No. of responses on which percentages are based)	73.8 (195)	82.1 (106)	
Raising a family (No. of responses on which percentages are based)	66.7 (195)	66.3 (104)	
Becoming an authority in my field (No. of responses on which percentages are based)	54.6 (196)	71.7 (106)	Chi-square=8.43 (.004); df=1 Cramer's V=.167
Obtaining recognition from my colleagues for contributions to my special field (No. of responses on which percentages are based)	38.3 (196)	61.0 (105)	Chi-square=14.16 (.001); df=1 Cramer's V=.217
Becoming very well off financially (No. of responses on which percentages are based)	31.6 (196)	44.3 (106)	Chi-square=4.82 (.028); df=1 Cramer's V=.126
Integrating spirituality into my life (No. of responses on which percentages are based)	41.3 (196)	37.1 (105)	
At least to some extent, make a practice of Mentoring new faculty (No. of respondents)	90.9 (197)	59.4 (106)	Chi-square=42.34 (.001); df=1 Cramer's V=.374
<b>Educational Objectives for Undergraduates</b>			
Prepare students for employment after college (No. of responses on which percentages are based)	80.6 (196)	91.5 (106)	Chi-square=6.217 (.013); df=1 Cramer's V=.143
Encourage students to become agents of social change (No. of responses on which percentages are based)	56.7 (194)	70.8 (106)	Chi-square=5.727 (.017); df=1 Cramer's V=.138

**Table 36. Percentage of Tenured and Tenure Track HERI Respondents Who Are Satisfied or Very Satisfied with Selected Aspects of Their Jobs by Academic Rank (Percentages; Spring 2008)**

	Tenured (Full & Associate Professors)	Tenure Track (Assistant Professors)
<b>Overall job satisfaction</b>	67.9	66.0
(No. of responses on which percentages are based)	(196)	(106)
<b>Institutionally Defined Job Conditions</b>		
Job security	95.9	70.8
(No. of responses on which percentages are based)	(193)	(106)
Health benefits	87.2	78.1
(No. of responses on which percentages are based)	(196)	(105)
Retirement benefits	81.0	79.8
(No. of responses on which percentages are based)	(189)	(104)
Relationship with administration	53.1	61.9
(No. of responses on which percentages are based)	(196)	(105)
Opportunity for scholarly pursuits	39.7	39.6
(No. of responses on which percentages are based)	(194)	(106)
Quality of students	33.3	44.3
(No. of responses on which percentages are based)	(195)	(106)
Salary	38.1	23.6
(No. of responses on which percentages are based)	(197)	(106)

Chi-square=38.01 (.001); df=1  
Cramer's V=.357

Chi-square=6.54 (.011); df=1  
Cramer's V=.147

**Table 37. Percentage of Tenured and Tenure Track HERI Respondents Reporting Recent Stress in Selected Areas by Academic Rank (Percentages; Spring 2008) \***

Source of stress	Tenured (Full & Associate Professors)	Tenure Track (Assistant Professors)	
<b>Professional Advancement</b>			
Committee work (No. of respondents)	77.0 (196)	70.3 (101)	
Research or publishing demands (No. of respondents)	62.4 (194)	84.9 (106)	Chi-square= 16.68 (.001); df=1 Cramer's V=.236
Keeping up with information technology (No. of respondents)	48.4 (155)	85.6 (104)	Chi-square=37.06 (.001); df=1 Cramer's V=.378
Review/promotion process (No. of respondents)	70.7 (191)	46.7 (105)	Chi-square= 16.61 (.001); df=1 Cramer's V=.237
Job security (No. of respondents)	13.0 (177)	53.8 (104)	Chi-square=54.10 (.001); df=1 Cramer's V=.439
<b>Life Management Issues</b>			
Self-imposed high expectations (No. of respondents)	80.8 (302)	79.9	
Lack of personal time (No. of respondents)	79.7 (300)	74.3	
Managing household responsibilities (No. of respondents)	68.1 (188)	80.0 (105)	Chi-square= 4.78 (.029); df=1 Cramer's V=.128
Personal finances (No. of respondents)	57.1 (191)	81.6 (103)	Chi-square= 17.79 (.001); df=1 Cramer's V=.246
<b>Family Responsibilities</b>			
Being part of a dual career couple (No. of respondents)	44.7 (302)	43.2	
Friction with spouse/partner (No. of respondents)	28.6 (147)	44.2 (86)	Chi-square= 5.87 (.015); df=1 Cramer's V=.159
Child care (No. of respondents)	30.8 (302)	30.4	
Care of elderly parent (No. of respondents)	66.1 (124)	46.9 (49)	Chi-square= 5.42 (.020); df=1 Cramer's V=.177
Children's problems (No. of respondents)	30.9 (301)	31.4	

\* The percentages in this table combine respondents who said any given source of stress had affected them "somewhat" or "extensively" during the preceding two years.

**Table 38. Characteristics of Positions Currently Held by Adjunct HERI Respondents by CSUN Tenure (Percentages; Spring 2008)**

Characteristic	Recent Hires (2001 or later)	Longer-Term (2000 or earlier)
<b>1. Year Appointed at CSUN</b>		
2006 - 2007	40.0	0.0
2001 - 2005	60.0	0.0
1991 - 2000	0.0	70.8
1981 - 1990	0.0	20.8
Before 1980	0.0	8.3
Total (No. of respondents)	100.0 (95)	100.0 (72)
<b>2. Average Number of Years at CSUN</b>		
Mean	3.5	14.9
Median	3.0	13.0
Interquartile range	1 - 5	10 - 19
<b>3. Respondents' Current Home College</b>		
Arts, Media and Communication	9.5	25.0
Business and Economics	7.4	1.4
Education	21.1	13.9
Engineering and Computer Science	3.2	2.8
Health and Human Development	14.7	9.7
Humanities	10.5	23.6
Science and Mathematics	13.7	8.3
Social and Behavioral Sciences	16.8	13.9
Other	3.2	1.4
Unknown	0.0	0.0
Total (No. of respondents)	100.0 (95)	100.0 (72)
<b>4. Currently Holds an Administrative Position</b>		
(No. of responses on which percentages are based)	4.2 (95)	6.9 (72)
<b>5. Currently teaching courses at more than one institution</b>		
Yes	43.2	30.6
No	56.8	69.4
Total (No. of respondents)	100.0 (95)	100.0 (72)
<b>6. Primary Employment Arena During Past Year</b>		
In Higher Education	71.5	81.9
<i>at this institution</i>	46.3	70.8
<i>at a different institution</i>	8.4	4.2
<i>in several institutions</i>	16.8	6.9
Outside Higher Education	28.4	18.1
Total (No. of respondents)	100.0 (95)	100.0 (72)

Chi-square= 17.31 (.027); df=8  
Cramer's V=.322

Chi-square= 10.48 (.015); df=3  
Cramer's V=.251

Table 38 cont'd.

Characteristic	Recent Hires (2001 or later)	Longer-Term (2000 or earlier)
<b>7. Resources Available to Part-Time Faculty During 2007-08</b>		
An e-mail account	96.8	94.4
Shared office space	74.7	75.0
A phone/voicemail	50.5	52.8
A personal computer	45.3	54.2
Teaching assistance	14.7	11.1
Use of private office	5.3	9.7
(No. of responses on which percentages are based)	(95)	(72)

**Table 39. Selected Characteristics of Adjunct HERI Respondents by CSUN  
Tenure (Percentages; Spring 2008)**

Characteristic	Recent Hires (2001 or later)	Longer-Term (2000 or earlier)
<b>1. Gender</b>		
Female	54.7	58.3
Male	45.3	41.7
Total (No. of respondents)	100.0 (95)	100.0 (72)
<b>2. Age</b> (as of Fall, 2007)		
Under 40	26.6	2.8
40-49	25.5	23.9
50-59	27.7	40.8
60 and over	20.2	32.4
Total (No. of respondents)	100.0 (94)	100.0 (71)
<b>3. Racial and Ethnic Identity</b>		
Traditionally Underserved	10.5	9.7
<i>American Indian</i>	2.1	0.0
<i>Pacific Islander</i>	1.1	0.0
<i>African American</i>	2.1	2.8
<i>Latina/o</i>	5.3	6.9
Asian	9.5	2.8
White	70.5	83.3
Other	10.5	8.3
Unknown	3.2	0.0
Total (No. of respondents)	104.2 (95)	104.2 (72)
<b>4. Country of Birth</b>		
USA	73.7	87.5
Other	26.3	12.5
Total (No. of respondents)	100.0 (95)	100.0 (72)
<b>5. Country of Citizenship</b>		
USA	92.6	100.0
Other	7.4	0.0
Total (No. of respondents)	100.0 (95)	100.0 (72)
<b>6. Is English your native language?</b>		
Yes	86.3	86.1
No	13.7	13.9
Total (No. of respondents)	100.0 (95)	100.0 (72)

Chi-square= 18.49 (.001); df= 3  
Cramer's V=.335

Chi-square= 4.82 (.028); df=1  
Cramer's V=.170

Chi-square= 5.54 (.019); df=1  
Cramer's V=.182

Table 39 cont'd. - 2

Characteristic	Recent Hires (2001 or later)	Longer-Term (2000 or earlier)
<b>7. Is/Was Your Spouse or Partner an Academic?</b>	25.3	27.8
(No. of responses on which percentages are based)	(95)	(72)
<b>8. Is/Was Your</b>		
Father an academic?	13.7	16.7
Mother an academic?	7.4	18.1
(No. of responses on which percentages are based)	(95)	(72)
<b>9. Respondent Belongs to a Faculty Union</b>	56.8	66.7
(No. of responses on which percentages are based)	(95)	(72)

Chi-square= 4.438 (.035); df=1  
Cramer's V=.163

**Table 40. Educational Background of Adjunct HERI Respondents by CSUN  
Tenure (Percentages; Spring 2008)**

	Recent Hires (2001 or later)	Longer-Term (2000 or earlier)
<b>Highest Degree Earned</b>		
Doctorate or equivalent (PhD, Ed D)	19.1	33.3
Professional degree (e.g., LLB, JD, DVM)	2.1	5.6
Master's or equivalent(MA, MS, MFA, MBA, etc.)	71.3	50.0
Bachelor's or equivalent	7.4	11.1
Total (No. of respondents)	100.0 (94)	100.0 (72)
<b>Degree Currently in Progress</b>		
None	82.1	91.7
Doctorate or equivalent (PhD, Ed D)	14.7	5.6
Master's or equivalent(MA, MS, MFA, MBA, etc.)	3.2	2.8
Total (No. of respondents)	100.0 (95)	100.0 (72)
<b>Year Highest Degree Earned</b>		
Before 1980	17.9	36.1
1981 to 1990	9.5	19.4
1991 to 2000	32.6	36.1
2001 to present	40.0	8.3
Total (No. of respondents)	100.0 (95)	100.0 (72)
<b>Broad Discipline of Highest Degree</b>		
Arts, Media and Communication	8.4	23.6
Business and Economics	6.3	1.4
Education	20.0	13.9
Engineering and Computer Science	3.2	1.4
Health and Human Development	15.8	8.3
Humanities	11.6	19.4
Science and Mathematics	14.7	8.3
Social and Behavioral Sciences	16.8	22.2
Other	3.2	1.4
Total (No. of respondents)	100.0 (95)	100.0 (72)

Chi-square= 8.15 (.043); df=3  
Cramer's V=.222

Chi-square= 23.97 (.001); df=1  
Cramer's V=.379

Chi-square= 16.16 (.040); df=8  
Cramer's V=.311

**Table 41. Percentage of Adjunct HERI Respondents Considering Selected Professional Transitions During the Recent Past By CSUN Tenure (Percentages; Spring 2008)**

	Recent Hires (2001 or later)	Longer-Term (2000 or earlier)	
Received at least one firm job offer (No. of responses on which percentages are based)	44.2 (95)	25.4 (71)	Chi-square= 6.26 (.012); df= 1 Cramer's V=.194
Considered leaving this institution for another (No. of responses on which percentages are based)	37.9 (95)	30.6 (72)	
Changed academic institutions (No. of responses on which percentages are based)	24.2 (95)	12.5 (72)	Chi-square= 3.63 (.057); df= 1 Cramer's V=.147
Requested/sought an early promotion (No. of responses on which percentages are based)	5.3 (95)	8.3 (72)	

**Table 42. Number of Hours Per Week Spent on Selected External Activities by Adjunct HERI Respondents by CSUN Tenure (Percentages; Spring 2008)**

Activity	Recent Hires (2001 or later)	Longer-Term (2000 or earlier)
<b>IV. Other Weekly Activities</b>		
<b>Commuting to Campus</b>		
None	6.3	1.4
1 to 4 hours	63.2	66.7
5 to 8 hours	22.1	23.6
9 or more hours	8.4	8.3
Total (No. of respondents)	100.0 (95)	100.0 (72)
<b>Household/Childcare Duties</b>		
None	22.1	12.5
1 to 4 hours	21.1	12.5
5 to 8 hours	21.1	19.4
9 to 12 hours	9.5	26.4
13 - 20 hours	7.4	13.9
21 or more hours	18.9	15.3
Total (No. of respondents)	100.0 (95)	100.0 (72)
<b>V. Consulting Activities</b>		
<b>Engaged in public service/professional consulting without pay</b>		
Yes	49.5	66.7
No	50.5	33.3
Total (No. of respondents)	100.0 (95)	100.0 (72)
<b>Engaged in paid consulting outside CSUN</b>		
Yes	32.6	52.8
No	67.4	47.2
Total (No. of respondents)	100.0 (95)	100.0 (72)
<b>Consultation with clients/patients</b>		
None	73.7	70.0
1 or more hours	26.3	30.0
Total (No. of respondents)	100.0 (95)	100.0 (70)
<b>Outside consulting/freelance work</b>		
None	62.1	47.2
1 or more hours	37.9	52.8
Total (No. of respondents)	100.0 (95)	100.0 (72)

Chi-square= 12.90 (.024); df=5  
Cramer's V=.278

Chi-square= 4.94 (.026); df=1  
Cramer's V=.172

Chi-square= 6.86 (.009); df=1  
Cramer's V=.203

Chi-square= 3.68 (.055); df=1  
Cramer's V=.148

**Table 43. Publishing Activities of Adjunct HERI Respondents by CSUN Tenure  
(Percentages; Spring 2008)**

	Recent Hires (2001 or later)	Longer-Term (2000 or earlier)
<b>Articles published in academic or professional journals</b>		
None	55.8	48.6
1-2	23.2	23.6
3 or more	21.1	27.8
Total (No. of respondents)	100.0 (95)	100.0 (72)
<b>Chapters published in edited volumes</b>		
None	83.2	67.6
1-2	11.6	14.1
3 or more	5.3	18.3
Total (No. of respondents)	100.0 (95)	100.0 (71)
<b>Books, manuals, or monographs published</b>		
None	80.0	49.3
1-2	12.6	36.6
3 or more	7.4	14.1
Total (No. of respondents)	100.0 (95)	100.0 (71)
<b>Op-ed pieces or editorials published</b>		
None	78.9	73.6
One or more	21.1	26.4
Total (No. of respondents)	100.0 (95)	100.0 (72)

Chi-square= 7.87 (.020); df= 2  
Cramer's V=.218

Chi-square= 17.73 (.001); df= 2  
Cramer's V=.327

**Table 44. Percentage of Adjunct HERI Respondents Participating in Professional Development Activities by CSUN Tenure (Percentages; Spring 2008)**

	Recent Hires (2001 or later)	Longer-Term (2000 or earlier)
Received institutional travel funds (No. of responses on which percentages are based)	14.7 (68)	25.0 (48)
Received internal grants for research (No. of responses on which percentages are based)	6.3 (80)	19.3 (57)
Received tuition remission (No. of responses on which percentages are based)	2.9 (69)	11.1 (54)
Association membership/dues paid by the institution (No. of responses on which percentages are based)	3.1 (65)	7.5 (40)
Received training for administrative leadership (No. of responses on which percentages are based)	4.9 (82)	2.0 (51)

Chi-square= 5.49 (.019); df= 1  
Cramer's V=.200

**Table 45. Current Teaching Patterns and Approaches of Adjunct HERI Respondents by CSUN Tenure (Percentages; Spring 2008)**

	Recent Hires (2001 or later)	Longer-Term (2000 or earlier)	
<b>Number of Undergraduate Courses Taught at CSUN During the Current Term</b>			
None	18.5	16.0	Chi-square= 19.65 (.001); df=4 Cramer's V=.435
One	37.0	10.0	
Two	24.1	16.0	
Three	13.0	24.0	
Four or more	7.4	34.0	
Total	100.0	100.0	
(No. of respondents)	(54)	(50)	
Mean	1.6	2.9	
Median	1.0	3.0	
Interquartile range	1 - 2	1 - 4	
<b>Number of Students Taught at CSUN During the Current Term</b>			
50 or fewer	59.1	19.0	Chi-square= 18.60 (.001); df=4 Cramer's V=.465
51 - 75	11.4	9.5	
76 - 100	9.1	14.3	
101 - 150	6.8	35.7	
More than 150	13.6	21.4	
Total	100.0	100.0	
(No. of respondents)	(44)	(42)	
Mean	63.6	108.6	
Median	41.5	109.5	
Interquartile range	19 - 98	60 - 147	
<b>Percentage of Respondents Teaching Remedial Skills in</b>			
Reading	8.4	22.2	Chi-square= 6.34 (.012); df=1 Cramer's V=.195
Writing	12.6	26.4	
Mathematics	6.3	4.2	Chi-square= 5.13 (.024); df=1 Cramer's V=.175
(No. of responses on which percentages are based)	(95)	(72)	
<b>Percentage of Respondents Involving Students in Research</b>			
Worked with undergraduates on a research project	15.8	29.6	Chi-square= 4.55 (.033); df= 1 Cramer's V=.166
(No. of responses on which percentages are based)	(95)	(71)	
Engaged undergraduates on <i>your</i> research project	10.5	22.5	Chi-square= 4.44 (.033); df= 1 Cramer's V=.163
(No. of responses on which percentages are based)	(95)	(71)	
<b>Percentage of respondents who have received an award for outstanding teaching</b>			
	27.4	41.7	Chi-square= 3.76 (.053); df= 1 Cramer's V=.150
(No. of responses on which percentages are based)	(95)	(72)	

**Table 46. Percentage of Adjunct HERI Respondents Giving Selected Assignments In Most or All of Their Courses by CSUN Tenure (Spring 2008)**

	Recent Hires (2001 or later)	Longer-Term (2000 or earlier)
Student presentations (No. of responses on which percentages are based)	56.8 (95)	45.8 (72)
Term/research papers (No. of responses on which percentages are based)	46.3 (95)	50.0 (72)
Multiple-choice exams (No. of responses on which percentages are based)	47.4 (95)	30.6 (72)
Quizzes (No. of responses on which percentages are based)	45.3 (95)	29.6 (71)
Short-answer exams (No. of responses on which percentages are based)	40.0 (95)	30.6 (72)
Essay exams (No. of responses on which percentages are based)	27.4 (95)	30.6 (72)
Weekly essay assignments (No. of responses on which percentages are based)	25.3 (95)	22.2 (72)

Chi-square= 4.82 (.028); df=1  
Cramer's V=.170

Chi-square= 4.22 (.004); df=1  
Cramer's V=.159

**Table 47. Percentage of Adjunct HERI Respondents Agreeing with Selected Statements About the CSUN Environment and the Treatment of Part-Time Faculty by CSUN Tenure (Percentages; Spring 2008)**

	Recent Hires (2001 or later)	Longer-Term (2000 or earlier)	
<b>The CSUN Environment</b>			
My values are congruent with the dominant institutional values (No. of responses on which percentages are based)	81.1 (86)	65.2 (65)	Chi-square= 5.16 (.023); df=1 Cramer's V=.180
My research is valued by faculty in my department (No. of responses on which percentages are based)	69.8 (86)	50.8 (65)	Chi-square= 5.65 (.017); df=1 Cramer's V=.193
Faculty feel that most students are well-prepared academically (No. of responses on which percentages are based)	36.2 (94)	14.3 (70)	Chi-square= 9.79 (.002); df=1 Cramer's V=.244
This institution should not offer remedial/developmental education (No. of responses on which percentages are based)	13.2 (91)	30.0 (70)	Chi-square= 6.86 (.009); df=1 Cramer's V=.206
Most of the students I teach lack the basic skills for college level work (No. of responses on which percentages are based)	56.8 (95)	71.8 (71)	Chi-square= 3.93 (.048); df=1 Cramer's V=.159
<b>The Duties of Part-Time Faculty</b>			
Are primarily responsible for introductory classes (No. of responses on which percentages are based)	62.4 (93)	60.0 (70)	
Are compensated for advising/counseling students (No. of responses on which percentages are based)	25.0 (92)	12.9 (70)	Chi-square= 3.70 (.054); df=3 Cramer's V=.151
Are required to attend meetings (No. of responses on which percentages are based)	34.7 (95)	31.0 (71)	
<b>The Treatment of Part-Time Faculty</b>			
Rarely get hired into full-time positions (No. of responses on which percentages are based)	67.4 (92)	72.9 (70)	
Have no guarantee of employment security (No. of responses on which percentages are based)	79.0 (95)	80.3 (71)	
Have access to support services (No. of responses on which percentages are based)	84.2 (95)	83.3 (72)	
Are given specific training before teaching (No. of responses on which percentages are based)	39.0 (95)	25.0 (72)	Chi-square= 3.61 (.058); df=1 Cramer's V=.147
Receive respect from students (No. of responses on which percentages are based)	96.8 (94)	94.4 (72)	
Have good working relationships with the admin. (No. of responses on which percentages are based)	77.9 (95)	75.0 (72)	
Are respected by full-time faculty (No. of responses on which percentages are based)	80.7 (93)	59.2 (71)	Chi-square= 9.19 (.003); df=1 Cramer's V=.235

**Table 48. Percentage of Adjunct HERI Respondents Asserting That Selected Commitments Have High Priority at CSUN by CSUN Tenure (Percentages; Spring 2008)**

	Recent Hires (2001 or later)	Longer-Term (2000 or earlier)	
<b>Importance of Institutional Priorities</b>			
To pursue extramural funding	55.6	37.9	Chi-square= 4.77 (.029); df=1 Cramer's V=.175
(No. of responses on which percentages are based)	(90)	(66)	
To enhance the institution's national image	56.7	48.6	
(No. of responses on which percentages are based)	(90)	(70)	
To increase or maintain institutional prestige	59.8	45.7	
(No. of responses on which percentages are based)	(92)	(70)	
To strengthen links with the for-profit, corporate sector	54.9	39.1	Chi-square= 3.93 (.047); df=1 Cramer's V=.157
(No. of responses on which percentages are based)	(91)	(69)	
To hire faculty stars	27.8	15.7	
(No. of responses on which percentages are based)	(90)	(70)	
<b>Attention Given to Equity Issues</b>			
To create a diverse multi-cultural campus environ.	76.9	68.6	
(No. of responses on which percentages are based)	(91)	(70)	
To develop an appreciation for multiculturalism	68.1	52.9	Chi-square= 3.90 (.048); df=1 Cramer's V=.156
(No. of responses on which percentages are based)	(91)	(70)	
To promote gender equity among faculty	55.4	57.4	
(No. of responses on which percentages are based)	(92)	(68)	
To increase the representation of minorities in the faculty and administration	45.6	36.2	
(No. of responses on which percentages are based)	(90)	(69)	
To recruit more minority students	57.3	33.3	Chi-square= 8.97 (.003); df=1 Cramer's V=.238
(No. of responses on which percentages are based)	(89)	(69)	
To increase the representation of women in the faculty and administration	43.3	30.9	
(No. of responses on which percentages are based)	(90)	(68)	

**Table 49. Personal and Professional Objectives Considered Essential or Very Important by Adjunct HERI Respondents by CSUN Tenure (Percentages; Spring 2008)**

	Recent Hires (2001 or later)	Longer-Term (2000 or earlier)
Developing a meaningful philosophy of life (No. of responses on which percentages are based)	80.0 (95)	80.6 (72)
Raising a family (No. of responses on which percentages are based)	65.3 (95)	62.5 (72)
Becoming an authority in my field (No. of responses on which percentages are based)	61.1 (95)	55.6 (72)
Obtaining recognition from my colleagues for contributions to my special field (No. of responses on which percentages are based)	42.1 (95)	36.1 (72)
Becoming very well off financially (No. of responses on which percentages are based)	44.2 (95)	25.0 (72)
Integrating spirituality into my life (No. of responses on which percentages are based)	44.2 (95)	47.2 (72)

Chi-square=6.57 (.010); df=1  
Cramer's V=.198

**Table 50. Percentage of Adjunct HERI Respondents Who Are Satisfied or Very Satisfied with Selected Aspects of Their Jobs by CSUN Tenure (Percentages; Spring 2008)**

	Recent Hires (2001 or later)	Longer-Term (2000 or earlier)
<b>Overall job satisfaction</b> (No. of responses on which percentages are based)	78.7 (94)	76.4 (72)
<b>Institutionally Defined Job Conditions</b>		
Job security (No. of responses on which percentages are based)	32.6 (89)	23.5 (68)
Health benefits (No. of responses on which percentages are based)	62.1 (58)	70.2 (57)
Retirement benefits (No. of responses on which percentages are based)	41.8 (79)	41.9 (62)
Relationship with administration (No. of responses on which percentages are based)	69.8 (86)	52.3 (65)
Opportunity for scholarly pursuits (No. of responses on which percentages are based)	36.1 (72)	24.1 (58)
Quality of students (No. of responses on which percentages are based)	50.5 (95)	43.1 (72)
Salary (No. of responses on which percentages are based)	30.9 (94)	18.3 (71)
<b>Collegial Interaction</b>		
Professional relationships with other faculty (No. of responses on which percentages are based)	79.8 (94)	65.3 (72)
Competency of colleagues (No. of responses on which percentages are based)	77.8 (90)	66.7 (69)
Social relationships with other faculty (No. of responses on which percentages are based)	69.7 (76)	53.8 (65)

Chi-square= 4.80 (.028); df=1  
Cramer's V=.178

Chi-square= 4.41 (.036); df=1  
Cramer's V=.163

Chi-square= 3.77 (.052); df=1  
Cramer's V=.164