

**NYU Faculty Senators Council
Survey of Faculty
Spring 2010**

Report of Findings
(Issued 11/22/10)

NYUFSC

**NYU Faculty Senators Council Survey of Faculty
Spring 2010
Report of Findings
(Issued 11/22/10)**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Distribution, Purpose and Data Collection	1
Response Rates and Respondents.....	2
Demographics of Respondents.....	3
Teaching Excellence.....	6
Branch Campuses.....	8
Faculty/Student and Faculty/Faculty Interactions.....	10
Governance/PAAC.....	13
Tenure.....	17
Benefits.....	19
Housing.....	22
Knowledge of and Communication with the FSC.....	26
Priorities for the FSC.....	28

The Distribution, Purpose and Data Collection Procedures for the Survey

On March 31, 2010, the Faculty Senators Council (FSC) distributed an on-line, Survey Monkey questionnaire to 2440 full-time tenured, tenure-eligible, or non-tenure eligible contract or clinical faculty. The list was obtained from the NYU Office of Academic Appointments and included all names on the university's official list of faculty as of 11/18/09 except for the School of Medicine. The SOM faculty were not included in the survey because the differences in their benefits package and administrative structure made many of the questions in the survey inapplicable. All other NYU schools were included. A list of the schools with at least one survey respondent and the number of respondents from each school can be found on page 4.

In addition to the full-time active faculty, the questionnaire was distributed to 576 retired faculty. This list, also obtained from the NYU Office of Academic Appointments, included retired faculty who had an NYU email address as of 2/9/10. It is therefore both incomplete and likely to include retired faculty who no longer access their NYU email account.

Reminder emails containing a link to the questionnaire were sent on 4/7/10 and 4/12/10, and data collection was concluded on 4/15/10.

The purpose of the survey was to ascertain the level of utilization and satisfaction of the respondents in terms of NYU benefits and their opinions and recommendations about a variety of matters regarding their specific school, the Faculty Senators Council, and NYU in general.

The questionnaire, which took about 20-30 minutes to complete, contained a mixture of closed-ended and open-ended questions.

- Closed-ended questions provide a list of responses from which the respondent is instructed to select one or as many as apply. When appropriate, the response of "other" with room for specification is also offered. The purpose of closed-ended items is to insure that every respondent considers the same list of answers and selects the one or ones that best represent their view. This allows the investigators to report that, having considered all of the possible answers, a given number and percentage of respondents selected each particular answer, i.e. a frequency distribution of the responses.
- The closed-ended items in the survey were analyzed by members of the FSC Communications Committee using PASW Statistics 18 and are reported in terms of percentages or mean scores in the report.
- Open-ended items pose a question but do not include a list of possible answers. The purpose of open-ended items is to encourage respondents to answer in any way they choose without being influenced by a predetermined list of answers. This allows the investigators to gain greater insight to the respondents' point of view.
- The open-ended items were reviewed and categorized by content areas by members of the FSC Communications Committee and tallied using Excel.

The Response Rates and the Respondents

Responses were received from 796 individuals, for an overall response rate of 26% of the 3016 active and retired faculty to whom the survey was sent. Faculty status was available for 709 of the respondents (670 active and 39 retired faculty), which permitted the calculation of the following response rates: 32% for tenured and tenure-track faculty, 26% for clinical faculty, and 7% for retired faculty. The extent to which the low response rate from retired faculty is a reflection of an out-dated list of email addresses or a decline in interest in responding to a survey about NYU benefits and issues is unknown.

Demographics of Respondents

Employment Status

		Number	Percent
	Current faculty	670	95%
	Retired	39	5%
	Total	709	100%

Faculty Status

		Number	Percent
	Tenured	358	50%
	Tenure-track	90	13%
	Non-tenure track	261	37%
	Total	709	100%

Gender

		Number	Percent
	Male	372	57%
	Female	276	43%
	Total	648	100%

Age

		Number	Percent
	Under 40	121	19%
	40 - 59	296	45%
	60 & over	233	36%
	Total	650	100%

School (in order of the number of respondents)

	Number	Percent
FAS	248	36%
Steinhardt	100	14%
Tisch	86	12%
Stern	80	12%
Dent/Nursing	71	10%
SCPS	36	5%
Libraries	19	3%
Liberal Studies	15	2%
Wagner	13	2%
Soc Work	13	2%
Gallatin	10	1%
Law	9	1%
Total	700	100%

Faculty Status by Gender

			Faculty Status			Total
			Tenured	Tenure-track	Non-tenure track	
Gender	Male	Count	207	36	129	372
		% within gender	55%	10%	35%	100%
	Female	Count	125	36	115	276
		% within gender	45%	13%	42%	100%
Total		Count	332	72	244	648
		% by gender	51%	11%	38%	100%

Faculty Status by School			Faculty Status			Total
			Tenured	Tenure-track	Non-tenure track	
School	FAS	Count	153	24	71	248
		% within School	61%	10%	29%	100%
Steinhardt	Count	54	18	28	100	
		% within School	54%	18%	28%	100%
Tisch	Count	32	3	51	86	
		% within School	37%	4%	59%	100%
Stern	Count	43	19	18	80	
		% within School	54%	24%	22%	100%
Dent/Nursing	Count	29	6	36	71	
		% within School	41%	8%	51%	100%
SCPS	Count	1	0	35	36	
		% within School	3%	0%	97%	100%
Libraries	Count	11	8	0	19	
		% within School	58%	42%	0%	100%
Liberal Studies	Count	0	0	15	15	
		% within School	0%	0%	100%	100%
Wagner	Count	8	3	2	13	
		% within School	62%	23%	15%	100%
Soc Work	Count	8	4	1	13	
		% within School	62%	31%	7%	100%
Gallatin	Count	7	2	1	10	
		% within School	70%	20%	10%	100%
Law	Count	7	0	2	9	
		% within School	78%	0%	22%	100%
Total		Count	353	87	260	700
		% by School	51%	12%	37%	100%

Teaching Excellence

1. Are you satisfied with the services offered by the University and/or your School that support teaching (e.g. Center for Teaching Excellence, etc.)?

	Number	Percent
Very Satisfied	79	13%
Satisfied	364	61%
Dissatisfied	131	22%
Very Dissatisfied	21	4%
Total	595	100%

- 1b. Mean level of satisfaction with the services offered by the University and/or your School that support teaching by School (in order of most satisfied):

1=Very Dissatisfied, 4=Very Satisfied				
		Mean	Standard Deviation	Valid Responses
School	Law	3.29	.76	7
	Stern	3.26	.62	77
	Gallatin	3.00	1.07	8
	Dent/Nursing	2.90	.56	63
	Libraries	2.89	.60	9
	Wagner	2.89	.60	9
	SCPS	2.81	.59	32
	FAS	2.80	.67	172
	Liberal Studies	2.70	.82	10
	Steinhardt	2.66	.72	76
	Tisch	2.63	.65	54
	Soc Work	2.45	.82	11

2. Are there specific areas [related to teaching] requiring more support (e.g. teaching large classes, supporting adjuncts, stimulating active student discussion, etc.)? (open-ended)

The 304 comments contained the following major themes in order of frequency (1=most frequent):

1. Teaching large classes, classroom space inadequate, better office space needed
2. Using technology, IT issues, problems with Blackboard
3. Supporting adjuncts
4. Stimulating discussions, enhancing critical thinking
5. More teaching assistance, support TAs
6. Meeting needs of students at different levels, language issues, other special needs
7. Grading/violations of academic integrity
8. Expand services of Center for Teaching Excellence
9. More funding, financial assistance
10. More clerical/administrative support
11. More information/more contact with Center for Teaching Excellence
12. Course content, developing learning objectives, curriculum development
13. Focus more on teaching/teaching support
14. Too much reliance on adjuncts
15. Only feedback comes from students/evaluations
16. Collaborative teaching

3. Please provide any additional comments, concerns, or suggestions you may have regarding teaching excellence (open-ended)

The 161 comments contained the following major themes in order of frequency (1=most frequent):

1. Teaching excellence is not rewarded/not a major focus when it comes to compensation or promotion, more support for teaching excellence needed
2. Lack of information on services offered to support teaching, CTE not offering as many programs, sessions not valuable/schedule conflicts
3. Teaching large classes, classroom space inadequate, better office space
4. Using technology, IT issues, problems with Blackboard
5. More workshops, methodology, hands-on approaches, discussion with colleagues, field-specific training
6. Teaching mentors, feedback from senior professors
7. Need better faculty, focus on hiring excellent faculty
8. Support/praise for Center for Teaching Excellence
9. Issues with student literacy, cultural issues, and other needs
10. Too many adjuncts, need more tenure-track positions
11. Negative impact of FAR4
12. More support for writing instruction

Branch Campuses

1. As part of the Global Network University initiative, NYU has opened degree granting programs (also known as branch/affiliate campuses) such as Tisch School of the Arts in Singapore, NYU Law School in Singapore, and NYU Abu Dhabi. Additional campuses are envisaged. What is your opinion of the initiative?

		Number	Percent
	In Favor	325	45%
	Undecided	234	33%
	Not in Favor	158	22%
	Total	717	100%

- 1b. Mean favorability rating of Global Network University initiative by School (in order of most favorable):

1=Not in favor, 2=Undecided, 3=In favor		Mean	Standard Deviation	Valid Responses
	Dent/Nursing	2.75	.67	48
	SCPS	2.61	.80	31
	Stern	2.51	.87	49
	Tisch	2.51	.87	61
	Steinhardt	2.37	.94	57
	Liberal Studies	2.33	1.00	9
	Libraries	2.27	1.01	11
	Gallatin	2.25	1.04	8
	Law	2.20	1.10	5
	FAS	2.07	1.00	155
	Wagner	2.00	1.15	4
	Soc Work	1.80	1.10	5

2. Please provide any additional comments, concerns, or suggestions you may have regarding the Global Network University initiative (open-ended)

The 295 comments contained the following major themes in order of frequency (1=most frequent):

1. Takes resources away from Washington Square/main campus, need more resources locally, more faculty support/tenure-track positions locally
2. Concern over partnering with Abu Dhabi/Middle East/Singapore/etc. (i.e. government, culture, academic freedom issues, etc.), failure of other universities in Abu Dhabi
3. Threatens to reduce academic standards, dilution of NYU's prestige, need for quality control
4. Lack of input/evaluation by faculty, need for transparency
5. In favor of, interested in involvement, and suggestions of how it could benefit main campus (i.e. web-access to courses, cutting edge faculty)
6. In favor of, but focus on quality rather than quantity, modest expansion, need for integration with NYU main campus
7. Do not have a strong understanding or enough information on initiative
8. Certain Schools/faculty excluded from global opportunities, should include all Schools, give all faculty choice to be involved
9. Corporatization of a brand versus expansion of an educational mission
10. Branch campuses have a lack of organization, strategy, support, development, and clear cultural/academic objectives
11. Concern over branch campuses being mainly money-making
12. Importance of campuses being integrated into local community
13. Compromises core values
14. Not the right time to expand, no need to expand
15. Suggestions of places to expand (i.e. Greece, Italy, Australia, India, China, Brazil)
16. Too much emphasis on Abu Dhabi

Faculty/Student and Faculty/Faculty Interactions

1. Would you like to see more programs to foster faculty/student interaction?

	Number	Percent
Yes	430	75%
No	142	25%
Total	572	100%

1b. Percentage of respondents favoring greater faculty/student interaction by School (in order of most in favor):

		In favor	Total
Schools	Libraries	Count	12
		Percent	100%
	Dent/Nursing	Count	54
		Percent	92%
	Soc Work	Count	7
		Percent	88%
	SCPS	Count	25
		Percent	86%
	Gallatin	Count	6
		Percent	86%
	Liberal Studies	Count	8
		Percent	80%
	Steinhardt	Count	63
		Percent	76%
	Tisch	Count	44
		Percent	76%
	FAS	Count	127
		Percent	71%
	Stern	Count	38
		Percent	66%
Law	Count	2	
	Percent	33%	
Wagner	Count	3	
	Percent	27%	
Total	Count	389	
	Percent	75%	

2. Would you like to see more opportunities for interaction with faculty from other Schools?

	Number	Percent
Yes	543	86%
No	87	14%
Total	630	100%

2b. Percentage of respondents favoring greater interaction with faculty from other Schools by School(in order of most in favor):

Schools		In favor	Total
	Dent/Nurs	Count	60
		Percent	100%
	Liberal Studies	Count	13
		Percent	100%
	Soc Wrk	Count	12
		Percent	100%
	Gallatin	Count	10
		Percent	100%
	Tisch	Count	63
		Percent	91%
	SCPS	Count	30
		Percent	91%
	Steinhardt	Count	78
		Percent	88%
	Libraries	Count	13
		Percent	87%
	FAS	Count	159
		Percent	83%
	Wagner	Count	9
		Percent	75%
Stern	Count	42	
	Percent	67%	
Law	Count	2	
	Percent	50%	
Total	Count	491	
	Percent	86%	

3. If you have any suggestions or comments on opportunities for interaction with students and/or faculty from other Schools, please describe below (open-ended):

The 144 comments contained the following major themes in order of frequency (1=most frequent):

1. Too many bureaucratic barriers/decentralization, Schools lack collegiality
2. More opportunities for connections with faculty outside department/NYU Schools
3. More interdisciplinary, applied projects, cross-departmental, co-teaching opportunities, fewer barriers to cross-listing courses
4. Faculty are too busy, programs are too time-consuming, need more initiative on part of faculty and support/funding from chairs/administration
5. More opportunities for interactions with students, importance of contact between students and faculty (i.e. lunch programs, orientation events, workshops, etc.)
6. There are already many opportunities for interaction with students
7. More opportunities for connections with faculty/students from other colleges/universities, US and international
8. There are already many opportunities for interaction with faculty
9. More residential programs (i.e. faculty fellow in residence)
10. Students do not get involved in these programs/difficult to engage
11. Need for a faculty club

Governance/Personnel and Affirmative Action

1. Are you satisfied with the level of faculty participation in decision-making at your School?

		Number	Percent
	Very Satisfied	48	7%
	Satisfied	244	36%
	Dissatisfied	226	34%
	Very Dissatisfied	150	23%
	Total	668	100%

1b. Mean level of satisfaction with faculty participation in decision-making at one's School by School (in order of most satisfied):

1=Very Dissatisfied, 4=Very Satisfied		Mean	Standard Deviation	Valid Responses
School	Law	3.50	.55	6
	Gallatin	3.10	1.10	10
	Soc Work	3.09	.83	11
	Wagner	3.00	.71	13
	Stern	2.65	.91	71
	Dent/Nursing	2.34	.92	62
	SCPS	2.26	.67	34
	Tisch	2.20	.85	83
	FAS	2.16	.87	200
	Libraries	2.11	.74	19
	Steinhardt	2.07	.84	95
	Liberal Studies	1.93	.88	15

2. Are you satisfied with the level of faculty participation in decision-making at the University level?

		Number	Percent
	Very Satisfied	6	1%
	Satisfied	142	24%
	Dissatisfied	218	37%
	Very Dissatisfied	223	38%
	Total	589	100%

2b. Mean level of satisfaction with the amount of faculty participation in decision-making at University by School (in order of most satisfied):

1=Very Dissatisfied, 4=Very Satisfied		Mean	Standard Deviation	Valid Responses
School	Law	3.00	.00	3
	Stern	2.41	.90	51
	Dent/Nursing	2.31	.75	48
	SCPS	2.27	.74	30
	Gallatin	1.90	.88	10
	FAS	1.83	.78	194
	Libraries	1.81	.75	16
	Steinhardt	1.67	.74	89
	Tisch	1.66	.69	74
	Liberal Studies	1.53	.83	15
	Wagner	1.43	.53	7
	Soc Work	1.42	.67	12

3. At present, non-tenure track full-time faculty (e.g. contract, clinical, etc.) are not represented in faculty governance at the University level. Do you believe they should be represented at the University level?

		Number	Percent
	Yes	442	63%
	Maybe	141	20%
	No	121	17%
	Total	704	100%

- 3b. Agreement that non-tenure track full-time faculty (e.g. contract, clinical, etc.) should be represented in University governance by Faculty Status:

		No	Maybe	Yes	Total
Tenured	Count	92	94	141	327
	Percent	28%	29%	43%	100%
Tenure-track	Count	19	23	36	78
	Percent	24%	30%	46%	100%
Non-tenure track	Count	4	16	233	253
	Percent	2%	6%	92%	100%
Total	Count	115	133	410	658
	Percent	18%	20%	62%	100%

4. If you believe non-tenure track full-time faculty (NTTF) should be represented at the University level, how do you think they should be represented (open-ended)?

The 325 comments contained the following major themes in order of frequency (1=most frequent):

1. Same voice as tenure/tenure-track faculty, full representation, full voting capacity
2. Become part of FSC
3. Elected as representatives from Schools, serve on committees
4. Some form of representation on the University Senate and/or University committees as voting members
5. Represented but in a limited or non-voting capacity, no voting on tenure
6. Form a separate council on the University Senate
7. Unionization
8. Avoid non-tenure track appointments/protect tenure
9. In the way NTTF would like representation/their choice
10. Subgroup of FSC/At-large roles
11. Clinical faculty should receive representation, not adjuncts
12. Should not be part of FSC

5. Please provide any additional comments, concerns, or suggestions you may have regarding faculty participation in governance (open-ended):

The 155 comments contained the following major themes in order of frequency (1=most frequent):

1. Faculty do not have a voice, no faculty governance, top-down, FSC has no power
2. NTTF should be represented, all faculty included in governance
3. Avoid non-tenure track appointments/protect tenure
4. Critiques of task forces and committees, choose only select representatives
5. Need for more transparency
6. NTTF are not fairly treated/do not have same voice
7. Better communication/interaction with board of trustees/faculty representation on board
8. NTTF should not have same voice as tenured faculty
9. Faculty participation in governance exists but most faculty do not get involved
10. Critiques of department chairs and governance at department level
11. More rotation of faculty on senate

Tenure

1. Are you satisfied with the clarity and fairness of the tenure process at your School?

		Number	Percent
	Very Satisfied	79	16%
	Satisfied	184	37%
	Mixture of Satisfied and Dissatisfied	150	31%
	Dissatisfied	45	9%
	Very Dissatisfied	34	7%
	Total	492	100%

1b. Mean level of satisfaction with clarity and fairness of tenure process at one's School by School (in order of most satisfied):

		Mean	Standard Deviation	Valid Responses
1=Very Dissatisfied, 5=Very Satisfied				
School	Law	4.00	1.15	7
	Stern	3.83	1.00	54
	Wagner	3.75	.75	12
	FAS	3.72	.93	178
	Gallatin	3.50	1.41	8
	Dent/Nursing	3.30	1.14	47
	Steinhardt	3.17	1.10	71
	Soc Work	3.08	1.08	12
	Tisch	3.02	1.18	46
	Libraries	3.00	1.06	17
	Liberal Studies	2.00	1.41	2
	SCPS	2.00	1.41	5

2. Comments on your satisfaction with the clarity and fairness of the tenure process at your School (open-ended):

The 102 comments contained the following major themes in order of frequency (1=most frequent):

1. Lack of clarity/fairness in process
2. Tenure criteria, guidelines not clear
3. Too much investment in NTTF positions, administration threatens continuation of tenure, tenure is being phased out
4. Departmental decisions regularly overturned, decisions should be made by department
5. Manipulated by deans and chairs/central administration
6. Should have more discussion of quality of work/academic performance
7. Requirements for tenure are clear/process is fair
8. Lack of feedback, transparency
9. Requirements vary by administration's goals, too political
10. Not tenure eligible and not satisfied with promotion process
11. Process should be revised, criteria is too difficult
12. Process is too long
13. Do not believe in tenure

Benefits

1. An array of NYU benefits is listed below. For each benefit used by you or a member of your family, please indicate your overall level of satisfaction:

(In order of greatest level of satisfaction)			
1=Very Dissatisfied, 4=Very Satisfied	Mean	Std. Deviation	Respondents
Flu Shot Program	3.59	.642	424
Wageworks: Commuter Expense Account	3.26	.803	228
NYU Retirement Plan	3.24	.652	577
Tuition Remission (TR) for Child, Undergraduate	3.22	.992	117
Health Care Flexible Spending Account (FSA)	3.18	.701	408
Prescription drug plan	3.15	.706	601
Dependent Care FSA	3.09	.689	150
Domestic Partner Benefits	3.06	.837	82
Maternity Leave	3.05	.928	75
Family Care Program	3.04	1.021	89
Life Insurance	3.04	.632	347
Long Term Disability Insurance	3.02	.602	257
TR for Self	3.01	.966	90
Medical benefits	3.01	.693	663
Long Term Care Insurance	2.90	.749	155
Employee Assistance Program (Carebridge)	2.87	.955	71
NYU Faculty Housing	2.78	.965	424
Dental	2.75	.812	637
Vision	2.68	.828	429
Palladium Membership	2.66	.996	95
Coles Membership	2.66	.939	308
TR for Spouse/Domestic Partner, Undergraduate	2.56	1.142	39
TR for Spouse/Domestic Partner, Graduate	2.56	1.027	73
Faculty Mortgage	2.45	1.169	128
TR for Child, Graduate	2.44	1.220	64
Portable Tuition	2.22	.946	106

2. Have you or members of your family experienced problems with any NYU benefits that you would like the Faculty Senators Council Benefits Committee to be aware of and look into? (open-ended)

The 204 comments contained the following major themes in order of frequency (1=most frequent):

1. Medical/health insurance
2. Housing
3. TR
4. Dental
5. Financial squeeze/salaries/making ends meet/salaries down, costs up
6. Benefits Office, including customer service, knowledge, quality of website/communications, transmission of information about benefits, offerings, etc.
7. Caremark
8. Coles/Palladium
9. Family care, e.g. maternity/bonding leave; emergency child care; elder care; day care; NYU School or day care
10. Vision
11. Retirement plan
12. FSA accounts
13. Contract faculty issues
14. Domestic Partner process, benefits
15. Other (or uncertain what referred to)
16. Benefits for retirees (all kinds)
17. Remarks about erosion of benefits, breach of contract, etc
18. Long-term care insurance
19. Carebridge
20. Benefits change process, e.g. lack of transparency, voice, input
21. WageWorks (commuter benefits)

3. Do you have suggestions for ways existing NYU benefits could be improved or suggestions for additional benefits you would like to see offered? (open-ended)

The 237 comments contained the following major themes in order of frequency (1=most frequent):

1. TR
2. Housing
3. Medical/health insurance
4. Dental
5. Coles/Palladium
6. Benefits Office, including customer service, knowledge, quality of website/communications, transmission of information about benefits, offerings, etc.
7. Financial squeeze/salaries/making ends meet/salaries down, costs up
8. Family care, e.g. maternity/bonding leave; emergency child care; elder care; day care; NYU school or day care
9. Vision
10. Other (or uncertain what referred to)
11. Remarks about larger NYU (or nation) issues, e.g. lack of transparency, voice, inclusion in decision making, disregard for faculty, need for universal health care
12. Contract faculty issues
13. Benefits change process, e.g. lack of transparency, voice, input
14. Caremark
15. Benefits for retirees (all kinds)
16. Retirement plan
17. Remarks about erosion of benefits, breach of contract, etc.
18. FSA accounts
19. Long-term care insurance
20. Domestic Partner process, benefits
21. WageWorks (commuter benefits)
22. Life insurance/disability insurance

4. An array of NYU retiree benefits is listed below. For each retiree benefit used by you or a member of your family, please indicate your overall level of satisfaction.

(In order of most satisfied)			
1=Very Dissatisfied, 4=Very Satisfied	Mean	Std. Deviation	Respondents
NYU Retiree Health Plan	3.02	.849	44
TR in retirement for self	2.82	.751	11
TR in retirement for spouse/DP, Undergraduate	2.80	.837	5
TR in retirement for spouse/DP, Graduate	2.50	.577	4
NYU Retiree Housing	2.22	1.215	18
Portable Tuition Benefit in retirement	2.21	.699	14
TR in retirement for child, Undergraduate	2.17	.753	6
TR in retirement for child, Graduate	2.00	.894	6

Housing

1. Do you currently reside or have you ever lived in faculty housing?

		Number	Percent
	Current resident	317	43%
	Former resident	97	13%
	Never been a resident	327	44%
	Total	741	100%

2. Since you moved into NYU University Housing, do you believe the quality of services, including maintenance, has improved or declined? (current-resident)

		Number	Percent
	Improved	67	21%
	The Same	169	54%
	Declined	78	25%
	Total	314	100%

2b. Mean level of improvement in quality of services, including maintenance, in NYU University Housing by Residence (current-resident, in order of the greatest level of improvement):

1=Declined, 2=Remained the same, 3=Improved		Mean	Standard Deviation	Valid Responses
	Waterside	2.25	.50	4
	WSV	2.01	.71	180
	Furman Hall	2.00	.	1
	8th St	2.00	.71	5
	Armory	1.83	.41	6
	Silver Towers	1.76	.61	75
	Peter Cooper	1.75	.96	4
	Riverwalk	1.67	.58	3

- 3. If NYU were to offer you a long term loan with a 2% interest rate for up to a third of the cost of housing you are considering buying, how likely would you be to accept that offer and vacate University Housing? (current-resident)**

		Number	Percent
	Very Likely	40	14%
	Likely	71	25%
	Unlikely	102	36%
	Very Unlikely	67	24%
	Total	280	100%

- 4. What incentives could NYU offer that would encourage you to leave university housing (e.g. mortgage assistance, down payment assistance, etc.)? (current-resident, open-ended)**

The 199 comments contained the following major themes in order of frequency (1=most frequent):

1. Down payment assistance
2. Mortgage assistance
3. No incentives would encourage leaving university housing, can not leave due to NYC housing market
4. Cash payment
5. Options for similar housing nearby/Greenwich village, not Roosevelt Island
6. Low interest loan
7. Comparable rent subsidy/monthly payment, affordable housing
8. More information on re-locating options and purchasing processes, aid of agent, assistance finding housing
9. Co-ownership with NYU
10. Increase in salary
11. 1 bedroom instead of studio for retirees, fixed rent for retirees

5. Please provide any additional comments, concerns, or suggestions you may have regarding faculty housing (current-resident, open-ended)

The 111 comments contained the following major themes in order of frequency (1=most frequent):

1. Decline in quality of services, specific maintenance issues, renovations needed, inefficient management companies, security issues
2. Unfair practices/allocation of housing (i.e. families with young children in one bedrooms, others w/o school aged children in larger apartments), lack of transparency
3. Do not want to leave faculty housing, very important benefit, crucial to recruitment
4. Need better retirement housing options/transparency, do not want to move, disincentive to retire
5. Rent increases beyond salary
6. University should expand affordable rental housing
7. Concern over building changes/renovations in 2031 plan
8. Housing office does not offer helpful service
9. Improvement in services/well-run

6. Did NYU provide assistance in your transition to new housing (e.g. mortgage or down payment assistance, etc.)? (former resident)

		Number	Percent
	Yes	71	32%
	No	153	68%
	Total	224	100%

7. Were you satisfied with NYU's role in that transition? (former resident)

		Number	Percent
	Very Satisfied	25	23%
	Satisfied	46	43%
	Dissatisfied	14	13%
	Very Dissatisfied	23	21%
	Total	108	100%

8. Please provide any additional comments, concerns, or suggestions you may have regarding faculty housing (former resident, open-ended)

The 49 comments contained the following major themes in order of frequency (1=most frequent):

1. Faculty housing office complaints
2. More transparent and equitable process of housing assistance, mortgage program/other assistance is not uniformly offered/varies by School
3. Need to expand faculty housing, more assistance
4. Suitable local apartments for retirees needed/opportunity to stay in housing for a few years after retirement
5. NYU mortgage support not substantial, assistance needs to be increased, unclear
6. Rent increases relative to salary
7. Praise for faculty housing, buildings/apartments, moving transition
8. Need more compensation/reward for those who move out or do not live in faculty housing
9. Complaints on NYU moving transition (e.g. moving company recommendations, Citibank)
10. Transition out of NYU housing is unaffordable for the majority

9. Are you satisfied with the clarity and fairness of the faculty housing process? (never been a resident)

		Number	Percent
	Very Satisfied	18	4%
	Satisfied	99	25%
	Dissatisfied	139	35%
	Very Dissatisfied	146	36%
	Total	402	100%

10. Please provide any additional comments, concerns, or suggestions you may have regarding faculty housing (never been a resident, open-ended)

The 192 comments contained the following major themes in order of frequency (1=most frequent):

1. Varies unfairly by School/individual, allocation not equitable, need sensitivity to family size (i.e. families versus single/couples without children)
2. Lack of transparency/information in process and allocation
3. Expanded housing options/assistance for faculty, should be offered to all full-time faculty, complaints about lack of options for NTTF
4. No longer a benefit but a recruitment tool, based on a star system, executive perk
5. No clear process when entering housing/requesting change, lack of response
6. Would not live in faculty housing

Knowledge of and Communications with the FSC

1. How knowledgeable are you about the work, actions, and/or activities of the Faculty Senators Council?

		Number	Percent
	Very Knowledgeable	48	7%
	Knowledgeable	107	15%
	Somewhat Knowledgeable	353	49%
	Not at all Knowledgeable	196	27%
	Have not heard of FSC	15	2%
	Total	719	100%

- 1b. Mean level of knowledge of work, actions, and activities of FSC by Faculty Status (in order of most knowledgeable):

1=Have not heard of FSC, 5=Very knowledgeable				
		Mean	Standard Deviation	Valid Responses
Faculty Status	Tenured	3.19	.94	349
	Non-tenure track	2.78	.76	255
	Tenure-track	2.54	.59	85

2. In which of the following ways do you prefer to receive news and information regarding the Faculty Senators Council? (check all that apply)

Preferred Forms of Communication	Frequency (N=797)	Percent
FSC Emails	450	57%
From School Senator	308	39%
FSC Newsletter	217	27%
Faculty Forums/Town Halls	120	15%
FSC Website	117	15%
Minutes and Reports	100	13%
Do not wish to receive news from FSC	12	2%

3. Please provide any additional comments on the amount and/or kind of information you receive from the FSC (open-ended)

The 71 comments contained the following major themes in order of frequency (1=most frequent):

1. Lack of substantive information/contact from FSC, do not receive any information from FSC
2. Ideas for FSC Communications: regular emails, FSC blog, hard copies, offer opportunity for faculty to share opinions
3. FSC does not have power or a voice in governance/does not achieve significant results
4. Lack of understanding of how the FSC functions within the university/would like more information on FSC accomplishments
5. NTTF should be represented, support for a union, do not feel connected to FSC as NTTF
6. FSC disconnected from faculty, council of insiders
7. Praise for faculty senator(s)
8. More and timelier information on top university issues (e.g. Abu Dhabi)
9. FSC communications/efforts have improved

Priorities for the FSC

1. What issues, topics, or concerns do you think should receive highest priority from the FSC (e.g. salary, benefits, faculty voice in governance, etc.)? (open-ended)

The 468 comments contained the following major themes in order of frequency (1=most frequent):

1. Salary (in terms of equity among Schools and tenured versus contract faculty, etc.)
2. Faculty voice in governance
3. Benefits
4. Faculty housing
5. Representation/equity for contract faculty, better contracts/promotion
6. Health/dental benefits
7. Tuition Benefits
8. Tenure process/protection of tenure
9. Retirement benefits
10. 2031 expansion, changes to Greenwich village, relationship with neighborhood
11. Family/childcare issues, child care center needed
12. Need more transparency
13. Top-down governance, corporate culture
14. Resources to support teaching excellence
15. Global campuses

2. Please provide any additional comments, concerns, or suggestions you wish to bring to the attention of the FSC (open-ended):

The 53 comments contained the following major themes in order of frequency (1=most frequent):

1. Representation/support of contract faculty
2. Lack of faculty voice/FSC power
3. Appreciation for survey
4. More town halls, forums, opportunities for faculty to voice opinion
5. 2031 plan and the costs/resources being used
6. Abu Dhabi/branch campuses and costs/resources used, faculty involvement and governance in AD
7. Include retired faculty in communications/discussions
8. Space issues: classrooms, offices
9. Salary freeze/inequality in salary
10. Housing issues