FACULTY OPINION & SATISFACTION SURVEY

Conducted November 2013

In response to multiple requests by Montana Tech faculty members, the Faculty Senate decided to revive the Faculty Opinion and Satisfaction survey. In November 2013, the survey was distributed to two faculty groups. Group 1 included the instructional faculty in the College of Letters, Sciences and Professional Studies; Highlands College; and the School of Mines and Engineering. Group 2 included faculty at the Montana Bureau of Mines and Geology; the Library; Athletics; and other faculty not directly affiliated with LSPS, Highlands College or SME. Adjunct faculty members were not invited to participate in this survey; the omission was strictly due to the difficulty in obtaining a complete and accurate adjunct faculty roster.

A total of 168 surveys were issued; 133 to Group 1 faculty and 35 to Group 2 faculty. The Group 1 and Group 2 response rates were 41% and 46%, respectively. Similar to student course evaluations, a numerical value was calculated for the response to each statement according to the following scale:

> 5 – Strongly agree
> 4 – Agree
> 3 – Neutral or no opinion
> 2 – Disagree
> 1 – Strongly disagree.

Weighted responses were calculated for the Group 1, Group 2 and the combined faculty responses. With the following exceptions, the overall averages of all questions were between 3.0 and 4.0.

- Question 26 concerning the library averaged 4.36,
- Question 27 concerning administrative support averaged 4.01
- Question 9 concerning Tech's research environment averaged 2.77
- Tech's website (question 29) and Moodle (question 28) averaged 2.87 and 2.88, respectively,
- Tech's strategy for attaining institutional goals (question 5) averaged 2.99.

Faculty members were provided the opportunity to comment on most questions. The comments were predominantly negative. Abbreviated comments are included in this report. However, the reports to Chancellor Blackketter and to President Engstrom contain the complete set of unedited comments. Additionally, unedited comments will be sent to the relevant administrators, department heads, or directors to which the individual questions pertain.

1. **Please identify your affiliation:**

	Group 1, %	Group 2, %
o College of Letters, Sciences and Professional Studies	44.4	12.5
o Highlands College	9.3	0
o Montana Bureau of Mines and Geology	0	81.3
o School of Mines and Engineering	46.3	0
o Other or not affiliated with a college or the MBMG	0	6.3

2. **What is your current faculty rank?**

	Group 1, %	Group 2, %
o Tenure track or instructional faculty	96.2	18.7
o Other	3.8	81.3

3. **What is your status in regard to tenure?**

	Group 1, %	Group 2, %
o Tenured	49.1	12.5
o Tenure-track	41.5	0
o Non tenure-track	9.4	87.5

4. **A clear and consistent vision of the values, goals and future direction of the institution has been articulated.**

	Group 1, %	Group 2, %	Combined, %
o Strongly agree	13.0	0	10.0
o Agree	40.7	43.8	41.4
o Neutral or no opinion	20.4	31.3	22.9
o Disagree	14.8	18.8	15.7
o Strongly Disagree	11.1	6.3	10.0
Weighted Response:	**3.30**	**3.13**	**3.26**

17 comments: 2 positive, 11 negative and 4 mixed

Abbreviated comments:
- Clear vision has been articulated
- Implementation of plan is just starting
- Values and goals are articulated but no action has occurred
- Core values are muddle
- Chancellor preaches "research" but non-researchers are hired
- Only goal is to grow the number of students
- Engineering ideals are being forced on other departments
- Unrealistic PhD expectations
- Mission statement doesn't state mission
- No goals and realistic plans to achieve
- Administration is paralyzed
- Goals are vague and there is no clear plan on how to achieve them
- Lack of knowledge about history of Tech
- No direction from administration
- Strategic plan not helpful
- Strategic plan not followed

- Asked to connect with students to retain students, and to do more research is contradictory
- Current obligations are not recognized or appreciated

5. A strategy for attaining institutional goals has been established.

	Group 1, %	Group 2, %	Combined,%
o Strongly agree	5.6	0	4.3
o Agree	40.7	37.5	40.0
o Neutral or no opinion	16.7	25.0	18.6
o Disagree	22.2	31.3	24.3
o Strongly Disagree	14.8	6.3	12.9
Weighted Response:	**3.00**	**2.94**	**2.99**

11 comments: 1 positive, 8 negative and 2 mixed

Abbreviated comments:
- Yes, it has
- Several goals regarding student numbers have been articulated
- Not well articulated - this appeared in several comments
- Told to get money for research but no institutional support
- No realistic plan for research space, parking, money to attract the type of faculty we want
- We are losing current faculty
- Poor leadership
- Administration mandates rather working together

6. I am provided opportunities to be meaningfully involved in institutional planning.

	Group 1, %	Group 2, %	Combined, %
o Strongly agree	16.7	0	12.9
o Agree	35.2	50.0	38.6
o Neutral or no opinion	16.7	37.5	21.4
o Disagree	22.2	6.3	18.6
o Strongly Disagree	9.3	6.3	8.6
Weighted Response:	**3.28**	**3.31**	**3.29**

7 comments: 0 positive, 7 negative and 0 mixed

Abbreviated comments:
- Decisions are handed down without consideration of faculty input
- Chancellor needs to listen to faculty rather than deans and other administrators
- Faculty concerns are not taken seriously
- Few opportunities to be involved, no communication
- Faculty get lab equipment but no space for it nor technical staff to run the equipment
- No shared governance
- Top down approach with no buy-in from faculty
- Chancellor relies on incompetent management team

7. **Attention to the educational mission of the institution is adequate.**

	Group 1, %	Group 2, %	Combined, %
Strongly agree	7.8	0	6.0
Agree	35.3	31.3	34.3
Neutral or no opinion	17.6	43.8	23.9
Disagree	27.5	18.8	25.4
Strongly Disagree	11.8	6.3	10.4
Weighted Response:	**3.00**	**3.00**	**3.00**

10 comments: 0 positive, 9 negative and 1 mixed

Abbreviated comments:
- Higher minimum expectations for students should be set
- As more faculty time is spent on research education will suffer
- Natural resource side of campus, aside from Petroleum, is being ignored
- Leadership needs to change
- Chancellor and Vice Chancellor of Research are poor fits for Tech, Provost is out of his league and it appears that Vice Chancellor of Administration and Finances is running the school
- Departments like Chemistry are being told to dumb down their courses
- Lust for high enrollment leads to admitting unprepared students
- Faculty who hold high standards are fired
- Some programs are embarrassingly weak academically
- Move towards research institution requires respect for faculty and staff
- Emphasis on sports is troubling
- Emphasis on quantity not quality
- No testing center for FE exam

8. **I feel appropriately involved in decisions that relate to academic programs.**

	Group 1, %	Group 2, %	Combined, %
Strongly agree	13.2	0	10.1
Agree	45.3	6.3	36.2
Neutral or no opinion	9.4	75.0	24.6
Disagree	22.6	6.3	18.8
Strongly Disagree	9.4	12.5	10.1
Weighted Response:	**3.30**	**2.75**	**3.17**

8 comments: 1 positive, 6 negative and 1 mixed

Abbreviated comments:
- Yes in School of Mines and Engineering
- No ability to influence departmental standards
- No discussion of breakup between civil and mechanical engineering
- Senate needs to be wary when critical items are being discussed
- Dictation rather than shared governance
- Faculty left out of the loop, most recently in the design of the freshmen engineering program
- Very top down management
- Pressure to lower credit limit from 136 to 120 despite alumni and employer disapproval

9. **The environment is conducive to the development and sustenance of a research program and scholarly activities at the institution.**

	Group 1, %	Group 2, %	Combined, %
o Strongly agree	5.7	0	4.3
o Agree	26.4	50.0	31.9
o Neutral or no opinion	20.8	6.3	17.4
o Disagree	26.4	37.5	29.0
o Strongly Disagree	20.8	6.3	17.4
Weighted Response:	**2.70**	**3.00**	**2.77**

14 comments: 2 positive, 11 negative and 1 mixed

Abbreviated comments:
- Improving
- Environment is conducive to do research but too little time is given to do it
- Very challenging place to conduct research
- Teaching and administrative loads are too high to establish effective research
- Real science and technological research is nearly impossible
- Publishing/research is valued but not supported
- Too narrow view of what research is
- Space is not found for the equipment which is necessary to do research
- Too many Montana Tech graduates are hired as faculty and this limits cross pollination of ideas
- Chancellor delegates authority without proper oversight, management team has no experience with writing grants and managing research work
- More teaching staff is needed to allow for research

10. **The administration accords faculty the dignity and respect that they deserve as professionals.**

	Group 1, %	Group 2, %	Combined, %
o Strongly agree	20.8	6.3	17.4
o Agree	35.8	43.8	37.7
o Neutral or no opinion	5.7	12.5	7.2
o Disagree	13.2	25.0	15.9
o Strongly Disagree	24.5	12.5	21.7
Weighted Response:	**3.15**	**3.06**	**3.13**

12 comments: 1 positive, 9 negative and 2 mixed

Abbreviated comments:
- Yes
- Administration treats faculty with too much respect
- Mutual respect is needed between faculty and administration
- Chancellor does but the middle management doesn't
- Respect is better at Highlands than on north campus
- Unprofessional atmosphere
- Chancellor thinks like a dean
- Faculty are not treated professionally
- Effort to fire tenured faculty over trivial matters is worrisome
- Contract management is poor and several faculty are forced to work without contracts

- Administration does not respect faculty time
- Administration promotes punishment over collegiality and teamwork
- Administration has no respect for faculty
- High turnover of young faculty is indicative of lack of respect
- Bureau is treated as second class citizen

11. I feel free to openly express my concerns and opinions without fear of repercussion.

	Group 1, %	Group 2, %	Combined, %
o Strongly agree	24.5	0	18.8
o Agree	28.3	56.3	34.8
o Neutral or no opinion	17.0	18.8	17.4
o Disagree	9.4	18.8	11.6
o Strongly Disagree	20.8	6.3	17.4
Weighted Response:	**3.26**	**3.25**	**3.26**

6 comments: 0 positive, 6 negative and 0 mixed

Abbreviated comments:
- Constructive criticism is not welcomed
- Threats have been made for expressing legitimate concerns
- There is a history of punishing faculty who don't "toe the line"
- There is a campaign of repression against faculty and union leaders
- The bullying training last year indicates that the answer is no
- Someone from UM should visit and judge this issue and it is likely that some changes would result

12. The administration communicates openly about important matters.

	Group 1, %	Group 2, %	Combined, %
o Strongly agree	13.2	6.3	11.6
o Agree	26.4	31.3	27.5
o Neutral or no opinion	24.5	43.8	29.0
o Disagree	20.8	12.5	18.8
o Strongly Disagree	15.1	6.3	13.0
Weighted Response:	**3.02**	**3.19**	**3.06**

6 comments: 0 positive, 5 negative and 1 mixed

Abbreviated comments:
- Communication is more open at Highlands College than on the north campus
- Faculty communicate to administration but the administration doesn't communicate to faculty
- Communication is unilateral
- Administration only communicates about "safe" matters
- Why are dean's council meetings not advertised for faculty to attend?
- The lack of a recent "State of Foundation" report is one example of lack of communication

13. The Faculty Senate adequately represents faculty interests.

	Group 1, %	Group 2, %	Combined, %
○ Strongly agree	14.8	0	11.4
○ Agree	35.2	31.3	34.3
○ Neutral or no opinion	37.0	62.5	42.9
○ Disagree	13.0	6.3	11.4
○ Strongly Disagree	0	0	0
Weighted Response:	**3.52**	**3.25**	**3.46**

9 comments: 1 positive, 4 negative and 4 mixed

Abbreviated comments:
- Greatly improved the representation but the Senate is still unable to respond forcefully and in a timely manner
- Hopefully it will evolve to a more powerful entity on campus
- Senate is empowered but lacks time to be effective
- Release time is needed for senators
- Tenured faculty need to be on the senate
- The VCAA effectively neutered accurate representation of the faculty
- Published minutes need to be available
- Why no more faculty meetings?

14. The Chancellor is effective in fundraising, managing and utilizing financial resources.

	Group 1, %	Group 2, %	Combined, %
○ Strongly agree	9.3	6.3	8.6
○ Agree	29.6	31.3	30.0
○ Neutral or no opinion	51.9	43.8	50.0
○ Disagree	3.7	12.5	5.7
○ Strongly Disagree	5.6	6.3	5.7
Weighted Response:	**3.33**	**3.19**	**3.30**

8 comments: 0 positive, 7 negative and 1 mixed

Abbreviated comments:
- Lack of reporting hinders judgment
- No financial report from Foundation
- No readable report of campus finances
- No funds raised for academic programs
- Salaries are not competitive
- Adjunct pay particularly low
- Boondoggle trips
- Lack of fundraising skills
- Majority of funds go to athletics
- Who was watching CAMP?
- Chancellor should teach one class per semester

15. The Chancellor effectively manages, provides leadership and coordinates campus activities.

	Group 1, %	Group 2, %	Combined, %
o Strongly agree	9.4	6.3	8.7
o Agree	37.7	43.8	39.1
o Neutral or no opinion	34.0	25.0	31.9
o Disagree	5.7	12.5	7.2
o Strongly Disagree	13.2	12.5	13.0
Weighted Response:	**3.25**	**3.19**	**3.23**

9 comments: 0 positive, 9 negative and 0 mixed

Abbreviated comments:
- Has needed skills but should start over with a clean house
- Not a strong or natural leader
- Delegates too much
- Leaves management to incompetent subordinates who are hostile to faculty
- No direction or leadership
- Tech needs leadership by example not mandates
- Absent, disengaged, too bureaucratic
- Only interested in sports and putting signs up on campus
- Need a computer center for FE exam
- Many departments need more faculty and positions not posted

16. The Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs effectively serves as the Chief Academic Officer for Montana Tech, provides academic leadership, institutional integrity, campus representation to external constituencies, management of the campus degree portfolio, budget planning and fiscal management, staffing, student affairs, and faculty development.

	Group 1, %	Group 2, %	Combined, %
o Strongly agree	16.7	13.3	15.9
o Agree	31.5	20.0	29.0
o Neutral or no opinion	18.5	46.7	24.6
o Disagree	13.0	6.7	11.6
o Strongly Disagree	20.4	13.3	18.8
Weighted Response:	**3.11**	**3.13**	**3.12**

12 comments: 2 positive, 8 negative and 2 mixed

Abbreviated comments:
- Responsive to faculty
- Pro-faculty development
- Good response on academic issues
- No leadership, not a role model, not academic
- Not an effective faculty advocate
- Faculty development begins with Provost but Provost lacks research experience
- Lack of research leadership
- Lacking experience beyond Montana Tech
- Lack of academic training

- Cronyism
- Should be replaced

17. The Vice Chancellor of Research and Dean of the Graduate School effectively sets a climate that enables excellence and growth in research and creative scholarship.

	Group 1, %	Group 2, %	Combined, %
o Strongly agree	22.6	6.3	29.0
o Agree	26.4	0	24.6
o Neutral or no opinion	32.1	37.5	31.9
o Disagree	7.5	43.8	5.8
o Strongly Disagree	11.3	12.5	8.7
Weighted Response:	**3.42**	**2.44**	**3.19**

15 comments: 6 positive, 6 negative and 3 mixed

Abbreviated comments:
- Most qualified of the administrators
- Does a good job
- Good addition to Tech
- Motivated and inclusive
- Has reinvigorated research on campus
- Seeks out research opportunities
- Helpful in preparing applications
- New perspective
- Better than previous
- Needs to reach out
- Rude, bully, doesn't listen to input
- Graduate schools need better administration
- Selective in who she helps
- Lacks vision
- Ignores history of natural resources
- Not good for Tech
- Slow in dealing with personal issues
- Lack of independence from Chancellor
- Who responsible for loss of CAMP?
- Faculty have no space to do research

18. The Vice Chancellor of Development and University Relations/President of the Montana Tech Foundation (VCDUR) effectively serves as head of the campus' fundraising arm, leads the offices of Alumni Affairs, Career Services and Public Relations, and markets the university to generate interest in and raise the profile of its programs, faculty and students.

	Group 1, %	Group 2, %	Combined, %
o Strongly agree	11.1	6.7	18.6
o Agree	31.5	13.3	31.4
o Neutral or no opinion	48.1	53.3	41.4
o Disagree	5.6	13.3	5.7
o Strongly Disagree	3.7	13.3	2.9
Weighted Response:	**3.41**	**2.87**	**3.29**

9 comments: 1 positive, 7 negative and 1 mixed

Abbreviated comments:
- Enthusiastic
- Does a good job
- Seems to care about the university
- Does well for athletics but not academics
- Needs to do more funding for non-engineering programs
- Too much emphasis on athletics
- Little communication
- Financial reports, both current and historical, are needed, similar to how they used to be given
- Foundation should be audited
- Clueless

19. **The Dean/ Director of my college/organizational unit makes her/his expectations clear and actively solicits faculty input.**

	Group 1, %	Group 2, %	Combined, %
o Strongly agree	18.5	50.0	15.7
o Agree	31.5	18.8	31.4
o Neutral or no opinion	25.9	31.3	24.3
o Disagree	9.3	0	12.9
o Strongly Disagree	14.8	0	15.7
Weighted Response:	**3.30**	**4.19**	**3.50**

8 comments: 3 positive, 4 negative and 1 mixed

Abbreviated comments:
- Expectations are clear
- Updates occur frequently and are well attended
- Solicits faculty input
- Good effort communicating changes and effort
- Communicates somewhat but more is needed
- Difficult to know dean's expectations
- Follow their own agenda without seeking input
- Protocols are ignored
- Too entrenched in their positions
- Should advocate for faculty more
- Decisions and long range plans are made without input
- Very top-down, no meetings with department heads or faculty
- Consideration should be given to holding another vote for restructuring

20. The Dean/Director of my college/organizational unit is fair, consistent and reasonable.

	Group 1, %	Group 2, %	Combined, %
o Strongly agree	18.5	43.8	24.3
o Agree	42.6	31.3	40.0
o Neutral or no opinion	11.1	18.8	12.9
o Disagree	13.0	6.3	11.4
o Strongly Disagree	14.8	0	11.4
Weighted Response:	**3.37**	**4.13**	**3.54**

9 comments: 1 positive, 6 negative and 2 mixed

Abbreviated comments:
- Open to disagreements
- Fair and reasonable but not always consistent
- Inconsistent in communicating with faculty
- Inconsistent, plays favorites and mistreats others
- Degrees of difference in departments must be acknowledged
- Deans are ridge and micro mange
- Slow in dealing with personnel issues
- Inadequate communication with faculty makes his leadership ineffectual
- Slow rate at which women are advanced is worrisome
- Deans should not serve for life terms
- Deans should be recruited nationally

21. The criteria used to make faculty promotion and tenure decisions are clear and consistent, and the evaluation, promotion and tenure processes are fair.

	Group 1, %	Group 2, %	Combined, %
o Strongly agree	9.4	6.3	8.7
o Agree	41.5	31.3	39.1
o Neutral or no opinion	20.8	18.8	20.3
o Disagree	17.0	25.0	18.8
o Strongly Disagree	11.3	18.8	13.0
Weighted Response:	**3.21**	**2.81**	**3.12**

19 comments: 2 positive, 15 negative and 2 mixed

Abbreviated comments:
- Criteria is consistent and processes are fair
- New standards help makes them clear and consistent
- Clear but the administration misses deadlines and often does not follow the rules Pressure on departments to raise standards is worrisome
- Management's job is to promote talent
- Faculty should not be required to apply for tenure
- Needs work due to different workloads and expectations
- Criteria are fair but raises that go along with promotions are not
- Expectations are higher for new faculty
- Salaries are inconsistent
- Promotions are inconsistent

- Professionals who teach should be eligible for tenure
- Inconsistencies in department standards is worrisome
- Too much variance between departments
- Schedules and criteria for tenure and promotion need to be sent to faculty on a regular basis
- Bias against union-friendly professors
- Cliquish, quality falls behind politics
- Cronyism and interferences by administrators

22. Laboratory and/or research space are adequate for my teaching and research needs.

	Group 1, %	Group 2, %	Combined, %
o Strongly agree	7.5	6.3	7.2
o Agree	52.8	68.8	56.5
o Neutral or no opinion	20.8	6.3	17.4
o Disagree	15.1	12.5	14.5
o Strongly Disagree	3.8	6.3	4.3
Weighted Response:	**3.45**	**3.56**	**3.48**

8 comments: 0 positive, 5 negative and 3 mixed

Abbreviated comments:
- Updates are needed
- Space is not used consistently
- Departments should raise their own money for space
- No plan for expansion of space
- Inadequate, highly inadequate

23. Classroom and laboratory maintenance and audio-visual systems in the classrooms are adequate.

	Group 1, %	Group 2, %	Combined, %
o Strongly agree	18.5	0	14.3
o Agree	46.3	43.8	45.7
o Neutral or no opinion	14.8	56.3	24.3
o Disagree	16.7	0	12.9
o Strongly Disagree	3.7	0	2.9
Weighted Response:	**3.59**	**3.44**	**3.56**

5 comments: 0 positive, 3 negative and 2 mixed

Abbreviated comments:
- Classroom have adequate IT and projectors
- Need more staff and money
- Inconsistent computer operations
- Heating in older buildings is Taught in a classroom where projector di
- IT person in our department is incompetent

24. The availability and quality of technology support (IT) are adequate.

	Group 1, %	Group 2, %	Combined, %
o Strongly agree	17.0	18.8	17.4
o Agree	32.1	56.3	37.7
o Neutral or no opinion	7.5	12.5	8.7
o Disagree	34.0	12.5	29.0
o Strongly Disagree	9.4	0	7.2
Weighted Response:	**3.13**	**3.81**	**3.29**

14 comments: 3 positive, 7 negative and 3 mixed

Abbreviated comments:
- They are the best and help me with my online class
- More investment in IT is needed
- Some are good others difficult to get ahold of
- Technicians do lab and desktop support erratically
- IT is woefully understaffed, response time is slow
- Staff is underpaid, overworked and generally slow
- Web site is poor
- Worst department on campus

25. At the department level, clerical/administrative support and assistance are adequate.

	Group 1, %	Group 2, %	Combined, %
o Strongly agree	50.0	18.8	42.9
o Agree	27.8	56.3	34.3
o Neutral or no opinion	7.4	18.8	10.0
o Disagree	7.4	6.3	7.1
o Strongly Disagree	7.4	0	5.7
Weighted Response:	**4.06**	**3.88**	**4.01**

5 comments: 2 positive, 2 negative and 1 mixed

Abbreviated comments:
- High quality of work
- They are the best and help me with my online class
- More than adequate
- Inconsistent support across campus
- They are under staffed and under paid

26. The availability and quality of library service (helpfulness of staff, hours of operation, etc.) and the availability and quality of library resources (journals, databases, etc.) are adequate.

	Group 1, %	Group 2, %	Combined, %
o Strongly agree	52.8	31.3	47.8
o Agree	41.5	50.0	43.5
o Neutral or no opinion	3.8	12.5	5.8
o Disagree	1.9	6.3	2.9
o Strongly Disagree	0	0	0
Weighted Response:	**4.45**	**4.06**	**4.36**

7 comments: 2 positive, 0 negative and 5 mixed

Abbreviated comments:
- Staff is great, amazing, bright spot
- Staff is eager to assist
- Responsive to our needs
- More hours would be helpful
- New computers are needed
- Make the library a higher priority
- Library expansion needs to be implemented

27. The bookstore provides adequate quality of service.

	Group 1, %	Group 2, %	Combined, %
o Strongly agree	35.2	18.8	31.4
o Agree	42.6	50.0	44.3
o Neutral or no opinion	18.5	18.8	18.6
o Disagree	1.9	6.3	2.9
o Strongly Disagree	1.9	6.3	2.9
Weighted Response:	**4.07**	**3.69**	**3.99**

9 comments: 3 positive, 5 negative and 1 mixed

Abbreviated comments:
- Excellent, friendly and professional service
- Provide good support to faculty and staff
- Lori has brought it back to life
- Enlarged space is better
- Orders are often messed up
- Book order forms were not properly distributed last semeseter
- Tech logo clothing is expensive
- Threatening letters are not helpful
- Obsolete

28. The course management system (Moodle 2) is useful.

	Group 1, %	Group 2, %	Combined, %
o Strongly agree	5.6	0	4.3
o Agree	33.3	6.7	27.5
o Neutral or no opinion	24.1	80.0	36.2
o Disagree	20.4	0	15.9
o Strongly Disagree	16.7	13.3	15.9
Weighted Response:	**2.91**	**2.80**	**2.88**

12 comments: 0 positive, 9 negative and 3 mixed

Abbreviated comments:
- Allows faculty and students to communicate
- Improved since its beginnings
- Blackboard and Moodle 1 were better
- Cumbersome, slow and not intuitive
- Old technology, poorly implemented

- Embarrassing, out of date, non-windows compliant software
- Not managed well
- Help desk is not helpful
- Students don't like it, complain that it is difficult to use
- No way to make material appear on a specific date
- Hate it, dysfunctional
- Moodle is terrible, should be called "muddle"

29. The Montana Tech web site is useful.

	Group 1, %	Group 2, %	Combined, %
o Strongly agree	9.3	0	7.1
o Agree	31.5	37.5	32.9
o Neutral or no opinion	20.4	6.3	17.1
o Disagree	24.1	31.3	25.7
o Strongly Disagree	14.8	25.0	17.1
Weighted Response:	**2.96**	**2.56**	**2.87**

12 comments: 1 positive, 12 negative and 5 mixed

Abbreviated comments:
- Remote email access is good
- Useful for faculty needs but possibly not for students
- Communicates little about engineering and science programs
- Contains little faculty information on research or courses
- Classified section would be helpful
- Full time web master is needed
- Course catalog is not useful
- No good way for department and faculty to design their own pages
- Poorly managed
- Hard to navigate
- Loaded with inaccurate and misleading information
- Should be updated more frequently
- Hard to find items
- Too many crashes
- Student complain about navigating to forms
- Needs an extreme over haul
- Dismal, painful, embarrassment, cumbersome
- Tech has lost potential faculty because of it

30. The office of Enrollment Services provides adequate quality of service.

	Group 1, %	Group 2, %	Combined, %
o Strongly agree	35.8	18.8	31.9
o Agree	41.5	0	31.9
o Neutral or no opinion	9.4	75.0	24.6
o Disagree	9.4	0	7.2
o Strongly Disagree	3.8	6.3	4.3
Weighted Response:	**3.96**	**3.25**	**3.80**

12 comments: 3 positive, 4 negative and 5 mixed

Abbreviated comments:
- Always helpful and professional
- Quality has improved
- Overworked and under staffed
- Better information is needed on class schedules
- Tours and events require faculty members to do what should be their job
- Hard to get hold of staff, should answer phones more regularly
- Considerable student complaints
- Many mistakes in course pre-requisites and other course features

31. The Registrar's office provides adequate quality of service.

	Group 1, %	Group 2, %	Combined, %
○ Strongly agree	35.8	18.8	31.9
○ Agree	41.5	6.3	33.3
○ Neutral or no opinion	13.2	62.5	24.6
○ Disagree	7.5	6.3	7.2
○ Strongly Disagree	1.9	6.3	2.9
Weighted Response:	**4.02**	**3.25**	**3.84**

6 comments: 1 positive, 1 negative and 4 mixed

Abbreviated comments:
- Very helpful
- Good when they can be reached
- Overworked and understaffed
- Intra-staff communication problems
- Confusion over advising versus registration issues
- Changes submitted are not always made

32. The office of Human Resources provides adequate quality of service.

	Group 1, %	Group 2, %	Combined, %
○ Strongly agree	17.0	12.5	15.9
○ Agree	47.2	12.5	39.1
○ Neutral or no opinion	26.4	31.3	27.5
○ Disagree	5.7	31.3	11.6
○ Strongly Disagree	3.8	12.5	5.8
Weighted Response:	**3.68**	**2.81**	**3.48**

9 comments: 0 positive, 8 negative and 1 mixed

Abbreviated comments:
- Frequent staff changes make it hard to know who to contact
- Payroll issues
- Contracts not getting out in a timely manor
- Unfair to faculty
- Respond too slowly

- Bully
- Terrible customer service
- Never return phone calls or email

33. The Public Relations office provides adequate quality of service.

	Group 1, %	Group 2, %	Combined, %
o Strongly agree	22.2	6.3	18.6
o Agree	35.2	18.8	31.4
o Neutral or no opinion	33.3	56.3	38.6
o Disagree	9.3	12.5	10.0
o Strongly Disagree	0	6.3	1.4
Weighted Response:	**3.70**	**3.06**	**3.56**

5 comments: 0 positive, 4 negative and 1 mixed

Abbreviated comments:
- Helpful for photo opportunities and newsletters
- Web site needs to be improved
- Biased towards athletics
- Academic achievements need to be stressed

34. Building and grounds maintenance is adequate.

	Group 1, %	Group 2, %	Combined, %
o Strongly agree	20.8	6.3	17.4
o Agree	43.4	56.3	46.4
o Neutral or no opinion	17.0	0	13.0
o Disagree	15.1	25.0	17.4
o Strongly Disagree	3.8	12.5	5.8
Weighted Response:	**3.62**	**3.19**	**3.52**

17 comments: 3 positive, 7 negative and 7 mixed

Abbreviated comments:
- Facilities does an excellent job
- Campus looks much better
- Vastly improved, getting better
- Sidewalks are needed
- Understaffed and under paid
- Lack of proper equipment to keep buildings clear
- Campuses could be more visually appealing
- NRB doesn't have grounds finished
- More ice control is needed
- Slow

35. The institution takes reasonable steps to provide a safe and secure campus.

		Group 1, %	Group 2, %	Combined, %
o	Strongly agree	20.4	18.8	20.0
o	Agree	55.6	56.3	55.7
o	Neutral or no opinion	16.7	6.3	14.3
o	Disagree	7.4	12.5	8.6
o	Strongly Disagree	0	6.3	1.4
	Weighted Response:	**3.89**	**3.69**	**3.84**

7 comments: 1 positive, 3 negative and 3 mixed

Abbreviated comments:
- Secure from violence
- Vastly improved with new security company
- Key card access should be included in every new building and remodel
- Need sidewalk along Granite street
- Need improved lighting
- Snow removal is improved but could be better
- Little security

36. The institution makes a concerted effort to create a welcoming and fair environment for employees.

		Group 1, %	Group 2, %	Combined, %
o	Strongly agree	16.7	18.8	17.1
o	Agree	40.7	31.3	38.6
o	Neutral or no opinion	18.5	31.3	21.4
o	Disagree	16.7	12.5	15.7
o	Strongly Disagree	7.4	6.3	7.1
	Weighted Response:	**3.43**	**3.44**	**3.43**

7 comments: 0 positive, 6 negative and 1 mixed

Abbreviated comments:
- Welcomed and helped by colleagues, not by administration
- Unhappy workers
- Workers underpaid
- Cronyism and nepotism
- Parking tickets issued on Christmas Eve and New Year's!

37. This survey captured my level of satisfaction adequately.

		Group 1, %	Group 2, %	Combined, %
o	Strongly agree	16.7	0	12.9
o	Agree	61.1	62.5	61.4
o	Neutral or no opinion	20.4	25.0	21.4
o	Disagree	1.9	12.5	4.3
o	Strongly Disagree	0	0	0
	Weighted Response:	**3.93**	**3.50**	**3.83**

8 comments: 0 positive, 2 negative and 6 mixed

Abbreviated comments:
- Need a question on how to cut costs for students
- Upper level management needs to be evaluated
- Minimum required education level should be instituted for all administrative positions
- More information on finances, fundraising and priorities is needed
- Evaluation of Vice Chancellor for Administration and Finance is needed
- Too much separation and non-interaction, need to work together
- Faculty input is not sought or needed

38. What is the most positive aspect of working at this institution?

Group 1:

- Love my job.
- Living in Butte.
- Working with dedicated colleagues.
- Working in Montana
- UG Teaching/Small Classes
- I work with a great team of faculty.
- Great co-workers
- Working in a small class room environment
- Working with students who are interested and engaged in the learning process.
- a welcoming and collaborative environment.
- a few good students and faculty
- Working with a great group of faculty and staff.
- teaching oportunities
- Good relationships with my colleagues
- Good students
- Always Moving Forward
- Faculty and Staff team with a lot of potential.
- Interacting with students
- The institutional reputation
- No answer.
- My department is collegial and supportive
- My dept and colleagues are professional
- A relatively small and congenial working environment all the way from the physical pant to the Chancellor.
- Working with the students and faculty
- location and people
- My colleagues and the good students who are willing to work.
- In general, a nice work atmosphere.
- colleagues and the students
- Lots! The student focus, the wonderful location, great coworkers, etc.
- it is in montana.
- small ratio of faculty to students
- Friendly, open people to work with and the quality of students.
- The students.
- Students

- The students and my colleagues
- Reputation for excellence
- Strong focused leadership with an open mind, creative freedom
- The people in my department
- The students
- Interactions with colleagues and students.
- It is still a rigorous and good engineering school
- Working with students that are involved in their learning, and helping them mature in their fields of study
- Students
- The dean of the nursing program and the director of the nursing program. The beautiful building we are in and all the up to date equipment. We get wonderful support from enrollment service and from the CT support desk. This is a great place to work!!
- Working with well qualified staff and leadership.
- The students
- The collegiality and collaboration among people in my department
- The students
- students
- Small college, getting to know and work with faculty in diverse disciplines.
- the people I work with
- The Students.
- I enjoy my own research and teaching activites.
- Supportive department and university colleagues
- The students

Group 2:

- The challenges of the job.
- The students
- Nice facilities and opportunities without the hassle of a large campus. Great people at MBMG, and those I know outside MBMG.
- colleagues
- The people. Tech has a WONDERFUL diversity of talent, and a friendly, open and communicative staff. The students want to be here and they work hard, they're an absolute pleasure to work with.
- I find the people, no matter what department, by and large are dedicated, easy to work with, and friendly.
- Provides great working/research opportunities.
- Lots of opportunity to grow professionally. Beautiful campus and surroundings.
- the view from just about anywhere on campus.
- The people
- The educational environment is a positive force in my work and interactions with others.
- people
- THe potential to conduct positive and quality research for addressing concerns and issues within the state, from individula concerns to legislative law-making.
- The nature of my work, and a friendly work environment.
- Small institution.
- Small, personal setting with good credentials.

- It's a small welcoming
- The type of work I get to do and the people I work directly with, access to the library and their staff
- The opportunity to work with dedicated colleagues with widely diverse backgrounds and interests

39. Describe the area or situation that needs the most improvement at this institution.

Group 2:

- Human resource assistance, guidance. Also realizing that there are many different job types and attention to all positions needs to be made.
- The administration needs to start respecting the faculty and staff. The administration needs to foster a positive work environment where people are paid adequately and treated as professionals and not as people who should feel fortunate that they have a job and are lucky to work for Tech.
- maybe salary inequities
- food service
- Administration and Finance needs some serious attention with an eye towards "bullying" the faculty and staff.
- The library.
- increase salaries.
- Too relaxed. Things need to get done faster.
- we need to raise the level of intellectual discourse on campus for students, staff and faculty. Faculty should not require personal invitations to attend research talks on campus, and students should be encouraged to attend and participate.
- More faculty and more staff
- I like the small campus the way it is -- the best improvement that comes to mind would be to have Highlands College closer -- but that might be beyond realistic financial expectations.
- Pay
- A more cohesive interaction and support between administration, faculty, and departments. A sense of pride building. THe old "my way or the Highway" attitude has distanced many staff from one another. A common and rewarding purpose to allow this campus to excel would be great.
- Pay scales! Current pay scales are far from competitive. Pay needs to generally increase if Tech wants to recruit quality faculty.
- Leadership
- I think students' evaluations of faculty should carry a much stronger weight
- Interaction with personnel during job searches
- Leadership needs to treat faculty as colleagues rather than mere employees--respect their perspectives, listen to them, and help them achieve their goals

Group 1:

- Inter-campus equalilty
- Overworked faculty and staff seems to be reducing moral for many. Reducing turnover in all areas should be another priority.
- More involvement and communication from administration.
- Change Department Heads to a 4 year term
- Academic quality could be higher/Low expectations for minimum student performance
- The appeal of the physical grounds.

- Work-load reduction, research opportunities, competitive pay
- More technical support
- Too much bureaucracy. Insufficient emphasis on the quality of the education that students receive.
- CTShelp, IT, and Moodle.
- Middle management...VCs, and Deans with real experience.
- Has the institution considered a Parking Garage on Campus?
- tenure
- quality of administrators
- Faculty Salary
- More funding
- Changes are needed in the Administration.
- Many faculty do not pull their own weight.
- open and respectful communication with N campus honchos and hanchas.
- Some of the administrators need to be replaced.
- Some departments feel they have lower priority than other departments
- the administration
- Dealing with difficult personnel issues.
- Need more lab facilities
- balance in teaching and research.
- Top administrators need to be replaced to end the climate of bullying and intimidation on campus.
- Heal the contentious relationship between faculty and admin. Faculty need to feel valued.
- fair and equitable salaries
- The website, and more interaction across departments would be nice...also more support of the fine arts would make this place great. Analog schools like NM Tech have a performing arts series, music classes, etc.
- better IT support, and scrap the tenure system.
- support for scholarly research
- Just keep moving forward, don't slack off.
- If research is required for tenure then better oppurtunities for success at this should be noted. For example the hours of teaching should be decreased if research is being completed.
- Administrative credibility and leadership
- Student Involvement
- Open communication
- Recruiting new students, web page
- Updating old buildings/classrooms to provide adequate temperature control and uncrowded seating for students.
- Student support
- Building maintenance and janitorial services.
- Lack of suitable and enough lab and research space. Why are we even getting money for athletics when we need research and lab space?
- Increase focus on high quality and challenging education; reduce class sizes and increase availability of GTA support
- I think all faculty and staff give 100% and when improvements need to get done, they do.
- Some cleanliness issues in hallways, restrooms, etc. This issues could use some improvement.
- Administration / faculty treatment
- Hidden agendas from top administration.

- Shared governance
- Administration
- Library
- LEADERSHIP. The Chancellor still deserves a chance, but he is doomed to fail with his incompetent management team. Clean house. You would think that Tech has tenure for administrators.
- support for faculty not in the union
- Swimming Pool.
- We only have one VC with a PhD and that is the only person who does a good job. We need to replace all the VC's except research and find people who can do the job.
- Lack of leadership from many administrators. Lack of respect shown to faculty and staff
- Library