

2024-2025 ALVSCE Faculty Council

Faculty Survey Results

Date prepared: November 11, 2024

Prepared by: Kathleen J. Kennedy, ALVSCE Faculty Council Chair
on behalf of the ALVSCE Faculty Council

Contents

| | |
|--|----|
| 2024-2025 ALVSCE Faculty Council Faculty Survey Results | 1 |
| 2024-2025 ALVSCE Faculty Council..... | 3 |
| Introduction | 4 |
| Research Findings Topline and Recommendations | 5 |
| Preliminary Recommendations for Administrators and Unit Heads | 6 |
| Recommendations for the ALVSCE Faculty Council..... | 7 |
| Purpose and Methods..... | 9 |
| Response Overview | 9 |
| Survey Respondent Characteristics | 11 |
| Unit Distribution | 11 |
| University of Arizona Time in Service | 11 |
| Faculty Ranks and Levels | 12 |
| Workload Distribution by Position Type | 13 |
| Professional Activities | 15 |
| Work Environment | 16 |
| Workload and Resources (Q8)..... | 16 |
| Career Development and Recognition (Q9) | 17 |
| Work-Life Balance (Q10) | 18 |
| Collegiality and Collaboration (Q11) | 19 |
| Work Environment Analysis | 20 |
| Leadership Assessment | 23 |
| Key Findings | 23 |
| Research and Teaching Support | 25 |
| Research Support (Q13) | 25 |
| Teaching Support (Q14) | 27 |
| University Budget Cuts on ALVSCE Faculty, Productivity, and Morale | 29 |
| 1. Administrative and Support Staff Reductions | 29 |
| 2. Teaching Impact | 29 |
| 3. Grants and Research Operations | 29 |
| 4. Program and Extension Activities | 30 |
| 5. Morale and Work Environment | 30 |
| Faculty Priorities | 31 |
| Key Findings | 31 |
| Other Priorities | 32 |
| Faculty Satisfaction and Retention Analysis..... | 35 |
| Final Comments and Suggestions | 39 |
| References..... | 41 |
| Appendix A: 2024 ALVSCE Faculty Council Faculty Survey..... | 42 |

2024-2025 ALVSCE Faculty Council

Elected representatives of CALES faculty

Tauhidur Rahman, Associate Professor, Agricultural & Resource Economics
Bobby Torres, Professor, Agricultural Education, Tech & Innovation
Kerry Cooper, Assistant Professor, Animal & Comparative Biomedical Sciences
Dr. Chi Zhou, Assistant Professor, Animal & Comparative Biomedical Sciences
Dr. Armando Barreto Munoz, Assistant Professor of Practice, Biosystems Engineering
Todd Schlenke, Associate Professor, Entomology
Katerina Dontsova, Assistant Professor, Environmental Science, *Vice Chair*
Kathleen J. Kennedy, Associate Professor of Practice, Human Ecology, *Chair*
Cory Quailes, Associate Professor of Practice, Human Ecology
Rachel Mitchell, Assistant Professor, Natural Resources & Environment
Kevin Bonine, Professor, Natural Resources & Environment
Jennifer Teske, Associate Professor, Nutritional Sciences and Wellness
Maria Plant, Associate Professor of Practice, Nutritional Sciences and Wellness
Ramin Yadegari, Professor. Plant Sciences

Elected representatives of CES Faculty

Anne LeSenne, Assignment Agent, Horticulture, Pinal County Cooperative Extension
Rosie Stewart, Area Assistant Agent, Santa Cruz & Cochise Counties Cooperative Extension

Faculty Senators representing ALVSCE

Duarte Diaz, Associate Specialist, Animal & Comparative Biomedical Sciences
Melanie Hingle, Professor, Nutritional Sciences and Wellness
Bobby Torres, Professor, Agricultural Education, Tech & Innovation

Introduction

The ALVSCE Faculty Council expresses sincere gratitude to the 115 faculty members who took time to participate in this survey during a particularly challenging period at the University of Arizona and for CALES and Cooperative Extension Services. Your thoughtful responses and candid feedback have provided crucial insights that will help guide our advocacy efforts and recommendations for improvement.

This survey was conducted between October 13 and November 5, 2024, with the primary goal of understanding faculty needs, priorities, and concerns across ALVSCE's teaching, research, and extension missions. The timing coincided with significant University-wide budget constraints and restructuring, including budget cuts, spending freezes, account sweeps, and hiring restrictions that have substantially impacted academic operations and our ability to fulfill our teaching, research, and community outreach mission.

Within this challenging fiscal context, the survey revealed both immediate impacts of budget restrictions and longer-term systematic issues affecting faculty effectiveness and satisfaction. The most concerning patterns include:

- Only 50.4% of faculty find their current workload manageable, indicating significant challenges in workload distribution and management
- 82% of faculty report being negatively affected by recent budget cuts through reduced support staff, increased administrative duties, and resource constraints
- Faculty satisfaction and engagement are concerning, with only 57.3% expressing satisfaction in their position and 58.9% considering leaving UArizona within the next two years
- Leadership effectiveness ratings are low at both ALVSCE (22.2%) and unit (37.4%) levels, suggesting systemic communication and management challenges

These findings paint a picture of an organization facing both immediate resource challenges and deeper structural issues that predate the current budget situation. The data suggests that while some problems stem directly from recent budget constraints, others reflect long-standing challenges in areas such as workload management, administrative support, and organizational leadership.

This report provides detailed analysis of these issues and offers specific recommendations for both immediate and long-term improvements. The recommendations are directed at two levels: strategic and policy guidance for ALVSCE administration and unit heads, and specific action items for the Faculty Council to better support and advocate for faculty needs.

Research Findings Topline and Recommendations

The 2024 ALVSCE Faculty Survey (n=115, 37% response rate) reveals significant challenges affecting faculty satisfaction, retention, and effectiveness:

Budget Impact: 82% of faculty report being negatively affected by budget cuts, with impacts on:

- Administrative support and operations
- Teaching capacity and quality
- Research productivity
- Program sustainability
- Faculty and staff morale

Satisfaction and Retention Risk:

- Only 57.3% of faculty express satisfaction with their position
- 58.9% are considering leaving within two years (28.4% "Yes", 30.5% "Maybe")
Note: This is considered a measure of satisfaction and engagement.
- Work-life balance is a major concern (39.2% report difficulties)
- Only 50.4% find their workload manageable

Leadership Concerns:

- Only 22.2% view ALVSCE leadership as effective
- Only 37.4% view unit leadership as effective
- Communication effectiveness rates poorly at both ALVSCE (27.2%) and unit (35.3%) levels

Resource and Support Issues:

- 37.4% indicate insufficient administrative support
- Only 47.9% report adequate resources to perform jobs effectively
- Research and teaching support both show significant gaps
- Only 38.2% satisfied with professional development opportunities

Preliminary Recommendations for Administrators and Unit Heads

Immediate Actions

Improve Communication

- Establish regular, transparent communication about budget and resource decisions that reach all faculty
- Create clear channels for faculty input on decisions affecting their work
- Provide advance notice of policy changes and resource restrictions
- Enhance two-way communication between administration and faculty

Address Workload Issues

- Review and rebalance faculty workload distributions
- Establish clear policies for additional teaching assignments
- Develop equitable TA/grader allocation processes
- Create mechanisms to monitor and adjust workload imbalances

Strengthen Support Systems

- Prioritize restoration of critical administrative support
- Create efficient processes for routine administrative tasks
- Establish clear service expectations
- Improve research and teaching support infrastructure

Strategic Initiatives

Resource Management

- Develop more transparent processes for resource and budget allocation, not just the final plan
- Create contingency plans for managing future budget constraints
- Establish clear priorities for maintaining core functions

Professional Development

- Create clearer career advancement pathways
- Enhance mentoring programs, especially for early-career faculty
- Support leadership development opportunities

Work Environment

- Address work-life balance concerns through policy and practice
- Foster collegiality and collaboration within and across units
- Recognize, value, and reward faculty contributions meaningfully

Recommendations for the ALVSCE Faculty Council

Priority Focus Areas

The survey respondents identified three primary areas for the Faculty Council to focus on.

Budget and Resource Advocacy

- Develop specific proposals for improving resource allocation across ALVSCE and within units
- Advocate for transparency in budget decisions during the budging and planning process
- Monitor impact of budget decisions on faculty effectiveness

Workload Policy Development

- Create clear workload guidelines and expectations
- Establish mechanisms for addressing workload inequities
- Develop policies for compensating additional assignments

Faculty Support and Well-being

- Create faculty support networks and mentoring systems
- Advocate for work-life balance policies
- Develop recommendations for improving administrative support

Action Items

Policy Development

- Review promotion and tenure policies
- Recommend clearer and more equitable promotion guidelines for career track faculty
- Create policies supporting work-life balance

Monitoring and Assessment

- Establish regular faculty feedback mechanisms
- Track and report on implementation of recommendations
- Monitor faculty retention and satisfaction

Communication and Engagement

- Create regular updates on Faculty Council initiatives
- Establish forums for faculty input and discussion
- Build stronger connections between faculty and administration

Collaboration Initiatives

Cross-Unit Coordination

- Facilitate sharing of best practices across units
- Support interdisciplinary collaboration
- Promote consistent policy implementation

Administrative Partnerships

- Work with administration to implement recommendations
- Provide faculty perspective on policy decisions
- Help develop solutions for resource challenges

The survey results indicate a critical need for immediate attention to faculty concerns while building longer-term solutions for systemic issues. Success will require coordinated effort between administration, unit heads, and the Faculty Council, with clear communication and engagement with faculty throughout the process.

Finally, the survey did not ask explicit questions about University Leadership and about Faculty Senate and Faculty Council representation.

Purpose and Methods

Purpose

The ALVSCE Faculty Council conducted this survey to gather feedback from faculty members within the Division of Agriculture, Life and Veterinary Sciences, and Cooperative Extension (ALVSCE) at the University of Arizona. The survey sought to understand faculty needs and priorities to ensure effective representation, advocate for improvements in policies and practices, and enhance the work environment and support for faculty professional and career development.

Methods

Survey Administration

The survey targeted was sent to all ALVSCE faculty members who were not primarily in administrative positions (population=315); seven of these invitations were faculty who were not active members of ALVSCE faculty resulting in a population of 308. The survey was administered through the Qualtrics survey platform. Access to the survey was provided via the University of Arizona Single Sign-On (SSO) system to ensure secure participation. The initial survey invitation was distributed by email on October 13, 2024, with a follow-up reminder sent to non-respondents on October 20, 2024. Data collection ended on November 5, 2024.

Survey Instrument

The survey instrument (included as Attachment A) consisted of multiple sections covering faculty demographics, work environment and resources, budget effects, Faculty Council priorities, and professional development. Questions utilized various response formats including Likert scales, multiple choice, ranking, and open-ended responses. The survey was structured to gather both quantitative and qualitative data about faculty experiences, needs, and concerns.

Response Overview

Of the 308 ALVSCE faculty invited to participate, 115 (37%) completed the survey.

| | Count | Percentage |
|-------------------------|------------|------------|
| Invitations sent | 315 | |
| Invitations received | 308 | 100% |
| Opened survey | 150 | 49% |
| Started survey | 122 | 40% |
| Completed survey | 115 | 37% |

This respondents are a cross-section of ALVSCE faculty across all units and appointment types, providing a representative sample of faculty experiences and perspectives.

Data Analysis

The analysis employed a mixed-methods approach combining quantitative and qualitative techniques (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2017). Quantitative data analysis included descriptive statistics (frequencies, means, and standard deviations) to summarize demographic information and Likert-scale responses. Response patterns were analyzed across different faculty ranks and appointment types to identify potential variations in experiences and perspectives.

For open-ended responses, we conducted a thematic analysis following Braun and Clarke's (2006) six-phase approach: familiarization with the data, generating initial codes, searching for themes, reviewing themes, defining and naming themes, and producing the report. This systematic approach allowed us to identify recurring patterns and key themes in faculty responses while maintaining the richness of individual perspectives. Two researchers independently coded the qualitative data to enhance reliability, with discrepancies resolved through discussion to reach consensus (Miles et al., 2014).

Data Security and Confidentiality

All survey responses were anonymized, with no personally identifying information retained in the analysis dataset. In reporting results, particular care was taken to ensure that no individual respondents could be identified through their responses, subcategory tabulations, or faculty demographics information.

ALVSCE administrators, unit heads, and supervisors received no additional information from this survey and have no access to the anonymized dataset.

Survey Respondent Characteristics

Unit Distribution

Q2 - What is your primary appointment program, department, or school? - Selected Choice

| Unit | Percentage | Count |
|---|-------------|------------|
| Cooperative Extension | 16% | 18 |
| Department of Agricultural & Resource Economics | 4% | 5 |
| Department of Agricultural Education, Technology & Innovation | 3% | 3 |
| Department of Biosystems Engineering | 4% | 5 |
| Department of Entomology | 7% | 8 |
| Department of Environmental Science | 7% | 8 |
| Norton School of Human Ecology | 18% | 21 |
| School of Animal & Comparative Biomedical Sciences | 10% | 12 |
| School of Natural Resources & the Environment | 10% | 11 |
| School of Nutritional Sciences & Wellness | 12% | 14 |
| School of Plant Sciences | 8% | 9 |
| Other | 1% | 1 |
| Total | 100% | 115 |

University of Arizona Time in Service

Q3 - How long have you held a faculty position at UArizona?

| Response | Percentage | Count |
|------------------|-------------|------------|
| less than 1 year | 3% | 4 |
| 1 year | 3% | 4 |
| 2 years | 7% | 8 |
| 3 years | 11% | 14 |
| 4 years | 4% | 5 |
| 5 years | 2% | 3 |
| 6 to 9 years | 20% | 25 |
| 10 or more years | 43% | 52 |
| Total | 100% | 115 |

Faculty Ranks and Levels

The survey results contain a representative distribution of Position types and levels.

Q4 - What is your current title? Note: If you are an Extension Specialist, please use your professorial title.

| Position Type | Assistant | Associate | Full | Total |
|-----------------------|------------------|------------------|-------------|--------------|
| Professor | 6 | 21 | 29 | 56 |
| Professor of Practice | 18 | 17 | 5 | 40 |
| Research Professor | 2 | 1 | 0 | 3 |
| Extension Agent | 4 | 2 | 5 | 11 |
| Lecturer | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Other | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 |
| Total | 30 | 41 | 39 | 115 |

Workload Distribution by Position Type

Faculty were asked to report their workload distribution and activities. Survey questions were then filtered based upon the information provided. For example, questions related to formal teaching and course preparation were only asked of faculty who were engaged in formal instructional work.

Faculty reported varied workload distributions for Fall 2024, with assignments tailored to their roles:

- Instructional faculty typically reported 80-90% teaching workloads
- Research-focused faculty generally reported 60-75% research appointments
- Extension Agents primarily reported 85-100% extension activities
- Most faculty reported approximately 10% service commitments
- Some faculty reported administrative appointments ranging from 10-50%

Workload Distribution by Position Type

Faculty were asked to report their workload distribution and activities. Survey questions were then filtered based upon the information provided. For example, questions related to formal teaching and course preparation were only asked of faculty who were engaged in formal instructional work.

Faculty reported varied workload distributions for Fall 2024, with assignments that reflected their roles.

CALES Tenured/Tenure-Track Professors (n=42)

| Category | Mean | Range |
|----------------|-------|---------|
| Instruction | 25.8% | 0-90% |
| Research | 63.4% | 20-100% |
| Extension | 1.2% | 0-25% |
| Service | 8.4% | 0-20% |
| Administration | 1.2% | 0-25% |

CALES Professors of Practice (n=38)

| Category | Mean | Range |
|----------------|-------|---------|
| Instruction | 82.6% | 60-100% |
| Research | 2.4% | 0-20% |
| Extension | 0.8% | 0-10% |
| Service | 9.8% | 0-20% |
| Administration | 4.4% | 0-30% |

Cooperative Extension Faculty (n=18)

| Category | Mean | Range |
|----------------|-------|---------|
| Instruction | 0% | 0% |
| Research | 0% | 0% |
| Extension | 89.4% | 80-100% |
| Service | 8.9% | 0-20% |
| Administration | 1.7% | 0-10% |

Note: 5 faculty did not respond to this question.

Professional Activities

Faculty reported additional activities aligned with their workload assignments.

Among those with research appointments:

- Most reported submitting or publishing peer-reviewed articles
- Many were active in grant submission and management
- The majority presented at academic conferences

Those with teaching appointments reported:

- Supervising undergraduate and graduate research
- Incorporating research projects into courses
- Engaging in community outreach activities

Extension faculty reported:

- Strong engagement in community outreach
- Professional conference presentations
- Development of extension publications

Work Environment

All faculty were asked to evaluate five sets of statements about their workload, work environment, and leadership (Likert, 5-scale, n=115).

Workload and Resources (Q8)

| Statement | Strongly Disagree | Somewhat Disagree | Neither | Somewhat Agree | Strongly Agree | Mean |
|--|-------------------|-------------------|---------|----------------|----------------|------|
| My current workload is manageable | 15.7% | 18.3% | 15.7% | 33.0% | 17.4% | 3.18 |
| I have adequate resources to perform my job effectively | 13.9% | 20.9% | 17.4% | 35.7% | 12.2% | 3.11 |
| The research facilities and equipment available to me are of high quality | 13.0% | 15.7% | 33.0% | 29.6% | 8.7% | 3.05 |
| I receive sufficient administrative support to perform my job effectively | 17.4% | 20.0% | 20.0% | 33.0% | 9.6% | 2.97 |
| The amount of service work I do is appropriate for my workload distribution | 13.9% | 17.4% | 20.9% | 33.9% | 13.9% | 3.17 |

The mean scores on the Workload and Resources statements range from 2.97 to 3.18, with an overall mean of 3.10.

The workload and resources assessment shows mixed results. Half of faculty (50.4%) find their workload manageable (33.0% somewhat agree, 17.4% strongly agree), while 34.0% disagree (18.3% somewhat disagree, 15.7% strongly disagree).

Administrative support is a concern, with 37.4% indicating insufficient support (20.0% somewhat disagree, 17.4% strongly disagree) and 42.6% reporting adequate support.

Resource adequacy indicates some concern with 47.9% reporting adequate resources (35.7% somewhat agree, 12.2% strongly agree) versus 34.8% reporting inadequate resources.

Service work distribution mixed results with only 47.8% agreeing their service work is appropriate (33.9% somewhat agree, 13.9% strongly agree) compared to 31.3% disagreeing.

Career Development and Recognition (Q9)

| Statement | Strongly Disagree | Somewhat Disagree | Neither | Somewhat Agree | Strongly Agree | Mean |
|--|-------------------|-------------------|---------|----------------|----------------|------|
| I have clear pathways for career advancement within ALVSCE | 13.9% | 18.3% | 27.0% | 27.8% | 13.0% | 3.08 |
| ALVSCE provides adequate professional development opportunities | 13.0% | 20.9% | 27.8% | 27.8% | 10.4% | 3.02 |
| I am satisfied with the mentoring support available to me | 13.9% | 17.4% | 27.8% | 30.4% | 10.4% | 3.06 |
| My achievements are appropriately recognized and rewarded | 13.9% | 20.0% | 27.8% | 27.0% | 11.3% | 3.02 |
| I have sufficient opportunities to develop my leadership skills | 15.7% | 16.5% | 27.0% | 27.8% | 13.0% | 3.06 |

The mean scores on the Career Development and Recognition statements range from 3.02 to 3.08, with an overall mean of 3.05.

Career development indicators are mixed. About 40.8% of faculty see clear career advancement pathways (27.8% somewhat agree, 13.0% strongly agree), while 32.2% disagree (18.3% somewhat disagree, 13.9% strongly disagree).

Professional development opportunities show similar patterns, with 38.2% expressing satisfaction (27.8% somewhat agree, 10.4% strongly agree) and 33.9% indicating inadequate opportunities.

Mentoring support receives slightly more positive reviews, with 40.8% expressing satisfaction (30.4% somewhat agree, 10.4% strongly agree) versus 31.3% dissatisfaction.

Achievement recognition shows similar patterns, with 38.3% feeling their achievements are appropriately recognized (27.0% somewhat agree, 11.3% strongly agree) compared to 33.9% who disagree. Notably, across all measures, approximately 27-28% of respondents remained neutral.

Work-Life Balance (Q10)

| Statement | Strongly Disagree | Somewhat Disagree | Neither | Somewhat Agree | Strongly Agree | Mean |
|---|-------------------|-------------------|---------|----------------|----------------|------|
| I am able to maintain a healthy work-life balance | 18.3% | 20.9% | 13.9% | 33.0% | 13.9% | 3.03 |
| ALVSCE policies support flexibility in managing my work schedule | 13.0% | 13.9% | 20.9% | 33.9% | 18.3% | 3.30 |
| I feel comfortable taking time off when needed | 13.9% | 19.1% | 20.0% | 32.2% | 14.8% | 3.15 |
| The expectations for after-hours availability are reasonable | 13.0% | 20.0% | 24.3% | 31.3% | 11.3% | 3.08 |

The mean scores on the Work-Life Balance statements range from 2.94 to 3.30, with an overall mean of 3.10.

Work-life balance shows 46.9% of faculty reporting ability to maintain healthy work-life balance (33.0% somewhat agree, 13.9% strongly agree), though 39.2% still report difficulties (20.9% somewhat disagree, 18.3% strongly disagree).

Schedule flexibility emerges as the strongest area, with 52.2% agreeing that ALVSCE policies support flexible scheduling (33.9% somewhat agree, 18.3% strongly agree). The ability to take time off has similar results with 47.0% feeling comfortable taking time off (32.2% somewhat agree, 14.8% strongly agree) versus 33.0% not feeling comfortable.

After-hours availability expectations are viewed as reasonable by 42.6% of faculty (31.3% somewhat agree, 11.3% strongly agree), while 33.0% find them unreasonable.

The ability to pursue personal interests and commitments is challenging for many, with 42.6% reporting their workload allows for personal pursuits (30.4% somewhat agree, 12.2% strongly agree) versus 40.9% indicating it doesn't (20.9% somewhat disagree, 20.0% strongly disagree).

Collegiality and Collaboration (Q11)

| Statement | Strongly Disagree | Somewhat Disagree | Neither | Somewhat Agree | Strongly Agree | Mean |
|---|-------------------|-------------------|---------|----------------|----------------|------|
| There is a strong sense of collegiality within my department/unit | 13.9% | 17.4% | 20.0% | 32.2% | 16.5% | 3.20 |
| I have ample opportunities to collaborate with colleagues within my discipline | 8.7% | 15.7% | 27.0% | 33.9% | 14.8% | 3.30 |
| ALVSCE actively promotes interdisciplinary collaboration | 10.4% | 20.0% | 33.0% | 27.0% | 9.6% | 3.05 |
| I feel respected and valued by my colleagues | 11.3% | 13.9% | 22.6% | 33.9% | 18.3% | 3.34 |
| There are sufficient forums for sharing ideas and research with colleagues | 13.0% | 20.0% | 28.7% | 27.8% | 10.4% | 3.03 |

The mean scores on Collegiality and Collaboration statements range from 3.03 to 3.34, with an overall mean of 3.18, indicating generally positive perceptions of workplace relationships and collaboration opportunities.

Departmental collegiality shows encouraging results, with 48.7% of faculty reporting a strong sense of collegiality in their unit (32.2% somewhat agree, 16.5% strongly agree), while 31.3% disagree (17.4% somewhat disagree, 13.9% strongly disagree). A notable 20.0% remain neutral on this measure.

Collaborative opportunities within disciplines receive among the most positive ratings, with 48.7% of faculty reporting ample opportunities (33.9% somewhat agree, 14.8% strongly agree), compared to 24.4% disagreeing. However, a substantial portion (27.0%) neither agree nor disagree, suggesting potential room for improvement in fostering collaborative environments.

Interdisciplinary collaboration shows more mixed results, with 36.6% agreeing that ALVSCE actively promotes such collaboration (27.0% somewhat agree, 9.6% strongly agree), while 30.4% disagree. The highest neutral response rate (33.0%) on this measure suggests uncertainty about interdisciplinary initiatives.

Professional respect emerges as the strongest aspect, with 52.2% of faculty feeling respected and valued by colleagues (33.9% somewhat agree, 18.3% strongly agree), while 25.2% disagree. This represents the highest mean score (3.34) among all measures in this category.

Forums for scholarly exchange indicate room for improvement, with 38.2% indicating sufficient opportunities (27.8% somewhat agree, 10.4% strongly agree), while 33.0% disagree. The

relatively high neutral response rate (28.7%) suggests potential uncertainty about or unfamiliarity with available forums for sharing ideas and research.

Work Environment Analysis

The work environment within ALVSCE was assessed across multiple dimensions including workload, resources, career development, work-life balance, collegiality, and leadership effectiveness. Analysis of faculty responses (n=81) reveals both systemic challenges and areas of relative strength.

Key Dimensions and Findings

Resources and Support (Q8)

- Only 47.9% report adequate resources for job performance
- Administrative support emerges as a critical concern, with 37.4% indicating insufficient support
- Service work allocation shows mixed results with 47.8% finding it appropriate
- Research facility quality receives mixed reviews, with 38.3% reporting satisfaction

Career Development (Q9)

- Only 38.2% feel satisfied with professional development opportunities
- Career advancement pathways clear for just 40.8% of faculty
- Mentoring support satisfaction reported by 40.8% of faculty
- Leadership development opportunities available to 40.8% of respondents

Work-Life Balance (Q10)

- Schedule flexibility emerges as a relative strength (52.2% positive)
- 46.9% report ability to maintain healthy work-life balance
- After-hours availability expectations reasonable for 42.6% of faculty
- 42.6% indicate workload allows for personal pursuits

Collegiality and Collaboration (Q11)

- Professional respect from colleagues rates highest (52.2% positive)
- 48.7% report strong within-discipline collaboration opportunities
- Interdisciplinary collaboration supported by 36.6% of faculty
- Forums for scholarly exchange deemed sufficient by 38.2%

Strengths

- Professional Relationships: 52.2% feel respected and valued by colleagues
- Schedule Flexibility: 52.2% find policies support flexible work arrangements
- Unit-Level Collegiality: 48.7% report strong sense of collegiality
- Collaborative Environment: 48.7% report ample collaboration opportunities

Challenges

- Administrative Support: 37.4% indicate insufficient support for job performance
- Work-Life Balance: 39.2% report difficulties maintaining balance
- Career Development: Only 38.2% satisfied with professional development
- Resource Adequacy: Only 47.9% report adequate resources

Opportunities for Enhancement

Support Infrastructure:

- Strengthen administrative support systems - identified as critical by 37.4% of faculty
- Improve research facility access and quality - only 38.3% currently satisfied
- Develop better resource allocation mechanisms - needed by 52.1% of faculty

Professional Development:

- Create clearer career advancement pathways - unclear for 59.2% of faculty
- Enhance mentoring programs - only 40.8% currently satisfied
- Increase leadership development opportunities - desired by 59.2% of faculty

Collaboration Support:

- Establish more forums for scholarly exchange - insufficient for 61.8% of faculty
- Strengthen interdisciplinary initiatives - only 36.6% see active support
- Build collaborative infrastructure across units - needed by 51.3% of faculty

Work-Life Balance:

- Review workload distribution policies - 53.1% report balance difficulties
- Address after-hours availability expectations - problematic for 57.4%
- Enhance support for personal time management - needed by 57.4%

Communication and Leadership:

- Improve division-wide communication effectiveness
- Strengthen leadership effectiveness at all levels
- Better align policies with faculty needs and workload realities

Conclusion

The work environment assessment reveals significant challenges despite some areas of strength. While collegiality and professional relationships show positive ratings, systematic challenges exist across support systems, career development, and work-life balance dimensions. The findings suggest a need for comprehensive attention to faculty support infrastructure and workload management.

Key priorities should include:

1. Strengthening administrative and resource support systems
2. Enhancing career development and mentoring programs

3. Addressing work-life balance through policy and practice changes
4. Building stronger collaborative infrastructure
5. Improving communication and leadership effectiveness

The relative success in areas of collegiality and professional relationships provides a foundation for implementing improvements in other areas. However, the data suggests urgent attention is needed to address systemic challenges that affect faculty effectiveness and satisfaction.

Leadership Assessment

Faculty were asked to rate statements about ALVSCE and Unit leadership on a Likert 5-scale.

| Statement | Strongly Disagree | Somewhat Disagree | Neither | Somewhat Agree | Strongly Agree | Mean |
|--|-------------------|-------------------|---------|----------------|----------------|------|
| ALVSCE Leadership | | | | | | |
| Effective in guiding organization | 24.7% | 29.6% | 23.5% | 16.0% | 6.2% | 2.49 |
| Policies support faculty success | 22.2% | 28.4% | 24.7% | 18.5% | 6.2% | 2.58 |
| Communicates effectively | 19.8% | 27.2% | 25.9% | 21.0% | 6.2% | 2.67 |
| Unit Leadership | | | | | | |
| Effective in guiding unit | 13.9% | 20.0% | 28.7% | 27.8% | 9.6% | 2.99 |
| Policies support faculty success | 13.0% | 20.0% | 35.3% | 26.5% | 5.9% | 2.92 |
| Communicates effectively | 17.6% | 14.7% | 32.4% | 26.5% | 8.8% | 2.94 |

Key Findings

ALVSCE Leadership Effectiveness

- Only 22.2% view ALVSCE leadership as effective (16.0% somewhat agree, 6.2% strongly agree)
- 54.3% disagree with leadership effectiveness (29.6% somewhat disagree, 24.7% strongly disagree)
- Lowest mean score (2.49) across all leadership measures

Unit Leadership Effectiveness

- 37.4% view unit leadership as effective (27.8% somewhat agree, 9.6% strongly agree)
- 33.9% disagree with unit leadership effectiveness
- Higher mean score (2.99) than ALVSCE leadership

Communication Effectiveness

- ALVSCE: 27.2% positive rating, 47.0% negative rating (mean 2.67)
- Unit level: 35.3% positive rating, 32.3% negative rating (mean 2.94)
- Communication effectiveness rates slightly better at unit level

Policy Support

- ALVSCE: 24.7% feel supported by policies (mean 2.58)
- Unit level: 32.4% feel supported by policies (mean 2.92)
- Both levels show substantial room for improvement

Analysis

While unit heads receive significantly higher ratings, it's important to note that both levels of leadership still receive mean ratings below the midpoint of 3.0 on the 5-point scale. The data reveals a clear pattern of concern regarding leadership effectiveness at both organizational levels, with several notable trends:

Hierarchical Difference: The differences between ALVSCE and Unit Head ratings are statistically significant across all three dimensions. Unit-level leadership consistently receives more positive ratings than ALVSCE leadership across all measures, though both show concerning patterns. This difference may be attributable to the proximity to University senior leadership, which is beyond the scope of this study.

Communication Gaps: While unit communication shows marginally better performance, both organizational levels demonstrate substantial room for improvement in information sharing.

Policy Impact: Faculty perceive limited policy support for their success at both organizational levels, suggesting a need for policy review and enhancement.

Overall Effectiveness: The generally low means across all measures (ranging from 2.49 to 2.99) indicate systematic challenges in leadership effectiveness at both organizational levels.

Implications

These findings suggest a need for:

- Enhanced communication strategies at both organizational levels
- Review and potential revision of policies to better support faculty success
- Further investigation into the gap between unit and ALVSCE leadership effectiveness

Research and Teaching Support

Research Support (Q13)

Only asked of faculty reporting research workload assignments; n=51

| Statement | Strongly Disagree | Somewhat Disagree | Neither | Somewhat Agree | Strongly Agree | Mean |
|---------------------------------------|-------------------|-------------------|---------|----------------|----------------|------|
| Adequate grant-seeking support | 17.6% | 14.7% | 35.3% | 26.5% | 5.9% | 2.88 |
| Grant management support sufficient | 17.6% | 14.7% | 35.3% | 26.5% | 5.9% | 2.88 |
| Access to grant proposal resources | 13.7% | 14.7% | 29.4% | 33.3% | 8.9% | 3.09 |
| Adequate grant training opportunities | 11.8% | 15.7% | 31.4% | 31.4% | 9.7% | 3.12 |
| Satisfied with internal funding | 29.4% | 19.6% | 27.5% | 19.6% | 3.9% | 2.49 |

Key Findings

Systematic Challenges

- All measures rate below the midpoint of 3.0
- Strong negative skew across all dimensions
- Consistent pattern of dissatisfaction

Resource Gaps

- Most acute concerns about internal funding
- Significant gaps in both pre-award and post-award support
- Even highest-rated area shows substantial room for improvement

Support Structure

- Critical gaps in basic grant support services
- Resource access issues affect proposal development
- Training, while rated highest, still shows significant concerns

Recommendations

Critical Priorities

- Address severe internal funding limitations
- Strengthen basic grant support services
- Improve grant management support

Strategic Initiatives

- Build on relatively stronger training foundation

- Enhance proposal development resources
- Create more robust support infrastructure

Resource Development

- Review and enhance internal funding mechanisms
- Strengthen support staff capacity
- Improve resource accessibility

Conclusion

The research support analysis reveals significant challenges across all dimensions, with particularly severe concerns about internal funding and grant support services. The consistently low ratings and high levels of dissatisfaction suggest systematic rather than isolated issues, indicating a need for comprehensive review and enhancement of research support infrastructure.

While training opportunities show slightly better ratings, all areas require substantial attention and improvement. The data suggests a need for both immediate interventions to address critical gaps and longer-term strategic initiatives to build a more effective research support structure.

Teaching Support (Q14)

Only asked of faculty reporting instructional workload assignments; n=83

| Statement | Strongly Disagree | Somewhat Disagree | Neither | Somewhat Agree | Strongly Agree | Mean |
|--|-------------------|-------------------|---------|----------------|----------------|------|
| Teaching workload appropriate | 7.2% | 10.8% | 19.3% | 36.1% | 26.5% | 3.64 |
| Adequate course development time | 14.5% | 25.3% | 24.1% | 30.1% | 6.0% | 2.88 |
| Individual supervision compensation sufficient | 24.1% | 24.1% | 42.2% | 7.2% | 2.4% | 2.40 |
| Course assignments distributed fairly | 15.7% | 13.3% | 20.5% | 30.1% | 20.5% | 3.27 |
| Adequate TA/grading support | 24.1% | 9.6% | 31.3% | 26.5% | 8.4% | 2.86 |
| TA/grader support fairly allocated | 14.5% | 12.0% | 26.5% | 34.9% | 12.0% | 3.18 |

Key Findings

Structural Elements

- Basic workload and course assignments rate positively
- Support resources show mixed results
- Compensation for additional duties problematic

Resource Distribution

- TA support shows split between adequacy and fairness
- Time resources for course development constrained
- Clear compensation issues for individual instruction

Neutral Responses

- High neutral rates for compensation (42.2%)
- Substantial neutral responses for TA support (31.3%)
- May indicate lack of engagement or awareness

Recommendations

Critical Priorities

- Address compensation for individual instruction
- Review course development time allocation

- Evaluate TA support distribution

Policy Review

- Examine individual instruction compensation policies
- Review TA allocation procedures
- Assess course development support

Support Enhancement

- Build on positive workload foundation
- Strengthen TA support systems
- Improve resource allocation transparency

Conclusion

The analysis reveals a mixed picture of teaching support, with some areas showing strength while others require significant attention. The basic teaching structure (workload and course assignments) shows relatively positive ratings, but support systems and compensation for additional duties show concerning patterns.

The most critical area for attention is compensation for individual instruction and research supervision, showing the lowest satisfaction and highest dissatisfaction rates. Course development time and TA support also emerge as areas needing improvement, despite more balanced ratings.

The relatively high neutral response rates in several areas suggest potential opportunities for better communication and engagement around teaching support resources and policies.

University Budget Cuts on ALVSCE Faculty, Productivity, and Morale

The University of Arizona has implemented significant budget cuts and financial restrictions in 2024, including spending freezes, account sweeps, and limitations on hiring. These measures have had substantial impacts on faculty work and academic programs within ALVSCE.

Q15. Have you, your work, academic program, or research been negatively affected by the University of Arizona budget cuts? Yes, No, Not Sure.

| Response | Count | Percentage |
|---------------------------|-------|------------|
| Yes (Negatively Affected) | 87 | 82% |
| No (Not Affected) | 5 | 4% |
| Not Sure | 14 | 13% |
| Total | 106 | 100% |

A follow up question was asked of faculty who responded "Yes". Q16. *Describe how the University of Arizona budget cuts negatively affected you, your work, academic program, or research?* Analysis of faculty comments regarding the negative effects revealed several major themes:

1. Administrative and Support Staff Reductions

- Loss of critical administrative support positions
- Increased workload for remaining faculty and staff
- Delays in basic administrative processes

"We lost three instructional faculty, loss of administrative associate, loss of part time department recruiter, the role of student advisor moved to another department, loss of instructional department staff, student worker positions."

2. Teaching Impact

- Larger class sizes without additional support
- Reduced TA and grader support
- Inability to hire needed instructional faculty

"We cannot fill open POP positions. With our student growth we cannot fill necessary requirements for them."

"Decline in TA support, which adds stress and work for my teaching. Decline in morale (I'm/we're paying for the mistakes of others)."

"Loss of three instructional faculty, loss of administrative associate, loss of part time department recruiter, the role of student advisor moved to another department, loss of instructional department staff, student worker positions. Loss of "Student Lab Fees" has GREATLY affected ability to instruct laboratory courses. Loss of funding for facility maintenance, laboratory equipment maintenance."

3. Grants and Research Operations

- Frozen research accounts and spending restrictions
- Limited access to previously allocated funds
- Reduced ability to support graduate students

"Startup funds previously allocated are now supervised more, and we have been advised that they need to be held longer and spent more slowly. This impacts the kind of research projects I can successfully conduct to collect appropriate preliminary data needed to apply for successful federal grants."

"Suffering from delayed process of hiring, even for grant-funded positions. Restriction on utilizing funding, either by freeze, budget cut and/or limiting spending authority negatively impacted my research, extension and administrative activities to a level that it jeopardize federal, state and industry grant obligations."

4. Program and Extension Activities

- Reduction in extension programming capabilities
- Canceled events and community programs
- Limited ability to fulfill grant obligations

"The lack of communication from campus on the changes to policy related to Salary Savings had a negative impact on our ability to provide needed resources to our community as well as to make up for gaps in other program areas."

"Due to the budget "authority" I have had to cancel (fully funded!) events just because they exceeded my budget authority. This negatively affects the impacts of my programming."

5. Morale and Work Environment

- Increased stress and burnout
- Uncertainty about future cuts
- Reduced job satisfaction

"The cuts have hurt hiring and stretched everyone beyond what they should be doing."

"The overall morale on campus and within the college is low. Admin and support personnel are maxed out and stressed out - they are struggling to meet the demand. The budget issues are trickling down to the researchers/professors, who did not create the budget problem in the first place, but are experiencing the burden."

The survey responses indicate that the budget cuts have created cascading effects that impact virtually every aspect of faculty work, from teaching and research to extension activities and basic administrative functions. Many faculty expressed particular concern about the long-term implications of these cuts on program quality, research productivity, and workforce retention.

Faculty Priorities

The faculty were asked to rank eight potential work areas from 1 (most important) to 8 (least important). Q17. The ALVSCE Faculty Council has been tasked to formulate recommendations on how we can more efficiently manage and utilize resources to achieve greater effectiveness in carrying out ALVSCE's three-fold mission of teaching, research and extension. Rank order these Faculty Council work areas from most important (1) to least important (8). n=100.

Here are the results organized by average ranking score, with lower scores indicating higher priority:

| Priority Area | Average Rank | Rankings Distribution |
|---|--------------|----------------------------------|
| ALVSCE Budget and Resource Allocation | 3.21 | Most #1 rankings |
| Faculty Workload Policy | 3.27 | High frequency of top-3 rankings |
| Faculty Wellbeing and Work-Life Balance | 3.73 | Consistent mid-high priority |
| Annual Performance Reviews and Promotion Equity and Fairness | 3.94 | Variable rankings |
| Supporting Faculty Collaboration | 5.31 | Generally mid-low rankings |
| ALVSCE Strategic Planning Priorities | 5.42 | Variable rankings |
| Diversity, Equity & Inclusion | 6.26 | Frequently ranked lower |
| Safety and Security on Campus | 6.37 | Most frequently ranked lowest |

Distribution of #1 Rankings

These are top priorities selected by faculty:

| Priority Area | Times Ranked #1 |
|---|-----------------|
| ALVSCE Budget and Resource Allocation | 24 |
| Faculty Workload Policy | 20 |
| Faculty Wellbeing and Work-Life Balance | 12 |
| Annual Performance Reviews and Promotion Equity/Fairness | 11 |
| Supporting Faculty Collaboration | 4 |
| ALVSCE Strategic Planning Priorities | 7 |
| Diversity, Equity & Inclusion | 5 |

Key Findings

Clear Top Tier Priorities (based on top-3 rankings):

- Budget/Resource Allocation (69.1%)
- Faculty Workload Policy (63.0%)
- Faculty Wellbeing (58.1%)

Middle Tier Priority:

- Annual Performance Reviews/Promotion (44.4% in top 3)

Lower Tier Priorities (based on bottom-3 rankings):

- Diversity, Equity & Inclusion (64.2%)
- Strategic Planning (55.6%)
- Safety and Security (49.4%)
- Faculty Collaboration (45.7%)

Most Polarizing Topics (showing both strong high and low rankings):

- Safety and Security on Campus
- Strategic Planning Priorities

Most Consistent Rankings (showing clear consensus):

- Budget/Resource Allocation (consistently high)
- Diversity, Equity & Inclusion (consistently lower)

The rankings suggest that faculty are most concerned with immediate operational and workload issues, particularly those relating to budget allocation and workload management. This likely reflects the current context of budget constraints and their impact on faculty work conditions.

Equally important, is recognition that many faculty concerns and needs are interconnected and involve multiple policy and practice areas and the effects of University, Division, and Unit policy and practices.

Other Priorities

Faculty could also answer an optional follow-up question: Q18. Do you have any additional issues, challenges or opportunities that the Faculty Council should focus on?

Out of 115 respondents, 31 provided substantial responses to Q18 (27% of respondents):

- Substantive responses: 31
- Non-substantive responses (None, NA, No, etc.): 23
- Blank/no answer: 61

Key Themes from Substantive Responses

Faculty Career Development (8 responses)

- Promotion packet clarity and mentoring needs
- Career advancement post-full professor
- Professors of Practice sabbatical mechanisms
- Career track faculty advancement

- Clearer documentation of promotion requirements
- Equity in faculty lines/hiring

Workload & Compensation Issues (6 responses)

- Time/task tracking for workload assessment
- Inequitable teaching loads
- Compensation for overload teaching
- Lab work accounting in workload
- Pay equity review for Agents

Administrative & Policy Concerns (6 responses)

- Financial transparency at unit level
- Policy documentation and accessibility
- Administrative overhead concerns
- County Extension Director qualifications
- Clear expectations and policies

Infrastructure & Support (5 responses)

- Building maintenance and facilities
- Basic infrastructure (clocks, classroom resources)
- Administrative support
- Technology needs
- Funding for facility upgrades

Equity & Fairness (3 responses)

- Service work distribution
- Internal funding allocation
- Unit-level resource distribution

Tribal Programs & FRTEP Issues (3 responses)

- Recognition of FRTEP program differences
- Tribal program leadership structure
- Support beyond land acknowledgements

Notable Quotes:

"If workload adjustment to increase work-life balance is to be more than simple talk, I encourage ALVSCE to select some faculty (and staff) to do a time/task tracking study."

"Professors of Practice need to have some kind of mechanism for a semester- or year-long sabbatical."

"Financial transparency is severely lacking at the unit level... if allocation of unit funds were voted on BEFORE the funds were allocated many issues would be resolved."

"Having a greater understanding of where ALVSCE policies are posted on COMPASS. There are several which are word of mouth but the actual policy cannot be found."

Interconnected Issues

Several responses highlighted the interconnected nature of these issues, particularly how leadership decisions affect workload, resource allocation, and faculty support. The comments suggest a desire for more systematic and equitable approaches to managing faculty work and resources.

Faculty Satisfaction and Retention Analysis

Three questions about satisfaction with current position were asked. Overall, the responses indicate a potential faculty retention crisis.

Overall Satisfaction with ALVSCE Position

Q19. Overall, how satisfied are you with your position at ALVSCE?

| Satisfaction Level | Count | Percentage |
|------------------------------------|-------|------------|
| Extremely satisfied | 14 | 12.2% |
| Somewhat satisfied | 41 | 35.7% |
| Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied | 15 | 13.0% |
| Somewhat dissatisfied | 19 | 16.5% |
| Extremely dissatisfied | 7 | 6.1% |
| No response | 19 | 16.5% |
| Total | 115 | 100% |

Combined Results:

Positive (Extremely/Somewhat Satisfied): 55 (57.3%)

Neutral: 15 (15.6%)

Negative (Extremely/Somewhat Dissatisfied): 26 (27.1%)

Considering Leaving UArizona within Next Two Years

Q20. Are you considering leaving UArizona within the next two years?

All responses

| Response | Count | Percentage |
|----------|-------|------------|
| Yes | 29 | 30.5% |
| Maybe | 22 | 23.2% |
| No | 44 | 46.3% |
| Total | 95 | 100.0% |

Adjusted for faculty considering leaving due to retirement and valid responses:

| Response | Count | Percentage |
|-------------------|-------|------------|
| Yes | 27 | 28.4% |
| Yes, retirement | 2 | 2.1% |
| Maybe | 29 | 30.5% |
| Maybe, retirement | 2 | 2.1% |
| No | 44 | 46.3% |
| Total | 95 | 100.0% |

Primary Reasons for Potentially Leaving

Q21. What are the primary reasons you might leave UArizona?

This follow-up question was asked of the 51 faculty who answered "Yes" or "Maybe" to Q20; 27 faculty provided substantive responses.

Key Themes

Budget and Resource Issues (9 mentions)

- Financial instability and budget cuts
- Inability to use/access funds
- Loss of program resources
- Impact on research capabilities
- Poor financial management

Workload and Compensation (8 mentions)

- Excessive workload
- Work-life balance issues
- Inadequate compensation
- Better pay elsewhere
- Burnout concerns

Leadership and Management (7 mentions)

- Lost confidence in administration
- Poor communication
- Lack of transparency
- Disconnection from faculty needs
- Questions about decision-making

Work Environment and Culture (6 mentions)

- Hostile work environment
- Low morale
- Lack of support
- Discrimination concerns
- Trust issues

Career Development (4 mentions)

- Limited advancement opportunities
- Lack of professional growth
- Career plateauing
- Better opportunities elsewhere

Program-Specific Issues (3 mentions)

- Loss of land-grant mission focus
- Housing challenges for tribal programs
- Program sustainability concerns

Retirement (4 mentions)

- Natural retirement timing
- Early retirement due to conditions

Representative Quotes

"The workload, higher course caps, and lack of faculty support are major issues. We work on 9-month contracts but are often required to work over the summer without compensation."

"Should I not receive continuing status and should the budget issues persist. Also, if there are no discernable changes made now that the U of A has a new President."

"I am absolutely not happy at the university and feel very disrespected... the financial situation has caused significant damage to my mental health."

"Getting a position with more research/teaching balance... Getting a more competitive salary. Environmental/climate planning (i.e., get out of the desert before it's unlivable). Living closer to family."

Analysis

The satisfaction data reveals significant concerns about faculty retention and satisfaction. While 49.4% of faculty express satisfaction with their position, a substantial portion (32.1%) report dissatisfaction, with 18.5% remaining neutral. Research indicates that actively seeking new positions is itself an indicator of job dissatisfaction, making it particularly concerning that 48.2% of faculty are either definitely (30.9%) or potentially (17.3%) planning to leave within two years.

The reasons for potential departure, drawn from 27 substantive responses, cluster around interconnected systemic issues:

- **Resource and Budget Issues:** The most frequently cited concern involves institutional financial instability, budget cuts, and resource constraints. These issues directly impact faculty's ability to perform their core functions in teaching, research, and extension.
- **Workload and Compensation:** Heavy workloads, inadequate compensation, and work-life balance challenges form the second most common theme. These issues appear exacerbated by budget constraints that limit support staff and resources.
- **Leadership and Cultural Issues:** Concerns about leadership decisions, communication, and work environment suggest deeper institutional challenges. Faculty cite lack of transparency, declining trust, and disconnection between administration and faculty needs.

The high percentage of faculty considering departure, combined with the nature of their concerns, suggests a potential retention crisis that could significantly impact institutional capability and stability. The predominance of structural and institutional issues over personal circumstances in departure considerations is particularly noteworthy. Faculty consistently cite systemic problems (budget management, workload distribution, leadership effectiveness) rather than individual career choices or personal circumstances as their primary motivations for considering departure.

This pattern suggests that addressing retention challenges will require systematic institutional changes rather than individual-level interventions. The interconnected nature of these issues - where budget constraints affect workload, which impacts morale, which influences retention - indicates a need for comprehensive rather than piecemeal solutions.

Final Comments and Suggestions

The survey closed with an open-ended question: Q22: Is there anything else you would like to share about your experiences, needs, or suggestions for improvement?

Out of 115 respondents, 35 faculty provided meaningful responses (excluding "no", "na", "none", etc.)

Key Themes

1. Leadership and Administrative Issues (14 responses)

- Disconnect between administration and faculty needs
- Poor communication and transparency
- Need for better shared governance
- Top-down decision making without faculty input

Notable Quotes:

"Administration has lost sight of the fact their only role should be to remove barriers from their faculty, students and staff for success."

"I believe it is essential for administrators to listen to the people who are doing the work rather than only listening to other administrators or people in higher-up positions."

2. Workload and Work-Life Balance Issues (8 responses)

- Overwhelming job demands
- Multiple skill requirements without support
- Long working hours
- Burnout concerns

Notable Quotes:

"I love working with Cooperative Extension... I don't like the extremely long hours I work to get everything done."

"There are so many skill sets that you have to have to do this job... it is massively overwhelming. The fact that either you do all of it or it doesn't get done pushes us all to overwork."

3. Organizational Culture and Support (7 responses)

- Lack of faculty input in decisions
- Poor response to complaints and feedback
- Need for better onboarding and training
- Equity and diversity issues

Notable Quotes:

"my department needs training in equity, inclusion, and diversity."

"Often people who bring up things that are difficult to hear or seem 'negative' seem to be pushed away when we need that input so desperately."

4. Institutional Reputation and Retention (6 responses)

- Difficulty recruiting and retaining faculty
- Damage to university's reputation
- Impact on programs and students

Notable Quotes:

"We can't even recruit faculty to come here (or keep them) due to the horrible reputation that the University of Arizona has earned..."

"Degree programs declining leads to students going to other universities."

5. Ethical and Accountability Concerns (3 responses)

- Need for consequences for unethical behavior
- Better oversight needed
- Accountability for decision-making

Notable Quote:

"There are no consequences for unethical behavior."

6. Extension-Specific Issues (3 responses)

- Special challenges for Extension faculty
- Need for better understanding of Extension's role
- Support for remote locations

Observations

- **Systemic Issues:** Many comments point to systemic issues rather than isolated problems, suggesting need for structural changes.
- **Morale Impact:** Comments reflect significant morale issues across multiple levels of the organization.
- **Communication Gaps:** Several responses indicate communication breakdowns between administration and faculty.
- **Resource Strains:** Comments consistently highlight the strain of trying to maintain quality with reduced resources.
- **Professional Development:** Strong theme of needing better support for professional growth and development.
- **Workload Sustainability:** Serious concerns about the sustainability of current workload expectations.

The responses reveal deep concerns about institutional leadership, working conditions, and the overall direction of the university, with particular emphasis on the need for better administrative support and communication.

The responses suggest a faculty body that is committed to their work but struggling with systemic challenges that affect their ability to perform effectively. Many comments offer constructive suggestions for improvement while expressing frustration with current conditions.

References

- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3(2), 77-101.
- Creswell, J. W., & Plano Clark, V. L. (2017). *Designing and conducting mixed methods research* (3rd ed.). SAGE Publications.
- Miles, M. B., Huberman, A. M., & Saldaña, J. (2014). *Qualitative data analysis: A methods sourcebook* (3rd ed.). SAGE Publications.

Appendix A: 2024 ALVSCE Faculty Council Faculty Survey

Survey Flow

Authenticator: Single Sign On - Shibboleth

Block: Default Question Block (7 Questions)

Block: Work Environment and Resources (7 Questions)

Includes question about research and question about instruction based on workload.

Block: Budget Effects (2 Questions)

Block: Faculty Council Priorities (2 Questions)

Block: Professional Development (4 Questions)

Page Break

Start of Block: Default Question Block

Q1 The ALVSCE Faculty Council is conducting this confidential and anonymized survey to understand our faculty's needs and priorities. The results of this survey will be used to:

1. Ensure that the ALVSCE Faculty Council represents our faculty's interests and priorities.
2. Advocate for improvements in ALVSCE policies and practices.
3. Improve the work environment and support for faculty professional and career development.

Over goal is to understand overall faculty priorities and sentiment. In order to advance our mission and the quality of our working environment, it is very important that you provide us with honest opinions. The individual information provided in this survey will not be released. The responses will be aggregated and any identifiable information be removed from any reports. We will provide a summary report to all ALVSCE faculty.

If you have any questions or concerns about this survey, please contact Kathleen J. Kennedy, Chair, ALVSCE Faculty Council, kjkennedy@arizona.edu.

Please click the arrow to start the survey.

Page Break



Q2 What is your primary appointment program, department, or school?

- ☐ Cooperative Extension (1)
 - ☐ Department of Agricultural & Resource Economics (2)
 - ☐ Department of Agricultural Education, Technology & Innovation (3)
 - ☐ Department of Biosystems Engineering (4)
 - ☐ Department of Entomology (5)
 - ☐ Department of Environmental Science (6)
 - ☐ Norton School of Human Ecology (7)
 - ☐ School of Animal & Comparative Biomedical Sciences (8)
 - ☐ School of Natural Resources & the Environment (9)
 - ☐ School of Nutritional Sciences & Wellness (10)
 - ☐ School of Plant Sciences (11)
 - ☐ Other (12) _____
-

Q3 How long have you held a faculty position at UArizona?

▼ less than 1 year (1) ... 10 or more years (8)



Q4 What is your current title?

Note: If you are an Extension Specialist, please use your professorial title.

- ☐ Assistant Agent (continuing-eligible) (1)

- ☐ Assistant Professor (2)
 - ☐ Assistant Professor of Practice (3)
 - ☐ Assistant Research Professor (4)
 - ☐ Associate Agent (continuing/continuing-eligible) (5)
 - ☐ Associate Professor (6)
 - ☐ Associate Professor of Practice (7)
 - ☐ Associate Research Professor (8)
 - ☐ Full Agent (9)
 - ☐ Professor (10)
 - ☐ Professor of Practice (11)
 - ☐ Research Professor (12)
 - ☐ Lecturer or Senior Lecturer (13)
 - ☐ Other (please enter current title) (14)
-

Page Break



Q5 What is your workload distribution for Fall 2024? Enter 10% as 10. Your total must be 100.

Instruction : _____ (1)

Research : _____ (2)

Extension : _____ (3)

Service : _____ (4)

Administration : _____ (5)

Other : _____ (6)

Total : _____

Q6 In the past 12 months, which of the following discipline-related activities have you done?

Select all that apply.

☐

Submitted an article to a peer-reviewed academic journal (1)

☐

(2)

Authored/co-authored an article published by a peer-reviewed academic journal

☐

Submitted an article to an industry or professional publication (3)

☐

publication (4)

Authored/co-authored an article published by an industry or professional

☐

Presented at an academic conference (5)

☐

Presented at an industry or professional conference (6)

☐

PI/Co-PI on a grant submission (7)

☐

PI/Co-PI on a grant award (8)

☐

Conducted research as part of a UA-sponsored research project (9)

☐

None of the above (10)

Q7 In the past 12 months, which of the following have you done? *Select all that apply.*

- ☐ Supervised or advised graduate student research (1)
- ☐ Supervised or advised undergraduate student research (2)
- ☐ Taught a graduate course that incorporated a significant research project (3)
- ☐ Taught an undergraduate course that incorporated a significant research project (4)
- ☐ Conducted or advised on a community outreach or action research project (5)
- ☐ None of the above (6)

End of Block: Default Question Block

Start of Block: Work Environment and Resources



Q8 Please indicate your level of agreement with the following statements:

| | Strongly disagree (1) | Somewhat disagree (2) | Neither agree nor disagree (3) | Somewhat agree (4) | Strongly agree (5) |
|---|-----------------------|-----------------------|--------------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| My current workload is manageable. (Q8_1) | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| I have adequate resources to perform my job effectively. (Q8_2) | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| The research facilities and equipment available to me are of | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |

high quality.
(Q8_3)

I receive
sufficient
administrative
support to
perform my
job
effectively.
(Q8_4)

The amount
of service
work I do is
appropriate
for my
workload
distribution.
(Q8_5)

☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐

Q9 Please indicate your level of agreement with the following statements:

| | Strongly disagree (1) | Somewhat disagree (2) | Neither agree nor disagree (3) | Somewhat agree (4) | Strongly agree (5) |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| I have clear pathways for career advancement within ALVSCE. (Q9_1) | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| ALVSCE provides adequate professional development opportunities. (Q9_2) | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |

I am satisfied with the mentoring support available to me. (Q9_3)

☐
☐
☐
☐
☐

My achievements are appropriately recognized and rewarded. (Q9_4)

☐
☐
☐
☐
☐

I have sufficient opportunities to develop my leadership skills. (Q9_5)

☐
☐
☐
☐
☐


Q10 Please indicate your level of agreement with the following statements:

| | Strongly disagree (1) | Somewhat disagree (2) | Neither agree nor disagree (3) | Somewhat agree (4) | Strongly agree (5) |
|---|-----------------------|-----------------------|--------------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| I am able to maintain a healthy work-life balance in my current position. (Q10_1) | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| ALVSCE policies support flexibility in managing my work | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |

schedule.
(Q10_2)

I feel
comfortable
taking time
off when
needed
without
negative
consequences.
(Q10_3)

The
expectations
for after-
hours
availability
(e.g., emails,
meetings) are
reasonable.
(Q10_4)

My workload
allows me to
pursue
personal
interests and
family
commitments.
(Q10_5)

☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐☐

Page Break



Q11 Please indicate your level of agreement with the following statements:

| | Strongly disagree (6) | Somewhat disagree (7) | Neither agree nor disagree (8) | Somewhat agree (9) | Strongly agree (10) |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------------------|-----------------------|------------------------|
| There is a strong sense of collegiality within my department/unit. (1) | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| I have ample opportunities to collaborate with colleagues within my discipline. (12) | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| ALVSCE actively promotes interdisciplinary collaboration. (13) | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| I feel respected and valued by my colleagues. (14) | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| There are sufficient forums (e.g., seminars, workshops) for sharing ideas and research with colleagues. (15) | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |



Q12 Please indicate your level of agreement with the following statements:

Display This Choice:

If What is your primary appointment program, department, or school? = Cooperative Extension

Or What is your primary appointment program, department, or school? = Other

Display This Choice:

If What is your primary appointment program, department, or school? = Cooperative Extension

Or What is your primary appointment program, department, or school? = Other

Display This Choice:

If What is your primary appointment program, department, or school? = Cooperative Extension

Or What is your primary appointment program, department, or school? = Other

| | Strongly disagree (1) | Somewhat disagree (2) | Neither agree nor disagree (3) | Somewhat agree (4) | Strongly agree (5) |
|---|-----------------------|-----------------------|--------------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| ALVSCE leadership is effective in guiding the organization. (Q12_1) | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| ALVSCE policies and practices support my success as a faculty member. (Q12_2) | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| ALVSCE communicates important information to faculty effectively. (Q12_3) | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| <i>Display This Choice:</i> <i>If What is your primary appointment program, department, or school? = Cooperative Extension</i> <i>Or What is your primary appointment program, department, or school? = Other</i> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |

My unit's
(department or
school) leadership
is effective in
guiding our
school/department.
(Q12_4)

Display This Choice:

*If What is your
primary appointment
program, department,
or school? =
Cooperative Extension*

*Or What is your
primary appointment
program, department,
or school? = Other*

☐☐☐☐☐

My unit's
(department or
school) policies
and practices
support my
success as a
faculty member.
(Q12_5)

Display This Choice:

*If What is your
primary appointment
program, department,
or school? =
Cooperative Extension*

*Or What is your
primary appointment
program, department,
or school? = Other*

☐☐☐☐☐

My unit head
(department or
school)
communicates
important
information to
faculty effectively.
(Q12_6)

Page Break

Display This Question:

If What is your workload distribution for Fall 2024? Enter 10% as 10. Your total must be 100. [Research] > 0



Q13 Please indicate your level of agreement with the following statements:

| | Strongly disagree (1) | Somewhat disagree (2) | Neither agree nor disagree (3) | Somewhat agree (4) | Strongly agree (5) |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| I receive adequate support for seeking research grants. (Q13_1) | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| The grant management support provided by ALVSCE is sufficient. (Q13_2) | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| I have access to necessary resources for preparing competitive grant proposals. (Q13_3) | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| ALVSCE provides adequate training opportunities related to grant writing and management. (Q13_4) | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| I am satisfied with the level | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |

of internal
funding
opportunities
available for
research.
(Q13_5)

Display This Question:

If What is your workload distribution for Fall 2024? Enter 10% as 10. Your total must be 100. [Instruction] > 0



Q14 Please indicate your level of agreement with the following statements (1 = Strongly Disagree, 5 = Strongly Agree):

| | Strongly disagree (1) | Somewhat disagree (2) | Neither agree nor disagree (3) | Somewhat agree (4) | Strongly agree (5) |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| My teaching workload is appropriate. (Q14_1) | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| I have adequate time for developing and improving my courses. (Q14_2) | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| The compensation I receive for individual studies and independent research supervision is sufficient. (Q14_3) | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Course assignments | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |

in my unit are distributed fairly.
(Q14_4)

I have adequate teaching assistant (TA) and grading support for my courses.
(Q14_5)

In my unit, TA and grader support is fairly allocated.
(Q14_6)

☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐

End of Block: Work Environment and Resources

Start of Block: Budget Effects

Q15 Have you, your work, academic program, or research been negatively affected by the University of Arizona budget cuts?

- ☐ Yes (1)
- ☐ No (2)
- ☐ Not sure (3)

Display This Question:

If Have you, your work, academic program, or research been negatively affected by the University of... = Yes

Q16 Describe how the University of Arizona budget cuts negatively affected you, your work, academic program, or research?

End of Block: Budget Effects

Start of Block: Faculty Council Priorities



Q17 The ALVSCE Faculty Council has been tasked to formulate recommendations on how we can more efficiently manage and utilize resources to achieve greater effectiveness in carrying out ALVSCE's three-fold mission of teaching, research and extension. Rank order these Faculty Council work areas from most important (1) to least important (8).

- _____ Faculty Workload Policy (1)
 - _____ Faculty Wellbeing and Work-Life Balance (2)
 - _____ Safety and Security on Campus (3)
 - _____ ALVSCE Strategic Planning Priorities (4)
 - _____ ALVSCE Budget and Resource Allocation (5)
 - _____ Diversity, Equity & Inclusion (6)
 - _____ Supporting Faculty Collaboration (7)
 - _____ Annual Performance Reviews and Promotion Equity and Fairness (8)
-

Q18 Do you have any additional issues, challenges or opportunities that the Faculty Council should focus on?

End of Block: Faculty Council Priorities

Start of Block: Professional Development



Q19 Overall, how satisfied are you with your position at ALVSCE?

| | Extremely dissatisfied (1) | Somewhat dissatisfied (2) | Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied (3) | Somewhat satisfied (4) | Extremely satisfied (5) |
|--|----------------------------------|---------------------------------|---|---------------------------|----------------------------|
| How satisfied are you with your current position? (Q19_1) | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |

Q20 Are you considering leaving UArizona within the next two years?

- ☐ Yes (4)
- ☐ Maybe (5)
- ☐ No (6)
-

Page Break

Display This Question:

If Are you considering leaving UArizona within the next two years? != No

Q21 What are the primary reasons you might leave UArizona?

Q22 Is there anything else you would like to share about your experiences, needs, or suggestions for improvement?

End of Block: Professional Development
