

# **Experiences With and Impressions of Scholarly and Creative Engagement at GVSU**

## **General Overview**

We are extremely grateful to everyone that has assisted with this project. We are especially thankful to our faculty colleagues that took time out of their busy schedules to complete this in-depth survey and engage with us on this topic. We are hopeful this report will foster constructive dialog among faculty and administration about the role scholarly and creative activity should play in the professional lives of faculty, the academic lives of students, and GVSU's interactions with the broader community.

### **Project Goals**

The current project had three goals:

- 1) To better understand the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on faculty scholarship at GVSU.
- 2) To gather insights from faculty regarding ways University administrators and offices can assist faculty in their scholarly endeavors.
- 3) To systematically measure faculty perceptions of the value of scholarship at GVSU.

While CSCE and related offices solicit feedback from faculty regarding their funding programs and policies/procedures, feedback is often sought and provided on an informal level and solicited primarily from faculty that participate in CSCE programs and funding mechanisms. Thus, this survey represents a more formal, systematic, and wider-ranging assessment of faculty experiences and impressions.

Readers, please note: The core of the report that follows is organized into sections based on these three goals and the corresponding survey questions. We recognize this document is long and detailed, so we created several features to aid readers. First, this document includes headings and bookmarks to aid with navigation; most PDF readers display a bookmarks feature on the left side of the screen. Second, Summary and Synthesis sections are included to highlight key points from the data. Third, quantitative data is summarized in tables that are referenced throughout the document and displayed at the end of the document. Fourth, a separate executive summary document highlights prevalent themes that emerged from the survey.

### **Project Personnel**

The survey upon which this report is based was created by Kristy Dean (Professor of Psychology) and Susan Mendoza (Director, CUSE), with feedback from Robert Smart (Director, CSCE) and CSCE office directors. The survey was sent to Christopher Plouff (Interim Provost) for feedback and approval; however, none was provided. Consequently, the survey was not distributed by CSCE directly, but on behalf of two Faculty Governance committees - Research & Development (R&D) and the Undergraduate Research Council (URC).

This report was written by Kristy Dean and Autumn Chorney (GVSU Honors Psychology major). Members of R&D and URC reviewed and provided feedback on drafts of this report and the executive summary. Kristy Dean and Autumn Chorney completed all data coding and analysis. A special thanks to Dr. Rachel Campbell (Assoc. Professor of Sociology), who provided some resources for qualitative data coding and analysis using MAXQDA.

### **Methodology and Data Analytic Approach**

The CSCE survey was advertised via email on November 4, 2021. This email was

## **Experiences With and Impressions of Scholarly and Creative Engagement at GVSU**

disseminated to all tenure-track faculty at GVSU, which according to Institutional Analysis includes 853 faculty. A total of 359 faculty members completed some portion of the survey, which reflects a response rate of 42.1%. Of these respondents, 284 completed the entire survey (adjusted response rate of 33.3%). The survey was administered via Qualtrics and was available from Thursday, November 4th, 2022 to Thursday, November 25<sup>th</sup>, 2022.

The survey included both quantitative and qualitative questions to assess our topics of interest. The quantitative data was analyzed using SPSS software. The qualitative data was analyzed using a thematic analysis approach (Braun & Clarke, 2006) and MAXQDA software. In general, this process involved 1) repeated reading of responses to each open-ended question and note-taking on repetitive themes by both Dr. Dean and Autumn Chorney independently, 2) discussion of identified themes, which then resulted in 3) the creation of codes and code descriptions that reflect these themes. At this point, 4) Dean and Chorney independently coded the same sample of responses, typically 20% of available responses, 4) calculated interrater reliability, and 5) discussed and reconciled any inconsistencies in understanding and use of the codes, and revised relevant codes and descriptors. After the coding scheme was finalized, 6) Dean and Chorney coded different halves of the responses. The current report combines analytic narrative and illustrative extracts, in the faculty respondents' own words, to describe important and informative patterns in respondents' qualitative comments. Please note that all reports of percentages provided in-text are rounded to the nearest tenth of a percent.

The current project is not considered "research" since it was not designed to develop or contribute to generalizable knowledge (see IRB Policy 210). Regardless, we adhered to IRB guidance throughout the course of this project. We consulted with the Office of Research Compliance and Integrity staff when designing this survey and embedding it within Qualtrics, and took care to follow IRB guidelines for the ethical collection and storage of this data (see IRB Policies 730 and 740, IRB Guidance G-16). The personnel with access to the data – Dr. Kristy Dean, Autumn Chorney – have completed all research ethics and human subjects training that is mandated for researchers at GVSU (CITI Training; see IRB Policy 310).

No personal identifiers (e.g., names, birthdates, IP addresses) were collected in the survey. Demographic data was collected to examine how representative our sample of respondents is relative to the population of GVSU faculty (see discussion below). Given the relatively small sample size, we recognize that it is technically possible, though logistically onerous, to identify individual respondents using a combination of multiple demographic descriptors. To ensure the privacy of this data, only Dr. Dean has access to the original data file, which is stored in accordance with IRB standards for Level 3 data (see IRB Policy 730). Excerpted responses included in this report either included no personal identifiers, or we redacted them. To be clear, the project personnel and CSCE have no desire to identify individual respondents and believe that doing so runs counter to GVSU's firmly held ethical standards and subverts the work we are attempting to do with this project.

### **Background Information about Survey Respondents**

We collected general demographic information from our survey respondents for two reasons. First, information about respondent rank, college, and department can provide CSCE with a more nuanced understanding of faculty needs and assist with identifying gaps or discrepancies in their funding structures. Scholars working in different fields, utilizing different

## Experiences With and Impressions of Scholarly and Creative Engagement at GVSU

methods, sometimes require different types of resources which may or may not be captured by CSCE's current funding mechanisms. Second, collecting demographic information allows us to determine whether our sample of respondents is representative of the broader GVSU faculty population. A representative sample more accurately reflects the thoughts, feelings, and concerns of the larger group and increases confidence that the results reflect the larger GVSU faculty community, rather than the voices of self-selected or especially outspoken individuals and groups. Stated another way, data from a representative sample is more difficult to diminish or dismiss.

### Representativeness of Faculty Sample Relative to GVSU Faculty Population

A total of 444 tenure-track faculty accessed the Qualtrics survey, although 85 did not proceed farther than the initial instructions screen. A total of 359 respondents completed some portion of the survey. More specifically, almost 64% of people who accessed the survey ( $N = 284$ ) completed the entire survey. That said, every respondent did not answer every question. Consequently, the number of respondents differs across the various survey questions discussed below. Table 1 displays the following demographic data from the survey and from Institutional Analysis records from the 2021-2022 academic year: 1) College affiliation, 2) professional rank, 3) gender identification, 4) ethnicity, and 6) age. For comparison purposes, the data from Institutional Analysis describes tenure-track faculty only<sup>1</sup> since this was the population of focus for this survey.

In terms of college affiliation, Brooks College of Interdisciplinary Studies (BCOIS) was slightly oversampled (6.8%) relative to the population (3.6%), as was the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences (CLAS; 57.9% vs. 53.8%). Padnos College of Engineering and Computing (PCEC) was slightly under-sampled relative to the population (6.8% vs. 8.4%), as was Seidman College of Business (6.0% vs. 8.1%). The largest discrepancy was around 4% (for CLAS). Regarding professional rank at GVSU, full professors were slightly oversampled (41.8%) relative to the population (37.7%), and assistant professors were slightly under-sampled (19.1% vs. 22.5%). Again, the largest discrepancy was only a 4% difference (for full professors).

Regarding gender identification, women were slightly oversampled (49.7%) relative to the population (47.5%), whereas men were slightly under-sampled (49.2% vs. 52.5%). The data collected for ethnic identification shows that White faculty were oversampled (86.5%) relative to the population (79.5%), and relative to some faculty of color: Asian and Pacific Islanders (6.7% vs. 10.8%) and Black and African Americans (1.7% vs. 3.6%). White faculty were oversampled by 7%, the largest discrepancy in the data set. Age range data was collected in this survey but was not available on the Institutional Analysis website.

Overall, the survey sample was sufficiently similar to the population of tenure-track faculty at GVSU. Although there were instances of over- and under-sampling, sampled values were often within 4 percentage points of population values, and are thus considered small. The largest difference – a 7% oversampling of White faculty – should be kept in mind when interpreting the data in this report, especially if/when issues of equity are explicitly voiced or implied.

### Faculty Characterization of Their Scholarship

Additional questions in the demographics section of the survey asked about the types of scholarly activity in which faculty are engaged at GVSU. These data are represented in Table 2. As we know, and these data reflect, a single faculty member can engage in various types of

## Experiences With and Impressions of Scholarly and Creative Engagement at GVSU

scholarship and utilize various methodologies/approaches. The data shows that the majority of faculty describe their scholarship as primarily involving discovery (74.2%) and application (51.6%). Both qualitative (67.5%) and quantitative methods (60.1%) are frequently used in scholarly inquiry.

Notably, 9.6% of faculty respondents utilized the “other methods” options, and write-in responses highlight an oversight in our creation of this question: the absence of language applicable to the creative arts and humanities fields. Respondents described artistic endeavors that are studio-based (e.g., “I paint in the studio and do field research for the work”), presented in gallery settings (e.g., “exploring ways to express ideas and concepts through video installation”), and generally emphasize that “Not all of us, particularly those in the performing arts, regularly engage in any of the forms of scholarship listed here.” Others describe their work as involving “hermeneutical methods”, “literary analysis”, and “historical research”. One faculty described their work as “reading and interpreting texts, arguments, and positions”. Others describe work involving textbook authorship, case studies, synthesis of existing research, systematic reviews, community partners, needs assessments, and big data analysis, among other approaches. This information is an important reminder that the professional lives of GVSU faculty are indeed diverse, and the language “scholarship”, although intended to be broad, may not sufficiently capture or appreciate the creative activity performed by our faculty.

### Faculty Reports of Time Devoted to Teaching, Scholarship, and Service

In the demographics section of the survey, respondents were asked two questions regarding the time they devote to their workload at GVSU. The “average workload question” stated, “Please consider the time you devote to teaching, scholarship, and service during an average week, in a normal academic year. What percentage of your time is devoted to each?” The “ideal workload question” was phrased similarly, but instead asked about “the time you would ideally like to devote” to these activities “if you had ultimate autonomy”.

A total of 262 respondents completed all three parts of the average workload question; 261 respondents completed all three parts of the ideal workload question. Although the questions were worded to request responses in percentage format, only 194 (74%) and 197 (75.5%) respondents provided responses that added up to around 100 for the average and ideal workload questions, respectively. The remaining 68 (for average workload, 26%) and 64 (for ideal workload, 24.5%) respondents interpreted the questions differently, referring to hours worked per week. Consequently, the data from these two samples of participants will be analyzed separately, although as you will see they yield similar findings.

Among those participants offering percentage responses, the mean scores for the average workload question were as follows: teaching ( $M = 63.1\%$ ,  $SD = 16.7\%$ ), scholarship ( $M = 16.2\%$ ,  $SD = 12.5\%$ ), and service ( $M = 21.2\%$ ,  $SD = 14.2\%$ ), with the total percentage time worked per week averaging to 100.5% ( $SD = 3.8\%$ ). That is, respondents are reporting that during an average week in an average academic year, most - over 3/5ths - of their time is devoted to teaching, with service and then scholarship as distant 2nd and 3rd priorities, respectively. By comparison, the mean scores for the ideal workload question were as follows: teaching ( $M = 52.3\%$ ,  $SD = 13.6\%$ ), scholarship ( $M = 32.5\%$ ,  $SD = 12.9\%$ ), and service ( $M = 15.1\%$ ,  $SD = 8.9\%$ ), with the total percentage time worked in an ideal week averaging to 100.0% ( $SD = 1.3\%$ ). This data suggests that when considering their ideal workload under autonomous conditions, respondents would prioritize time toward teaching first, scholarship second, and service third.

Paired samples t-tests were conducted to examine whether there is a significant difference

## Experiences With and Impressions of Scholarly and Creative Engagement at GVSU

between faculty reports of their actual and ideal workload estimates. Results show that faculty would ideally prefer to spend significantly less time on teaching,  $t(191) = 10.54, p < .001, d = .72$ , significantly more time on scholarly/creative activity,  $t(191) = -19.34, p < .001, d = 1.29$ , and significantly less time on service,  $t(191) = 6.94, p < .001, d = .52$ . Examining the total percentage values, the results show that faculty would ideally prefer an overall reduction in workload,  $t(191) = 1.98, p = .049, d = .21$ .

Among those participants that reported their workload in hours per week, the mean scores for the average workload question were as follows: teaching ( $M = 29.23$  hours,  $SD = 10.57$ ), scholarship ( $M = 8.15$  hours,  $SD = 6.98$ ), and service ( $M = 11.17$  hours,  $SD = 7.65$ ), with the total hours worked per week averaging to 48.96 ( $SD = 10.82$ ). That is, respondents are again reporting that, during an average week in an average academic year, most - 3/5th - of their time is devoted to teaching, with service and then scholarship as distant 2nd and 3rd priorities, respectively. By comparison, the mean scores for the ideal workload question were as follows: teaching ( $M = 23.27$  hours,  $SD = 7.31$ ), scholarship ( $M = 13.75$  hours,  $SD = 5.14$ ), and service ( $M = 6.72$  hours,  $SD = 4.59$ ), with the total hours worked in an ideal week averaging to 43.73 ( $SD = 6.95$ ). This data suggests that respondents, when considering their ideal workload under autonomous conditions, are prioritizing time toward teaching first, scholarship second, and service third.

Again, paired samples t-tests were conducted to examine whether there is a significant difference between faculty reports of their actual and ideal workload estimates, this time on the hours worked per week data. These results are similar to those reported above: faculty would ideally prefer to spend significantly less time on teaching,  $t(63) = 6.47, p < .001, d = .67$ , significantly more time on scholarly and creative activity,  $t(63) = -6.83, p < .001, d = .89$ , and significantly less time on service,  $t(63) = 6.36, p < .001, d = .75$ . Examining the total hours worked per week, the results show that faculty would ideally prefer an overall reduction in workload, around 5 hours less than their actual workload, although this is notably still above the 40 hours/per week “standard”,  $t(63) = 6.42, p < .001, d = .59$ .

In sum, despite respondents interpreting these questions differently - in terms of percentage of time vs. hours worked per week - the results are similar. Respondents report that their actual workload prioritizes teaching, which consumes around 60% of their time, after which time is allocated to service then scholarship, in that order. When considering their ideal workload, respondents still report that the majority of their efforts would be devoted to teaching, although this would instead consume around 52-53% of their time, which represents an approximate 6-8 hours less time per week. Additionally, the ideal workload would increase the time devoted to scholarship (around 5-6 more hours/week), and decrease the time devoted to service (around 4 fewer hours/week). Overall, faculty are reporting working more than the “standard” 40 hours per week, and report that even under ideal conditions, hours per week would still be above this standard expectation.

## The Impact of COVID-19 on Scholarly/Creative Activity at GVSU

### Faculty Descriptions of Impact

The first question in this section of the survey stated: “Please describe how the COVID-19 pandemic period (beginning March 2020) has impacted your scholarship.”<sup>2</sup> A total of 339 respondents answered this open-ended question. Of primary interest, responses were coded to assess 1) the general impact of the pandemic on scholarship. That is, did the pandemic have a

## Experiences With and Impressions of Scholarly and Creative Engagement at GVSU

negative, positive, mixed, or no impact on scholarship? Additionally, responses were coded to assess 2) the specific ways in which the pandemic affected faculty scholarship.

### *General Impact of COVID-19 Pandemic on Scholarly/Creative Activity*

Respondents report that the COVID-19 pandemic impacted their scholarship negatively ( $n = 287$ , 84.7%), positively ( $n = 13$ , 3.8%), both positively and negatively ( $n = 17$ , 5.0%), or had little to no impact ( $n = 22$ , 6.5%). Interrater reliability for these codes was high, Kappa > .90 (Brennan & Prediger, 1981). This data shows that the COVID-19 pandemic period was largely experienced by faculty as a hindrance to their scholarly/creative endeavors.

### *Specific Ways The COVID-19 Pandemic Affected Scholarly/Creative Activity*

Responses were coded as reflecting the following themes: 1) time for scholarship; 2) funding for scholarship; 3) access to resources (which includes mention of COVID-19-related restrictions limiting or complicating access); 4) access to collaborators; 5) recognition/value of scholarship; 6) compliance obligations; 7) mental/physical health concerns; 8) personal/family obligations; 9) resiliency (e.g., accommodations made to one's scholarship due to the pandemic-related limitations). The paragraphs that follow describe each theme in order of most to least frequently mentioned, describe the basis for coding each theme, and provide example responses to illustrate each theme. See Table 3 for a summary of theme frequencies.

**Time for Scholarship.** This theme was noted by 182 respondents (53.7%). Responses were coded as reflecting this theme if they generally and explicitly referenced the amount of time for scholarship or specifically identified some variable as influencing the time devoted to scholarship. Most respondents that referred to time discussed having limited time for scholarship during the COVID-19 pandemic. Specifically, 162 (89%) responses that were coded as reflecting the “time” theme also described the pandemic as having a negative effect on scholarship. By contrast, fewer respondents referencing time reported the pandemic as having a mixed impact ( $n = 9$ , 4.9%), no impact ( $n = 4$ , 2.2%), or a positive impact ( $n = 7$ , 3.8%) on their scholarship.

The most mentioned factor influencing time was teaching responsibilities ( $n = 112$ , 61.5%); this includes the time demands of transitioning to online instruction, and the University mandate to teach extra courses during the 2020-2021 academic year. One respondent stated, “The increased teaching loads that were implemented for the 2020-2021 had a tremendous impact on my ability to devote time to scholarship; four courses, most of which were completely different course preps is untenable.” By comparison, 8 respondents (4.4%) referred to increased service or administrative demands, which included departmental, college, or University level service activities, Unit head responsibilities, or any general reference to “service” that was related to University functioning. Twenty-one respondents (11.5%) referred to both teaching and service demands on their time. 12 (6.6%) respondents referenced personal demands involving childcare responsibilities. One respondent stated, “I have a young child...who has presented myriad challenges to working from home. Most of my work can only occur (with proper focus and concentration) after my daughter has gone to bed for the night.” The remaining responses regarding time constraints were general and did not identify the factors that limited time ( $n = 22$ , 12.1%; e.g., “increased workload related to the pandemic”, “the other institutional demands placed on me”) or described having more time as a consequence of the transition online ( $n = 13$ , 7.1%).

**Access to Resources.** This theme was noted by 130 respondents (38.3%). Responses were coded as reflecting this theme if they explicitly referred to limited or complicated access to

## Experiences With and Impressions of Scholarly and Creative Engagement at GVSU

resources used to perform and/or disseminate scholarly activities. This includes space (e.g., laboratories, archives, data collection sites, etc.), equipment, and other supplies used for scholarship, human subjects, and conferences, many of which were canceled or transitioned online. Because access to these resources was directly related to stay-at-home guidance or overall safety restrictions, any references to such guidance/restrictions was also included in this theme. Lack of access to spaces or necessarily materials ( $n = 59, 45.4\%$ ) was a common sub-theme. Respondents described their lack of access to lab spaces, libraries/archives, and field sites, including health and education settings, as well as technology and other resources located in those spaces. One respondent stated, “It was impossible to get into the lab with students for a while so research was slowed down considerably.” Another sub-theme involved travel; 46 respondents (35.4%) described the pandemic’s impact on their ability to travel to conduct scholarship, or its impact on their ability to disseminate scholarship, primarily through conference attendance. For example, one faculty member stated that the pandemic, “killed my plans to travel to archives in [country redacted] where I collect data for my research”; many other responses reflect the sentiment that they “...missed out on opportunities to interact with peers as conferences that would have resulted in new projects.” Notably, a few ( $n = 7$ ) respondents stated that conference attendance was either equally or more accessible to them with the shift to virtual forums. A final sub-theme involved limitations on the recruitment of human subjects, mentioned by 29 respondents (22.3%).

**Concerns about Mental and/or Physical Health.** This theme was noted by 43 respondents (12.7%). Responses were coded as reflecting this theme if they explicitly referenced concerns about mental or physical health, or used related language that speaks to the cognitive, emotional, or motivational effects of the pandemic (e.g., “stressed”, “burnout”, “limited bandwidth”, “challenging to feel inspired”, “mental energy”). Almost all respondents described their own challenges with and concerns about managing mental and physical health ( $n = 39, 90.7\%$ ), although several also describe the difficulties of supporting the health of others ( $n = 16, 37.2\%$ ). Twelve respondents (27.9%) reflected on both their health and the health of others. One faculty noted, “Many people--students, staff, and faculty--are experiencing the aftereffects of months of stress, concerns, and personal loss within the pandemic. We may be back in the classroom, but things are not back to normal. This challenges one's investment in scholarship with respect to cognitive load, concentration, available time, etc.” Another stated, “The pandemic impacted my scholarship due to the fact that I had to balance a WFH situation with two children who were also virtual. The mental load of every decision and working full time as a professor, a scholar, and a homeschooler was overwhelming.” As one faculty stated, “Trauma and research don’t mesh well.”

**Scholarly Resilience.** Due to the stress and restriction of the pandemic, several faculty reported adapting their scholarship agendas to accommodate these constraints. This theme was noted by 43 respondents (12.7%). Some respondents ( $n = 14, 32.6\%$ ) describe shifting their attention to a different phase of the scholarly/creative process, like discontinuing data collection and focusing on analysis, writing, or study design. Respondents also discussed the need to pursue different topics because of the constraints of the pandemic ( $n = 11, 25.6\%$ ). For example, one faculty stated that the pandemic, “forced me to redirect all of my plans and start from scratch on new research”; another stated, “I forayed into different types of research which I found fruitful and meaningful.” The third sub-theme that emerged involved transitioning data collection or dissemination methods from in-person to online ( $n = 14, 32.6\%$ ). It is important to note that while some respondents described these adjustments as having some type of “silver lining” that

## Experiences With and Impressions of Scholarly and Creative Engagement at GVSU

ultimately offered them some benefit, others characterized these adjustments as unsatisfactory compromises and expressed concerns about the quality and validity of their scholarly products as a consequence.

**Access to Collaborators.** This theme was noted by 40 respondents (11.8%). Responses were coded as reflecting this theme if they explicitly referred to interacting with collaborators or changes in the nature or degree of scholarly collaborations. Most of these responses ( $n = 32$ , 80%) emphasized that access to collaborators was limited. Respondents referred to canceled travel plans to meet with collaborators, the “inability to engage with community partners in healthcare, schools”, “the added strain on my schedule to mentor undergrad students”, and “difficulty collaborating with coauthors at other universities who sometimes faced greater pandemic-related constraints on their research time.” Some faculty respondents report sentiments like the following: “My research program lost its momentum and its ability to efficiently transfer knowledge from trained members to new members.” Many faculty respondents described impediments to their collaborations with undergraduate or graduate student collaborators ( $n = 18$ ). One respondent stated, “Increased workload (4 courses and creating online courses) has made it very difficult to provide quality mentoring to research students, which includes meeting time and time to review student's data and writing.”

**Funding for Scholarship.** This theme was noted by 29 respondents (8.6%). Responses reflected this theme if they described how the pandemic affected their access to or use of GVSU-provided professional development funds, sabbatical funds, or federal grants. Responses regarding professional development funds cited reductions and or general lack of funds. For example, one faculty member stated that “the lack of professional development funds for online workshops or conferences” negatively impacted their scholarly engagement. Those with federal grants described having to delay or revise their scholarship to keep their funding; others described the pandemic as limiting the time available to write grant applications. Several faculty described delayed and canceled sabbaticals and having to revise their sabbatical plans because of the delay.

**Personal or Family Obligations.** This theme was noted by 22 respondents (6.5%). Responses were coded as reflecting this theme if they describe the pandemic as impacting the scale or scope of personal or family responsibilities, thus reducing the overall time devoted to scholarly/creative activities. The following statement by one faculty member reflects a key sentiment in these responses: “I have increased competing demands for my time and increasing blurriness between work/life boundaries and balance” due to COVID-related work-from-home transition. More specifically, several respondents referenced interruptions to childcare, school closures, and the difficulties of focusing on work while attending to children at home and overseeing their online schooling. For example, one faculty said, “Most of my work can only occur (with proper focus and concentration) after my daughter has gone to bed for the night.” Other faculty describe the need to care for sick or quarantined family members, spouse's unemployment, and generally taking on more household tasks given business closures.

**Recognition and/or Valuation of Scholarship.** This theme was noted by 8 respondents (2.4%). Responses were coded as reflecting this theme if the respondent described decreased interest or engagement in scholarship due to the COVID-19 pandemic and/or the University's response to it. For example, one respondent stated, “The pandemic really caused me to re-evaluate the worth of doing my scholarly activity in the summer as unpaid labor vs. the worth of resting, spending time with my family, etc....Essentially coming face to face with mass mortality has made me want more of life outside of work. If GVSU wants to support my scholarship they



## Experiences With and Impressions of Scholarly and Creative Engagement at GVSU

can reduce teaching loads & service work to create time for it.” Another respondent said, “The pandemic has led me to reassess my career and relationship with scholarship. It has exposed the longstanding discrepancy between how faculty and administration view the role of scholarship at this university.”

**Compliance Obligations.** This theme was noted by 6 respondents (1.8%). Responses were coded as reflecting this theme if they explicitly attributed the pandemic’s impact on their scholarship to GVSU or other institutional changes to health or safety policies or procedures. Most respondents ( $n = 4$ , 60%) referred to changes in IRB policies regarding in-person interactions with subjects, however “CDC precautions” and new policies/procedures regarding travel reimbursement were also mentioned.

### Barriers Hindering Ability to Return to Usual Pace of Scholarly/Creative Activity

Respondents were posed the following question: “If you paused or slowed your scholarship, which of the following do you perceive as barriers to returning to your usual pace?” Ten potential barriers were listed, and respondents indicated their responses as “yes” or “no”. The survey also included a text box to allow respondents the opportunity to describe their thoughts and experiences regarding each barrier. The barriers were 1) Time/existing workload, 2) funding, 3) access to supplies, equipment, and/or space, 4) access to collaborators and/or student research assistants, 5) access to human subjects, 6) recognition in the personnel process, 7) degree of value placed on scholarship, 8) training needs, 9) compliance obligations, 10) uncertainty about available internal supports, and 11) an “other” write-in option.

A total of 344 respondents answered this question by marking a response for at least one of the listed barriers. Of those respondents, 333 (96.8%) marked “yes” to at least one of the listed barriers, and 11 (3.2%) marked “no” for all listed barriers. Examined another way, of the 358 respondents that responded to some portion of this survey, 333 (93%) reported perceiving at least one barrier hindering their return to their usual pace of scholarly activity.

When considering perceptions for each barrier separately, it is important to note that respondents did not mark a response for every barrier listed. This means that the sample size for each barrier will differ. Additionally, only some respondents opted to expand on their “yes” or “no” response with an open-ended description. Please refer to Table 4 for a summary of the quantitative data. The most frequently mentioned barriers - identified by 20% or more of respondents - are discussed in more detail below.

### *Lack of Time*

Lack of time was the most frequently reported barrier to returning to one’s usual pace of scholarly activity, reported by 296 respondents, 86.8% of the sample responding to this question. Respondents who provided open-ended descriptions of their experience ( $n = 141$ ) emphasized several themes, beginning with the challenges of teaching online and supporting students. For example, one respondent commented that “the commitments to flexible teaching (custom deadlines, individual student care) and the extra work involving technology (posting notes, making materials accessible for remote learning/students missing for illness)” consumed their time. Another states that, “The time required to teach a normal 9-credit load has increased by 30-50%. The extra time devoted to making many different types of student accommodations has severely impacted the time available for research.” Many faculty cited the University mandated shift in teaching workload during the 2020-2021 academic year, referring to “teaching load increases”, “extra teaching”, 4-4 and 4-3 course loads, and teaching “overloads” limiting their

## Experiences With and Impressions of Scholarly and Creative Engagement at GVSU

time for scholarship. Other faculty emphasized the difficulties of balancing work and personal obligations. For example: “More domestic work, more cooking, more schooling, more supervision of children’s schoolwork while the same level of teaching and service and scholarship was expected.” Personnel loss and its implications for remaining faculty was noted; for example, one faculty member stated, “Our department is down two faculty with no approval to fill them so we are absorbing the workload and it is draining.” Relatedly, concerns about increased service and administrative obligations were frequently voiced. One faculty stated, “I spend 10-15 hours a week on service because there is no one else to do it.” Another stated, “We are being asked to do more all the time, without removing previous administrative loads.”

### *Low Value Placed on Scholarship*

Concerns about the degree of value placed on scholarship was the 2<sup>nd</sup> most frequently reported barrier ( $N = 134$ , 41% of respondents). Participants who elaborated on their responses ( $n = 65$ ) referenced the administration’s request for faculty to pause scholarship to allow for greater focus on teaching. One faculty stated, “Admin asked us to stop our scholarship during COVID. This is impossible for many of us with ongoing projects and grant deadlines.” Multiple faculty communicated sentiments like this: “When the university chose to require more teaching during the pandemic, it showed the value the university places on scholarship.” A major theme within these comments was concern with a zero-sum, oppositional view of the value placed on teaching and service relative to scholarship. For example, “For me, this may be more accurately stated on the degree of value placed on other, non-scholarship things. Particularly compensated and uncompensated instructional and administrative work.” Another faculty stated, “I can’t shake the perception that, while scholarship is nominally valued by university administration, the onslaught of new initiatives (REP4, Reach Higher, push of online pedagogy) makes sustained scholarly activity an at-best tolerated activity.”

### *Access to Collaborators*

Access to collaborators was identified as a barrier by 34.6% of the question respondents ( $N = 115$ ). A common theme that emerged from the respondents who elaborated on their responses ( $n = 39$ ) was challenges in recruiting and collaborating on scholarship with students. Several faculty commented on student and faculty burnout due to the pandemic. One faculty stated, “I do a lot of undergraduate research, but students are overwhelmed and have been less able to participate.” Another said, “I was unable to cultivate research relationships with students last year and am too exhausted to do that this year.” Another theme involved COVID-related restrictions that limited their collaborative work with students and faculty. These include difficulties with “students gaining access to healthcare facilities for research purposes”, “restrictions in access to field sites and lab spaces” and remote meetings (e.g., “We were not interacting in person. This interferes with relationship building.”). Other concerns related to collaborative work reflect side-effects of the pandemic other than COVID-related restrictions/safety protocols. For example, some faculty reported sentiments like “Our graduate student numbers have dropped and there are not enough students to cover all the opportunities in the department.”

### *Funding*

Funding concerns were identified as a barrier by 30.7% of the question respondents ( $N = 102$ ). Forty-eight respondents chose to elaborate on their responses. One major theme offered by

## Experiences With and Impressions of Scholarly and Creative Engagement at GVSU

respondents was limited funding for conference and professional travel. Faculty stated that “My conferences are international. Funding is sparse.”, and “What money is available is either insufficient to pay for even ONE annual conference, or requires us to fill out time-consuming applications for even smaller amounts.” Indeed, the intersection of time and funding arose in multiple responses (e.g., “No time to search for/write grant proposals.”). Several faculty also refer to spending money out-of-pocket to supplement university supports. The need for travel funding expands beyond dissemination at conferences; respondents discussed using travel funds to “maintain professional certifications” and networking with collaborators. Respondents also describe the desire for more flexibility in funding mechanisms. Comments in this vein tended to emphasize the negative impact of COVID-related restrictions (e.g., “It is difficult to reliably plan for funding when the global COVID conditions are constantly changing. If I apply for grants, I am worried that I may not be able to fulfill them within the stated timeline.”). Indeed, another faculty member experienced this exact scenario, stating “Some of my external funding sources were dropped because of my delayed sabbatical.” Lastly, some faculty expressed interest in funding sources better aligned with the scale and scope of their projects. For example: “Internal funding is in such small quantities that it doesn't help for sciences” and “access to funding should increase to accommodate more expensive fees.”

### *Access to Human Subjects*

The challenges of research with human subjects during the pandemic was identified by 25.4% of respondents ( $N = 115$ ), with 33 respondents choosing to elaborate on their “yes” response. Several faculty describe how COVID-related restrictions limited access to human subjects and the spaces they occupy. This included access to health facilities and workers, who were especially burdened by the pandemic, as well as educational, workplace, and correctional settings, and laboratories conducting human subjects research. For example, one respondent stated, “Our research is generally done in the workplace setting. With the obvious shut down and employment difficulties it is hard to find sites willing to participate in research.” Several responses also reflect respondents’ concerns about the potential burdens of research participation on human subjects. These concerns centered on participants’ potential discomfort with in-person interactions and the mental/emotional weight of participants’ competing priorities. For example, one faculty respondent stated, “Between how busy everyone is and that there is still some nervousness about being in-person, it’s hard for me to get user study participants.” Another respondent stated they had “no desire to add any extra stuff to the plates of those I would be working with.”

### *Access to Resources*

Eighty-one respondents (24.9%) stated that limited access to resources has impacted their scholarly and creative endeavors, with 34 respondents offering more detailed information in their open-ended responses. The most common theme, referenced by 21 respondents, involved little to no access to spaces. This includes research sites like laboratories, office spaces on campus, educational settings, libraries and archives, and studios and other spaces for creative work. Some respondents also identified issues with the supply chain that delayed or otherwise limited access to necessary items; some examples include books, reagents, and “equipment”.

### *Uncertainty about Internal Supports*

Seventy-seven respondents (23.8%) identified uncertainty about internal support as a

## Experiences With and Impressions of Scholarly and Creative Engagement at GVSU

barrier to resuming their scholarly and creative activities, with 17 respondents offering more detailed feedback. One theme that emerged from some of these responses centered on uncertainty around monetary supports offered by GVSU, like sabbatical leave funds (e.g., “I am very concerned about the discussions regarding sabbaticals.”) and professional development funds (e.g., “The handling of pdf funds has been difficult.”) Notably, some of these responses convey the sentiment that access to monetary supports has been uncertain and complicated even prior to the pandemic. Respondents stated that “It would be great to receive internal supports, although I don’t typically qualify for many of these”, “only those ‘in favor’ know and get the grants”, “a bad Dept Chair can sink proposals”, and “I think this is an ongoing issue given the university’s budget as a function of declining enrollment.” Other responses identified idiosyncratic concerns that do not coalesce into themes.

### *Recognition in the Personnel Process*

Sixty-four respondents (20%) stated that concerns about the degree of recognition for scholarly/creative efforts in the personnel process was a barrier to restarting such efforts after the pandemic. Thirty-one faculty elaborated on their response. The most common theme in these responses centered on uncertainty regarding the request to “pause” scholarship during the pandemic and its aftereffects on personnel processes. Respondents expressed concern that the scholarship pause was confusing (e.g., “I guess this year doesn’t count?”) or insufficient (e.g., “Only 1 year’s research was announced as ‘forgiven’. Even when the pandemic is still not over!”) and expressed concern about how it would be taken into account during personnel processes (e.g., “I am fearful that my pause year will impact future personnel actions”). Another theme that emerged centered on disparities in how and why scholarly/creative activities are valued in the personnel process. Some responses touched on differences across career stages (e.g., “No one seems to expect or support research for full professors - the focus is on pre-tenure.”). Others identified differences across topics (e.g., “certain types seem to be disproportionately weighed”) and recent changes to the personnel standards regarding the four different types of scholarly/creative activity (e.g., “Until recently, [respondent’s topic of inquiry] was not viewed as scholarship in the personnel process.”).

### *Other Barriers*

This question also provided respondents with an opportunity to list and describe other perceived barriers that are not captured by the existing list of barriers; 38.4% of respondents identified at least one additional barrier. Many of these barriers were relatively unique to the respondent or emerged infrequently and thus cannot be characterized as a pattern, at least within this section of the survey. That said, some patterns did emerge across respondents. The most frequently mentioned barrier related to the mental and physical toll of the COVID-19 pandemic. Faculty report “mental fatigue” and feeling “emotionally spent”, and that “the cognitive load of pandemic/insurrection/massive protests etc. leaves less space for creative imagining/ability to focus deeply.” Other faculty refer to “anxiety about impending changes to programs and the institution”, worry if they will “get a breakthrough infection in an area with less medical infrastructure” when traveling, and highlight the stress of balancing their professional and family obligations (e.g., “My access to childcare is much more limited”, and “All the fear of keeping my family safe.”). A second theme that emerged involved administrative and service workloads, referenced by multiple faculty. For example, one faculty member stated they took on “new service responsibility at the unit and university levels. More and more responsibilities were

## Experiences With and Impressions of Scholarly and Creative Engagement at GVSU

added, even though not all are contributing to true shared Faculty governance.” Another faculty, when discussing their administrative coordinator position, said “Although I receive a very small stipend, I do not receive any course release, making it extremely difficult to concentrate on scholarship as much as I would like to.”

### **Barriers Hindering Ability to Sustain Accelerated Pace of Scholarly/Creative Activity**

Respondents were posed the following question: “If your scholarship was accelerated and you intend to maintain this accelerated pace, which of the following do you perceive as barriers limiting your ability to do so?” Ten potential barriers were listed, and respondents indicated their responses as “yes” or “no”. The barriers were the same as those listed above.

A total of 185 respondents answered this question by marking a response for at least one of the listed barriers. Of those respondents, 99 (53.5%) marked “yes” to at least one of the listed barriers, and 86 (46.5%) marked “no” for all listed barriers. Examined another way, of the 358 respondents that responded to some portion of this survey, 99 (27.7%) reported perceiving at least one barrier to sustaining their accelerated pace of scholarly activity.

When considering perceptions for each barrier separately, again, we must note that respondents did not mark a response for every barrier listed and thus the sample size for each barrier differs. Additionally, it is possible that some respondents may have misunderstood that this set of questions was only applicable to those faculty who experienced an accelerated pace of scholarly activity during the COVID-19 pandemic period. Two pieces of evidence support this. First, 177 (49.4%) respondents answered both the “paused” and “accelerated” scholarship sets of questions. While it is technically possible that a single faculty member experienced both a pause and an acceleration in their scholarship program over the COVID-19 pandemic period, it seems unlikely that this was the experience of 49.4% of respondents, especially considering respondents' qualitative data show the vast majority slowed or stopped their scholarship. Second, of 185 respondents that answered the question set re: accelerated pace, close to half of the respondents ( $n = 86$ , 46.5%) did not identify any barriers, even “other” barriers. This suggests that many faculty responded “no” to barriers re: acceleration because they did not really accelerate the pace of their scholarship. All of this to say: we encourage readers to interpret the data for this question with caution. Please refer to Table 5 for a summary of the quantitative data. The most frequently mentioned barriers - identified by 20% or more of respondents - are discussed in more detail below.

### ***Lack of Time***

Lack of time was the most frequently reported barrier to maintaining an accelerated pace, reported by 48.6% of the sample responding to this question. Few respondents elaborated on this barrier; however, the tenor of these open-ended responses is that other faculty responsibilities limit the time one can devote to scholarship. For example, one faculty stated that “Expectations for teaching and service have increased, so time and energy are limited.” Another faculty stated that “we are short staffed” and “administrative, teaching, advising loads seem heavier than normal”. Another point raised by multiple faculty is that “time is always a barrier”. One faculty stated, “This has always been a limiting factor at GVSU. It would be nice if faculty could ‘buy’ some time from teaching with external support.”

### ***Funding***

Funding concerns were identified as a barrier by 27% of the respondents. One theme that

## Experiences With and Impressions of Scholarly and Creative Engagement at GVSU

emerged from the 12 open-ended responses was the idea that issues of time and funding were interrelated. A different faculty member than the one quoted above said, “I personally would like funding to buy out a course to increase time and reduce the existing workload.” Other faculty said, “I have no time to try and write grants”, and “need time to see what kinds of funding/fellowships are available.” Another theme that emerged centered on the need for funding to support undergraduate and graduate collaborators. This was mentioned by 1/3 of the respondents that provided open-ended elaborations.

### ***Low Value Placed on Scholarship***

Concerns about the degree of value placed on scholarship was the 3<sup>rd</sup> most frequently reported barrier (26.6% of respondents). Few participants elaborated on their responses ( $n = 5$ ), however, 3 of these respondents expressed some type of concern regarding discrepancies in how scholarship is valued. One respondent stated, “Feels like the level I am doing is appreciated, but not acknowledged. Other tasks must still be completed and others don’t take on.” Another stated, “Although scholarship is recognized in my unit and college, certain types seem to be disproportionately weighted.” The third respondent stated, “People have received full professor for portfolios that I will have at contract renewal. That’s fine, I will just keep doing my thing?”.

### ***Access to collaborators***

Access to collaborators was identified as a barrier by 22.7% of the question respondents. Among respondents who elaborated on their response ( $n = 7$ ), 2 cited the need for faculty-level collaborators. One faculty stated, “I believe I would have difficulty without colleagues who would also want to move at an accelerated pace”. Notably, 5 referred to needing/wanting to work with student collaborators. One faculty stated, “Student research assistants are needed. They require training and mentoring, which take time and energy. Currently, there is no compensation or ability to earn reassigned time for training and mentoring students.” Another wrote, “Still challenging to recruit quality GAs to the program.”

### **Summary and Synthesis**

Faculty feedback regarding the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on their scholarly and creative activities coalesces to emphasize several points, summarized below in no particular order.

1) The COVID-19 pandemic had a largely negative impact on faculty scholarship. This is perhaps unsurprising to most readers. What is notable, however, is the degree of consensus - 84.7% of faculty respondents, the vast majority, describe experiencing the pandemic as a hindrance to their scholarly and creative endeavors. These respondents describe slowing or stopping their scholarship, needing to engage in onerous revisions to their standard procedures for conducting scholarship to accommodate COVID-19-related restrictions, and various other hardships to continued engagement. Survey data regarding barriers impacting the pace of scholarship also speaks to the pervasiveness of the pandemic’s impact on faculty. Almost twice as many respondents reported that they slowed their usual pace of scholarly/creative engagement than accelerated it; this increases to 3 ½ times more faculty if we consider the possibility that some respondents who completed questions re: accelerated pace did so accidentally. This discrepancy in need should be noted by administrators and offices as they determine the most effective ways to distribute resources. Given the large number of faculty attempting to resume

## Experiences With and Impressions of Scholarly and Creative Engagement at GVSU

their scholarship, there will most certainly be an increased need for resources to aid this process.

2) Faculty experienced similar barriers regardless of the pace of their scholarship during the pandemic. Time, monetary concerns, concerns about the value of scholarship at GVSU, and difficulties connecting and collaborating with colleagues arose as the most frequently mentioned barriers in both sets of survey questions. While some of these issues may be unique to the COVID-19 pandemic - like limited access to collaborators, due to COVID mitigation strategies - others may reflect issues that were present before, but exacerbated by the pandemic, like concerns about professional development funding and the value of scholarship at GVSU.

3) Faculty had limited time to engage in scholarship during the pandemic. The “time” theme emerged as the most frequently mentioned concern across all survey questions in this section. 53.7% of respondents referenced time in their open-ended responses, 86.8% identified time as a barrier to their usual pace of scholarship, and 48.6% referenced time as a barrier to maintaining an accelerated pace of scholarship. These results suggest that strategies that provide faculty with more time to conduct scholarship would be the most effective in that they would help combat the most common obstacle to scholarly and creative engagement.

4) Faculty are concerned about the monetary support available for scholarly/creative activities, independent of the pandemic’s effects. Regardless of one’s pace of scholarly/creative engagement during the pandemic, lack of funding and limitations on support resources that require funding are a primary concern. As mentioned above, some of these resources - like access to spaces, materials, and human subjects - are more accessible now that COVID-19 mitigation strategies have relaxed. However, other monetary support (e.g., course releases, professional development/travel funds, funds for undergraduate and graduate collaborators) were perceived as lacking even before the pandemic. This distinction, between concerns that are inherently caused by the pandemic vs. concerns that existed previously and were exacerbated by the pandemic, may be useful to consider when determining where time, energy, and funds should be invested.

5) Collaborators play a valuable role in faculty’s scholarly/creative engagement. Access to collaborators was a concern for faculty in general, regardless of their pace of scholarship during the pandemic. Faculty identified a range of collaborators, from undergraduate and graduate student mentees, community partners, and peer collaborators at GVSU or other academic institutions. Though communication with collaborators was maintained through computer-mediated forms of interaction (e.g., Zoom meetings), in-person meetings occurring on campus, in the community, and at conferences and workshops were severely limited and often absent. Again, as the pandemic wanes, access to collaborators should increase. However, the tone of comments suggests faculty are uncertain of the long-term effects that hampered collaborations will have on their scholarly progress and personnel evaluations, as well as the consequences for student collaborators who rely on faculty mentoring and high-impact experiences to build their professional resumes.

6) Faculty perceived some COVID-management solutions as signaling that scholarly/creative activity has limited value. This theme was the 2nd most frequently mentioned by faculty who slowed their scholarly/creative activity during the pandemic (after time), and the 3rd most

## Experiences With and Impressions of Scholarly and Creative Engagement at GVSU

frequently mentioned by faculty who accelerated their scholarly pace (after time and funding). Faculty that elaborated on their responses anchored on two key changes to professor workload during the pandemic period that were perceived as signaling devaluation - demands to teach a 4th course and requests to pause scholarly/creative activity. These responses are often characterized by mixed feelings. Many faculty described understanding the need to redistribute workload to emphasize teaching and student support during the pandemic, consistent with GVSU's teaching focus. Yet they also expressed concern with the message this sends about the value of scholarly/creative activity at GVSU. The tone of these responses, then, seems to be about the degree to which scholarship is valued relative to other facets of the professional workload and whether COVID-related changes to this workload were temporary or will be used to establish new, lower expectations and valuation of scholarship.

### Faculty Feedback on Fostering Engagement in Scholarly/Creative Activity

#### Faculty Feedback to CSCE

The first question in this section of the survey asked, "What are some steps that CSCE can take to help faculty actively engage in scholarly and creative activity?" A total of 246 respondents answered this open-ended question. Three overarching categories of themes were identified: *Funding*, *Assistance*, and *Advocacy*. Within the Funding category, responses were coded as reflecting 1) general requests for more funding, 2) funds to reduce/rebalance workload, 3) funds to support research assistants and other employees, 4) funds to support dissemination, and 5) funds to support supplies and space. Within the Assistance category responses were coded as reflecting the need for more or varied assistance with 1) information sharing, 2) connection and collaboration, 3) application processes, 4) balancing workload, and 5) specific scholarship-related tasks. Within the Advocacy theme, responses were coded as reflecting the desire for greater 1) recognition of the value of scholarly/creative activity and 2) accommodation and celebration of specific kinds of activities. Interrater reliability for these codes was high, Kappa = .86 (Brennan & Prediger, 1981). See Table 6 for a summary of theme frequency.

Before we discuss the content of these various themes, we would like to note that while faculty respondents did provide constructive feedback as requested, many also offered positive, evaluative feedback and expressed appreciation for CSCE's efforts to support scholarly and creative activity at GVSU ( $n = 41$ , 16.7% of respondents). For example, one faculty stated, "CSCE is already doing an outstanding job supporting grant seekers and PIs and providing internal funds." Another wrote, "CSCE has been very supportive of my research. Thank You." This was the most frequently mentioned theme emerging from faculty responses to this question which suggests that CSCE's current efforts to support scholarly and creative activity are recognized and appreciated. That said, 33 of these responses (80.5%) included both positive affirmation and constructive feedback, suggesting that faculty perceive a continued need for further improvement of CSCE support.

In contrast, some faculty ( $n = 6$ , 2.4%) expressed negative evaluations of the CSCE. For example, one faculty stated, "I consider this unit another bureaucratic barrier to research - not a support mechanic." Additionally, some faculty respondents reported no need for changes to CSCE activities ( $n = 15$ , 6.1% of respondents). Almost all responses consisted of very general statements (e.g., "None"); one statement did also include positive feedback for the CSCE.



## Experiences With and Impressions of Scholarly and Creative Engagement at GVSU

### *Feedback Regarding Funding*

As mentioned above, respondents who expressed concerns or ideas about funding scholarly/creative activity identified five specific ways in which CSCE could revise its funding mechanisms and structures. These are discussed below in the order of most to least frequently referenced.

**Funds to Reduce or Rebalance Workload.** This theme was noted by 30 respondents (12.2%). Responses were coded as reflecting this theme if they explicitly referred to funding that could be used to reduce or rebalance the current workload and in doing so allow for more time to be devoted to scholarship. When discussing this, faculty commonly referred to sabbatical funds, reassigned time, course releases, and “buying out” of teaching. For example, one faculty stated, “Provide more funding and support for faculty to take time off from teaching (e.g., buy out courses) to conduct research. Not just those that are “behind” or are in “desperate need”, but also to reward those that are active.” Another faculty stated: “Encourage the upper administration to reserve funding that can be directed towards research activities. For example, it would be useful if faculty can earn reassigned time for training and mentoring students who are research assistants. Faculty provide important high-impact opportunities for these students, but the workload is high and draining.” This theme was the most frequently mentioned funding theme. This suggests that many faculty believe that funded workload reduction mechanisms are a valuable method of achieving a more optimal balance between teaching, scholarship, and service responsibilities.

**General Requests for More Funding.** This theme was noted by 29 respondents (11.8%). Responses were coded as reflecting this theme if they expressed a general desire for more funding but didn’t specify the type of funding or how it would be used. Additionally, this code was used for responses that generally referred to professional development funds but did not specify how the respondent uses those. A representative example: “have more grants and funds for faculty research”. Another faculty stated, “Expanding internal funding opportunities; making more professional development funds available to faculty.” Notably, of the 29 responses, 16 responses (55.2%) detailed additional non-funding related themes besides general requests in their response. This could be interpreted as suggesting that for these respondents, funding was not the only or the main concern regarding scholarly engagement.

**Funds to Support Employees.** This theme was noted by 27 respondents (11.0%). Responses were coded as reflecting this theme if they requested that funds be allocated to support personnel who work on scholarly/creative projects, such as undergraduate and graduate research assistants. One faculty said, “Provide more research assistants, or funding would be helpful.” Some faculty referenced the difficulty of competing against higher-wage jobs for employees. For example, one faculty member stated “Provide more money in the internal funding for research that involve undergraduate students. There is a crisis of employees right now and if we are going to compete with hiring students in our research groups vs them getting a higher paying job somewhere, they will go there and not work with us.”

**Funds for Dissemination.** This theme was noted by 25 respondents (10.2%). Responses were coded as reflecting this theme if they requested funding to support the dissemination of scholarly/creative products such as funding for conference travel. Many faculty members expressed the need to attend conferences but described the cost of travel as a barrier to dissemination. One faculty member stated, “Increase the amount of professional development funds so that when conferences do return to in-person, faculty are not paying for a requirement of our jobs out of pocket.” Another mentioned “While academic conferences can be wonderful

## Experiences With and Impressions of Scholarly and Creative Engagement at GVSU

opportunities to collaborate and forge relationships that ultimately benefit our scholarship and our teaching, I'm not willing to tap into my personal finances to support this activity. It's simply cost-prohibitive, especially for faculty with children."

**Funds for Supplies.** This theme was noted by 24 respondents (9.8%). Responses were coded as reflecting this theme if they referenced continuing or revising existing CSCE grants that fund supplies (e.g., mini-grant, Catalyst grant), or otherwise requested funding to execute their scholarly/creative endeavors. This included, for example, the purchase of supplies, paying research participants, and traveling to collect data as well as general statements like "fund research". One respondent emphasized the need for "Funds for supplies used to train student workers in addition to funds for collecting data", whereas another requested "more frequent opportunities for mini-grants". Another faculty describing the need for equipment funds stated, "Increase faculty development funds for the first time in a decade."

### *Feedback Regarding Assistance*

Respondents who expressed concern or ideas about receiving more or different kinds of assistance identified specific ways in which CSCE could assist faculty. These are discussed below in the order of most to least frequently referenced.

**Assistance with Connection and Collaboration.** This theme was noted by 24 respondents (9.8%). Responses were coded as reflecting this theme if they explicitly requested that CSCE help scholars/creators connect with each other. A review of these responses reveals two subthemes. The first includes requests for assistance with connecting with fellow faculty members. For example, one respondent mentioned "We have no opportunities to interact with each other as scholars on this campus. Like FTLC has mentoring groups around teaching, I would love opportunities for scholarly discussions, working lunches, presentations where faculty share their research, etc." A second subtheme reflects requests for assistance with connecting with student assistants/mentees. As this faculty member stated, "What I also mentioned before - a forum for faculty and students to connect - would be great."

**Assistance with Information Sharing.** This theme was noted by 23 respondents (9.4%). Responses were coded as reflecting this theme if they requested that the CSCE share more information with faculty members such as assistance identifying funding sources. This code also included statements that expressed a desire for the CSCE to gather information from faculty regarding faculty members' varied inquiry processes and unique needs. For example, one respondent stated, "It would be nice to have an infographic to help faculty determine which internal funding sources are appropriate for the work they are looking to do. It would also be helpful to have information written up on various research-related policies so that faculty don't have to look everything up on their own and piece it together themselves." Another stated, "I believe a CSCE representative should visit all units (once per year) at their unit meeting to share the CSCE funding opportunities and grant application process" much like library liaisons do.

**Assistance with the Application Process.** This theme was noted by 23 respondents (9.4%). Responses were coded as reflecting this theme if they explicitly requested that the CSCE assist faculty with grant applications. This included references about barriers to funding, assistance with grant writing, and making the application process easier and more flexible for faculty. One respondent stated "Make acquisition of funding easier. Even the process of applying for mini-grants is clunky." Another stated, "Make the grant application documents more friendly. All the big grants require a lot of time and efforts to prepare the documents to apply. It is really time consuming. If the aim is to give money to support faculty, it will be more beneficial to

## Experiences With and Impressions of Scholarly and Creative Engagement at GVSU

simplify the process, and required paperwork.”

**Assistance with Balancing Workload.** This theme was noted by 22 respondents (8.9%). Responses were coded as reflecting this theme if they requested that the CSCE help reduce non-scholarship-related workload (teaching, advising, service, and administration) through means other than funding. Faculty frequently mentioned a need for more time to devote to scholarly activities. Responses mentioned a variety of both tangible and intangible ways in which time could be more efficiently managed. For example, one respondent, when referring to fellow faculty, stated, “Help them figure out how to be more efficient in things like course prep, grading, and converting modalities so they have more time to write”. Another faculty member stated, “Making teaching and service workloads more symmetrical would be helpful, as (from my perspective) those that do the most research are often asked to do more service as well.”

**Assistance with Specific Scholarly Tasks.** This theme was noted by 15 respondents (6.1%). Responses were coded as reflecting this theme if they requested that the CSCE assist with specific tasks that are part of the scholarly/creative process. Several faculty emphasized workshops as a useful forum for delivering such assistance. For example, one faculty stated, “Offer continuing education on topics novice researchers would be interested in”, whereas another said, “Offer spaces to facilitate research, for example, faculty writing groups and/or workshops”. Assistance with writing was mentioned by several faculty in some way, whereas other research activities - statistical analyses, IRB applications - were relatively infrequent (<2 respondents each).

### *Feedback Regarding Advocacy*

Respondents who expressed concern or ideas about the perceived value of scholarly and creative activity identified two specific ways in which CSCE could advocate for faculty. These are discussed below in the order of most to least frequently referenced.

**Recognition of the Value of Scholarly/Creative Activity.** This theme was noted by 36 respondents (14.6%). Responses were coded as reflecting this theme if they requested that the CSCE recognize and advocate for the importance of scholarly/creative activity. This included requests for non-monetary awards to recognize excellence, increasing research visibility, and generally advocating for the importance of engaging in scholarly/creative activity at GVSU. All statements expressed the desire for more (rather than less) value and communication. For example, one faculty member stated, “The single most important thing you could do, more important than every other thing you currently do-- even more important than funding, would be to advocate for faculty research in the university. Getting the university to value our time for research would be tantamount to giving us all grants. In other words, by far the most good you could accomplish.” Notably, 17 of these statements (47.2%) emphasized that the value of scholarship needs to be communicated to and appreciated by Deans, “the administration”, and “the University”. By comparison, 1 statement expressed the need for faculty culture around scholarship to change, 1 statement emphasized the importance of students knowing and appreciating the role of faculty scholarship at GVSU, and 17 statements did not specify a target group for such communications of value. This theme was the most frequently mentioned code among the advocacy theme and the second most frequently mentioned theme only after the “positive feedback” code. This indicates that many faculty desire the CSCE to take on a more explicit advocacy role at GVSU. One respondent encapsulates this sentiment by saying, “Please keep repeating narratives about the importance of the teacher-scholar model for our identity as an institution. We need a champion for scholarship outside of the traditional faculty systems.”

## Experiences With and Impressions of Scholarly and Creative Engagement at GVSU

**Recognition of Specific Types of Scholarly/Creative Activity.** This theme was noted by 10 respondents (4.1%). Responses were coded as reflecting this theme if they requested that the CSCE recognize and advocate for different approaches to scholarship and underrepresented scholarly/creative fields and approaches. This code included responses that requested more funding for specific activities and responses that requested more subjective support. One sentiment that emerged from these responses is the desire for the humanities and “non-laboratory” methods of inquiry such as archival research and field studies to be acknowledged as valuable scholarship. For example, one faculty member stated, “Meet with faculty in the humanities to discuss ways OURs and CUSE and the rest can be more humanities-friendly. Offer funding specifically for archival research or for intensive library research here at GVSU”. Another focus of these responses was on assistance for people at different stages of their careers. For example: “More support for mid-career faculty who find themselves “behind” or who have had to change course. Many of us came in under one set of standards and have seen those change. Many have had to change trajectories for research because of shifting university resources and standards.”

### Summary and Synthesis of Feedback to CSCE

Faculty feedback to the CSCE highlights the following key messages. Again, the order of these points does NOT denote their importance or impact.

- 1) Faculty value the work CSCE is currently doing to support scholarly and creative activity at GVSU. Despite the survey’s focus on constructive feedback, many respondents spontaneously offered evaluative feedback, with more than 6 times more faculty offering positive vs. critical feedback.
- 2) Faculty provided feedback on a wide range of concerns and needs. Faculty presented a variety of different suggestions as to what the CSCE could do to support scholarly/creative activity at GVSU, with a total of 12 different feedback themes. Many of these suggestions were mentioned at similar frequencies to one another ( $ns \sim 22-27$ ), though they touched on different types of concerns: about the availability of funding, the need for non-monetary assistance with scholarship, and advocacy for the scholarly/creative work that faculty perform. The wide range of different types of feedback suggests that faculty perceive the CSCE as a versatile entity with a multifaceted role in facilitating scholarship on campus.
- 3) Faculty want the CSCE to highlight the value of scholarly and creative activity at GVSU. This was the most frequently cited piece of constructive feedback. That this theme emerged so frequently suggests that many faculty believe their scholarly efforts are currently undervalued at GVSU relative to their other professional responsibilities and believe the CSCE, as a third-party stakeholder, could improve scholarship at GVSU by advocating for the value of faculty engagement in research/scholarship/creative activity. Stated another way, the results of this survey suggest that faculty respondents view CSCE’s role as providing both tangible and intangible support. Tangible, monetary support for scholarship is integral to engagement and productivity, however, intangible support has value too: it boosts morale, communicates important values, and contributes to building a scholarly culture. The information garnered from this survey suggests that CSCE may want to expand how they construe their mission to support scholarship to include more non-financial means of support and advocacy.

## Experiences With and Impressions of Scholarly and Creative Engagement at GVSU

4) Faculty want the CSCE to address concerns regarding the balance between teaching, scholarship, and service (i.e., workload). The second most frequently cited theme argues for the need for targeted funding for mechanisms that will facilitate a more satisfactory and attainable workload balance. In general, the frequency of this theme and the tenor of responses suggests that faculty want to engage in scholarship yet lack sufficient time to do so. Respondents report wanting CSCE to offer funding that is specifically intended to reduce or redistribute non-scholarly workload (e.g., teaching and service/administrative work), including opportunities to buy out of courses with CSCE funds, and opportunities for leave beyond the traditional sabbatical system. Faculty also expressed the need for a more formal system of compensating work that contributes value to the University and its students but is currently unpaid, such as mentoring undergraduates through scholarly and creative endeavors. Responses emphasize achieving workload equity and balance through tangible, monetary support, consistent with CSCE's history as the primary source of internal funding for scholarship at GVSU. However, such pursuits will necessitate buy-in from Upper Administration, as well as Deans and Unit Heads/Chairs who would play an integral role in ensuring coverage of teaching and service workload at the local level.

5) Faculty want the CSCE to expand the amount and availability of existing funding mechanisms. The third most frequently cited theme can be summarized as “more” - more funding for scholarly and creative endeavors. Notably, this theme captures responses that generally requested more funding as well as related themes, similar in frequency, which expanded on this to specifically call for more funding to support employees (especially students engaged in scholarship), conference dissemination costs, and supplies, materials, and space needs. The feedback from this survey suggests that CSCE, and those who determine CSCE's budget, might consider taking steps to expand the tangible support available from this office.

### Faculty Feedback to the University

The next question in this section of the survey asked, “What are some steps that the University can take to help faculty actively engage in scholarly and creative activity?” We intentionally used the broad language “University” so that respondents could focus their attention on whatever facet of University structure they believe is important. Faculty consistently referred to Upper Administration, the Senior Leadership Team (SLT), the Provost, and the President in their responses, suggesting they interpreted our reference to “the University” as meaning Upper Administration leadership at GVSU. A total of 253 respondents answered this question. Three overarching themes were identified: *General Feedback*, *Actions*, and *Advocacy*. Within the General Feedback theme, responses were coded as reflecting 1) general requests for more funding, and 2) general requests for more time. Within the Action theme, responses were coded as reflecting the desire for the University to actively change some facet of the following: 1) funds to support scholarship, 2) funds to support research personnel, 3) reduction in teaching workload, 4) reduction in service workload, 5) requests for more faculty or staff to be hired, 6) addressing workload equity, 7) connection and collaboration, and 8) specific research-related tasks. Within the Advocacy theme, responses were coded as reflecting 1) the desire for greater recognition of the value of research, and 2) recognition of diverse approaches and fields. Interrater reliability for these codes was high, Kappa = .81. (Brennan & Prediger, 1981).

First, in addition to the constructive feedback described below, one ( $n = 1$ , 0.4% of

## Experiences With and Impressions of Scholarly and Creative Engagement at GVSU

respondents) faculty member provided positive feedback to the university. This response expressed that University was neither a barrier nor an asset to research. A larger number of faculty respondents expressed a negative evaluation of the university's role in scholarly/creative activity engagement ( $n = 14$ , 5.5% of respondents). For example, one respondent stated that at GVSU, "Scholars are not truly valued... This is all bad stuff." Additionally, some faculty respondents reported no need for changes to University activities to foster scholarship ( $n = 5$ , 1.2% of respondents). These responses discussed being uncertain as to what exactly the university could do to facilitate scholarship.

### *General Feedback*

As mentioned above, respondents who expressed general concerns or ideas, but did not elaborate on those, identified two specific ways in which the university could enhance scholarship.

**General Requests for More Time.** This theme was noted by 18 respondents (7.1%). Responses were coded as reflecting this theme if they expressed a general need for more time to devote to scholarship but did not specify how to increase time or reduce other demands on time. For example, one faculty member stated, "Support faculty who are playing multiple roles (teaching, administration) with time."

**General Requests for More Funding.** This theme was noted by 9 respondents (3.6%). Responses were coded as reflecting this theme if they expressed a general desire for more funding to be devoted to scholarship but did not specify the type of funding or how it would be used. One respondent stated, "Increase funding. Actively support grant writing and grant support."

### *Feedback Regarding Action*

Respondents who provided more concrete and descriptive responses regarding what actions the University could take identified seven specific ways in which the university could enhance scholarship. These are discussed below in the order of most to least frequently referenced.

**Reduction in Teaching Workload.** This theme was noted by 73 respondents (28.9%). Responses were coded as reflecting this theme if they expressed a need for reduction in teaching workload such as increasing sabbatical funds, ability to 'buy out' of teaching, reassigned time, and the ability to accumulate credits toward a course release. This also included references to time-intensive graduate professional teaching workloads. For example, one respondent stated, "Offer graduate professional faculty a reasonable teaching workload. With the workload that graduate professional faculty on a 12-month contract now have, there is little time for scholarly activity." Another respondent stated, "Recognize that teaching takes a lot of time, so there needs to be some give and take to allow more time for research." Several respondents also highlighted the additional paperwork and emotional labor that came with COVID-19 regulations. Given the volume of responses that reflect this code, we explored the data further to identify sub-themes. Of the 73 responses, 10 (13.7%) responses explicitly conveyed the sentiment that when the time devoted to teaching is increased, either because of student or administrative needs, time for scholarship is the first to be sacrificed. One faculty illustrates this concern by saying, "Something has to give and it is either the quality of the teaching or engagement in scholarship." Notably, 32 (43.8%) responses directly stated that teaching-related workload should be lessened by reducing the number of courses taught and/or the amount of labor associated with each course. For

## Experiences With and Impressions of Scholarly and Creative Engagement at GVSU

example, one faculty member stated “The one big help would be a course release. This would give time to focus on two classes and this would increase time for research.” By comparison, 6 responses requested that the teaching workload specifically be acknowledged, 3 responses requested reductions in class size, and 2 responses specified that the graduate teaching load should be reduced. The 20 remaining responses included general statements and did not provide specific remedies for reducing teaching-related workload. This was the most frequently mentioned theme overall which suggests that faculty see the scale and scope of teaching responsibilities as one of the largest barriers to engaging in research.

**Address Workload Inequities.** This theme was noted by 58 respondents (22.9%). Responses were coded as reflecting this theme if they mentioned addressing inequities in workload and job expectations. This included references to differences in tenure and promotion standards across Units and Colleges, rethinking how workload is determined within and across Units and Colleges, and ensuring that extra work faculty do is credited in some way. For example, one faculty member stated, “Ensure that fair expectations are set for service, particularly for untenured tenure-track faculty. Many of us feel like we shouldn't say no when asked to do more service, and it seems like some of us get taken advantage of.” Another stated, “Acknowledge the various levels of knowledge and training in research that exist among faculty members. It's not realistic to set the same expectations in research across all faculty. Consider offering different faculty tracks with different expectations. For example, a teaching track with higher teaching workload and lower research expectations; and a research track with a lower teaching workload and higher research expectations.” Responses in this section expressed a highly diverse range of concerns that were captured by this code. Few responses spoke on similar issues. Despite this, 11 (19.0%) specifically referenced the imbalanced workload at the graduate level. These comments made mention of how a 12-month contract limits the amount of time one can devote to scholarship.

**Reduction in Service Workload.** This theme was noted by 51 respondents (20.2%). Responses were coded as reflecting this theme if they expressed a need for a reduction in service and administrative work. This included references to excessive emails, meetings, and initiatives. This also included mentions of the need to streamline procedures. For example, one faculty stated, “Some processes are really clunky and not efficient. Think about ways to streamline processes. Even finding things on GV website is a nightmare.” Of the 51 responses, 16 (31.4%) emphasized the need to slow the introduction of new initiatives, programs, and processes. For example, one respondent stated, “Slow the pace of change. It is impossible to actively engage in Reach Higher, visioning, surveys, and other faculty forum revolving around major institutional change (major restructuring, changing banner, changing blackboard, etc) and at the same time stay focused on scholarly activity.”

**Funds to Support Scholarship.** This theme was noted by 47 respondents (18.6%). Responses were coded as reflecting this theme if they requested that funding and or other tangible resources be devoted to supporting research activities. This included mentions of travel/conference funds, access to research-related resources (such as space, supplies, and software), publication costs, and professional development funds. One respondent requested the university “Increase departmental PD funds, which have not increased in the 20 years since I was hired! It was \$900 in 2001 and it's still \$900.” Another stated, “Provide more material support: it's that simple. Again, faculty shouldn't have to foot the bill; if the university really values scholarship, they can at least provide adequate funding to go to one domestic conference per academic year.” Another stated, “Due to inflation, that means that we can now do substantially

## Experiences With and Impressions of Scholarly and Creative Engagement at GVSU

less with our professional development funds than we could when I was hired (that \$900 now has the buying power that \$700 did in 2009). Based on inflation calculators, to keep up with inflation, we should not be receiving at least \$1,150 a year.” Of the 47 responses, 23 (48.9%) referenced a general increase in funding for research-related activities without specifying what the funding would be used for. Twelve responses (25.5%) specifically mentioned the need to increase funding to purchase research equipment and secure research space. Eight responses (17.0%) mentioned the need to increase funding for the purposes of disseminating research. The remaining 4 responses contained idiosyncratic recommendations that did not represent a coherent theme.

**Requests for Hiring.** This theme was noted by 21 respondents (8.3%). Responses were coded as reflecting this theme if they requested that the university hire more faculty and/or support staff. One faculty member requested the university “Allow us to hire the faculty we need to run our program. If we cannot carry out our essential teaching functions, how can we even begin to work on scholarship?” Another respondent stated, “Hire more people--faculty as well as support staff, including APs in advising centers--to give us all more TIME to do the jobs we were hired to do.”

**Requests for Funding to Support Employees.** This theme was noted by 18 respondents (7.1%). Responses were coded as reflecting this theme if they requested that more funding be allocated for people who work on research projects such as undergraduate and graduate research assistants, and other personnel. One respondent stated, “increase funding for student researchers -- students who are putting themselves through school cannot necessarily afford to take time to do extra things like research with faculty, even though faculty are eager to provide that experience for more students. Paying a greater number of students a reasonable wage to be research assistants would be a win-win.” Another respondent offered a possible solution: “The University could also help by making 5 hours of student worker time a week available to each faculty member with an active research agenda.”

**Assistance with Connection and Collaboration.** This theme was noted by 10 respondents (4.0%). Responses were coded as reflecting this theme if they requested that the university help researchers connect with each other. One respondent requested the university, “Create events that faculty can attend to network and collaborate on scholarship ideas - especially those that traverse multiple disciplines.”

### *Feedback Regarding Advocacy*

Respondents who provided more concrete and descriptive responses regarding how the University could advocate for faculty identified two specific ways in which the university could enhance scholarship. These are discussed below in the order of most to least frequently referenced.

**Recognition of the Value of Research.** This theme was noted by 59 respondents (23.3%) and was the 2nd most frequently mentioned theme for this question in the survey. Responses were coded as reflecting this theme if they requested that the university recognize and advocate for the importance of scholarship. This included requests for non-monetary awards to recognize excellence, considering scholarship in regard to tenure and promotion, and increasing the visibility of scholarly/creative activity at GVSU. This also includes any responses that convey specific beliefs about how research should be viewed or valued. All but 1 of these statements expressed the desire for more (rather than less) value to be placed on scholarship. For example, one respondent said, “Include this as central in our vision statement and understand the



## Experiences With and Impressions of Scholarly and Creative Engagement at GVSU

impact that this aspect of our work has on our success as an institution.” Another faculty member stated, “Actively promote a culture of research and scholarship and recognize that teaching and scholarship are two facets of the same endeavor.” Indeed, 26 of these responses (44.1%) emphasized that the University should explicitly communicate to faculty, students, and the public that scholarly and creative activity and/or the teacher-scholar model is important to GVSU.

**Recognition of Specific Research.** This theme was noted by 17 respondents (6.7%). Responses were coded as reflecting this theme if they expressed the desire for the university to recognize and advocate for underrepresented approaches to scholarship and/or specific areas of scholarship. One faculty member stated, “The university should recognize that time is of far more importance to scholars in the humanities than money. Costs for equipment and labs in the sciences are not balanced by similar resources for faculty in the humanities.” Another faculty member stated, “Count work with students as scholarship, even if it doesn't produce concrete artifacts for the faculty member. Recent changes in T&P standards count mentoring students as teaching only. Mentoring is hard work and IS scholarship, but it's counted as teaching for me unless we happen to publish AND I'm on the paper.”

### Summary and Synthesis of Feedback to the University

Faculty feedback to the University highlights the following key messages. Again, the order of these points does NOT necessarily denote their importance or impact.

1) Faculty provided feedback on a wide range of concerns and needs, with consensus on the most pressing issues. Faculty presented a variety of different suggestions as to what the University could do to facilitate scholarly activity at GVSU; these responses reflect 12 different themes. Unlike the feedback to CSCE, where different themes were mentioned at similar frequencies, feedback to the University reflects a three-tier categorization of themes. The most important theme was mentioned at the rate of  $n = 73$ , the next four are  $n = 47-59$ , then the bottom tier was  $n = 9-21$ . Examined another way, there appears to be a division between the top 5 most frequently mentioned themes and the remaining 8 themes. This shows that while there is a wide range of concerns expressed, there is a consensus on the most pressing issues faculty want GVSU leadership to address.

2) Faculty responses often included multiple suggestions for improvement. Although a similar number of respondents provided feedback regarding CSCE's ( $N = 246$ ) and the University's ( $N = 253$ ) efforts to facilitate scholarly engagement, individual responses regarding University efforts often touched on more than one theme. This results in more separate pieces of feedback to the University survey question (401, see Table 7) relative to the CSCE survey question (350, see Table 6).

3) Faculty want the University to consider strategies for reducing non-scholarly workload for those active in scholarship. The “reduce teaching workload” theme was the most frequently mentioned theme within this section. The frequency and the tenor of these responses suggest that faculty believe that fulfilling GVSU's dedication to excellence in teaching means committing a disproportionate amount of time to teaching relative to scholarship. Consequently, faculty feedback centers on improving scholarly engagement by offering teaching reduction mechanisms for active scholars. In general, concern with the current workload emerged in several themes. Notably, of the top 5 most frequently mentioned themes emerging from faculty responses, 3 of

## Experiences With and Impressions of Scholarly and Creative Engagement at GVSU

these emphasize concerns with workload - teaching workload, service workload, and equitable distribution of work among faculty and staff colleagues. The frequency and thus importance of these themes indicate that many faculty are feeling stretched thin due to the large volume of other time-consuming responsibilities. One possible reason why workload is discussed more frequently in this section compared to the feedback given to the CSCE is that University administrators (like the Provost) play a more active role in forming and approving professional policies and standards related to faculty workload. The data from this survey suggests that the University and other stakeholders, like Academic Senate, may consider working with faculty to determine a more balanced workload.

### Faculty Feedback to Other Offices and Committees

The next question in this section of the survey stated, “Consider each of the offices and committees below, which include CSCE and reporting Units. What are some steps each can take to help faculty actively engage in scholarship?” The list was as follows: 1) Your Unit/Department, 2) Your College, 3) Faculty Governance, 4) Office of Research Compliance and Integrity (ORCI), 5) Institutional Review Board (IRB) or Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee (IACUC), 6) Office of Sponsored Programs (OSP), 7) Center for Undergraduate Scholar Engagement (CUSE, i.e., OURS, Fellowships), 8) Other CSCE Offices (e.g., Lab Safety, Tech Commercialization, High-Performance Computing), and 9) Other office, committee, or individual. The number of respondents varied across these 9 sub-questions and will be reported in each corresponding section below. Given the low number of responses for some of these offices, and the infrequency of some coding themes, we encourage readers to interpret this information carefully as they draw conclusions.

### Faculty Feedback to Unit/Department

A total of 152 respondents offered feedback regarding their Unit/Department. Responses were coded as reflecting 1) requests for tangible support, 2) requests for intangible support, 3) requests for a more balanced workload, 4) information sharing, 5) assistance with connection and collaboration, 6) requests for more staff to be hired and 7) changes or clarification regarding standards for tenure and promotion. Interrater reliability for these themes was high, Kappa = .98 (Brennan & Prediger, 1981). These themes are discussed below in the order of most to least frequently referenced and summarized in Table 9.

First, in addition to the constructive feedback described below, many respondents offered positive feedback and expressed appreciation for their unit/department’s efforts to support scholarly and creative activity at GVSU ( $n = 18$ , 11.8% of respondents). For example, one faculty stated, “None - honestly, my department does a wonderful job supporting faculty research.” A relatively smaller number of faculty respondents expressed a negative evaluation of their unit/department ( $n = 4$ , 2.6% of respondents). For example, one respondent stated that their unit was “not helpful (perhaps even obstructive).”

**Assistance with Balancing Workload.** This theme was noted by 58 respondents (38.2%). Responses were coded as reflecting this theme if they refer to the balance between scholarship, teaching, and service responsibilities, either within an individual’s workload, or workload that is distributed across individuals and groups. This code was also applied to general mentions of needing more time (for scholarly engagement) as well as specific strategies that allow for better distribution of time. One respondent stated, “Create a more even service workload between faculty...Decrease the 'hidden' work behind academia that faculty are not

## Experiences With and Impressions of Scholarly and Creative Engagement at GVSU

given credit for." Another stated, "More consistent teaching load (fewer new preps); more acceptance of buyout time or reassigned time." This was the most frequently mentioned code, suggesting faculty perceive time to engage with scholarship - or the lack thereof - as one of the most valuable resources or form of assistance from their Unit.

**Requests for Tangible Support.** This theme was noted by 25 respondents (16.5%). Responses were coded as reflecting this theme if they explicitly requested tangible support such as funding to do research, monetary rewards for finished projects, or practical support such as resources and space. This code captured faculty responses that mention "release time", "reassigned time", "buy out", and sabbaticals which inherently involve a financial investment. For example, one respondent stated, "Reward scholarship via promotion and merit money". Another faculty member stated, "Our Unit needs more physical space to conduct human research."

**Requests for Intangible Support.** This theme was noted by 25 respondents (16.5%). Responses were coded as reflecting this theme if they explicitly requested intangible support such as non-monetary awards and showcasing of research activities and outcomes. One respondent stated, "Talk about it at dept meetings, ask how to support it, make it visible." This code also included general references to wanting scholarship to be valued more. For example, one respondent stated, "Recognize the value of research-active faculty members."

**Information Sharing.** This theme was noted by 16 respondents (10.5%). Responses were coded as reflecting this theme if they referenced how information is shared with faculty, between faculty, and between faculty and the Unit head/Chair. This included general references to research presentation meetings on campus such as "lunch and learns." One faculty stated, "Share among our school the work we're doing. Lunch and learns. Publicize our work in our e-newsletter, on our website, etc." Another faculty stated, "continue to distribute notifications about funding opportunities."

**Assistance with Connection and Collaboration.** This theme was noted by 15 respondents (9.9%). Responses were coded as reflecting this theme if they explicitly requested assistance with helping researchers connect with each other and forming collaborations. One respondent stated, "More collaboration- helping those with interests work together." Another stated, "Incorporate research advice into existing mentoring programs; creation of scholarship accountability to groups to touch base throughout the year."

**Changes or Clarification Regarding Standards for Tenure and Promotion.** This theme was noted by 13 respondents (8.6%). Responses were coded as reflecting this theme if they referenced changes or clarification for the expectations of tenure and promotion. One respondent stated, "Make faculty expectations for scholarship clear for all levels beyond tenure." Another stated, "Scholarship accomplishments should be expected of faculty, especially all new hires."

**Requests for Hiring.** This theme was noted by 12 respondents (7.9%). Responses were coded as reflecting this theme if they explicitly requested that more support staff or faculty be hired. When discussing faculty hires, respondents emphasized the need for replacing faculty lines after a department member has retired. In many cases, these statements were general (e.g., "hire more faculty"). Other responses emphasized the need for support staff. For example, one faculty stated, "With decreased support staff in the office, more administrative tasks are falling to the faculty, which eats up a lot of time."

### *Faculty Feedback to College*

## Experiences With and Impressions of Scholarly and Creative Engagement at GVSU

A total of 157 respondents answered this open-ended question. Responses were coded as reflecting 1) requests for tangible support, 2) requests for intangible support, 3) requests for a more balanced workload, 4) information sharing, 5) assistance with connection and collaboration, 6) requests for more staff to be hired and 7) changes or clarification regarding standards for tenure and promotion<sup>3</sup>. Interrater reliability for these themes was high, Kappa = .91 (Brennan & Prediger, 1981). These themes are discussed below in the order of most-to-least frequently referenced and summarized in Table 9.

Again, in addition to constructive feedback, respondents offered positive feedback for their college's efforts to support scholarly and creative activity at GVSU ( $n = 7$ , 4.5% of respondents). One faculty stated, "The college supports research activities well." A similar number of faculty expressed a negative evaluation of their college ( $n = 6$ , 3.8% of respondents). One respondent stated, "my college does nothing to encourage research."

**Assistance with Balancing Workload.** This theme was noted by 58 respondents (36.9%). Responses were coded as reflecting this theme if they explicitly or implicitly refer to the balance between scholarship, teaching, and service responsibilities, either within an individual's workload, or workload that is distributed across individuals and groups. This included general mentions of needing more time as well as specific strategies that allow for better distribution of time to better support facets of one's workload. One respondent stated, "Recognize the work overload where it exists, and take steps to reduce it so there is time for faculty to do their work...it is the aspect of my otherwise wonderful job that has been the saddest reality of my professional life: in this school, the workload does not allow for scholarship/creative activity, at least not in our department...". This was the most frequently mentioned theme for this question, again suggesting that faculty are acutely aware of and motivated to address the challenges of balancing their professional responsibilities.

**Requests for Tangible Support.** This theme was noted by 50 respondents (31.9%). Responses were coded as reflecting this theme if they explicitly requested tangible support such as funding to do research or monetary rewards for finished projects, but also practical support such as resources and space. This included mentions of "release time", "buy out", and "sabbaticals", which inherently involve a financial investment. For example, one respondent stated, "Provide money for conferences, workshops, publications, travel, technology, student assistance and training."

**Requests for Intangible Support.** This theme was noted by 30 respondents (19.1%). Responses were coded as reflecting this theme if they explicitly requested intangible support such as non-monetary awards and showcasing of research activities and outcomes. This included general references to the value of research. One representative statement includes the following: "recognition and acknowledgment of the time it takes to engage in scholarship."

**Information Sharing.** This theme was noted by 12 respondents (7.6%). Responses were coded as reflecting this theme if they referenced how information is shared with faculty, between faculty, and between faculty and college deans. This included general references to research presentations and weekly writing sessions. In one illustrative example, a respondent stated, "Sponsor faculty/student roundtables of research presentation, book publishing, etc., that present and critique completed faculty projects."

**Assistance with Connection and Collaboration.** This theme was noted by 12 respondents (7.6%). Responses were coded as reflecting this theme if they explicitly requested assistance with helping researchers connect with each other and forming collaborations. For example, one respondent stated, "Promote opportunities for collaborative research across units

## Experiences With and Impressions of Scholarly and Creative Engagement at GVSU

within the college where it fits and makes sense.”

**Requests for Hiring.** This theme was noted by 12 respondents (7.6%). Responses were coded as reflecting this theme if they explicitly requested that more support staff or faculty be hired. One faculty stated, “Hire tenure track faculty. Don't leave fewer of us to do increasing amounts of work.”

**Changes or Clarification Regarding Standards for Tenure and Promotion.** This theme was noted by 11 respondents (7.0%). Responses were coded as reflecting this theme if they referenced changes or clarification for the expectations of tenure and promotion. For example, one respondent stated, “Reduce stress by just being clear about changes in expectations on research. That way we will not suddenly be hit with a 'low performance' remark. Lack of clarity makes for much more stress.”

### *Faculty Feedback to Faculty Governance*

A total of 84 respondents answered this open-ended question. Responses were coded as reflecting 1) requests for tangible support, 2) requests for intangible support, 3) requests for a more balanced workload, 4) requests to streamline various processes, and 5) changes or clarification regarding standards for tenure and promotion. Interrater reliability for these themes was high, Kappa = .85 (Brennan & Prediger, 1981). The themes are discussed below in the order of most-to-least frequently referenced, and frequencies are summarized in Table 10.

In terms of evaluative feedback, one respondent ( $n = 1$ , 1.2% of respondents) offered positive feedback and three ( $n = 3$ , 3.6% of respondents) provided negative feedback. These comments were general statements that did not specifically reference faculty governance.

**Assistance with Balancing Workload.** This theme was noted by 29 respondents (34.5%). Responses were coded as reflecting this theme if they explicitly or implicitly refer to the balance between scholarship, teaching, and service responsibilities, either within an individual's workload, or workload that is distributed across individuals or groups. This included general mentions of needing more time as well as specific strategies that allow for better distribution of time. One respondent stated, “Advocate for a reduction in faculty admin/service requirements so that all efforts faculty are expected to spend time on are truly useful and efficient.” Again, this was the most frequently mentioned theme, indicating a strong desire on the part of faculty for a more manageable and optimized workload.

**Requests for Intangible Support.** This theme was noted by 20 respondents (23.8%). Responses were coded as reflecting this theme if they explicitly requested intangible support such as non-monetary awards and showcasing of research activities and outcomes. This included general references to appreciating the value of research. For example, one respondent stated, “Continue to be a voice to GVSU administration regarding faculty workload and the expectations across service, community engagement and scholarship.”

**Requests for Tangible Support.** This theme was noted by 19 respondents (22.6%). Responses were coded as reflecting this theme if they explicitly requested tangible support such as funding to do research or monetary rewards for finished projects, but also practical support such as resources and space. This included mentions of “release time”, “buy out”, and “sabbaticals”. One respondent stated, “Recognize that \$450-\$900 is not going to be enough funding to keep scholars actively engaged with research. It won't even get a decent panel of respondents for one single project.” Another stated, “Push for more funding and work to create more structures to support faculty research.”

**Changes or Clarification Regarding Standards for Tenure and Promotion.** This

## Experiences With and Impressions of Scholarly and Creative Engagement at GVSU

theme was noted by 13 respondents (15.5%). Responses were coded as reflecting this theme if they referenced changes or clarification for the expectations of tenure and promotion. One respondent stated, “Make scholarship expectations more clear. There is too wide a range of expectation across departments”

**Streamline Processes.** This theme was noted by 7 respondents (8.3%). Responses were coded as reflecting this theme if they requested changes to procedures and structures that impact either the functioning of faculty governance or the work performed by faculty. For example, one respondent stated, “Make it a point to evaluate EACH committee at GVSU and determine if it is even necessary. Cut out non-essential committees.” Another stated, “...and work to create more structures to support faculty research.”

### *Summary and Synthesis - Unit/Department, College, and Faculty Governance Sections*

Due to the similarities found in the preceding sections, we will synthesize feedback to these non-CSCE offices here. Faculty feedback to the Unit/department, College, and Faculty Governance highlight the following key messages, reported in no particular order:

1) Faculty want a more evenly balanced workload. Workload imbalances was the most frequently mentioned theme across all three survey questions. Indeed, balanced workload was the most frequently mentioned theme by a moderate (8-9 more responses than second leading theme) to substantial (25 or more responses than second leading theme) amount throughout all three questions. This suggests a strong consensus that faculty are most concerned with improving the balance between teaching, service, and scholarship more than any other issue. The tone of statements also emphasizes that faculty are keenly aware of the interdependent nature of their teaching, scholarship, and service responsibilities and motivated to optimize this balance. That workload concerns are more frequently mentioned than requests for tangible, monetary support (see below) suggests that many faculty perceive time to engage with scholarship as going further to support scholarly activities than money.

2) Faculty requested both tangible and intangible support. The second and third most frequently mentioned codes were tangible and intangible support, with the former ranking second for the Unit and College, and the latter ranking second for Faculty Governance. Again, the frequency of these themes across questions and relative to other themes emphasizes the importance of facilitating scholarship by providing monetary support and by communicating its value within our communities.

3) Faculty concerns regarding workload and tangible/intangible support span multiple levels of our institutional structure. The fact that these three themes emerged as the most frequent across different levels of our institutional structure - “local” groups like one’s Unit and College, groups that serve and represent the entire faculty community like CSCE and Faculty Governance, and the top University officials - highlight the importance of a multimodal approach to fostering scholarly and creative activity. That is, efforts by one office, group, or administrator may have a greater impact on scholarly engagement at GVSU to the extent they are supported by other offices, groups, and administrators.

### *Faculty Feedback to Office of Research Compliance and Integrity (ORCI)*

A total of 42 respondents answered this open-ended question. Responses were coded as

## Experiences With and Impressions of Scholarly and Creative Engagement at GVSU

reflecting 1) general descriptions of the ORCI's core mission, 2) requests for assistance with the application process, 3) requests for changes to the review process, 4) information sharing, 5) support for specific kinds of research, and 6) requests that fall outside of the ORCI's capabilities. These are discussed below in the order of most-to-least frequently referenced. Interrater reliability for these codes was high, Kappa = .87 (Brennan & Prediger, 1981). See Table 11 for a summary of theme frequency.

In terms of evaluative feedback, 17 respondents (40.5%) offered positive feedback for the ORCI and two (4.8%) offered negative feedback. Regarding the constructive feedback reported below, 7 responses (16.7%) could not be coded because the content of the response did not fit with existing themes or was too vague to code. For example, one respondent stated simply, "Do not suffer fools."; another stated "research is still research".

**Information Sharing.** This theme was noted by 6 respondents (14.3%). Responses were coded as reflecting this theme if they referenced how the ORCI shares information with faculty. This included references to training resources, which was mentioned by 4 of the respondents (66.7%). For example, one faculty stated, "provide simple training videos for common questions."

**Changes to Review Process.** This theme was noted by 4 respondents (9.5%). Responses were coded as reflecting this theme if they referenced changing standards, requirements, or procedures for reviewing applications or protocols. This included mentions of the review process taking too long (e.g., "faster turn around on IRB approvals of full committee") and idiosyncratic reviewers (e.g., "the individual biases that continue to exist in various review boards is concerning at best").

**Recommendations Beyond the Mission of the ORCI.** This theme was noted by 4 respondents (9.5%). Responses were coded as reflecting this theme if they requested something that was beyond the scope of the ORCI mission such as awarding funds (e.g., "grant funding", "provide a simple system that easily tracks funding expenditures"). It seems likely that these responses reflect a misunderstanding of which office the respondent was referring to, or a desire to emphasize, whenever possible, issues especially important to the respondent.

**Assistance with Application Processes.** This theme was noted by 3 respondents (7.1%). Responses were coded as reflecting this theme if they requested assistance with preparing applications/protocols or if they referred to changing requirements for applications. This included general references to the amount of paperwork and time it takes to prepare applications (e.g., "Streamline any forms/training required of faculty.").

**Continue Mission.** This theme was noted by 3 respondents (7.1%). Responses were coded as reflecting this theme if they referenced the basic mission of ORCI, such as "ensure compliance and integrity", but offer no other details or substance. For example, one respondent stated, "Make people be accountable and comply and have integrity."

**Recognition of Specific Research.** This theme was noted by 1 respondent (2.4%). Responses were coded as reflecting this theme if they requested either intangible or tangible support to be devoted to specific types of research, fields, or personnel. The respondent stated, "They do a good job but should learn more about [type of research redacted] protocols."

### ***Faculty Feedback to Institutional Review Board (IRB) or Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee (IACUC)***

A total of 51 respondents answered this open-ended question. Responses were coded as reflecting 1) general descriptions of the IRB/IACUC's core mission, 2) requests for assistance

## Experiences With and Impressions of Scholarly and Creative Engagement at GVSU

with the application process, 3) requests for changes to the review process, 4) information sharing, 5) support for specific kinds of research, 6) requests that fall outside of the IRB/IACUC's capabilities. These are discussed below in the order of most-to-least frequently referenced. Interrater reliability for these codes was high, Kappa = .90 (Brennan & Prediger, 1981). In terms of evaluative feedback, 19 respondents (37.3%) offered positive feedback for the IRB/IACUC and 2 (3.9%) offered negative feedback. See Table 12 for a summary of theme frequency.

**Information Sharing.** This theme was noted by 9 respondents (17.7%). Responses were coded as reflecting this theme if they referenced how the IRB/IACUC shares information with faculty. This included general references to being offered training. For example, one faculty stated, "Offer times that are open to come and get help working on IRBs. I put them in so infrequently that I forget the steps. It would be more time-efficient to have a workshop to attend."

**Changes to Review Process.** This theme was noted by 7 respondents (13.7%). Responses were coded as reflecting this theme if they advocated for changing standards, requirements, or procedures for reviewing applications or protocols. This included mentions of the review process taking too long and reviewers being idiosyncratic. One respondent stated, "Provide timely reviews of IRB submissions and strong supports to remediate or address issues that arise. Clear guidelines for what is necessary or how things have changed due to the pandemic."

**Assistance with Application Processes.** This theme was noted by 6 respondents (11.8%). Responses were coded as reflecting this theme if they requested assistance with procedures to prepare applications or protocols and if they referred to changing requirements for applications. This included general references to the amount of paperwork and time it takes to prepare applications. One faculty stated, "Make the process less daunting. There are way too many questions and it takes almost several days to fill this out. Even to administer a survey has such a long process to obtain approval. Some sort of easier way will be very beneficial."

**Continue Mission.** This theme was noted by 4 respondents (7.8%). Responses were coded as reflecting this theme if they referenced the basic mission of IRB/IACUC, such as "make clear the importance of research ethics" but offer no other feedback. For example, one respondent stated, "Continue to balance being diligent, strict with compliance to prevent violations, liability or exposure with being streamlined and efficient. It's a hard balance to strike but I think they have done a good job at it."

**Recognition of Specific Research.** This theme was noted by 4 respondents (7.8%). Responses were coded as reflecting this theme if they requested either intangible or tangible support to be devoted to specific types of inquiry, fields, or personnel. One respondent, when discussing misunderstandings about their area of research, stated, "I know several faculty members who have deliberately moved away from community engagement and clinical research studies due to this IRB review process."

**Recommendations Beyond the Mission of the IRB/IACUC.** This theme was noted by 2 respondents (3.9%). Responses were coded as reflecting this theme if they requested something that was beyond the responsibilities of the IRB/IACUC such as awarding funds or identifying human subjects to recruit (which is the responsibility of principal investigators).

### *Faculty Feedback to Office of Sponsored Programs (OSP)*

A total of 55 respondents answered this open-ended question. Responses were coded as



## Experiences With and Impressions of Scholarly and Creative Engagement at GVSU

reflecting 1) general descriptions of the OSP's core mission, 2) requests for proactive support, 3) requests for more staff to be hired, 4) requests for assistance with the application process, 5) requests for changes to the review process, 6) information sharing, 7) support for specific kinds of research, 8) requests that fall outside of the OSP's capabilities. These are discussed below in the order of most-to-least frequently referenced. Interrater reliability for these codes was high, Kappa = .94 (Brennan & Prediger, 1981).

In terms of evaluative feedback, 11 respondents (20%) offered positive feedback for the OSP, and 0 respondents offered negative feedback. Notably, 7 respondents (12.7%) stated they were unsure of the OSP's purpose and capabilities (e.g., "not sure what this office does", "let people know what their program does"). See Table 13 for a summary of theme frequency.

**Information Sharing.** This theme was noted by 9 respondents (16.4%). Responses were coded as reflecting this theme if they referenced how the OSP shares information with faculty. This included general references to being offered training. One faculty stated, "monthly or bimonthly newsletter about what is happening and what is available". Another stated, "Visit departments, get to know research areas of faculty so you can help find grants we might apply for. We simply do not have the time to browse!".

**Requests for Proactive Support.** This theme was noted by 8 respondents (14.6%). Responses were coded as reflecting this theme if they requested that the OSP actively help faculty identify funding sources. One faculty stated, "Rather than waiting for faculty to approach them with grant ideas, it would be helpful for them to proactively seek out grant opportunities that would be a good fit for GVSU faculty."

**Assistance with the Application Process.** This theme was noted by 7 respondents (12.7%). Responses were coded as reflecting this theme if they requested assistance with procedures to prepare applications or protocols and if they referred to changing requirements for applications. This included general references to the amount of paperwork and time it takes to prepare applications. One faculty stated, "Make it as easy to submit and execute a grant. The faculty do not submit these grant proposals and forms often enough to remember everything. We appreciate any help that we can get."

**Recognition of Specific Scholarly/Creative Activities.** This theme was noted by 7 respondents (12.7%). Responses were coded as reflecting this theme if they requested either intangible or tangible support to be devoted to specific types of inquiry, fields, or personnel that are perceived as not typically supported by this office. Respondents emphasized the need for "seed funding" and collaborative grants, funds to hire undergraduate and graduate research assistants, and funds that support course releases.

**Continue Mission.** This theme was noted by 7 respondents (12.7%). Responses were coded as reflecting this theme if they referenced the basic mission of OSP, such as "financial support", or "find funding for active scholars".

**Hiring Staff for OSP.** This theme was noted by 5 respondents (9.1%). Responses were coded as reflecting this theme if they explicitly requested that more support staff or faculty be hired for the OSP office. This is encapsulated by this example statement: "Have more people. There are too few people who can work with faculty."

**Assistance with Management Process.** This theme was noted by 4 respondents (7.3%). Responses were coded as reflecting this theme if they requested assistance with an aspect of grant management. One respondent stated, "Provide better post-grant management support."

**Recommendations Beyond the Mission of the OSP.** This theme was noted by 1 respondent (1.8%). Responses were coded as reflecting this theme if they requested something

## Experiences With and Impressions of Scholarly and Creative Engagement at GVSU

that was beyond the capabilities of the OSP such as directly awarding funds.

### ***Faculty Feedback to Center for Undergraduate Scholar Engagement (i.e., OURS, Fellowships)***

A total of 65 respondents answered this open-ended question. Responses were coded as reflecting 1) general descriptions of the CUSE/OURS 's core mission, 2) requests for assistance with various processes, 3) requests for tangible support, 4) requests for intangible support, 5) information sharing, 6) support for specific kinds of research, and 7) requests that fall outside of the CUSE's capabilities. These are discussed below in the order of most-to-least frequently referenced. Interrater reliability for these codes was high, Kappa = .88 (Brennan & Prediger, 1981). In terms of evaluative feedback, 15 respondents (23.1%) offered positive feedback for the CUSE/OURS and 1 (1.5%) offered negative feedback. See Table 14 for a summary of theme frequency.

**Requests for Tangible Support.** This theme was noted by 21 respondents (32.3%). Responses were coded as reflecting this theme if they explicitly requested tangible support such as funding to execute scholarly/creative activity, monetary awards for finished projects, but also practical support such as resources and space. Most responses referenced more or continued support or expansion of existing funding mechanisms (e.g., "better funding for conference travel", "expand summer programs", "more funds available to hire undergrad"). Specific requests for tangible support emphasized funding activities during the academic year (e.g., "more opportunities like the semester-based Remote OURS grants"), support for small-scale research projects, and support for faculty mentors, not just undergraduate students (e.g., "provide more official compensation for mentoring students, either via time or funds").

**Recognition of Specific Scholarly/Creative Activities.** This theme was noted by 11 respondents (16.9%). Responses were coded as reflecting this theme if they requested either intangible or tangible support to be devoted to specific types of inquiry, fields, personnel, or models. Most responses emphasized perceived discrepancies in funding across fields (e.g., "Support humanities and social science (educational) research and not just the sciences") and inquiry models (e.g., "Support faculty who work with larger groups of students. Not just the one to one ratio").

**Continue Mission.** This theme was noted by 10 respondents (15.4%). Responses were coded as reflecting this theme if they referenced the basic mission of CUSE/OURS, such as "provide funding for undergraduate research assistants" but offer no other details or substance. For example, one respondent stated, "Continue to provide funding mechanisms to students and faculty for productive mentored research relationships" which encapsulates the basic mission of CUSE.

**Assistance with Processes.** This theme was noted by 10 respondents (15.4%). Responses were coded as reflecting this theme if they referenced streamlining or revising application, review, training, and any other processes related to the funding OURS provides. This included references to applying for funds, review of those applications, how funds are administered, eligibility for funds, final reports, and research assistant training. For example, one respondent stated, "reduce the number of workshops and required "trainings" that many of these programs entail so students can focus on lab work." Another stated, "Decrease the length of submissions so that it is less work to apply for programs that only supply meager funds."

**Information Sharing.** This theme was noted by 4 respondents (6.2%). Responses were coded as reflecting this theme if they referenced how CUSE/OURS shares information and

## Experiences With and Impressions of Scholarly and Creative Engagement at GVSU

communicates with faculty. For example, one faculty stated, “perhaps monthly open houses and chances for faculty to promote research in person.”

**Recommendations Beyond the Mission of CUSE/OURS.** This theme was noted by 2 respondents (3.1%). Responses were coded as reflecting this theme if they requested something that was beyond the responsibilities of the CUSE/OURS such as providing funding for graduate students and non-scholarly/creative activities like instructional design.

**Assistance with Connection and Collaboration.** This theme was noted by 2 respondents (3.1%). Responses were coded as reflecting this theme if they explicitly requested assistance with helping scholars connect with students and forming collaborations. One respondent stated, “Connect students with potential mentors based on their mutual interests.”

**Requests for Intangible Support.** This theme was noted by 0 respondents. As described in previous sections, responses would be coded as reflecting this theme if they explicitly requested intangible support such as non-monetary awards and expressions of congratulations and affirmation for scholarly/creative activities and their outcomes. This code also includes general references to the value of research. The lack of respondents requesting intangible support from the CUSE/OURS could possibly indicate that faculty are currently satisfied with the efforts of this office to signal the value of scholarship, or that they do not perceive this as a primary role of this office.

### *Faculty Feedback to Other CSCE Offices (e.g., Lab Safety, Tech Commercialization, High Performance Computing)*

A total of 30 respondents answered this open-ended question. Responses were coded as referring to 1) CSCE and CSCE-sponsored sources of internal funding, 2) High Performance Computing, 3) Lab safety, and 4) non-CSCE offices (e.g., IT/Tech Supply). Some respondents did not specify a CSCE office; however their responses coalesce to reflect a need for 5) assistance with information sharing. These are discussed below in the order of most-to-least frequently referenced. Given the small number of respondents to this survey question, we focus our analysis on themes that emerge for 3 (10%) or more respondents. As such, responses that reference lab safety were not summarized as there were not more than three respondents who mentioned this code.

**CSCE.** This theme was noted by 8 respondents (20%). Responses were coded as reflecting this theme if they explicitly referred to “CSCE”, a specific CSCE funding mechanism, or the need for research-related supplies (which is the purview of the “main” CSCE office and R&D). A little less than half of responses (37.5%) expressed a positive assessment of the CSCE (e.g., “We have great support from CSCE. The bridge grant. And staffs are wonderful to work with and really helpful.”). The remaining responses emphasize the need for more or continued funding.

**High Performance Computing.** This theme was noted by 6 respondents (20%). Responses were coded as reflecting this theme if they mentioned High Performance Computing. Half of responses (50%) expressed a negative evaluation of the HPC. The remaining responses expressed a neutral (33%) or a positive (16%) assessment. One respondent stated, “HPC has been a real barrier to accessing remote servers for intensive analyses. It has taken years to get software installed on servers.”

**Information Sharing.** This theme was noted by 5 respondents (16.7%). Responses were coded as reflecting this theme if they referenced communication and sharing information between faculty and CSCE offices. Respondents reported wanting more information (e.g., “I’m

## Experiences With and Impressions of Scholarly and Creative Engagement at GVSU

not sure what's offered on campus.") or offered solutions to improve communication and information sharing (e.g., "perhaps monthly online series for faculty, staff and students on these various topics?").

**Other, Non-CSCE Offices.** Some faculty offered feedback regarding offices that are not part of the CSCE structure, namely IT/Technology Supply. This theme was noted by 3 respondents (10%). Responses were coded as reflecting this theme if they generally mentioned IT or Tech Supply more specifically. All responses expressed a critical evaluation of IT and or Tech Supply. One respondent stated, "IT support and access to adequate research space have been the largest barriers to productivity I have faced (beyond time)."

### *Faculty Feedback to Other Office, Committee, or Individual*

A total of 25 respondents answered this open-ended question. Responses were coded as referring to 1) CSCE, 2) IT/Tech Supply 3) upper administration, 4) Business and Finance or Accounting offices, 5) other unlisted offices, 6) requests for tangible support, and 7) requests for intangible support. Due to the low number of respondents to this survey question, we focus our analysis on themes that emerge for 3 (12%) or more respondents. These are discussed below in the order of most-to-least frequently referenced.

**Upper Administration.** This theme was noted by 12 respondents (48%). Responses were coded as reflecting this theme if they mentioned Upper Administration, the President, the Provost, and/or the Senior Leadership Team (SLT). Most of these responses (91%) expressed a criticism of Upper Administration. One respondent stated, "Senior Leadership Team. Make "the pursuit of knowledge" part of GVSU's mission. We are not here just to educate students, we are also here to produce original research and further human knowledge."

**Other Unlisted Offices.** This theme was noted by 3 respondents (12%). Responses were coded as reflecting this theme if they explicitly mentioned any office that was not captured by other codes. Three offices were mentioned with this code: Library, Facilities, and Faculty Governance.

### *Summary and Synthesis – Feedback to CSCE Offices*

It is challenging, and perhaps uninformative, to synthesize the feedback provided to CSCE offices given the relatively smaller number of responses (Ns range from 30 to 65 for these offices) and the varied missions of CSCE offices. Therefore, the key points that follow speak to major themes that emerged from the feedback given for 1) advisory/oversight offices (ORCI, IRB/IACUC, OSP, etc.) and 2) funding offices (CUSE). Faculty feedback to the CSCE offices highlights the following key messages, reported in no particular order:

1) Faculty want more accessible information and assistance with processes from advisory offices. Among advisory offices that primarily offer informational guidance to faculty scholars, the most frequently mentioned types of feedback involve improvements to information sharing procedures and assistance with facets of application processes. This indicates that faculty highly value easily accessible information regarding office functions, types of supports available, and more straightforward application processes.

2) Faculty want tangible support from offices that provide funds. Among offices that do directly provide funds (OURS/CUSE), the most frequently mentioned theme was, perhaps not surprisingly, requests for more tangible support. Faculty expressed their appreciation for existing

## Experiences With and Impressions of Scholarly and Creative Engagement at GVSU

funds and funding mechanisms, but also stated the need for expanding the amount and types of funds available.

### The Perceived Value of Scholarly/Creative Activity at Different Levels of the University

#### Faculty Descriptions of Value

The first question in this section of the survey asked, “What do you perceive to be the value of engaging in scholarly and creative activity at GVSU?” A total of 278 respondents answered this question. Of primary interest, responses were coded to assess different conceptualizations of the value of engaging in scholarship. Within this thematic category, we identified 10 themes: 1) The intrinsic value of scholarship, 2) scholarly advancement, 3) faculty job responsibilities, 4) student outcomes, 5) elevating GVSU, 6) creating a dynamic scholarly community, 7) contributing knowledge, 8) knowledge application, 9) scholarship compliments other activities, and 10) scholarship distracts from other activities.

Additionally, several faculty respondents voiced their perceptions of the degree of value placed on scholarship at the University. While this was not what the question intended to assess, these responses provide insight into the mindset of faculty and the current scholarly climate, and mirror other questions posed in this section of the survey. Consequently, we identified two other thematic categories: Degree of Value, and Value Discrepancies. Within the Degree of Value thematic category, responses were coded as reflecting the sentiment that research has been given 1) high or excessive value, 2) moderate or sufficient value, or 3) low or insufficient value at GVSU. This category also codes for statements that convey 4) uncertainty about degree of value. Within the Value Discrepancies thematic category, responses were coded as reflecting the sentiment that scholarship is valued differently 1) across the stages of one’s career, 2) across groups at GVSU, 3) in terms of what people say about it vs. do to support it, 4) in terms of actual vs. ideal degree of value, and 5) in the past vs. present. Interrater reliability for these codes was high, Kappa = .93.

#### *Conceptualizations of the Value of Engaging in Scholarly/Creative Activity*

Respondents who provided a concrete description of how they perceived the value of scholarship identified ten descriptions of value. These are discussed below in the order of most-to-least frequently referenced. Frequencies are also summarized in Table 15.

**Scholarship Compliments other Professional Activities.** This theme was noted by 108 respondents (38.9%). Responses were coded as reflecting this theme if they explicitly conveyed the belief that scholarly activity enriches other aspects of one’s professional responsibilities at GVSU, including teaching and/or service. This included references to research active faculty as more knowledgeable teachers and better equipped to address professional responsibilities. One respondent stated, “My scholarship directly informs other aspects of my work and keeps me more engaged and informed in my teaching and service.” Another stated, “It is what gives me the knowledge to teach, and it is vital in all of my activities in the university. If I am engaged in research, I have more to share in the classroom, my research developments allow me to connect to my fellow faculty in meaningful way, and it promotes the liberal arts philosophy of the university.”

Given the large number of responses that reflect this code, we explored the data further to identify sub-themes. Notably, it was common for respondents to reference multiple sub-themes.

## Experiences With and Impressions of Scholarly and Creative Engagement at GVSU

Of these 108 responses, 89 (82.4%) emphasized that scholarship and teaching are mutually beneficial activities. One faculty member illustrated this point by stating, “If a prof isn't learning, they can't teach well.” Indeed, 23 (21.3%) responses emphasized that incorporating scholarship in the classroom can inspire interest and passion in students. Similarly, 10 (9.3%) responses conveyed the belief that faculty who are engaged in scholarship tend to be more passionate teachers. Lastly, 10 (9.3%) responses referenced scholarship as an important component of enhancing faculty’s abilities to perform service responsibilities. This “scholarship as complementary” theme was the most frequently mentioned theme overall which indicates that many faculty believe that engaging in scholarly/creative activity benefits their other professional responsibility.

**Scholarly Activity Benefits Student Scholars.** This theme was noted by 94 respondents (33.8%). Responses were coded as reflecting this theme if they referenced scholarship’s benefit to students by acting as a high impact experience for students and being an alternative route for learning beyond the classroom context. Respondents state that, “Learning outside the classroom with faculty is a unique opportunity that we talk about to incoming students.”, that it “Models for students the benefits of cultivating an inquisitive mind.”, and “...captures the interest of those bright and creative students that standard course work may not inspire.”, and “...staying current enough with a discipline to publish something helps us steer our students into currently active fields (perhaps by scholarly contacts)...”.

Some responses elaborated on the specific kinds of benefits students may experience as a result of engaging in scholarly and creative activity. Of the 94 responses, 23 (24.5%) described how students can experience personal benefits like the acquisition of skills, participating in hands-on learning, and gaining scientific role models. For example, one respondent stated, “It provides students opportunities to work and learn outside of the classroom setting. They learn the value of failure, learning from mistakes, trouble-shooting, critical thinking. This is something that can be done in a classroom setting, but not at the same level as that done in a lab.” Another respondent builds on this sentiment to include, “academic ownership, self-direction, and creative problem solving in the face of setbacks sets the stage for students to become adult learners.” Additionally, 15 (16%) responses described professional benefits to students, including learning about different potential careers (e.g., “It helps encourage students to consider R&D career directions that they wouldn’t otherwise encounter.”), and becoming more competitive for jobs, internships, and graduate programs (e.g., “Additional benefits...can include getting students internships with collaborating external groups”, and “...this enhances their chances to apply to prestigious graduate schools for PhD programs.”).

**Scholarship Has Intrinsic Value.** This theme was noted by 56 respondents (20.1%). Responses were coded as reflecting this theme if they expressed the belief that research has an inherent value by its very nature. This included references to personally enjoying research, intellectual curiosity, and research as a key component of identity. One faculty member stated, “It is also the enriching intellectual adventure that drew all of us faculty to pursue our graduate degrees and a career in academia.” Another faculty member stated, “I do research because I personally enjoy it and believe that being a scholar means life-long learning.”

**The Value of Improving as a Scholar.** This theme was noted by 50 respondents (18.0%). Responses were coded as reflecting this theme if they conveyed the belief that scholarship provides opportunities for faculty to stay current in the field, practice skills, and opens doors for professional growth. One respondent emphasized the importance of, “Building a research agenda that informs my work and understanding of the discipline.” Another faculty

## Experiences With and Impressions of Scholarly and Creative Engagement at GVSU

member described, “staying current in the discipline in keeping my own research skills up-to-date.”

**Scholarship Contributes Important/New Knowledge.** This theme was noted by 46 respondents (16.6%). Responses were coded as reflecting this theme if they referenced using scholarship to advance the field, further human knowledge, and contribute to something larger than themselves. One faculty member illustrates this theme well with the following straightforward statement: “My motivation to pursue research stems from a personal desire to add more knowledge to the world.”

**Scholarship Elevates GVSU.** This theme was noted by 35 respondents (12.6%). Responses were coded as reflecting this theme if they referenced scholarship’s ability to bring recognition to GVSU. This included mentions of distinguishing GVSU from other universities and recruiting strong students and faculty. For example, one respondent stated, “brings recognition to GVSU and my program - attracts students - demonstrates the quality of the program and educational value when faculty publish and disseminate.”

**Scholarship is a Job Requirement.** This theme was noted by 32 respondents (11.5%). Responses were coded as reflecting this theme if they emphasized scholarship as a necessary component to being a faculty member. Respondents described how, “Knowledge creation is part of our job. It’s what makes us a university.”, and “Teaching is an intellectual profession. In order to be an academic, teaching at the University level, it is vital that one engages in scholarly and creative activity.” This theme included references to scholarship as a requirement for tenure/promotion and receiving raises. For example, one respondent stated, “all college personnel documents include scholarship expectations for tenure/promotion actions.”

**Scholarly Knowledge is Useful/Impactful.** This theme was noted by 24 respondents (8.6%). Responses were coded as reflecting this theme if they referenced scholarship’s implications for policy, communities, and work in specific fields/industries. For example, one respondent described how active engagement in scholarship can have “...local and even global impact at the scientific, educational and societal levels.”

**Scholarly Activity Fosters a Dynamic Community.** This theme was noted by 21 respondents (7.6%). Responses were coded as reflecting this theme if they conveyed the belief that scholarship creates a desirable community in which to work and learn. This community/climate theme was also reflected in statements that emphasized the positive, collective outcomes gained by building relationships among students and colleagues. One respondent stated, “It makes the university a dynamic and thriving community where knowledge happens, where new ways of understanding the world are supported, encouraged, celebrated. It makes GVSU an exciting place to work and study.”

**Scholarly Activity Distracts from Other Responsibilities.** This theme was noted by 6 respondents (2.2%). Responses were coded as reflecting this theme if they referenced research as something that takes time away from teaching and service responsibilities. For example, one respondent stated, “Particular colleagues seem able to carry out significant academic/scientific research. My perception is that most (not all, but most) who do this manage it by to some extent shirking service, or teaching, responsibilities.”

### *Degree of Value*

Respondents who provided a description of how they perceived the degree of value identified four descriptions of value. These are discussed below in the order of most-to-least frequently referenced.

## Experiences With and Impressions of Scholarly and Creative Engagement at GVSU

**Low/Insufficient Value.** This theme was noted by 45 respondents (16.2%). Responses were coded as reflecting this theme if they expressed one of the following sentiments: scholarly activity is not valued enough, not valued enough compared to teaching and service responsibilities, or should be valued more. One respondent stated, “I think GVSU does not value research and scholarship. It does a poor job of recognizing the talents we have on the campus. Furthermore, I noticed that active scholarship does not translate into an increase in salaries and a positive impression in the promotion or getting tenured”. Another stated, “GVSU seems very unconcerned with scholarship, other than for me to meet the requirements of tenure. Tenured faculty seem uninterested in scholarship.”

**Moderate/Sufficient Value.** This theme was noted by 13 respondents (4.7%). Responses were coded as reflecting this theme if they conveyed one of the following beliefs: that research is valued sufficiently at GVSU, valued appropriately and/or proportionately to the importance of teaching and service activities, or no changes in value are needed. For example, one faculty member stated, “I think GVSU still values knowledge scholarship and creative activity for its intrinsic value. And that's a good thing. I hope that continues.”

**High/Excessive Value.** This theme was noted by 8 respondents (2.9%). Responses were coded as reflecting this theme if they expressed one of the following sentiments: that scholarly activity is valued too much at GVSU, is valued disproportionately more than teaching and service activities, or should be valued less. For example, one respondent stated, “We overvalue it. Or, at least my department does. I think it is very differently valued at different places in the university. I view this is a problem.”

**Unsure of Value.** This theme was noted by 3 respondents (1.1%). Responses were coded as reflecting this theme if they expressed that they were unsure of research's value at GVSU or unable to judge its degree of value. One respondent stated, “It's unclear how much faculty research and scholarship is valued at the administrative level.”

### ***Value Discrepancies***

Respondents who provided a detailed account of how value differs across the university identified five different types of value discrepancies. These are discussed below in the order of most-to-least frequently referenced.

**Communications Vs. Actions.** This theme was noted by 26 respondents (9.4%). Responses were coded as reflecting this theme if they referred to a discrepancy between what people - including both faculty and administration - say or communicate about the value of scholarly/creative activity and what people do to support it. For example, one respondent stated, “We say it's highly valued, but we are constantly putting up barriers to successful scholarship. It's hard to get funding all along the process. We are constantly trying to take sabbaticals away or reduce them.”

**Differences Across Groups.** This theme was noted by 21 respondents (7.6%). Responses were coded as reflecting this theme if they mentioned differences in how research is valued across departments, colleges, and fields. For example, one faculty member stated, “Varies depending on department and college; some place a higher value and have higher standards for scholarly and creative activity than others.”

**Actual Vs. Ideal Degree of Value.** This theme was noted by 13 respondents (4.7%). Responses were coded as reflecting this theme if they highlighted differences between how scholarship is currently valued and how scholarship should ideally be valued. For example, one respondent stated, “I think that there is a tendency to value my research more for the opportunities I provide undergraduate research assistants (high impact experiences) than for its



## Experiences With and Impressions of Scholarly and Creative Engagement at GVSU

own sake. If I think about that too much, it makes me feel as though my work isn't valued as much as it could be. For my own health and well-being, I try not to persevere on this.”

**Degree of Value in Present Vs. Past.** This theme was noted by 7 respondents (2.5%). Responses were coded as reflecting this theme if they emphasized differences in how research is currently valued and how research was valued in the past. One respondent stated, “The “Significant focus” part of the faculty load was created to recognize the importance of scholarship, yet over time it seems to have been chipped away, with individuals taking on curricular or administrative tasks as their Significant Focus....it was never intended to a back-door way for people to take on jobs like assessment or run search committees.”

**Differences Across Career.** This theme was noted by 2 respondents (0.7%). Responses were coded as reflecting this theme if they mentioned differences in how research is valued across stages of a faculty member’s career trajectory. One respondent stated, “High during tenure and promotion. Low thereafter.”

### Summary and Synthesis

Faculty feedback regarding the value of scholarship emphasize the following key messages, reported in no particular order:

1) Faculty responses reflect a diverse array of reasons to value scholarly/creative activity.

Faculty described a wide range of conceptualizations of the value of scholarship at GVSU; these responses reflect 9 unique themes.

2) Individual faculty responses often describe multiple conceptualizations of value. Despite having a similar number of respondents ( $N = 278$ ) as previous questions about the CSCE ( $N = 246$ ) and the University ( $N = 253$ ), individual responses describing conceptualizations of the value of scholarship at GVSU often included more than one theme. This results in many more separate pieces of feedback to this survey question (472, see Table 15) relative to previous survey questions about the CSCE (350, see Table 6) and the University (401, see Table 7).

3) Faculty believe that scholarly activity is far more complimentary than distracting. The sentiment that scholarly and creative engagement increases the value and caliber of one’s teaching and service activities was the most frequently mentioned theme in this section. Notably, 18 times more respondents conveyed this belief ( $n = 108$ ) than conveyed the belief that scholarship detracts from teaching ( $n = 6$ ). This theme’s pervasiveness shows that faculty strongly believe in GVSU’s teacher-scholar model, and that decrements in or devaluation of scholarship could have negative implications for the work faculty do in the classroom to empower learners.

4) Faculty believe that including student scholars in their scholarly and creative endeavors is an impactful pedagogical and professional experience. This was the second most frequently mentioned theme in this section. For many fields, first-hand experience with scholarly inquiry and creative activity is one of the most impactful experiences students can have at GVSU - not only in terms of cultivating their foundation of knowledge in a field or technical and cognitive skill sets, but also in terms sparking intellectual curiosity and building a professional network to advance students’ future academic and professional pursuits. Mentoring is essential to this endeavor and is a marketable strength that sets GVSU apart from competitor institutions.

## Experiences With and Impressions of Scholarly and Creative Engagement at GVSU

5) Faculty believe that scholarly and creative activity is integral to their identity and professional development. These themes were the third and fourth most frequently mentioned themes, respectively, and represent a more personal side to the value of scholarly/creative endeavors at GVSU. That is, these activities yield personal benefits to faculty, both in terms of their psychological well-being and their striving for excellence in their profession. This suggests that efforts that foster engagement in scholarly/creative activity at GVSU also have the potential to foster an inclusive campus climate for faculty.

One general observation: Despite being closer to the end of this extensive survey, this question about the value of scholarly/creative activity still received very thorough and passionate responses. Indeed, when offered an additional opportunity to “share any additional thoughts you have about the value of scholarly and creative activity at GVSU”, 123 respondents (44%) took the time to elaborate on their previous statements. We did not systematically code these statements, as a cursory review did not identify any new themes beyond those identified above. Instead, these statements frequently affirmed GVSU as a teaching-focused institution, the complementary nature of teaching and scholarship, and the need for better workload balance through sufficient monetary support.

### Perceived Degree of Value of Scholarly/Creative Activity at Unit, College, and University Levels

#### Perceived Degree of Value at the Unit/Department Level

Respondents were asked, “How much do you think your Unit/Department values scholarly and creative activity?” and provided a rating scale ranging from 1 (*none at all*) to 5 (*a great deal*), with 3 (*a moderate amount*) as the midpoint. A total of 299 respondents answered this question. The overall mean score was above the midpoint ( $M = 3.67$ ,  $SD = .97$ ), representing a degree of value somewhere between “a moderate amount” and “a lot”. The median score was a 4 (*a lot*). 87.3% of participants answered this question with a 3 (*a moderate amount*, the midpoint) or higher.

Respondents were then asked, “What evidence or experiences are you drawing on to answer this question re: the value of scholarship within your Unit/Department?”. A total of 257 respondents answered this question, with 250 respondents providing usable/codable responses. As a first step, we coded the evaluative tone of these responses. That is, we coded each response as either clearly indicating 1) support for the value of scholarship, 2) lack of support for, or opposition to, the value of scholarship, 3) both support and opposition, or 4) neither explicit support nor opposition (evaluatively neutral statements). This analysis is an alternative way of examining, with qualitative data, respondents' impressions of the value their Units place on scholarly/creative activity.

These results mirror the quantitative results mentioned previously: most respondents convey that their Units show support for the value of scholarship ( $n = 110$ , 42.8%). For example, one faculty member stated, “My unit is enthusiastic about my scholarship and responds to requests supporting endeavors as needed.” By contrast, 45 respondents (17.5%) provide evidence showing lack of support for scholarship (e.g., “I’ve been told on multiple occasions that I am not permitted to engage in scholarly activities because “Department teaching workload needs must

## Experiences With and Impressions of Scholarly and Creative Engagement at GVSU

be prioritized.”), and 28 respondents (10.9%) describe mixed support (e.g., “We are given resources but not enough time.”). Sixty-seven respondents (26.1%) provided evaluatively neutral statements (e.g., “Conversations with other faculty, personnel decisions.”).

More importantly, each piece of evidence mentioned by respondents was coded to identify key themes. These include: 1) General critiques, 2) general affirmations, 3) social context cues, 4) prioritization, 5) information sharing/communication, 6) intangible support, 7) tangible support, and 8) faculty evaluations<sup>4</sup>. The most frequently mentioned pieces of evidence - identified by 15% or more of respondents - are discussed in more detail below. See Table 16 for a summary of theme frequencies.

### *Faculty Evaluations*

This was the most mentioned piece of evidence for the perceived value of scholarly activity, noted by 119 respondents (46.3%). Responses were coded as reflecting this theme if they discussed faculty evaluation in some way, referenced scholarship’s place in tenure and promotion standards, yearly faculty evaluations (FAP/FAR reviews), and/or merit raises. Since this was the most common theme in responses to this question, we further examined whether respondents were citing this evidence as supportive of or in opposition to the value of scholarship. Specifically, most responses were either value neutral ( $n = 51$ , 42.9% of theme responses, e.g., “Yearly review and pay raises”) or positive in tone ( $n = 46$ , 38.7%). For example, one faculty member stated, “In personnel decisions, scholarship is often viewed as the most important area of consideration.” By comparison, 12 (10.1%) respondents cited faculty evaluations when discussing mixed messages regarding the value of scholarly/creative activity (e.g., “Weak scholarship would damage for personnel decisions but strong scholarship would not be rewarded.”), and 9 (7.6%) respondents cited this theme when discussing limited valuation of scholarship (e.g., “My scholarship and my having a [name of grant redacted] were dismissed as irrelevant when it came to promotion.”). This theme’s prominence suggests that the weight given to scholarship in faculty evaluations is a key piece of information faculty use to gauge their Unit’s valuation of scholarly/creative activity.

### *Intangible Support*

This theme was noted by 55 (21.4%) faculty members. Responses were coded as reflecting this theme if they mentioned the support and encouragement of research engagement and achievements by colleagues and unit heads. Respondents emphasized the way in which encouragement and small, but meaningful, gestures can positively impact both the perceived value of research and the researcher themselves. One respondent illustrates this theme well by stating, “My department chair encourages each of us to produce, then congratulates our success.”

### *What is Prioritized*

This theme was noted by 52 (20.2%) respondents. Responses were coded as reflecting this theme if they discussed which faculty responsibilities are seen as most important or mentioned a tradeoff between certain responsibilities. Many responses highlighted the tendency for other responsibilities such as teaching and service to take priority over scholarship. For example, one faculty member stated, “I am a research-active scholar. My personal experience showed that the program values a service-active faculty more than someone who is a research-active faculty. I noticed that our research is a kind of a check-box that needs to be marked rather than recognized as a valuable contribution to the institutional reputation.”

## Experiences With and Impressions of Scholarly and Creative Engagement at GVSU

### ***Information Sharing and Communication***

This theme was noted by 48 (18.7%) faculty members. Responses were coded as reflecting this theme if they referenced colleagues and Unit heads communicating about scholarly engagement and achievements, either generally or about the specific work faculty are doing. This included mentions of collaborating with fellow faculty members on research projects. For example, one respondent stated, “In the past we have regularly hosted faculty presentations on the state of their scholarship, what they are researching and how. In these exchanges it has been possible for us not only to learn what others are doing, but to contribute actively to a colleague’s success.”

### **Perceived Degree of Value at College Level**

Respondents were asked, “How much do you think your College values scholarly and creative activity?”, and were provided a rating scale ranging from 1 (*none at all*) to 5 (*a great deal*), with 3 (*a moderate amount*) as the midpoint. A total of 292 respondents answered this question. The overall mean score was slightly above the midpoint ( $M = 3.23$ ,  $SD = .97$ ), representing “a moderate amount” of value. The median score was also a 3. Almost 78% (77.7%) of participants answered this question with a 3 (*a moderate amount*) or higher.

Respondents were then asked, “What evidence or experiences are you drawing on to answer this question re: the value of scholarship within your College?”. A total of 221 respondents answered this question, with 203 respondents providing usable/codable responses. We again coded the evaluative tone of these responses (see prior section, Perceived Degree of Value at the Unit Level, for further description). Responses for this section again mirror the quantitative data, but also more clearly demonstrate the degree of variability in faculty perceptions. The largest percentage of respondents state that the College support for scholarship is limited or absent ( $n = 72$ , 32.6%). For example, one faculty member stated, “College support has been decreasing due to limited resources and shifting strategic priorities. There is less time and funds to support research and it's not often spoken of in terms of strategy, except as a tool to facilitate teaching.” A total of 54 respondents (24.4%) describe their College as more supportive of scholarship (e.g., “The dean has provided opportune support to research initiatives of colleagues in our college, including our unit.”), whereas 30 respondents (13.6%) describe mixed evidence (e.g., “I think my college values it for personnel evaluation, but provides little in terms of opportunities to develop, deepen, enrich, or present scholarship.”). Forty-seven respondents (21.3%) provided evaluatively neutral statements (e.g., “The policy documents and conversations with folks in the Dean’s office.”).

Again, the types of evidence faculty cited were coded to identify key themes. The same themes identified for the Unit emerged for the College feedback. These include: 1) General critiques, 2) general affirmations, 3) social context cues, 4) prioritization, 5) information sharing/communication, 6) intangible support, 7) tangible support, and 8) faculty evaluations. The most frequently mentioned pieces of evidence - identified by 15% or more of respondents - are discussed in more detail below. See Table 17 for a summary of theme frequencies.

### ***Faculty Evaluations***

Again, this was the most mentioned piece of evidence for the perceived value of scholarly activity, noted by 79 respondents (35.8%). Responses were coded as reflecting this theme if they discussed faculty evaluations in general or if they referenced scholarship’s place in

## **Experiences With and Impressions of Scholarly and Creative Engagement at GVSU**

tenure and promotion standards, yearly faculty evaluations, and/or merit raises. Like the Unit level data, most responses were either value neutral ( $n = 39$ , 49.4%; e.g., “Annual faculty expectations.”) or positive in tone ( $n = 21$ , 26.6%). For example, one faculty respondent stated, “This has become increasingly important based on the re-written college personnel documents.” Relatively fewer responses cited faculty evaluations when discussing mixed messages regarding the value of scholarly/creative activity ( $n = 8$ , 10.1%; e.g., “It’s part of our personnel process but direct support often seems lacking.”) and 12 (15.2%) respondents cited this theme when discussing limited valuation of scholarship (e.g., “College seems less interested in research/scholarly work based on tenure/promotion requirements.”). This theme’s prominence emphasizes that personnel guidelines are one of the main pieces of evidence signaling the degree of value placed on scholarly/creative activity at the College level.

### ***Tangible Support***

This theme was noted by 46 (20.8%) faculty members. Responses were coded as reflecting this theme if they referenced the presence or absence of monetary resources given to perform scholarship or to award completed research and scholarly achievements. For example, one respondent stated, “The fact that they have not increased the professional development funds in recent decades indicated to me that they do not value scholarship as much as they should.”

### ***What is Prioritized***

This theme was noted by 46 (20.8%) respondents. Responses were coded as reflecting this theme if they discussed which responsibilities are seen as most important or mentioned a tradeoff between certain responsibilities. Again, a major focus of these responses was the degree to which scholarship was prioritized relative to teaching and service. For example, one faculty member stated, “The norm is to focus on teaching which is above and beyond workloads that would facilitate (quality) scholarly pursuits.”

### ***Information Sharing and Communication***

This theme was noted by 40 (18.1%) faculty members. Responses were coded as reflecting this theme if they referred to the absence/presence of communications from Deans about scholarly engagement and achievement, and College-level opportunities to share scholarship or facilitate collaborations. For example, one respondent stated, “There is little if any messaging from the college level about growing our scholarly activity.” By comparison, another respondent stated, “The dean has demonstrated that [pronoun redacted] reads and is knowledgeable about faculty work, which is so very refreshing.”

### ***Intangible Support***

This theme was noted by 38 (17.2%) faculty members. Responses were coded as reflecting this theme if they mentioned the support and encouragement of research engagement and achievements by people at the College-level. For example, one faculty member stated, “They celebrate scholarship in mailings and on the websites” whereas another stated, “The college highlights and publicizes the work done in some disciplines/units but others are mostly ignored.”

### ***Perceived Degree of Value Among Upper Administration***

Respondents were asked, “How much do you think Upper Administration values scholarly and creative activity?” and were provided a rating scale ranging from 1 (*none at all*) to

## Experiences With and Impressions of Scholarly and Creative Engagement at GVSU

5 (*a great deal*), with 3 (*a moderate amount*) as the midpoint. A total of 285 respondents answered this question. The overall mean score was below the midpoint ( $M = 2.53$ ,  $SD = 1.09$ ), representing a degree of value between “a little” and “a moderate amount”. The median score was a 2 (*a little*). Almost 45% (44.9%) of participants answered this question with a 3 (*a moderate amount*) or higher.

Respondents were then asked, “What evidence or experiences are you drawing on to answer this question re: the value of scholarship to Upper Administration?”. A total of 224 respondents answered this question, with 205 respondents offering usable/codable responses. Consistent with the quantitative data just reported, this qualitative feedback reflects a more neutral-to-negative impression of the degree to which Upper Administration values scholarly/creative activity. The largest percentage of respondents convey the perception that GVSU leadership has a relatively negative view of scholarship ( $n = 118$ , 52.7%). For example, one respondent stated, “I think they give it lip service but have little idea of a) the time it takes to have a scholarly agenda; b) the connection between active scholarship and good teaching; and c) the point of scholarship w/in [specific field redacted] especially.”. A total of 25 respondents (11.2%) describe university leadership as supportive of scholarship (e.g., “They realize that it enhances the experience of students who participate in these activities and makes GVSU an attractive place for talented students.”), whereas 45 respondents (20.1%) describe mixed evidence (e.g., “I think Upper Administration wants faculty to engage in scholarship because it makes the University look good, but doesn’t really examine the systemic ways at the University that scholarship is difficult for faculty to engage in.”). Seventeen respondents (7.6%) provided evaluatively neutral statements (e.g., “Funding opportunities and university goals/initiatives.”).

Importantly, the types of evidence faculty cited were coded to identify key themes. Evidence included 1) General critiques, 2) general affirmations, 3) hiring decisions, 4) scholarly activity’s conditional value, 5) prioritization, 6) information sharing and communication, 7) intangible support, 8) tangible support, and 9) faculty evaluations. The most frequently mentioned pieces of evidence - identified by 15% or more of respondents - are discussed in more detail below. See Table 18 for a summary of theme frequencies.

### ***What is Prioritized***

This was the most listed piece of evidence for this section; a total of 96 (42.9%) respondents mentioned this theme. Notably, the concept of “priorities” is more extensive at this higher level of university structure. Responses were coded as reflecting this theme if they described priorities, or tradeoffs between priorities, in one of the following ways: in terms of the three facets of the professor role (teaching, scholarship, service), student affairs issues like enrollment, retention, diversity/equity/inclusion, educational initiatives and collaborations (e.g., REP4, L3), or approaches or viewpoints regarding the purpose of college (e.g., “business model”, liberal arts tradition, vocational training, etc.).

Examining this theme in more detail, the data show that the majority of faculty referencing priorities are citing this as evidence that scholarly/creative activity is undervalued relative to other priorities ( $n = 66$ , 68.8%). For example, one respondent stated, “The university seems to have moved towards a business model - get as many students into seats for budgetary reasons. I understand that tuition pays for what we do, but the intellectual life of the university is suffering.” Additionally, 21 respondents (21.9%) cite priorities when describing mixed messages regarding the value of scholarship. For example: “The administration shows a commitment to scholarship/creative activity by ‘giving’ us a 3/3 load. To this, I’m very thankful. Meanwhile, the

## Experiences With and Impressions of Scholarly and Creative Engagement at GVSU

number of affiliates continues to grow. This means the administration no longer wants research-oriented faculty.” By comparison, 4 respondents (4.2%) discuss priorities as supporting the valuation of scholarship (e.g., “Quality scholarship helps raise the profile and reputation of an institution.”), and 4 respondents (4.2%) provided value-neutral responses regarding prioritization of scholarship (e.g., “university goals/initiatives”). The prominence of this theme suggests that faculty attend to the messages and actions of GVSU leadership and weigh this information heavily when determining the degree to which Upper Administration values scholarly/creative activity relative to other priorities.

### *Tangible Support*

This theme was noted by 66 (29.5%) respondents. Responses were coded as reflecting this theme if they referenced the presence or absence of monetary resources given to do research or to award completed research and scholarly achievements. One respondent stated, “The professional development funds available to faculty have not changed in 20 + years. There is no summer stipend available for research that is equivalent to the teaching stipend.”

### *Information Sharing and Communication*

This theme was noted by 40 (17.9%) faculty members. Responses were coded as reflecting this theme if they referenced the Upper Administration’s degree of communication about scholarly engagement and achievement. For example, one faculty member stated, “Upper administration doesn’t seem to speak to research in their direct strategy and external communications. It’s there, but feels cursory and second to teaching, students and service to the community, instead of on its own as a pillar to help support.”

### **Comparisons Across Levels**

Are there statistically significant differences in the way faculty perceive their Units/Departments, Colleges, and Upper Administration valuation of scholarly and creative activity? To examine this question, we conducted separate paired samples t-tests<sup>5</sup>. This statistical test compares each pair of observations - Unit vs. College, Unit vs. Upper Admin, College vs. Upper Admin - to test whether the mean difference between each pair is significantly different from zero, relative to the degree of variability in responses. Respondents reported that they perceived their Unit ( $M = 3.67$ ,  $SD = .97$ ) as valuing research more than their College ( $M = 3.23$ ,  $SD = .97$ ),  $t(291) = 8.68$ ,  $p < .001$ , and Upper Administration ( $M = 2.53$ ,  $SD = 1.09$ ),  $t(284) = 15.02$ ,  $p < .001$ . They also perceived their College as valuing research more than Upper Administration,  $t(280) = 11.39$ ,  $p < .001$ . These results suggest that faculty perceive their more local communities (Units/Departments) as valuing research more than relatively more distal communities (Colleges, Upper Administration).

Another set of paired samples t-tests was conducted separately for respondents in each College to examine whether there are College-level differences in perceived value at these different levels of university organizational structure. These data are presented in Table 19. We caution readers to note sample sizes when interpreting these results. Given the issues associated with small sample sizes (Button et al., 2013; Fried, 2017) we also conducted nonparametric Wilcoxon signed rank tests for comparison purposes. In general, regardless of the statistical test used, results show that faculty differ in their perceptions of the degree to which scholarly/creative activity is valued as a function of their College affiliation. Faculty in CLAS and BCOIS show significant differences in their perceptions of value across the three levels of

## Experiences With and Impressions of Scholarly and Creative Engagement at GVSU

university structure; these patterns of results resemble the results reported for the entire sample, when collapsing across College affiliation. Faculty in CECI and KCON report significant differences in value perceptions between Upper Administration and Unit, and Upper Administration and College. Faculty in PCEC and SCP show significant differences in value perceptions between Upper Administration and Unit. And finally, CHP and University Libraries report no significant differences in perceived value of scholarly and creative activity across these three levels of university organizational structure.

### Summary and Synthesis

The data regarding faculty perceptions of the degree to which their Unit, College, and Upper Administration value scholarly/creative activity coalesces to suggest the following points, reported in no particular order:

- 1) Information about/experiences with personnel evaluations is frequently used by faculty to assess the degree to which their Unit and College values scholarship. This was the most frequently discussed piece of evidence in both the Unit/Department and College sections and signals the key role personnel standards and evaluation processes play in faculty's experiences with scholarship at GVSU. Notably, individual faculty play an integral role in developing and revising their own Unit's personnel standards. At the College level, faculty influence personnel standards through elected representatives to advisory committees. More in-depth discussion in these contexts may help faculty better align personnel standards with beliefs about the value of scholarly/creative activity.
- 2) Information about/experiences with university priorities is frequently used by faculty to assess the degree to which Upper Administration values scholarship. This was the most frequently discussed piece of evidence signaling the value of scholarly/creative activity by GVSU leadership. As before, responses reflecting this theme discussed faculty vs. administration differences in the perceived value of scholarship and emphasized the importance of appreciating the complementary nature of scholarship and other facets of the professor role. Additionally, responses reflecting this theme also discussed differences in the value of scholarship relative to the importance of other, specific priorities of Upper Administration (e.g., retention, budget). These responses tend to convey the perspective that the priorities of GVSU leadership seemingly conflict with the scholarly priorities of faculty.
- 3) Faculty perceive scholarship to be valued less by administrators at higher levels of the university organizational structure. The faculty respondents as a whole report more positive, supportive perceptions of scholarship at the Unit level, after which perceptions of support decline incrementally at the College and Upper Administrations levels. When College affiliation is taken into consideration, we see this general, linear pattern of valuation emerge for some Colleges but not others. That said, faculty in 6 of 8 GVSU Colleges report that their Unit values scholarly/creative activity more than Upper Administration, suggesting this perception is held by a large number of faculty within the GVSU community.

### Final Thoughts



## Experiences With and Impressions of Scholarly and Creative Engagement at GVSU

It is challenging to synthesize findings across all three parts of this report, as the survey upon which it is based had multiple aims - 1) to better understand the pandemic's impact on scholarly/creative engagement, 2) to solicit feedback CSCE and related offices can use to improve their programming and funding mechanisms, and 3) to better understand faculty perceptions of the value of scholarship and the scholarly climate at GVSU. For many readers, individual sections of the report will be more valuable to their specific goals than this final summation. However, there are some key sentiments that emerge across all three sections and deserve a final highlight.

1) The COVID-19 pandemic has impacted scholarly/creative engagement negatively, and in multiple ways. Although not all faculty report struggling with scholarly/creative engagement during the pandemic period, the vast majority did. In some cases, the specific obstacles they faced were directly related to COVID-19 mitigation strategies, budgetary measures that impacted scholarship via changes in teaching workload, and the psychological stress of living through a global pandemic. In other cases, though, the pandemic appears to have exacerbated existing obstacles, like funding accessibility and the value of scholarship at a teaching-focused institution. It is unclear how long the pandemic will continue to impact scholarly/creative engagement, though faculty feedback provides some insight into the types of interventions that may be more or less effective in ameliorating the effects of the pandemic on scholarship.

2) Faculty emphasize that “support” for scholarly/creative activity comes in many forms. Faculty feedback regarding their experience with scholarship during the COVID-19 pandemic highlights the importance of supporting this work with sufficient time and monetary resources. Faculty feedback to CSCE and the University again emphasize the importance of investing in funding mechanisms that rebalance workload and provide faculty more time for scholarship. This feedback also identifies less tangible forms of support - encouragement, recognition, appreciation - as an important facet of support that may be underutilized. Faculty discussions of the value of scholarship again highlight how workload priorities, monetary funds, and sharing information about the value of scholarship signal degree of support for these endeavors.

3) Faculty value scholarly/creative work and its benefits and are concerned by the relative lack of valuation they perceive among administrators. Faculty respondents describe their scholarly/creative activities as integral to their success in the classroom, the high-impact mentoring they provide to students, and their personal satisfaction with and improvement of their professional duties at GVSU, among other benefits. Despite these positive impacts, faculty respondents describe receiving negative and mixed messages about the value of scholarship from their Colleges and GVSU leadership, especially during the COVID-19 pandemic, yet relatively more positive messages, through personnel documents and procedures, about value from their Units.

4) Many faculty are confused and dissatisfied with the degree to which scholarly/creative activity is valued and supported relative to other aspects of the faculty role and administrative priorities. Specifically, the data reveal two types of concerns about priorities. First, faculty expressed concern with what they perceive to be the disproportionate lesser value of scholarship relative to teaching and service. Many faculty clearly acknowledged and expressed appreciation for GVSU's teaching-focused mission and reported wanting a workload that continues to prioritize

## Experiences With and Impressions of Scholarly and Creative Engagement at GVSU

teaching. However, faculty also report a large discrepancy between the time spent on teaching vs. research and want to generally reduce that discrepancy so that scholarship is a clear 2nd priority, and service is a clear 3rd priority. Second, some faculty expressed concern with what they perceive to be the declining role of scholarly/creative activity at GVSU relative to other administrative priorities. This concern is not captured by any one specific coded theme, but rather by the tenor of responses across themes and sections of the survey that describe shifts in the university culture around scholarly/creative activity. This is reflected in faculty statements about how COVID-related budgetary measures limited access to scholarly funding and required significant changes to workload that slowed or stopped a majority of the scholarly/creative activities on campus. This is also reflected in faculty descriptions of the lack of informal and formal discussion of scholarship among administrators, and initiatives and strategic planning processes with limited integration of language and goals around scholarly/creative activity. Whether this undercurrent of disregard for scholarship is perceived or actual, or both, requires further clarification and discussion.

We hope this information is useful to the GVSU community as we continue to grapple with the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic, the current state of scholarly/creative engagement at GVSU, and our general vision for what we wish to accomplish at GVSU. It is not our place (authors of this report) to make recommendations for future action; that is instead the role of our various communities. However, we offer two suggestions, informed by the synthesis of this data, to help guide future actions, and we offer several questions to help facilitate discussion within our various GVSU communities.

1) The interdependent nature of the teacher-scholar role requires better balance to achieve optimal outcomes for faculty, students, and administrators. Time is a limited resource. More time devoted to teaching - or scholarship, or service - means less time devoted to the other professional responsibilities, or an increase in time devoted to professional vs. personal duties. As many faculty reported in this survey, workload balance is a primary goal that involves continual practice. To the extent we can strive for better balance, we are more likely to optimize the benefits that stem from GVSU's teacher-scholar model. This includes benefits to faculty (e.g., greater job satisfaction, more opportunities for professional development, enrichment, and excellence), students (e.g., invigorated classroom experiences, greater availability of high-impact experiences), and administrators (e.g., increased student retention, enhanced visibility of GVSU's unique educational niche).

2) Valuing and supporting scholarly/creative engagement at GVSU will necessarily involve communication, collaboration, and action across all levels of university organizational structure. Our university organizational structure is inherently interdependent; decisions made at one level impact the choices available to and likely outcomes experienced by others at a different level. When making decisions within an organization, people tend to adopt either a top-down or bottom-up approach, both of which have their strengths and weaknesses. These realities emphasize the importance of clear communication and collaboration within and across our Units, Colleges, and other faculty and administrative communities (e.g., faculty governance committees, CSCE offices) as decisions are made regarding how to foster scholarly and creative engagement appropriately and effectively. Everyone (who is interested) has a role to play.

## Experiences With and Impressions of Scholarly and Creative Engagement at GVSU

### Reflection/Discussion Questions

#### *For individual faculty scholars:*

- 1) For those faculty who did not complete the survey upon which this report is based: How does your particular experience with scholarly/creative activity during the COVID-19 pandemic compare to the aggregated experiences described in this report? Do you agree/disagree with the feedback faculty colleagues provided to CSCE, CSCE offices, etc.? Are your thoughts about the value of scholarship similar to or different from what is described here?
- 2) Now that (hopefully!) the worst of the COVID-19 pandemic is over, what obstacles to scholarly/creative engagement have been alleviated for you? What barriers still remain? Do you think there are facets of your experience with scholarship during the pandemic that were not captured by this survey? When considering barriers that still remain, do you have a sense of where to look for relevant resources, or who to reach out to for assistance finding and accessing useful resources?
- 3) For those interested in advocating for scholarly/creative activity at GVSU: What are some things faculty could do within their classrooms and in interactions with students to raise the profile of these endeavors? What actions can be taken by individuals within their Units, Colleges, within faculty governance committees, and at the University level?

#### *For Units/Departments:*

- 1) The results of this survey suggest that less tangible forms of support for scholarly/creative activity - encouragement, appreciation, etc. - are important for creating a sense of community and a stimulating work climate. What can be done at the Unit level to foster this?
- 2) Issues regarding workload, especially the time available to sufficiently engage in scholarly/creative work, emerged throughout this survey. What could be done at the Unit level to rebalance workload for faculty active in scholarship? What practical constraints must be considered? What resources are available (from CSCE, the College, other sources) to alleviate these constraints? Could changes be made to teaching (e.g., course offerings, course caps, major requirements) or service (e.g., accountability for department committee work) to optimize these activities while also optimizing the scholarship workload? Are there ways to distribute Unit-level workload more equitably and address hidden workload to balance workload optimally across Unit colleagues?
- 3) The survey reveals several different ways that faculty conceptualize the value of scholarly/creative activity at GVSU. Which ones resonate the most with faculty in your Unit? Are some thoughts about the value of scholarship more/less consistent with your field? Your Unit's mission or vision?
- 4) Faculty report looking to personnel guidelines and evaluation processes as information signaling the value of scholarly/creative activity within their Unit. Do your Unit's guidelines and processes accurately reflect your Unit's thoughts about the value of scholarship? What changes could be made to revise guidelines or clarify or streamline evaluation processes?

#### *For College Deans:*

- 1) This report described aggregate data, collapsing across all Colleges at GVSU. Do you think these results reflect your faculty's experiences during the pandemic? Are there particular facets of this survey data you would like to examine more specifically, with an eye toward the feedback given by faculty in your College? In your informal/formal discussions, do your faculty perceive these

## **Experiences With and Impressions of Scholarly and Creative Engagement at GVSU**

results as reflecting their experiences? Do your faculty concur with the feedback provided to CSCE, the University, the Unit and College? How do your faculty perceive the value of scholarly/creative activity? What is your evidence?

- 2) Issues regarding workload balance, monetary funding, and encouragement/appreciation emerged throughout this survey. How could these issues be addressed at the College level? Are there current programs that address these issues that could be expanded or revised? Are there faculty within your College that have experience/expertise or are motivated to help Deans address these issues? Is it useful to share information or otherwise collaborate across Colleges to address these issues? How so?
- 3) College Deans occupy a unique position “sandwiched” in between Upper Administration and Units within the university organizational structure. How does this impact the actions you can take to facilitate scholarly/creative engagement for your faculty? Does this position grant you different or unique opportunities or resources that Unit Chairs and Upper Administration do not have? Does this position involve different or unique constraints?

### ***For CSCE and Affiliated Offices:***

- 1) How do the results of this report impact how your office allocates funds? Is there value in redistributing funds across funding mechanisms, revising eligibility criteria, developing new types of funds, etc.?
- 2) What strategies are currently in place to disseminate information about CSCE offices and available resources (both monetary and informational)? How could these strategies be revised to incorporate the feedback from this report?
- 3) Faculty expressed wanting CSCE to play a more active role in advocating for the importance of scholarly/creative activity at GVSU. What practical steps could be taken to enhance this facet of the CSCE mission? What role do CSCE directors, advisory committees, and award recipients play in this process?

### ***For Upper Administration:***

- 1) How do you see scholarly/creative activity contributing to GVSU’s mission, vision, and values? How does this viewpoint compare with the faculty perceptions described in this report? If there is a discrepancy between your actual viewpoint and faculty perceptions of your viewpoint, what are some possible reasons for this discrepancy? What can be done to resolve potential discrepancies?
- 2) What are some concrete ways you could emphasize the value of the teacher-scholar model in communications to faculty? What about communications to students? The broader GVSU community?
- 3) Given the feedback provided in this report, what are some top-down ways Upper Administration could tangibly/monetarily support scholarly and creative engagement? This includes addressing workload-related issues that impact the time available to engage in scholarship, a key theme throughout this survey.
- 4) As cited by many faculty, COVID-related budgetary changes required that faculty teach additional courses during the 2020-2021 academic year, which subsequently hindered scholarly/creative engagement. Were these workload changes temporary or have they continued into the 2021-2022 academic year or beyond? If they continue, what measures are being taken to return workload to pre-pandemic norms? Under what conditions would workload balance change again in the future? Is there utility in preparing alternative plans for coping with future budgetary

## **Experiences With and Impressions of Scholarly and Creative Engagement at GVSU**

constraints that do not involve altering the teaching/scholarship/service workload?

- 5) Are there aspects of the strategic plan - either strategic priority areas, outcomes, or objectives - that could be revised to include a greater emphasis on faculty scholarly/creative activity and related activities and outcomes (e.g., mentoring, community impact of scholarship, public recognition of scholarship, etc.)?

## Experiences With and Impressions of Scholarly and Creative Engagement at GVSU

### Footnotes

<sup>1</sup> The current survey was aimed at tenure-track faculty specifically, rather than all faculty employees, since scholarly/creative engagement is a required part of tenure-track faculty workload and personnel standards. Given this specific focus, when referring to “faculty” in this document, we are referring to tenure-track faculty specifically. Dropping the “tenure-track” reference is intended to shorten this document and is definitely NOT intended to discount the contributions of adjunct, affiliate, and visiting faculty, who are essential to the success of GVSU.

<sup>2</sup> It is important to keep in mind that these results, gathered during Fall 2021 semester, reflect faculty members’ concerns about their scholarly/creative activity during the pandemic period. It is unclear how each individual faculty member construed “the pandemic period”. For some this may have ended with Fall 2021 and the transition back to traditional, in-person instruction. For others, the 2021-2022 academic year may be included within the pandemic period.

<sup>3</sup> As some readers may notice, the themes and coding definitions used for the College responses are the same as those used for the Unit/Department responses. Indeed, many of the themes that appear in one section of this report appear in others. We repeat our description of these themes and definitions used for coding for the sake of readers that are skimming this report or reading specific sections.

<sup>4</sup> Additional themes that were coded, but not reported above, include the following:

- 1) General Critiques: This theme reflects responses that generally describe limited or absent valuation of scholarly/creative activity but included no other specific information. For example: “I see no substantive interest in scholarship from the college.”
- 2) General Affirmations: This theme reflects responses that generally describe the presence of valuation of scholarly/creative activity but included no other specific information. For example: “As a member of the [College redacted] faculty I feel my research is of high value.”
- 3) Social Context Cues: This theme reflects responses that describe how the respondent is looking to the behavior of others as evidence of the value of scholarship. For example: “I see how much scholarship our faculty do and that investment of their own time shows me that we value it.”; “Research-active faculty are marginalized in the department and those that conduct no research dominate departmental culture.”
- 4) Who Is/Isn’t Hired: This theme reflects responses that describe who is hired such as tenure-track faculty, affiliates/adjuncts, administrators, or the presence or absence of new positions or replacements as signaling value of scholarship. For example: “They won’t hire TT faculty, which means the remaining faculty are increasingly bearing the service load of the rest who retired...” Please note this theme only emerged within responses toward Upper Administration.
- 5) Conditional Support: This theme reflects responses that portray the value of scholarly/creative activity as being contingent on meeting some condition. For example: “My sense is that research is valued only if it brings grant money with it.”; “...they likely do not value research in the humanities as much as they do in other academic areas.” Please note this theme only emerged within responses toward Upper Administration.

<sup>5</sup> Preliminary tests confirm that most assumptions for the paired-sample t-test were met: 1) value was measured on a continuous 1-to-5 scale, 2) we’ve already established that our sampling

## Experiences With and Impressions of Scholarly and Creative Engagement at GVSU

method resulted in a sample of survey respondents that is representative of the tenure-track GVSU population, 3) it is reasonable to assume that all survey respondents reported their responses independently, and 4) Shapiro-Wilk tests of normality confirm a normal distribution for all three value measures. However, 5) box plots do identify outliers for all three measures of value. Given all assumptions were not met, we conducted nonparametric Wilcoxon Signed Rank tests. The results confirm significant differences between all three measures of value,  $Z$ s range from -7.79 to -11.17, all  $ps < .001$ . For ease of interpretation, we focus our report on the results of the paired samples  $t$ -tests, which are likely more familiar to readers.

### References

- Braun, V. & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3(2), 77-101. <https://doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp063oa>
- Brennan, R.L., and Prediger, D. J. (1981). Coefficient Kappa: some uses, misuses, and alternatives. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 41, 687-699. <https://doi.org/10.1177/001316448104100307>
- Button, K. S., Ioannidis, J. P. A., Mokrysz, C., Nosek, B. A., Flint, J., Robinson, E. S. J., & Munafò, M. R. (2013). Power failure: Why small sample size undermines the reliability of neuroscience. *Nature Reviews Neuroscience*, 14, 356-376. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nrn3475>
- Fried, E. (2017, September). *When small samples are problematic*. Measurement, modeling & complexity of mental health. <https://eiko-fried.com/small-samples-can-be-inherently-problematic/>

## Experiences With and Impressions of Scholarly and Creative Engagement at GVSU

Table 1

Demographic information from tenure-track GVSU faculty; survey respondents (*Ns* vary) and Institutional Analysis (*N* = 853)

<b>Demographics</b>	<b>Data from Survey, <i>N</i> (%)</b>	<b>Data from Institutional Analysis, <i>N</i> (%)</b>
College Affiliation	<i>N</i> = 266	
BCOIS	18 (6.8%)	31 (3.6%)
CECI	24 (9.0%)	93 (10.9%)
CHP	22 (8.3%)	70 (8.2%)
CLAS	154 (57.9%)	459 (53.8%)
KCON	7 (2.6%)	29 (3.3%)
PCEC	18 (6.8%)	72 (8.4%)
SCB	16 (6.0%)	69 (8.1%)
Libraries	7 (2.6%)	27 (3.2%)
ASA	0	3 (.4%)
Not reported/Did not respond	92	
Professional Rank	<i>N</i> = 282	
Professor	118 (41.8%)	322 (37.7%)
Associate Professor	110 (39.0%)	333 (39%)
Assistant Professor	54 (19.1%)	192 (22.5%)
Instructor	0	6 (.70%)
Not reported/Did not respond	76	
Gender Identification	<i>N</i> = 191	
Female/Woman	95 (49.7%)	405 (47.5%)
Male/Man	94 (49.2%)	448 (52.5%)
Another Identification	2 (1.0%)	0
Not reported/Did not respond	167	0
Ethnicity	<i>N</i> = 178	
American Indian/Alaskan Native	0	2 (.23%)
Asian/Pacific Islander	12 (6.7%)	92 (10.8%)
Black/African American	3 (1.7%)	31 (3.6%)
Hispanic/Latino	6 (3.4%)	34 (4.0%)
White	154 (86.5%)	678 (79.5%)
Multi-Ethnic	3 (1.7%)	2 (.23%)
Not reported/Did not respond	180	14 (1.6%)
Age	<i>N</i> = 255	Not available
18-24 years	0	
25-34 years	14 (5.5%)	
35-44 years	68 (26.7%)	
45-54 years	82 (32.2%)	
55-64 years	75 (29.4%)	
65-74 years	16 (6.3%)	



## Experiences With and Impressions of Scholarly and Creative Engagement at GVSU

75+ years	0
Not reported/Did not respond	103

Table 2

Types of scholarship faculty pursue, and types of methods/approaches utilized in that scholarship.

	<i>N</i> (%) Respondents Reporting “Yes”
<b>Types of Scholarship (<i>N</i> = 252)</b>	
Scholarship of Discovery	187 (74.2%)
Scholarship of Integration	87 (34.5%)
Scholarship of Application	130 (51.6%)
Scholarship of Teaching	102 (40.6%)
<b>Types of Methodologies/Approaches (<i>N</i> = 271)</b>	
Qualitative methods	183 (67.5%)
Quantitative methods	163 (60.1%)
Laboratory contexts	70 (25.8%)
Field contexts	81 (29.95%)
Clinical contexts	24 (8.9%)
Archival methods	56 (20.7%)
Computational methods	61 (22.5%)
Other methods	26 (9.6%)

## Experiences With and Impressions of Scholarly and Creative Engagement at GVSU

Table 3

Summary of themes that emerge from responses to the statement, “Please describe how the COVID-19 pandemic period (beginning March 2020) has impacted your scholarship.”

<b>Themes</b>	<b><i>N</i> Responses</b>	<b>% of Total Respondents</b>
Time	182	53.7%
Access to resources	130	38.3%
Concerns about mental/physical health	43	12.7%
Scholarly resilience	43	12.7%
Access to collaborators	40	11.8%
Funding for scholarship	29	8.6%
Personal/family obligations	22	6.5%
Recognition/value of scholarship	8	2.4%
Compliance obligations	6	1.8%

Note: *N* = 339 respondents answered this survey question.

## Experiences With and Impressions of Scholarly and Creative Engagement at GVSU

Table 4

Barriers impacting faculty's ability to return to their usual pace of scholarly/creative activity.

Potential Barrier	Total N	Yes N (%)	No N (%)
Time	341	296 (86.8%)	45 (13.2%)
Funding	332	102 (30.7%)	230 (69.3%)
Access to resources	325	81 (24.9%)	244 (75.1%)
Access to collaborators	332	115 (34.6%)	217 (65.4%)
Access to human subjects	331	84 (25.4%)	247 (74.6%)
Recognition in personnel process	320	64 (20%)	256 (80%)
Degree of value placed on scholarship	327	134 (41%)	193 (59%)
Training needs	322	33 (10.2%)	289 (89.8%)
Compliance obligations	324	52 (16%)	272 (84%)
Uncertainty about internal supports	323	77 (23.8%)	246 (76.2%)
Other factors	138	53 (38.4%)	85 (61.6%)

## Experiences With and Impressions of Scholarly and Creative Engagement at GVSU

Table 5

Barriers impacting faculty's ability to maintain their accelerated pace of scholarly/creative activity.

<b>Potential Barrier</b>	<b>Total N</b>	<b>Yes N (%)</b>	<b>No N (%)</b>
Time	185	90 (48.6%)	95 (51.4%)
Funding	174	47 (27%)	127 (73%)
Access to resources	171	21 (12.3%)	150 (87.7%)
Access to collaborators	172	39 (22.7%)	133 (77.3%)
Access to human subjects	171	21 (12.3%)	150 (87.7%)
Recognition in personnel process	164	23 (14%)	141 (86%)
Degree of value placed on scholarship	169	45 (26.6%)	124 (73.4%)
Training needs	166	7 (4.2%)	159 (95.8%)
Compliance obligations	168	14 (8.3%)	154 (91.7%)
Uncertainty about internal supports	169	26 (15.4%)	143 (84.6%)
Other factors	88	5 (5.7%)	83 (94.3%)

## Experiences With and Impressions of Scholarly and Creative Engagement at GVSU

Table 6

Summary of themes that emerge from responses to the question, “What are some steps that CSCE can take to help faculty actively engage in scholarly and creative activity?”

<b>Themes</b>	<b><i>N</i> Responses</b>	<b>% of Total Respondents</b>
<b>Funding</b>		
To Reduce/Rebalance Workload	30	12.2%
General Requests for More	29	11.8%
To Support Employees	27	11.0%
For Dissemination	25	10.2%
For Supplies	24	9.8%
<b>Assistance</b>		
With Connection/Collaboration	24	9.8%
With Information Sharing	23	9.4%
With Application Process	23	9.4%
With Balancing Workload	22	8.9%
With Specific Scholarly Tasks	15	6.1%
<b>Advocacy</b>		
Recognize the Value of Scholarship	36	14.6%
Recognize Specific Needs	10	4.1%
<b>Evaluative Feedback</b>		
Positive	41	16.7%
Critical	6	2.4%
No Feedback/No Need for Changes	15	6.1%

Note: *N* = 246 respondents answered this survey question.

## Experiences With and Impressions of Scholarly and Creative Engagement at GVSU

Table 7

Summary of themes that emerge from responses to the question, “What are some steps that the University can take to help faculty actively engage in scholarly and creative activity?”

<b>Themes</b>	<b>N Responses</b>	<b>% of Total Respondents</b>
<b>General Feedback</b>		
More Time (no further explanation)	18	7.1%
More Funding (no further explanation)	9	3.6%
<b>Actions</b>		
Reduce Teaching Workload	73	28.9%
Address Workload Inequities	58	22.9%
Reduce Service Workload	51	20.2%
Financially Support Scholarship	47	18.6%
Hire Faculty and Staff	21	8.3%
Financially Support Research Employees	18	7.1%
Foster Connection/Collaboration	10	4.0%
<b>Advocacy</b>		
Recognize the Value of Scholarship	59	23.3%
Recognize Specific Scholarly Needs	17	6.7%
<b>Evaluative Feedback</b>		
Positive	1	.4%
Critical	14	5.5%
No Feedback/No Need for Changes	5	1.2%

---

Note:  $N = 253$  respondents answered this survey question.

## Experiences With and Impressions of Scholarly and Creative Engagement at GVSU

Table 8

Summary of themes that emerge from responses to the question, “Consider each of the offices and committees below, which include CSCE and reporting Units. What are some steps your Unit/Department can take to help faculty actively engage in scholarship?”

<b>Themes</b>	<b><i>N</i> Responses</b>	<b>% of Total Respondents</b>
<b>Evaluative Feedback</b>		
Positive	18	11.8%
Critical	4	2.6%
<b>Constructive Feedback</b>		
Balance Workload	58	38.2%
Tangible Support	25	16.5%
Intangible Support	25	16.5%
Information Sharing	16	10.5%
Foster Connection/Collaboration	15	9.9%
Clarify Standards for Tenure/Promotion	13	8.6%
Hire Faculty and Staff	12	7.9%
Streamline Processes	2	1.3%

Note: *N* = 152 respondents answered this survey question.

## Experiences With and Impressions of Scholarly and Creative Engagement at GVSU

Table 9

Summary of themes that emerge from responses to the question, “Consider each of the offices and committees below, which include CSCE and reporting Units. What are some steps your College can take to help faculty actively engage in scholarship?”

<b>Themes</b>	<b><i>N</i> Responses</b>	<b>% of Total Respondents</b>
<b>Evaluative Feedback</b>		
Positive	7	4.5%
Critical	6	3.8%
<b>Constructive Feedback</b>		
Balance Workload	58	36.9%
Tangible Support	50	31.9%
Intangible Support	30	19.1%
Information Sharing	12	7.6%
Hire Faculty and Staff	12	7.6%
Foster Connection/Collaboration	12	7.6%
Clarify Standards for Tenure/Promotion	11	7.0%
Streamline Processes	2	1.3%

Note: *N* = 157 respondents answered this survey question.



## Experiences With and Impressions of Scholarly and Creative Engagement at GVSU

Table 10

Summary of themes that emerge from responses to the question, “Consider each of the offices and committees below, which include CSCE and reporting Units. What are some steps Faculty Governance can take to help faculty actively engage in scholarship?”

<b>Themes</b>	<b><i>N</i> Responses</b>	<b>% of Total Respondents</b>
<b>Evaluative Feedback</b>		
Critical	3	3.6%
Positive	1	1.2%
<b>Constructive Feedback</b>		
Balance Workload	29	34.5%
Intangible Support	20	23.8%
Tangible Support	19	22.6%
Clarify Standards for Tenure/Promotion	13	15.5%
Streamline Processes	7	8.3%
Hire Faculty and Staff	2	2.4%
Specific Research	1	1.2%

Note: *N* = 84 respondents answered this survey question.

## Experiences With and Impressions of Scholarly and Creative Engagement at GVSU

Table 11

Summary of themes that emerge from responses to the question, “Consider each of the offices and committees below, which include CSCE and reporting Units. What are some steps the Office of Research Compliance and Integrity (ORCI) can take to help faculty actively engage in scholarship?”

<b>Themes</b>	<b><i>N</i> Responses</b>	<b>% of Total Respondents</b>
<b>Evaluative Feedback</b>		
Positive	17	40.5%
Critical	2	4.8%
<b>Constructive Feedback</b>		
Information Sharing	6	14.3%
Changes to Review Process	4	9.5%
Recommendations Beyond Mission	4	9.5%
Assistance with Application Process	3	7.1%
Continue Mission	3	7.1%
Recognition of Specific Activities	1	2.4%

Note: *N* = 42 respondents answered this survey question.

Table 12

Summary of themes that emerge from responses to the question, “Consider each of the offices and committees below, which include CSCE and reporting Units. What are some steps the Institutional Review Board (IRB) or Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee (IACUC) can take to help faculty actively engage in scholarship?”

<b>Themes</b>	<b><i>N</i> Responses</b>	<b>% of Total Respondents</b>
<b>Evaluative Feedback</b>		
Positive	19	37.3%
Critical	2	3.9%
<b>Constructive Feedback</b>		
Information Sharing	9	17.7%
Changes to Review Process	7	13.7%
Assistance with Application Process	6	11.8%
Continue Mission	4	7.8%
Recognition of Specific Activities	4	7.8%
Recommendations Beyond Mission	2	3.9%

Note: *N* = 51 respondents answered this survey question.

## Experiences With and Impressions of Scholarly and Creative Engagement at GVSU

Table 13

Summary of themes that emerge from responses to the question, “Consider each of the offices and committees below, which include CSCE and reporting Units. What are some steps the Office of Sponsored Programs (OSP) can take to help faculty actively engage in scholarship?”

<b>Themes</b>	<b>N Responses</b>	<b>% of Total Respondents</b>
<b>Evaluative Feedback</b>		
Positive	11	20%
Confusion	7	12.7%
Critical	0	0%
<b>Constructive Feedback</b>		
Information Sharing	9	16.4%
Requests for Proactive Support	8	14.6%
Assistance with Application Process	7	12.7%
Recognition of Specific Activities	7	12.7%
Continue Mission	7	12.7%
Hiring Staff for OSP	5	9.1%
Recommendations Beyond Mission	1	1.8%

Note: *N* = 55 respondents answered this survey question.

## Experiences With and Impressions of Scholarly and Creative Engagement at GVSU

Table 14

Summary of themes that emerge from responses to the question, “Consider each of the offices and committees below, which include CSCE and reporting Units. What are some steps the Center for Undergraduate Scholar Engagement (i.e., OURS, Fellowships) can take to help faculty actively engage in scholarship?”

<b>Themes</b>	<b><i>N</i> Responses</b>	<b>% of Total Respondents</b>
<b>Evaluative Feedback</b>		
Positive	15	23.1%
Critical	1	1.5%
<b>Constructive Feedback</b>		
Tangible Support	21	32.3%
Recognition of Specific Activities	11	16.9%
Continue Mission	10	15.4%
Assistance with Processes	10	15.4%
Information Sharing	4	6.2%
Recommendations Beyond Mission	2	3.1%
Foster Connection/Collaboration	2	3.1%
Intangible Support	0	0%

Note: *N* = 65 respondents answered this survey question.

## Experiences With and Impressions of Scholarly and Creative Engagement at GVSU

Table 15

Summary of themes that emerge from responses to the question, “What do you perceive to be the value of engaging in scholarly and creative activity at GVSU?”

<b>Themes</b>	<b><i>N</i> Responses</b>	<b>% of Total Respondents</b>
<b>Conceptualizations of Value of Scholarship</b>		
Compliments Other Activities	108	38.9%
Student Outcomes	94	33.8%
Intrinsic Value	56	20.1%
Scholarly Improvement	50	18.0%
Contributing Knowledge	46	16.6%
Elevates GVSU	35	12.6%
Job Requirement	32	11.5%
Scholarly Knowledge is Useful	24	8.6%
Fosters a Dynamic Community	21	7.6%
Distracts from Other Activities	6	2.2%
<b>Degree of Value</b>		
Low/Insufficient Value	45	16.2%
Moderate/Sufficient Value	13	4.7%
High/Excessive Value	8	2.9%
Unsure of Value	3	1.1%
<b>Value Discrepancies</b>		
Communications Vs. Actions	26	9.4%
Differences Across Groups	21	7.6%
Actual Vs. Ideal Degree of Value	13	4.7%
Degree of Value in Present Vs. Past	7	2.5%
Differences Across Career.	2	0.7%

---

Note: *N* = 278 respondents answered this survey question.

## Experiences With and Impressions of Scholarly and Creative Engagement at GVSU

Table 16

Summary of themes that emerge from responses to the question, “What evidence or experiences are you drawing on to answer this question re: the value of scholarship within your Unit/Department?”

<b>Themes</b>	<b><i>N</i> Responses</b>	<b>% of Total Respondents</b>
<b>Perception of Value</b>		
Positive Value	110	42.8%
Value Not Stated	67	26.1%
Negative Value	45	17.5%
Mixed Value	28	10.9%
<b>Evidence Cited</b>		
Faculty Evaluations	119	46.3%
Intangible Support	55	21.4%
What is Prioritized	52	20.2%
Information Sharing and Communication	48	18.7%
Social Context Cues	37	14.4%
Tangible Support	34	13.2%
General Affirmation	7	2.7%
Not Applicable	7	2.7%
General Critique	0	0%

---

Note: *N* = 257 respondents answered this survey question.

## Experiences With and Impressions of Scholarly and Creative Engagement at GVSU

Table 17

Summary of themes that emerge from responses to the question, “What evidence or experiences are you drawing on to answer this question re: the value of scholarship within your College?”

<b>Themes</b>	<b><i>N</i> Responses</b>	<b>% of Total Respondents</b>
<b>Perception of Value</b>		
Negative Value	72	32.6%
Positive Value	54	24.4%
Value Not Stated	47	21.3%
Mixed Value	30	13.6%
<b>Evidence Cited</b>		
Faculty Evaluations	79	35.8%
Tangible Support	46	20.8%
What is Prioritized	46	20.8%
Information Sharing and Communication	40	18.1%
Intangible Support	38	17.2%
Not Applicable	18	8.1%
General Critique	14	6.3%
Social Context	12	5.4%
General Affirmation	7	3.3%

Note: *N* = 221 respondents answered this survey question.

## Experiences With and Impressions of Scholarly and Creative Engagement at GVSU

Table 18

Summary of themes that emerge from responses to the question, “What evidence or experiences are you drawing on to answer this question re: the value of scholarship to Upper Administration?”

<b>Themes</b>	<b>N Responses</b>	<b>% of Total Respondents</b>
<b>Perception of Value</b>		
Negative Value	118	52.7%
Mixed Value	45	20.1%
Positive Value	25	11.2%
Value Not Stated	17	7.6%
<b>Evidence Cited</b>		
What is Prioritized	96	42.9%
Tangible Support	66	29.5%
Information Sharing and Communication	40	17.9%
Conditional Support	27	12.1%
Faculty Evaluations	25	11.2%
Intangible support	22	9.8%
Not Applicable	19	8.5%
General Critique	9	4.0%
Who Is/Isn't Hired	8	3.6%
General Affirmation	5	2.2%

---

Note: *N* = 224 respondents answered this survey question.



## Experiences With and Impressions of Scholarly and Creative Engagement at GVSU

Table 19

Perceived value at the unit, college, and administration levels as a function of College affiliation.

College (N)	Unit <i>M</i> ( <i>SD</i> )	College <i>M</i> ( <i>SD</i> )	Admin <i>M</i> ( <i>SD</i> )	Paired samples t-test results	Wilcoxon signed rank test results
BCOIS (N=15-17)	3.50 (1.10)	2.94 (1.24)	2.18 (.81)	U vs. C: $t(15)=2.52, p=.023^*$ U vs. A: $t(16)=4.23, p=.001^*$ C vs. A: $t(14)=2.09, p=.055$	U vs. C: $Z=-2.17, p=.030^*$ U vs. A: $Z=-2.96, p=.003^*$ C vs. A: $Z=-2.00, p=.046^*$
CECI (N=24)	3.38 (1.06)	3.25 (.90)	2.67 (1.17)	U vs. C: $t(23)=.83, p=.417$ U vs. A: $t(23)=2.90, p=.008^*$ C vs. A: $t(23)=3.25, p=.004^*$	U vs. C: $Z=-.83, p=.405$ U vs. A: $Z=-2.50, p=.013^*$ C vs. A: $Z=-2.63, p=.009^*$
CHP (N=22)	3.50 (1.06)	3.18 (1.22)	3.18 (.96)	U vs. C: $t(21)=1.50, p=.148$ U vs. A: $t(21)=1.32, p=.200$ C vs. A: $t(21)=.00, p=1.00$	U vs. C: $Z=-1.43, p=.154$ U vs. A: $Z=-1.24, p=.216$ C vs. A: $Z=-.30, p=.763$
CLAS (N=148-152)	3.84 (.84)	3.20 (.85)	2.32 (1.01)	U vs. C: $t(151)=8.89, p<.001^*$ U vs. A: $t(147)=15.59, p<.001^*$ C vs. A: $t(147)=11.62, p<.001^*$	U vs. C: $Z=-7.22, p<.001^*$ U vs. A: $Z=-9.34, p<.001^*$ C vs. A: $Z=-8.31, p<.001^*$
KCON (N=7)	4.14 (1.57)	4.00 (1.53)	2.57 (1.40)	U vs. C: $t(6)=1.00, p=.356$ U vs. A: $t(6)=2.98, p=.025^*$ C vs. A: $t(6)=3.33, p=.016^*$	U vs. C: $Z=-1.00, p=.317$ U vs. A: $Z=-2.06, p=.039^*$ C vs. A: $Z=-2.06, p=.039^*$
PCEC (N=17-18)	3.50 (.92)	3.39 (.85)	2.94 (1.03)	U vs. C: $t(17)=.70, p=.495$ U vs. A: $t(16)=2.16, p=.046^*$ C vs. A: $t(16)=1.95, p=.069$	U vs. C: $Z=-.71, p=.480$ U vs. A: $Z=-2.00, p=.046^*$ C vs. A: $Z=-1.81, p=.070$
SCB (N=15-16)	3.50 (1.32)	3.19 (1.52)	2.47 (1.25)	U vs. C: $t(15)=1.58, p=.136$ U vs. A: $t(14)=2.51, p=.025^*$ C vs. A: $t(14)=1.46, p=.167$	U vs. C: $Z=-1.52, p=.129$ U vs. A: $Z=-2.12, p=.034^*$ C vs. A: $Z=-1.29, p=.196$

## Experiences With and Impressions of Scholarly and Creative Engagement at GVSU

Libraries ( $N=6-7$ )	3.33 (.82)	3.67 (.52)	3.00 (1.00)	U vs. C: $t(5)=-1.58, p=.175$	U vs. C: $Z=-1.41, p=.157$
				U vs. A: $t(6)=.80, p=.457$	U vs. A: $Z=-.82, p=.414$
				C vs. A: $t(5)=1.46, p=.203$	C vs. A: $Z=-1.34, p=.180$

Note: Unit is abbreviated as “U”. College is abbreviated as “C”. Upper Administration is abbreviated as “A”. *M* refers to mean, and *SD* refers to standard deviation. *Ns* differ within College because not all participants responded to all three of the questions about value of scholarly/creative activity. \*Significant at the .05 level.