Faculty Climate Survey 2020
Report
Executive Summary

Purpose
The 2020 Faculty Senate Climate Survey (FCS2020) focused on the general categories of the job performance of the university-wide officers, deans and chairs, and the general satisfaction of Faculty. The survey instrument was developed by the Faculty Senate's Climate Survey committee of the Faculty Governance Committee with the goal to continue to assess faculty perceptions regarding administration's overall performance, as well as to determine those issues or criteria that impact their evaluations before the COVID-19 pandemic. The FCS2020 was completely anonymous, and no personal or contact information was recorded.

This report summarizes survey results and serves as a source for the Senate’s Executive Committee agenda in meetings with the President and cabinet in 2020. The results are summarized numerically and without any interpretation, while the open-ended comments are summarized by themes to protect the anonymity of the respondents.

Methodology
The FCS2020 was conducted January 27-February 7, 2020. Of the 1,652 invitations sent to Faculty, 516 responses were received from tenure track, non-tenure track, and librarians (31% response rate). The instrument had five main content areas (performance of central administration, the President, the Provost, the Vice President for Research and Technology Transfer, the Vice President for Student Affairs and Enrollment Services, and the respective deans and department chairs). Further, respondents rated their levels of job satisfaction as faculty, and their satisfaction with their college and department. For faculty in the Katherine G. McGovern College of the Arts, College of Liberal Arts and Social Sciences and College of Technology, there was an additional section for the Faculty Senate's Dean's feedback Off-Cycle Review.
President's Approval Ratings
The majority of faculty (64%) approved to strongly approved of the President's job performance. The average was 2.6 on a 7-point scale, with 1 indicating strong approval, 7 indicating strong disapproval, and a midpoint of 4 for neither approve/nor disapprove.

Provost's Approval Ratings
Almost half of the faculty (48%) approved to strongly approved of the Provost's job performance. The average was 3.2 on a 7-point scale, with 1 indicating strong approval, 7 indicating strong disapproval, and a midpoint of 4 for neither approve/nor disapprove.

VP-Research and Technology Transfer's Approval Ratings
About half of the faculty (50%) indicated somewhat approval or above for the VP for Research and Technology Transfer's job performance. The average was 3.3 on a 7-point scale, with 1 indicating strong approval, 7 indicating strong disapproval, and a midpoint of 4 for neither approve/nor disapprove.

VP-Student Affairs and Enrollment Services
About 40% of the faculty indicated somewhat approval or above for the VP for Student Affairs and Enrollment Services' job performance. The average was 3.4 on a 7-point scale, with 1 indicating strong approval, 7 indicating strong disapproval, and a midpoint of 4 for neither approve/nor disapprove.

Deans' Approval Rating
Dean's approval ratings were, on average, similar to those of the University-wide officers (3.1 average rating on a 7-point scale). Differences emerged across colleges, particularly in Architecture, Liberal Arts and Social Sciences, NSM, Engineering, and Business, wherein averages were above the mean indicating somewhat dissatisfaction with dean performance. Conversely, HRM, Technology, Nursing, Medicine, and Social Work as a group were below the mean, indicating satisfaction with dean performance in these colleges.
Department Chairs' Approval Rating
Department chairs averaged the highest approval ratings (2.5 average rating on a 7-point scale), though significant variability was observed across colleges and departments. Department chairs in Architecture, Pharmacy, Arts, Technology, and Libraries tended to receive lower approval ratings than department chairs in Business, Education, Medicine, Optometry, and Liberal Arts and Social Sciences.

Faculty Members' Overall Satisfaction with the University of Houston as a Place to Work
About three-fourths of the faculty (73%) indicated at least being somewhat satisfied with the University of Houston as a place to work, with 14% indicating being very satisfied. The average was 3.0 on a 7-point scale, with 1 being very satisfied, 7 being very dissatisfied, and a midpoint of 4 for being neither satisfied/nor dissatisfied. Satisfaction ratings were highest in the areas of HRM, Social Work, Law, Education, and Medicine, and Arts, Architecture, NSM, Honors, and Business had lower satisfaction ratings.

Issues Facing the University of Houston
Faculty identified the competitiveness of faculty salaries, the growth of internal resources for research, the impact of long-term funding of the College of Medicine on other Colleges, the competitiveness of Graduate Tuition Fellowships, and a decrease of funding for Athletics as some of the most important issues facing the University of Houston today.
In regards to the working climate, Faculty perceptions seem to incidicate that the University of Houston is a supportive environment that celebrates student diversity and collegiality and professionalism among their colleagues. Both tenure track and non-tenure track (NTT) faculty expressed significant concerns about salary compression and pay equity between genders, ranks, and promotion, and these themes were especially apparent among NTT faculty. Respondents also indicated a lack of resources, especially in the humanities and social sciences, for achieving the 50-in-5 goals and perceived expectations of being asked to do “more with less.” Related to this theme, issues of staff turnover, lack competitive salaries and professional development for staff, lack of adequate support for graduate students, increasing red tape and bureaucracy, and lack of necessary infrastructure to conduct research and teaching were noted as hurdles that diminish faculty productivity. Regarding the administration, many faculty perceive that the leadership do not reflect the diversity of the student body and that there is not enough transparency of the budgetary practices and allocation of budgets to colleges and departments. Some faculty also noted increases in parking costs and the University’s support of athletics and the College of Medicine that contribute negatively to the working climate at the University.
Specific issues you would like to see the Faculty Senate address.

Areas that respondents would like Faculty Senate to focus on include streamlining administrative procedures (i.e., travel, procurement, IT, and APR), reducing red tape, increasing budget transparency and providing colleges and departments greater budgetary flexibility to increase research productivity. Faculty would also like the Faculty Senate to advocate for graduate student compensation and health insurance gaps and to increase the number and amount of internal grants for research. Other key issues include addressing parking costs, funding to athletics, and the funding mechanism for the College of Medicine. In terms of compensation (particularly merit and promotion increases), respondents would like the Senate to focus on pay equity, salary compression, and merit. For non-tenure track faculty, respondents indicated that they would like to see new policies that reflect a more equitable pay structure for workloads and for salary raises upon promotion.
Respondents highlighted student body diversity and how, over the years, the academic level of students has improved dramatically. There were also positive comments about the senior administration, namely the President, Provost, and Vice President for Research and Technology Transfer. Comments seemed to indicate a sentiment that even though UH can do more in terms of increasing its support for research and teaching, it has improved significantly in comparison to previous years. Initiatives spearheaded by the Faculty Engagement and Development office, as well as student success initiatives, were praised. UH’s branding strategy was also viewed positively, as it provides a more cohesive presentation of the University and was perceived as having a positive impact at local and national levels. Several comments also highlighted the construction of new buildings and the attention to improve and renovate an aging infrastructure.
Survey Participants by College

- BAUER: 4%
- COE: 7%
- CLASS: 24%
- COM: 2%
- NSM: 17%
- CON: 1%
- OPT: 5%
- PHARM: 3%
- TECH: 7%
- HRM: 2%
- EGR: 6%
- ARCH: 2%
- GCSW: 2%
- HOBBY: 0%
- HON: 2%
- KGMCA: 7%
- LAW: 3%
- LIB: 6%
Survey Participants by Rank

- Professor: 29%
- TT Associate Professor: 24%
- TT Track Assistant Professor: 13%
- NTT Research Full Professor: 0%
- NTT Research Associate Professor: 0%
- NTT Research Assistant: 2%
- NTT Clinical Full Professor: 2%
- NTT Clinical Associate Professor: 2%
- NTT Clinical Assistant Professor: 5%
- NTT Instructional Full Professor: 2%
- NTT Instructional Associate Professor: 3%
- NTT Instructional Assistant Professor: 8%
- Librarian: 0%
- Associate Librarian: 3%
- Assistant Librarian: 3%
- Lecturer: 2%
- Other: 2%
Survey Participants by years employed at the University

- Less than a year
- 1 to 5 years
- 6 to 10 years
- 11 to 15 years
- 16 to 20 years
- 21 to 25 years
- 26 to 30 years
- 31 to 35 years
- 36 to 40 years
- 41 to 45 years
- More than 50 years

Number of participants by years employed at the University:

- Less than a year: 0%
- 1 to 2 years: 1%
- 3 to 5 years: 2%
- 6 to 10 years: 3%
- 11 to 15 years: 4%
- 16 to 20 years: 5%
- 21 to 25 years: 6%
- 26 to 30 years: 7%
- More than 50 years: 0%
Issues

Decrease funding to Athletics

Funding of COM

Increase resources for research

Increase the diversity of the Faculty
Increase efficiency of APR Procedures

Administrative efficiency of hiring

Increase Faculty in new initiatives

Competitiveness of GTF
Faculty involvement in new policies

- Not at all imp.: 1%
- Slightly imp.: 8%
- Moderately imp.: 27%
- Very imp.: 36%
- Extremely imp.: 28%
Two Most Important Issues

#1 Issues

- Funding to Athletics: 29%
- Diversity of the Faculty: 16%
- Resources for research: 13%
- Improve the competitiveness of faculty salaries: 10%
- Improve efficiency of travel procedures: 3%
- Reduce parking costs: 2%
- Efficiency of purchasing procedures: 2%
- Efficiency of the APR: 3%
- Faculty involvement in new initiatives: 2%
- Faculty involvement in new policies: 3%
- Faculty involvement in new initiatives: 2%
- Faculty involvement in new policies: 3%
#2 Issues

- Funding to Athletics: 7%
- Funding of COM: 10%
- Resources for research: 12%
- Diversity of the Faculty: 15%
- Competitiveness of faculty salaries: 10%
- Reduce parking costs: 8%
- Efficiency of Level procedures: 5%
- Increase administrative efficiency of purchasing procedures: 3%
- Efficiency of hiring procedures: 4%
- Efficiency of APR: 4%
- Competitiveness of GTF: 10%
- Faculty involvement in new initiatives: 6%
- Faculty involvement in new policies: 5%
Resources for Teaching & Research, Compensation and Overall Satisfaction

Teaching requirement at the University of Houston?

- Very manageable: 24%
- Manageable: 43%
- Somewhat manageable: 14%
- Neither: 3%
- Somewhat unmanageable: 7%
- Unmanageable: 2%
- Very unmanageable: 1%
- Not applicable: 6%

How easy is it to obtain the resources that you need for teaching at the University of Houston?

- Very easy: 8%
- Easy: 22%
- Somewhat easy: 22%
- Neither easy nor difficult: 16%
- Somewhat difficult: 13%
- Difficult: 9%
- Very difficult: 4%
- Not applicable: 6%
How easy is it to obtain the resources that you need for research at the University of Houston?

- Very easy: 2%
- Easy: 5%
- Somewhat easy: 14%
- Neither easy nor difficult: 17%
- Somewhat difficult: 20%
- Difficult: 16%
- Very difficult: 12%
- Not applicable: 14%

Overall, how satisfied are you with the University of Houston as a place to work?

- Very satisfied: 14%
- Satisfied: 37%
- Somewhat satisfied: 22%
- Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied: 5%
- Somewhat dissatisfied: 12%
- Dissatisfied: 7%
- Very dissatisfied: 3%
Satisfaction with Senior Administration

How satisfied are you with the senior administration at this university?

Overall, do you approve of the way the President has handled her job?
Overall, do you approve of the way the **Provost** has handled her job?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly approve</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approve</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat approve</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither approve nor disapprove</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat disapprove</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disapprove</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disapprove</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall, do you approve of the way the **Vice President for Research** has handled his job?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly approve</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approve</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat approve</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither approve nor disapprove</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat disapprove</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disapprove</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disapprove</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Overall, do you approve of the way the **Vice President for Student Affairs and Enrollment Services** has handled his job?

![Bar chart showing approval levels]

- **Strongly approve**: 6%
- **Approve**: 25%
- **Somewhat approve**: 9%
- **Neither approve nor disapprove**: 50%
- **Somewhat disapprove**: 6%
- **Disapprove**: 3%
- **Strongly disapprove**: 2%
College Satisfaction

How satisfied are you with your senior administration at your College?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College</th>
<th>Very satisfied</th>
<th>Satisfied</th>
<th>Somewhat satisfied</th>
<th>Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied</th>
<th>Somewhat dissatisfied</th>
<th>Dissatisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BAUER</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COE</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLASS</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COM</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSM</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CON</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPT</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHARM</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TECH</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HRM</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EG</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARCH</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GCSW</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HON</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KGMCA</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAW</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIB</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key:
- Very satisfied
- Satisfied
- Somewhat satisfied
- Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied
- Somewhat dissatisfied
- Dissatisfied
- Very dissatisfied
Overall, do you approve of the way your **Dean** has handled their job?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Strongly approve</th>
<th>Approve</th>
<th>Somewhat approve</th>
<th>Neither approve nor disapprove</th>
<th>Somewhat disapprove</th>
<th>Disapprove</th>
<th>Strongly disapprove</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BAUER</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COE</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLASS</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>63%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSM</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CON</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPT</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHARM</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TECH</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HRM</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>44%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EGR</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td></td>
<td>15%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARCH</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td></td>
<td>25%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GCSW</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HON</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
<td>20%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KGMCA</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAW</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td></td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIB</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td></td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Strongly approve
- Approve
- Somewhat approve
- Neither approve nor disapprove
- Somewhat disapprove
- Disapprove
- Strongly disapprove
Departmental

How effectively are your talents being utilized by the department?

- Extremely effectively: 14%
- Very effectively: 30%
- Moderately effectively: 32%
- Slightly effectively: 12%
- Not effectively at all: 11%

How positive or negative are your interactions with other members of your department?

- Very positive: 31%
- Positive: 42%
- Somewhat positive: 12%
- Neither positive nor negative: 7%
- Somewhat negative: 4%
- Negative: 2%
- Very negative: 1%
How valued do you feel your input and opinions are by department leaders?

- Extremely valued: 22%
- Very valued: 30%
- Moderately valued: 23%
- Slightly valued: 15%
- Not valued at all: 10%

Overall, do you approve or disapprove of the way your Department Chair has handled their job?

- Strongly approve: 38%
- Approve: 27%
- Somewhat approve: 13%
- Neither approve nor disapprove: 8%
- Somewhat disapprove: 5%
- Disapprove: 3%
- Strongly disapprove: 6%
Appendix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Variance</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Decrease funding to Athletics</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>477</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact of long term funding of the College of Medicine on other Colleges</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>474</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase the internal resources for research</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>476</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase the diversity of the Faculty</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>474</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve the competitiveness of faculty salaries</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>479</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduce parking costs</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>477</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase administrative efficiency of travel procedures</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>477</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase administrative efficiency of purchasing procedures</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>474</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase administrative efficiency of hiring procedures</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>472</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase efficiency of the Annual Performance Review procedures</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>473</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase the competitiveness of Graduate Tuition Fellowships</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>474</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase Faculty involvement in new initiatives</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>476</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase Faculty involvement in new policies</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>474</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field</td>
<td>Min</td>
<td>Max</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Standard Deviation</td>
<td>Variance</td>
<td>Responses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How manageable or unmanageable is your teaching requirement at the University of Houston?</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>476</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall, how satisfied or dissatisfied are you with the University of Houston as a place to work?</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>477</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How satisfied or dissatisfied are you with the senior administration at this university?</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>477</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field</td>
<td>Min</td>
<td>Max</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Standard Deviation</td>
<td>Variance</td>
<td>Responses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall, do you approve or disapprove of the way the President has handled her job?</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>474</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall, do you approve or disapprove of the way the Provost has handled her job?</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>474</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall, do you approve or disapprove of the way the Vice President for Research has handled his job?</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>468</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field</td>
<td>Min</td>
<td>Max</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Standard Deviation</td>
<td>Variance</td>
<td>Responses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall, do you approve or disapprove of the way the Vice President for Student Affairs and Enrollment Services has handled his job?</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>452</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How satisfied or dissatisfied are you with the senior administration at your College?</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>467</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall, do you approve or disapprove of the way your Dean has handled their job?</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>466</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field</td>
<td>Min</td>
<td>Max</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Standard Deviation</td>
<td>Variance</td>
<td>Responses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How effectively are your talents being utilized by the department?</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>469</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How positive or negative are your interactions with other members of your department?</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>468</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How valued do you feel your input and opinions are by department leaders?</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>468</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall, do you approve or disapprove of the way your Department Chair has handled their job?</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>460</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>