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at
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ABSTRACT

This survey was conducted by the Faculty Senate Research and Creative Activity Committee (RACAC), whose charge is as follows: “This committee shall review, report and recommend to the Senate matters concerning University policies, procedures and actions regarding research and creative activity; University facilities for research and creative activity; funding for research and creative activity; and responsibilities and liabilities of researchers.” The purpose of this survey (of the full and part time faculty at UB) was to determine “issues,” related to research and creative activity, with a view toward recommending “action items” as part of a report to the Faculty Senate. Simply put, “what’s on the minds of the faculty regarding research and creative activity?” The survey was accessed by the respondents using a URL address and an Internet browser. The respondents were required to have a valid faculty username and password. The results of this survey were tabulated electronically and discussed and interpreted by the RACAC. The RACAC herewith formulates its conclusions and recommendations including specifics, where possible. Respondents’ confidentiality was preserved, but did not preclude the option of providing non-confidential information. Over one-half (1/2) of the currently active PI / co-Pi’s responded, and about one-half (1/2) of those provided optional written comments. Some of the demographic data collected include: faculty rank, school, funding level, funding agencies and years at UB. There were strong responses to many of the eighty (80) queries, which were ranked by “strength-of-response”. The RACAC believes that the results of this survey will be very useful to the administration in working with the faculty to achieve mutual goals. Also, the survey format itself can serve as a vehicle for monitoring the progress thereof. Current plans include repeating this survey annually and making this and subsequent reports available as a downloadable pdf file on the Faculty Senate web site.
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INTRODUCTION

The purpose of the survey was to find out “what is on the minds of the faculty at UB concerning research and creative activity”, with a view toward improving the atmosphere and supporting services thereof. The RACAC met regularly many times during the Fall 2000 semester and after multiple drafts of the survey instrument, Buffalo Survey and Research Inc. was hired to critique the document with a specific charge of removing any unintentional bias in the queries. The resulting survey instrument “went live” on February 19, 2001, and survey input was terminated on March 19, 2001.

DEMOGRAPHICS SUMMARY

There are currently about 600 presently funded PI’s or co-PI’s at the State University of New York at Buffalo. Although the survey was intended to include all research and creative activity, there was very little response from faculty involved in unfunded creative activity. Of the 308 respondents to the survey, 302 have been a PI or co-PI on a grant at UB and 300 have been a PI or co-PI on a grant elsewhere. The resulting variety of current funding sources - both federal and otherwise – is shown below.
Most (82%) of the respondents were full time faculty on a state line with a distribution of professors (38%), associate professors (24%), assistant professors (22%) and research/clinical professors of all ranks (9%).

The response frequency of the 15 schools was more or less proportional to their size, with the highest frequencies from: School of Medical and Biomedical Sciences (76), College of Arts and Sciences-Social Sciences (44), School of Engineering and Applied Sciences (42), College of Arts and Sciences-Natural Sciences and Mathematics (39), Health Related Professions (21) and College of Arts and Sciences-Arts and Letters (14).

About 40% (122) of the respondents had total annual funding levels below $100,000; 25% (77) were between $249,999 and $100,000; and 11% (14) had more than $500,000. The distribution in terms of years at UB was: 0 – 5 years, 26% (81); 6 – 10 years, 19% (58); 11- 15 years, 17% (51) and 16 or more years, 36% (111). The percent totals do not add up to 100% because there were some empty responses to these queries. Unfortunately, the RACAC was advised that “some junior faculty” did not complete the survey for fear of retribution.

RESULTS

The results of the survey are shown in the accompanying figures. By and large, the results speak for themselves. It can be seen that there are strong responses to many of the queries. The strongest responses are perhaps identifiable by the highest (unipolar) frequency of “strongly agree” / “agree” and “disagree” / “strongly disagree”. Accordingly, each query response was arbitrarily assigned the following numerical values:

- “strongly agree” (SA) = -2
- “agree” (A) = -1
- “neutral” (N) = 0
- “disagree” (D) = +1
- “strongly disagree” (SD) = +2.

The average of these numerical values, for each query, is the rank (RNK) given in the accompanying figures, sorted by decreasing absolute value of RNK. Also given is the number (n) of responses which were not “don’t know” (DK) or “blank” (B), along with that percentage (%) of the total. Results for each of the individual 15 schools will be made available by special arrangements with the Faculty Senate office.

There were 150 written comments, which are largely consistent with and elaborate on the query results. It is very difficult to briefly summarize these comments. However, the following general themes are prevalent. There is a need (in unranked order) to:

- Improve direct two-way communications
- Clarify our mission
- Increase support for infrastructure
- Increase support for pilot projects
- Improve the responsiveness of sponsored programs
- Address the difficulties of clinical faculty
- Demystify indirect costs
- Give more attention to creative activity
- Provide PI-specific, convenient, user-friendly and useful information on funding sources
- Improve planning

The verbatim written comments, without identifiers, will be made accessible by appointment with the Faculty Senate office.

RECOMMENDATION

The RACAC urges the Administration to carefully review the results of this survey and then engage in dialogue to squarely address the issues revealed by this study. It is strongly recommended that these reviews become part of an ongoing process – not a series of “fire drills”. The RACAC believes that the results of this survey will be very useful to the administration in working with the faculty to achieve mutual goals. Also, the survey format itself can serve as a vehicle for monitoring the progress thereof.
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“strongly agree” (SA) = -2, “agree” (A) = -1, “neutral” (N) = 0, “disagree” (D) = +1, “strongly disagree” (SD) = +2;

number of responses which were not “don’t know” (DK) or “blank” (B), \( n = n_{SA} + n_{A} + n_{N} + n_{D} + n_{SD} \);

\[ RNK = \frac{(-2)n_{SA} + (-1)n_{A} + (0)n_{N} + (+1)n_{D} + (+2)n_{SD}}{n} \]

SUNY-funded tuition scholarships for graduate students are an important ingredient in supporting research.

- **SA**: 54%
- **A**: 31%
- **N**: 6%
- **D**: 2%
- **SD**: 3%
- **DK**: 0%
- **B**: 0%

\[ n = 298 \]
\[ \% = 97 \]

Exit interviews are useful to determine what UB could have done to retain the individual.

- **SA**: 43%
- **A**: 39%
- **N**: 4%
- **D**: 5%
- **SD**: 1%
- **DK**: 7%

\[ n = 284 \]
\[ \% = 93 \]

A secure electronic means for preparing, sending and receiving all funded purchase forms should be implemented complete with electronic tracking.

- **SA**: 41%
- **A**: 39%
- **N**: 11%
- **D**: 2%
- **SD**: 6%
- **DK**: 1%

\[ n = 285 \]
\[ \% = 93 \]

There should be a uniform university policy on: Periodic faculty review of key administrative personnel.

- **SA**: 45%
- **A**: 43%
- **N**: 8%
- **D**: 2%
- **SD**: 4%
- **DK**: 1%

\[ n = 299 \]
\[ \% = 97 \]

There should be a uniform university policy on: Periodic faculty review of Chairs.

- **SA**: 41%
- **A**: 46%
- **N**: 7%
- **D**: 2%
- **SD**: 0%
- **DK**: 2%

\[ n = 297 \]
\[ \% = 97 \]

There should be a uniform university policy on: Periodic faculty review of Deans.

- **SA**: 42%
- **A**: 44%
- **N**: 9%
- **D**: 2%
- **SD**: 1%
- **DK**: 1%

\[ n = 303 \]
\[ \% = 99 \]
“strongly agree” (SA) = -2, “agree” (A) = -1, “neutral” (N) = 0, “disagree” (D) = +1, “strongly disagree” (SD) = +2;

number of responses which were not “don’t know” (DK) or “blank” (B), \( n = n_{SA} + n_{A} + n_{N} + n_{D} + n_{SD} \);

\[ \text{RNK} = \frac{(-2) n_{SA} + (-1) n_{A} + 0 n_{N} + (+1) n_{D} + (+2) n_{SD}}{n}. \]

- A secure electronic means for preparing, sending and receiving all research forms should be implemented.

There should be a uniform university policy on: Disbursement of indirect cost and IFR generated by research grants.

- There should be a uniform university policy on: Periodic faculty review of key service personnel.

- The administration obtains adequate faculty input regarding policy and administrative changes in research and funding activities.

- I understand well how indirect cost money is used at UB.
“strongly agree” (SA) = -2, “agree” (A) = -1, “neutral” (N) = 0, “disagree” (D) = +1, “strongly disagree” (SD) = +2;
number of responses which were not “don’t know” (DK) or “blank” (B), n = n_{SA} + n_{A} + n_{N} + n_{D} + n_{SD};
RNK = \frac{(-2) n_{SA} + (-1) n_{A} + (0) n_{N} + (+1) n_{D} + (+2) n_{SD}}{n}.

The procedure for obtaining matching funds for research and creative activity is well-defined.

- Strongly Agree (SA): 16%
- Agree (A): 6%
- Neutral (N): 29%
- Disagree (D): 35%
- Strongly Disagree (SD): 1%

RNK = 0.99
n = 268
% = 87

Of teaching, research and service, research is currently: The most important ingredient in determining promotions.

- Strongly Agree (SA): 36%
- Agree (A): 33%
- Neutral (N): 11%
- Disagree (D): 10%
- Strongly Disagree (SD): 7%

RNK = -0.94
n = 285
% = 93

Policies, decisions and actions that influence research and creative activity make sense to me.

- Strongly Agree (SA): 1%
- Agree (A): 7%
- Neutral (N): 21%
- Disagree (D): 35%
- Strongly Disagree (SD): 28%

RNK = 0.89
n = 281
% = 92

I believe at UB the emphasis is on:
- Research: 43%
- Teaching: 14%
- Service: 35%

RNK = -0.83
n = 302
% = 98

There is a need for dedicated faculty and special guest parking on all campuses.

- Strongly Agree (SA): 34%
- Agree (A): 35%
- Neutral (N): 15%
- Disagree (D): 8%
- Strongly Disagree (SD): 1%

RNK = -0.87
n = 302
% = 98

There is a well-defined mechanism in place for provision of travel money for conference attendance for unfunded research.

- Strongly Agree (SA): 4%
- Agree (A): 14%
- Neutral (N): 13%
- Disagree (D): 26%
- Strongly Disagree (SD): 35%

RNK = 0.79
n = 281
% = 92
“strongly agree” (SA) = -2, “agree” (A) = -1, “neutral” (N) = 0, “disagree” (D) = +1, “strongly disagree” (SD) = +2; number of responses which were not “don’t know” (DK) or “blank” (B), n = n_{SA} + n_{A} + n_{N} + n_{D} + n_{SD};

\[ \text{RNK} = \frac{(-2) n_{SA} + (-1) n_{A} + (0) n_{N} + (+1) n_{D} + (+2) n_{SD}}{n}. \]

There should be a uniform university policy on: Teaching v. research workloads.

- **Strongly Agree (SA)**: 32%
- **Agree (A)**: 13%
- **Neutral (N)**: 15%
- **Disagree (D)**: 28%
- **Strongly Disagree (SD)**: 1%

**RNK** = -0.77, n = 300, % = 98

There are high standards for: Tenure.

- **Strongly Agree (SA)**: 42%
- **Agree (A)**: 17%
- **Neutral (N)**: 11%
- **Disagree (D)**: 9%
- **Strongly Disagree (SD)**: 7%

**RNK** = -0.74, n = 292, % = 95

There is a need for explicit, public support from the higher UB administration for animal experimentation as a legitimate and necessary part of advancing medical and biological research.

- **Strongly Agree (SA)**: 25%
- **Agree (A)**: 3%
- **Neutral (N)**: 4%
- **Disagree (D)**: 28%
- **Strongly Disagree (SD)**: 17%

**RNK** = -0.71, n = 209, % = 68

Regarding my research and creative activity at UB, there is adequate: Support staff.

- **Strongly Agree (SA)**: 5%
- **Agree (A)**: 14%
- **Neutral (N)**: 10%
- **Disagree (D)**: 40%
- **Strongly Disagree (SD)**: 22%

**RNK** = 0.71, n = 278, % = 91

The Provost monitors other universities regarding their research and creative activity climate.

- **Strongly Agree (SA)**: 5%
- **Agree (A)**: 32%
- **Neutral (N)**: 12%
- **Disagree (D)**: 4%
- **Strongly Disagree (SD)**: 1%

**RNK** = -0.69, n = 163, % = 53

It is difficult for Research/Clinical faculty to obtain tenure-track, state-funded faculty positions at UB.

- **Strongly Agree (SA)**: 12%
- **Agree (A)**: 19%
- **Neutral (N)**: 10%
- **Disagree (D)**: 7%
- **Strongly Disagree (SD)**: 2%

**RNK** = -0.69, n = 151, % = 49
“strongly agree” (SA) = -2, “agree” (A) = -1, “neutral” (N) = 0, “disagree” (D) = +1, “strongly disagree” (SD) = +2;
number of responses which were not “don’t know” (DK) or “blank” (B), n = n_{SA} + n_{A} + n_{N} + n_{D} + n_{SD};
RNK = \left( -2 \times n_{SA} + (-1) \times n_{A} + (0) \times n_{N} + (+1) \times n_{D} + (+2) \times n_{SD} \right) / n.

There should be a uniform university policy on: Importance of the generation of commercially valuable products, such as patents, in terms of academic career development.

RNK = -0.67
n = 267
% = 87

A Faculty Club at UB should be established.

RNK = -0.65
n = 288
% = 94

There are high standards for: Hiring.

RNK = -0.65
n = 298
% = 97

There are high standards for: Promotions.

RNK = -0.62
n = 285
% = 93

There is a morale problem among the faculty in my unit at UB.

RNK = -0.65
n = 305
% = 99

There is a concerted effort to recruit senior scholars.

RNK = 0.62
n = 279
% = 91
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“strongly agree” (SA) = -2, “agree” (A) = -1, “neutral” (N) = 0, “disagree” (D) = +1, “strongly disagree” (SD) = +2;
number of responses which were not “don’t know” (DK) or “blank” (B), \( n = n_{SA} + n_{A} + n_{N} + n_{D} + n_{SD} \);
\[
RNK = \frac{(-2) n_{SA} + (-1) n_{A} + (0) n_{N} + (+1) n_{D} + (+2) n_{SD}}{n}.
\]

The following convey the attitude that they are there to serve the faculty: Sponsored Programs Administration.

**RNK = -0.62**

n = 279

% = 91

Organized Research Units, emphasizing interdisciplinary research, should be a University priority.

**RNK = -0.62**

n = 299

% = 97

The higher echelons of UB administration have the necessary experience/educational background to understand the unique aspects of research and creative activity.

**RNK = 0.61**

n = 270

% = 88

Of teaching, research and service, research is currently: The most important ingredient in determining salary increases.

**RNK = -0.60**

n = 282

% = 92

Regarding my research and creative activity at UB, there is adequate: Funding.

**RNK = 0.59**

n = 278

% = 91

There should be a uniform university policy on: Term limits for Deans.

**RNK = -0.55**

n = 297

% = 97
“strongly agree” (SA) = -2, “agree” (A) = -1, “neutral” (N) = 0, “disagree” (D) = +1, “strongly disagree” (SD) = +2;
number of responses which were not “don’t know” (DK) or “blank” (B), \( n = n_{SA} + n_{A} + n_{N} + n_{D} + n_{SD}; \)
\[ RNK = \left[ (-2) n_{SA} + (-1) n_{A} + (0) n_{N} + (+1) n_{D} + (+2) n_{SD} \right] / n. \]

The following convey the attitude that they are there to serve the faculty: Chair’s office.

![Pie chart](chart1)

Faculty and administrators currently have a healthy collegial relationship.

![Pie chart](chart2)

Regarding my research and creative activity at UB, there is adequate: Computer facilities.

![Pie chart](chart3)

The following appear to be more concerned with "how things look" than with "how things actually are": Dean.

![Pie chart](chart4)

Stipends for research assistants in my discipline are competitive.

![Pie chart](chart5)

There are resources for equipment maintenance in my unit.

![Pie chart](chart6)
“strongly agree” (SA) = -2, “agree” (A) = -1, “neutral” (N) = 0, “disagree” (D) = +1, “strongly disagree” (SD) = +2; number of responses which were not “don’t know” (DK) or “blank” (B), n = n_{SA} + n_{A} + n_{N} + n_{D} + n_{SD};

\[ \text{RNK} = \frac{\left[\left(-2\right) n_{SA} + \left(-1\right) n_{A} + \left(0\right) n_{N} + \left(+1\right) n_{D} + \left(+2\right) n_{SD}\right]}{n}. \]

Politics (or luck, committee constituency, subjectivity v. objectivity, etc.) are more important than scholarship in determining: Salary increases.

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{RNK} &= -0.42 \\
n &= 276 \\
% &= 90
\end{align*}
\]

The research atmosphere at UB is faculty-friendly.

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{RNK} &= 0.40 \\
n &= 294 \\
% &= 96
\end{align*}
\]

The following convey the attitude that they are there to serve the faculty: Grant and Contract Services.

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{RNK} &= -0.38 \\
n &= 255 \\
% &= 83
\end{align*}
\]

There is a desperate need for equipment upgrade in my unit.

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{RNK} &= -0.42 \\
n &= 289 \\
% &= 94
\end{align*}
\]

The quality of administrative services provided to PI's is adequate for: Sponsored Programs Administration.

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{RNK} &= -0.40 \\
n &= 249 \\
% &= 81
\end{align*}
\]

Regarding my research and creative activity at UB, there is adequate: Physical space.

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{RNK} &= -0.38 \\
n &= 285 \\
% &= 93
\end{align*}
\]
"strongly agree" (SA) = -2, “agree” (A) = -1, “neutral” (N) = 0, “disagree” (D) = +1, “strongly disagree” (SD) = +2;
number of responses which were not “don’t know” (DK) or “blank” (B), \( n = n_{SA} + n_A + n_N + n_D + n_{SD} \);
\[ \text{RNK} = \frac{(-2) n_{SA} + (-1) n_A + (0) n_N + (+1) n_D + (+2) n_{SD}}{n}. \]

The following usually act in a timely fashion to retain successful researchers: Chair.

- **SA**: 17%
- **A**: 33%
- **N**: 14%
- **D**: 11%
- **SD**: 12%

```
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SA</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
```

\[ \text{RNK} = -0.38 \]
\[ n = 268 \]
\[ \% = 87 \]

The results from this survey will be taken seriously by the: Dean.

- **SA**: 6%
- **A**: 18%
- **N**: 15%
- **D**: 25%
- **SD**: 20%

```
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SA</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
```

\[ \text{RNK} = 0.32 \]
\[ n = 224 \]
\[ \% = 73 \]

The results from this survey will be taken seriously by the: Chair.

- **SA**: 16%
- **A**: 29%
- **N**: 12%
- **D**: 4%
- **SD**: 13%

```
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SA</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
```

\[ \text{RNK} = -0.28 \]
\[ n = 246 \]
\[ \% = 80 \]

The quality of administrative services provided to PI's is adequate for: Chair's office.

- **SA**: 10%
- **A**: 29%
- **N**: 22%
- **D**: 12%
- **SD**: 7%
- **DK**: 17%

```
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SA</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DK</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
```

\[ \text{RNK} = -0.29 \]
\[ n = 247 \]
\[ \% = 80 \]

The quality of administrative services provided to PI's is adequate for: Grant and Contract Services.

- **SA**: 5%
- **A**: 32%
- **N**: 22%
- **D**: 13%
- **SD**: 4%
- **DK**: 23%

```
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SA</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DK</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
```

\[ \text{RNK} = -0.28 \]
\[ n = 233 \]
\[ \% = 76 \]
“strongly agree” (SA) = -2, “agree” (A) = -1, “neutral” (N) = 0, “disagree” (D) = +1, “strongly disagree” (SD) = +2;
number of responses which were not “don’t know” (DK) or “blank” (B), $n = n_{SA} + n_A + n_N + n_D + n_{SD}$;
$RNK = \frac{(-2) n_{SA} + (-1) n_A + (0) n_N + (+1) n_D + (+2) n_{SD}}{n}$.

The quality of administrative services provided to PI's is adequate for: Health and Safety.

- RNK = 0.26
- n = 297
- % = 97

The lack of convenient, faculty-designated parking is an obstacle to research and creative activity.

- RNK = 0.25
- n = 305
- % = 99

I believe at UB the emphasis is on: Service.

- RNK = -0.28
- n = 188
- % = 61

The following usually act in a timely fashion to retain successful researchers: Dean.

- RNK = 0.25
- n = 257
- % = 84

Regarding my research and creative activity at UB, there is adequate: Instrumentation.

- RNK = -0.26
- n = 248
- % = 81

The following convey the attitude that they are there to serve the faculty: Health and Safety.

- RNK = -0.25
- n = 217
- % = 71
“strongly agree” (SA) = -2, “agree” (A) = -1, “neutral” (N) = 0, “disagree” (D) = +1, “strongly disagree” (SD) = +2;

number of responses which were not “don’t know” (DK) or “blank” (B), \( n = n_{SA} + n_{A} + n_{N} + n_{D} + n_{SD} \);

\[ RNK = \frac{(-2) n_{SA} + (-1) n_{A} + (0) n_{N} + (+1) n_{D} + (+2) n_{SD}}{n}. \]

The following convey the attitude that they are there to serve the faculty: Dean’s office. 

- **SD**: 17%
- **D**: 23%
- **SA**: 5%
- **A**: 23%
- **N**: 26%

\[ RNK = 0.25 \]
\[ n = 289 \]
\[ % = 94 \]

My unit is successful in keeping successful researchers. 

- **SD**: 15%
- **D**: 27%
- **SA**: 4%
- **A**: 27%
- **N**: 23%

\[ RNK = 0.22 \]
\[ n = 297 \]
\[ % = 97 \]

The quality of administrative services provided to PI's is adequate for: Payroll. 

- **SD**: 13%
- **D**: 25%
- **SA**: 4%
- **A**: 27%
- **N**: 25%

\[ RNK = -0.21 \]
\[ n = 224 \]
\[ % = 73 \]

The following appear to be more concerned with "how things look" than with "how things actually are": Chair. 

- **SD**: 15%
- **D**: 29%
- **SA**: 14%
- **A**: 15%
- **N**: 18%

\[ RNK = 0.19 \]
\[ n = 281 \]
\[ % = 92 \]

The following convey the attitude that they are there to serve the faculty: Payroll. 

- **SD**: 5%
- **D**: 16%
- **SA**: 5%
- **A**: 33%
- **N**: 24%

\[ RNK = -0.19 \]
\[ n = 253 \]
\[ % = 82 \]

The quality of administrative services provided to PI's is adequate for: Dean's office. 

- **SD**: 12%
- **D**: 17%
- **SA**: 3%
- **A**: 22%
- **N**: 24%

\[ RNK = 0.17 \]
\[ n = 238 \]
\[ % = 78 \]
Politics (or luck, committee constituency, subjectivity v. objectivity, etc.) are more important than scholarship in determining: 
Teaching loads.

```
Politics (or luck, committee constituency, subjectivity v. objectivity, etc.) are more important than scholarship in determining: 
Teaching loads.

\[ \text{Politics, etc.} \]
\[ \text{Scholarship} \]
\[ \text{Total} \]
```

Consolidation of IRB's at UB would be useful.

```
Consolidation of IRB's at UB would be useful.

\[ \text{Consolidation} \]
\[ \text{Useful} \]
\[ \text{Total} \]
```

The quality of administrative services provided to PI's is adequate for: 
Purchasing.

```
The quality of administrative services provided to PI's is adequate for: 
Purchasing.

\[ \text{Quality} \]
\[ \text{Adequate} \]
\[ \text{Total} \]
```

I have adequate balance among my teaching, research and service activities.

```
I have adequate balance among my teaching, research and service activities.

\[ \text{Balance} \]
\[ \text{Adequate} \]
\[ \text{Total} \]
```

The following convey the attitude that they are there to serve the faculty: Personnel.

```
The following convey the attitude that they are there to serve the faculty: Personnel.

\[ \text{Serve} \]
\[ \text{Faculty} \]
\[ \text{Total} \]
```

The following convey the attitude that they are there to serve the faculty: Purchasing.

```
The following convey the attitude that they are there to serve the faculty: Purchasing.

\[ \text{Serve} \]
\[ \text{Faculty} \]
\[ \text{Total} \]
```
“strongly agree” (SA) = -2, “agree” (A) = -1, “neutral” (N) = 0, “disagree” (D) = +1, “strongly disagree” (SD) = +2;
number of responses which were not “don’t know” (DK) or “blank” (B), n = n_{SA} + n_{A} + n_{N} + n_{D} + n_{SD};

$$\text{RNK} = \frac{(-2) n_{SA} + (-1) n_{A} + (0) n_{N} + (+1) n_{D} + (+2) n_{SD}}{n}.$$  

The quality of administrative services provided to PI's is adequate for: Personnel.

![Pie chart showing the distribution of responses](chart1.png)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SA</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DK</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$$\text{RNK} = -0.12$$

$n = 236$

$\% = 77$

I believe at UB the emphasis is on: Teaching.

![Pie chart showing the distribution of responses](chart2.png)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$$\text{RNK} = -0.11$$

$n = 302$

$\% = 98$

The following usually act in a timely fashion to retain successful researchers: Provost.

![Pie chart showing the distribution of responses](chart3.png)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DK</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$$\text{RNK} = 0.11$$

$n = 196$

$\% = 64$

Politics (or luck, committee constituency, subjectivity v. objectivity, etc.) are more important than scholarship in determining: Faculty promotion.

![Pie chart showing the distribution of responses](chart4.png)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DK</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$$\text{RNK} = -0.06$$

$n = 280$

$\% = 91$

Student concerns take precedence over faculty research and creative activity concerns in determining budget priorities.

![Pie chart showing the distribution of responses](chart5.png)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DK</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$$\text{RNK} = 0.05$$

$n = 275$

$\% = 90$

The results from this survey will be taken seriously by the: Provost.

![Pie chart showing the distribution of responses](chart6.png)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DK</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$$\text{RNK} = -0.05$$

$n = 196$

$\% = 64$
“strongly agree” (SA) = -2, “agree” (A) = -1, “neutral” (N) = 0, “disagree” (D) = +1, “strongly disagree” (SD) = +2;
number of responses which were not “don’t know” (DK) or “blank” (B), n = n_{SA} + n_{A} + n_{N} + n_{D} + n_{SD};
RNK = \left[(-2) n_{SA} + (-1) n_{A} + (0) n_{N} + (+1) n_{D} + (+2) n_{SD}\right] / n.

I would encourage a colleague in my own specialty to seek a position at UB.

There is adequate institutional coordination of Institutional Review Boards at UB.