



# **Needs Assessment and Research Interests: Faculty Survey Results**

Office of Research and Sponsored Programs  
College of St. Catherine  
Funded in part by NIH, EARDA Grant

August 2007

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Office of Research and Sponsored Programs (ORSP), currently staffed by Beth Koenig and Kirsten Walters, seeks to promote and facilitate faculty/staff research and to assist faculty/staff in seeking, applying for, and managing grants from government funding sources. ORSP is charged with developing policies to ensure integrity in research and compliance with federal and state regulations. ORSP is also responsible for budgetary oversight of all academic research/program grants, both public and private, awarded to CSC faculty and staff.

ORSP, long with the EARDA Advisory Committee, created a survey to learn more about faculty members' research interests and needs. The purposes of this survey were to:

1. determine the research/scholarly interests of CSC faculty.
2. assess the needs of CSC faculty as they pursue research/scholarly interests and seek funding opportunities.
3. determine ways in which the ORSP can best address the research/scholarly needs of CSC faculty.
4. assess ORSP's current services

309 CSC faculty were invited via e-mail to participate in this electronic survey during spring 2007. 130 faculty members responded for a response rate of 42%.

### Key findings:

- About ¾ths (76%) of faculty reported that discipline-based research appealed to them “very much” (the response scale was ‘not at all’, ‘somewhat’, ‘very much’.) 21% responded it was “somewhat” appealing. 50% reported that research on teaching and learning appealed to them “very much” (42% ‘somewhat’) and 28% indicated that creative work appealed to them “very much” (41% ‘somewhat’). (p.10 of this report)
- More faculty respondents who had a tenure-track contract reported that research on teaching and learning was very appealing, compared to faculty with other types of contracts. (tenure-track contract 70%, rolling contract 58.1%, tenure contract 42% and temporary contract 36.4%).
- Faculty were significantly more satisfied with the type (M= 4.04) and quality (M=3.90) of research they were conducting, compared to the quantity (M = 2.96). (The response scale was 1= very dissatisfied and 5= very satisfied). (p.11)
- The average percentage of time faculty reported they spend on teaching/advising was about 72%. The average for research/scholarly activities was 13% and it was 15% for service. (p.12)
- Overall, the top barriers to faculty research/scholarly activities were: lack of time (93.08% of faculty respondents ranked this as one of the top five barriers), challenge of getting formal course release for research (51.54%), lack of funding opportunities (43.08%) and lack of knowledge regarding funding opportunities (33.85%). (pp. 14-17)
- Faculty reported having experience with various sources of internal funding during the past five years. The most frequently sought sources of funding were the Faculty Travel Grant (73.8% of faculty respondents sought this funding during the past five years), the Faculty Research and Scholarly Activities Grant (43.1%) and the Curriculum Development Grant (35.4%). COE grants, Bush mini-grants and the Carol Easley Denny Award were also sought by about 15-19% of the faculty who responded to this survey. (pp. 18-20)

- Faculty reported receiving internal funding from Faculty Travel Grants (69.2% of faculty respondents were awarded this funding during the past five years), the Faculty Research and Scholarly Activities Grant (36.9%) and the Curriculum Development Grant (30.0%). The Bush mini-grants and COE grants were awarded to about 15-17% of faculty respondents.
- Overall, sources of internal funding that were awarded at a rate of 90% or greater were the: Faculty Travel Grant, Bush mini-grant, Small-scale 3M Collaborative Student-Faculty Research Grant for STEM research, Undergraduate Faculty Research Grant, Undergraduate Faculty Research Grant, Community Work and Learning Faculty/Staff Professional Development Grant and the Arts and Humanities Collaborative Research Grant.
- Approximately 37% of faculty respondents reported that their experiences with grant-seeking at the College of Catherine were 'somewhat positive' or 'very positive' while 17% reported their experiences were 'somewhat negative' or 'very negative'. (Responses here do not distinguish between ORSP, COE, ACDC, Development etc. It was a question about general grant seeking.) (p.21)
- Approximately 19% of faculty respondents have sought funding from governmental funding sources, 19% from foundations and 4% from corporate funding sources. Approximately 12% of faculty respondents have been awarded funding from governmental funding sources, 13% from foundations and about 2% from corporate funding sources. (p.22)
- As reported by the faculty who completed this survey, the rate of funding from government sources, corporate funding sources and foundations was 60-68%. (ORSP staff have records of the actual funding rate, which is higher than what is reported here.) (p.22)
- Overall, the top barriers for grant-seeking were: lack of time (73.9% faculty ranked this as one of the top five), challenge of getting formal course release to write grant proposal (36.9%), not knowing where to go for assistance (29.2%) and challenge and/or hassle of managing grant (25.4%). (pp.22-25)
- Faculty seemed to be most confident about conducting research (57.5% chose 'very confident'), developing a research project/proposal (43.8%) and writing a proposal (39.2%). (p.26)
- Faculty respondents seemed to be least confident about seeking out funding sources for research/scholarly activities (33.1% chose 'not at all confident'), sustaining the work post-grant (33.1%), and developing a grant budget (29.2%). (p.26)
- Faculty were asked if they have found the ORSP staff to be helpful in various ways. (45% or more faculty responded 'NA' to each item.) 80% or more of faculty respondents who reported they had worked with ORSP staff, reported they found the ORSP staff to be clear in their communications, helpful in answering my questions, helpful in offering feedback, timely in processing paperwork, helpful with CSC business office forms, helpful in the grant application process, timely in responding to questions/concerns and helpful in guiding one through the internal grant approval process/form. (p.28)

## BACKGROUND & OBJECTIVES

The Office of Research and Sponsored Programs (ORSP), currently staffed by Beth Koenig and Kirsten Walters, seeks to promote and facilitate faculty/staff research and to assist faculty/staff in seeking, applying for, and managing grants from government funding sources. ORSP is charged with developing policies to ensure integrity in research and compliance with federal and state regulations. ORSP is also responsible for budgetary oversight of all academic research/program grants, both public and private, awarded to CSC faculty and staff.

The purposes of this survey were to:

1. determine the research/scholarly interests of CSC faculty.
2. assess the needs of CSC faculty as they pursue research/scholarly interests and seek funding opportunities.
3. determine ways in which the ORSP can best address the research/scholarly needs of CSC faculty.
4. assess ORSP's current services

The data collected will be used to assess the research/scholarly needs of CSC faculty and to improve the services of the ORSP. The data may also be used to compare research/scholarly activities and support services at CSC with those of similarly situated institutions.

## METHODS

### Survey & Data Collection

The survey was developed by the ORSP and the EARDA Advisory Committee. The committee assisted in generating topics to measure and the survey was submitted to the committee for feedback and revision. The survey has 33 items, some which have multiple parts (see Appendix). The survey is divided into four sections that include: research interests, grant-seeking experience, needs and demographics. Faculty were invited to complete the survey via an e-mail message from the ORSP. The survey was administered online and it took approximately 10 minutes to complete.

### Participants

All 309 CSC faculty were invited via e-mail to participate in this electronic survey during spring 2007. 130<sup>1</sup> people responded, for a response rate of 42%. (As of August 2007, there are 304 faculty members.)

- 42% of respondents were from Arts & Sciences (Humanities 25%, Sciences 17%), 35% were from Health Professions and 21% were from Professional Programs (see Table 1). (Approximately 34% of the faculty are in Arts and Sciences, 46% of the faculty are in Health Professions and 20% of the faculty are in Professional Programs.)
- The majority of respondents (58%) have been at St. Kate's for 8 or more years. The range was 50-77% across the four academic areas (i.e., Arts & Sciences- Humanities, Arts & Sciences-Sciences, Health Professions and Professional Programs). 42% of respondents have been at St. Kate's 7 or fewer years (see Tables 1 & 2)
- 41% of faculty who responded have a tenure contract, 23% have a tenure track contract, 25% have a rolling contract and 9% have a temporary contract (see Tables 1 & 3)

---

<sup>1</sup> 132 people submitted electronic surveys, 2 cases had no responses for any items. They were treated as "blank" survey submissions and were removed from the dataset, leaving N=130.

- 69% of faculty indicated they worked with students seeking their bachelor's degree, 36% worked with graduate students, 19% worked with associate-degree students and 5% worked with certificate seeking students (Faculty indicated all the degree levels they worked with.) (see Tables 1 & 4)
- About  $\frac{3}{4}$  of faculty who responded to this survey work with students in just one level (i.e., certificate, associate, bachelor, graduate). 55.6% of faculty in Professional Programs work with students in just one level, as do 76.1% in Health Professions, 75.8% in Arts & Sciences-Humanities and 100% in the Arts and Sciences-Sciences (see Table 5).
- 17.7% of faculty work with students in two levels (i.e., certificate, associate, bachelor, graduate) and 6.1% work with students in three or four levels. Faculty in Arts & Sciences- Humanities, Health Professions and Professional Programs tend to have more faculty working with students from different degree levels (see Table 5).

Table 1  
*Years at CSC, current contract type, academic area and level(s) of students*

	N	%
<b>Years at CSC</b>		
3 years or fewer	29	22.3
4-7 years	25	19.2
8 or more years	75	57.7
<b>Current contract type</b>		
Tenured	53	40.8
Tenure Track	30	23.1
Rolling	33	25.4
Temporary	11	8.5
<b>Academic area</b>		
Arts & Sciences - Humanities (Alan Silva)	33	25.4
Arts & Sciences - Sciences (Alan Silva)	22	16.9
Health Professions (Margaret McLaughlin)	46	35.4
Professional Programs (Susan Cochrane)	27	20.8
<b>Level(s) of student faculty work with (check all that apply)*</b>		
Certificate	7	5.4
Associate	25	19.2
Bachelor	90	69.2
Graduate	47	36.2

\*Note: 74.6% (N=97) chose 1 level, 17.7% (N=23) chose 2 levels, 4.6% (N=6) chose 3 levels and 1.5% (N=2) chose 4 levels

Table 2  
*Years at CSC by academic area*

Years at CSC		Academic Area					Total
		[Not Answered]	Arts & Sciences - Humanities (Alan Silva, Dean)	Arts & Sciences - Sciences (Alan Silva, Dean)	Health Professions (Margaret McLaughlin, Dean)	Professional Programs (Susan Cochrane, Dean)	
[Not Answered]	Count	1	0	0	0	0	1
	% within row	100.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	100.0%
	% within column	50.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.8%
3 years or fewer	Count	0	9	2	8	10	29
	% within row	.0%	31.0%	6.9%	27.6%	34.5%	100.0%
	% within column	.0%	27.3%	9.1%	17.4%	37.0%	22.3%
4-7 years	Count	0	4	3	15	3	25
	% within row	.0%	16.0%	12.0%	60.0%	12.0%	100.0%
	% within column	.0%	12.1%	13.6%	32.6%	11.1%	19.2%
8 or more years	Count	1	20	17	23	14	75
	% within row	1.3%	26.7%	22.7%	30.7%	18.7%	100.0%
	% within column	50.0%	60.6%	77.3%	50.0%	51.9%	57.7%
Total	Count	2	33	22	46	27	130
	% within row	1.5%	25.4%	16.9%	35.4%	20.8%	100.0%
	% within column	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table 3  
*Current contract type by academic area*

Contract Type		Academic Area					Total
		[Not Answered]	Arts & Sciences - Humanities (Alan Silva, Dean)	Arts & Sciences - Sciences (Alan Silva, Dean)	Health Professions (Margaret McLaughlin, Dean)	Professional Programs (Susan Cochrane, Dean)	
[Not Answered]	Count	0	0	1	1	1	3
	% within row	.0%	.0%	33.3%	33.3%	33.3%	100.0%
	% within column	.0%	.0%	4.5%	2.2%	3.7%	2.3%
Temporary	Count	0	4	1	5	1	11
	% within row	.0%	36.4%	9.1%	45.5%	9.1%	100.0%
	% within column	.0%	12.1%	4.5%	10.9%	3.7%	8.5%
Rolling	Count	1	4	2	16	10	33
	% within row	3.0%	12.1%	6.1%	48.5%	30.3%	100.0%
	% within column	50.0%	12.1%	9.1%	34.8%	37.0%	25.4%
Tenure Track	Count	0	8	2	13	7	30
	% within row	.0%	26.7%	6.7%	43.3%	23.3%	100.0%
	% within column	.0%	24.2%	9.1%	28.3%	25.9%	23.1%
Tenured	Count	1	17	16	11	8	53
	% within row	1.9%	32.1%	30.2%	20.8%	15.1%	100.0%
	% within column	50.0%	51.5%	72.7%	23.9%	29.6%	40.8%
Total	Count	2	33	22	46	27	130
	% within row	1.5%	25.4%	16.9%	35.4%	20.8%	100.0%
	% within column	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Table 4  
*Level(s) of students with whom faculty work by academic area*

Level(s) of Students		Academic Area				Total
		Arts & Sciences - Humanities (Alan Silva, Dean)	Arts & Sciences - Sciences (Alan Silva, Dean)	Health Professions (Margaret McLaughlin, Dean)	Professional Programs (Susan Cochrane, Dean)	
certificate	Count	3	0	0	4	7
	% within row	42.9%	0.0%	0.0%	57.1%	100.0%
	% within column	6.7%	0.0%	0.0%	9.1%	4.1%
associate	Count	3	1	20	1	25
	% within row	12.0%	4.0%	80.0%	4.0%	100.0%
	% within column	6.7%	4.5%	34.5%	2.3%	14.8%
bachelor	Count	31	21	19	19	90
	% within row	34.4%	23.3%	21.1%	21.1%	100.0%
	% within column	68.9%	95.5%	32.8%	43.2%	53.3%
graduate	Count	8	0	19	20	47
	% within row	17.0%	0.0%	40.4%	42.6%	100.0%
	% within column	17.8%	0.0%	32.8%	45.5%	27.8%
Total	Count	45	22	58	44	169
	% within row	26.6%	13.0%	34.3%	26.0%	100.0%
	% within column	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Note: The total (N=169) is the number of responses made by the 130 respondents. Respondents were instructed they could choose more than one level.

Table 5

*Number of level(s) of students with whom faculty work by academic area*

Number of levels faculty work with		Academic Area					Total
		[Not Answered]	Arts & Sciences - Humanities (Alan Silva, Dean)	Arts & Sciences - Sciences (Alan Silva, Dean)	Health Professions (Margaret McLaughlin, Dean)	Professional Programs (Susan Cochrane, Dean)	
0	Count	2	0	0	0	0	2
	% within row	100.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	100.0%
	% within column	100.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	.0%	1.5%
1	Count	0	25	22	35	15	97
	% within row	.0%	25.8%	22.7%	36.1%	15.5%	100.0%
	% within column	.0%	75.8%	100.0%	76.1%	55.6%	74.6%
2	Count	0	5	0	10	8	23
	% within row	.0%	21.7%	.0%	43.5%	34.8%	100.0%
	% within column	.0%	15.2%	.0%	21.7%	29.6%	17.7%
3	Count	0	2	0	1	3	6
	% within row	.0%	33.3%	.0%	16.7%	50.0%	100.0%
	% within column	.0%	6.1%	.0%	2.2%	11.1%	4.6%
4	Count	0	1	0	0	1	2
	% within row	.0%	50.0%	.0%	.0%	50.0%	100.0%
	% within column	.0%	3.0%	.0%	.0%	3.7%	1.5%
Total	Count	2	33	22	46	27	130
	% within row	1.5%	25.4%	16.9%	35.4%	20.8%	100.0%
	% within column	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

## RESULTS

The results are organized into four sections: research interests, grant-seeking experience, needs and evaluation of interaction with ORSP (Office of Research and Sponsored Programs) staff.

### RESEARCH INTERESTS

#### INTERESTS

- About ¾ths (76%) of faculty reported that discipline-based research appealed to them “very much” (the response scale was ‘not at all’, ‘somewhat’, ‘very much’.) 21% responded it was “somewhat” appealing. 50% reported that research on teaching and learning appealed to them “very much” (42% ‘somewhat’) and 28% indicated that creative work appealed to them “very much” (41% ‘somewhat’).
- There were no significance differences for discipline-based research or research on teaching and learning based on years at CSC or academic areas.
- There were some significant differences based on type of contract. Those who reported that discipline-based research was very appealing included: 87% of those with a tenure contract, 86% of those with a tenure-track contract, 72.7% of those with a temporary contract, and 53.1% of those with a rolling contract.
- More faculty respondents who have a tenure-track contract reported that research on teaching and learning was very appealing when compared to faculty with other types of contracts. (tenure-track contract 70%, rolling contract 58.1%, tenure contract 42% and temporary contract 36.4%).
- There were no significant differences in interest in creative work based on years at CSC, academic areas, or contract type.
- Faculty were asked to describe the research/scholarly activity they were engaged in using a few key terms. Responses were coded independently by two people who then met to discuss and revise those categories. Then they coded the responses again into the new categories. Research topics fell into the following categories (see Table 6).

Table 6

#### *Categories of faculty research topics*

• Science/STEM (Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics)	• Research about women
• Uses of technology	• Politics, economics, trade and transportation
• Health, nursing, sport medicine, OT	• Ethics, philosophy and religion
• Teaching/learning/pedagogy	• Communication, writing and media
• Community action	• Research focused on the library
• Social justice, race, cross-cultural studies	• Psychology
• Linguistics and languages	• Business, organizations, leadership, careers
• Literature	• Fine art, performance, photography
• History	

**SATISFACTION**

- Faculty were significantly more satisfied with the type (M= 4.04) and quality (M=3.90) of research they were conducting, compared to the quantity (M = 2.96). (The response scale was 1= very dissatisfied to 5= very satisfied) (see Table 7).

Table 7

*Mean satisfaction with quantity, quality and type of research faculty were conducting (total sample and by academic area, years, and contract type)*

	Satisfaction with Research		
	Quantity	Quality	Type
Total sample	2.96	3.90	4.04
Academic area			
Arts & Sciences - Humanities (Alan Silva)	2.88	4.12	4.41
Arts & Sciences - Sciences (Alan Silva)	3.00	3.68	4.14
Health Professions (Margaret McLaughlin)	2.96	3.80	3.93
Professional Programs (Susan Cochrane)	2.96	3.92	3.63
Years at CSC			
3 years or fewer	2.93	3.70	3.69
4-7 years	3.08	3.76	3.83
8 or more years	2.93	4.01	4.23
Current contract type			
Tenured	2.87	3.98	4.34
Tenure Track	2.82	3.86	3.81
Temporary	2.60	3.27	3.30
Rolling	3.28	3.94	3.91

Note: Response scale was 1=very dissatisfied, 2=somewhat dissatisfied, 3=neither dissatisfied nor satisfied, 4=somewhat satisfied, 5=very satisfied

ALLOCATION OF TIME

- The average percentage of time faculty reported they spend on teaching/advising was about 72%. The average for research/scholarly activities was 13% and it was 15% for service (see Table 8).

Table 8

*Mean percentage of time faculty spend on teaching/advising, research/scholarly activities and service (total sample and by academic area, years, and contract type)*

	Percentage of Time in each Area of Work		
	Teaching/ advising	Research/ scholarly activities	Service
Total sample	71.68	13.00	15.16
Academic area			
Arts & Sciences - Humanities (Alan Silva)	68.33	14.09	17.03
Arts & Sciences - Sciences (Alan Silva)	73.27	12.41	14.32
Health Professions (Margaret McLaughlin)	77.00	11.09	11.98
Professional Programs (Susan Cochrane)	65.13	15.53	19.34
Years at CSC			
3 years or fewer	76.03	12.17	11.79
4-7 years	72.92	11.84	15.16
8 or more years	69.52	13.75	16.53
Current contract type			
Tenured	69.37	13.58	16.76
Tenure Track	75.17	12.60	12.23
Rolling	70.07	15.01	14.92
Temporary	77.73	6.18	16.09

Faculty were asked if they have incorporated research/scholarly activities into their teaching and if so, how. Of the 122 faculty who responded to that item, approximately 90% (N=110) indicated they do incorporate their research/scholarly activities into their teaching. Some faculty share information about their research/scholarly activities in lectures and in-class examples. Others create assignments and activities based on research/scholarly activities, incorporate their research/scholarly work into TRW and GSJ, structure lab projects, and engage students in more intensive research collaboration with faculty. Additional methods of incorporating research/scholarly activities into teaching were through one-on-one advising, pedagogy and curriculum. Clearly, most faculty respondents incorporated their research/scholarly activities into their teaching, and some indicated they do it often, if not “always”.

Faculty were asked if they involved their undergraduate students in their research/scholarly activities. 122 faculty responded to this item and approximately 50% reported they do involve undergraduate students. The ways of involvement included: recruiting students to serve as participants in research, working with students in AMP, working with students as RAs and TAs, working with students on grants like the 3M grants and involving students in their courses, teaching and independent research.

Faculty were also asked if they involved graduate students in their research/scholarly activities. About 17% of faculty who responded to this item (21 of the 118), reported they have involved graduate students in their research/scholarly activities in one way or another (e.g., assist in reviewing literature, finding sources and analyzing data).

- Approximately 45% of faculty spend 11 to 30 hours per week during the summer on research and scholarly activities. About 39% spend 0 and 10 hours per week and about 9% spend 31 or more hours per week (see Table 9).

Table 9

*Time faculty spend on research/scholarly activities during the summer (reported in percentages) (total sample and by academic area, years, and contract type)*

	Hours per week				
	0-10	11-20	21-30	31-40	More than 40
Total sample	39.23	24.62	20.77	5.38	3.85
Academic area					
Arts & Sciences - Humanities (Alan Silva)	16.13	38.71	32.26	6.45	6.45
Arts & Sciences - Sciences (Alan Silva)	31.82	31.82	27.27	9.09	0
Health Professions (Margaret McLaughlin)	56.52	19.57	13.04	6.52	4.35
Professional Programs (Susan Cochrane)	56.52	17.39	21.74	0	4.35
Years at CSC					
3 years or fewer	52.00	20.00	24.00	0	4.00
4-7 years	45.83	25.00	20.83	8.33	0
8 or more years	36.99	28.77	21.92	6.85	5.48
Current contract type					
Tenured	30.77	25.00	26.92	11.54	5.77
Tenure Track	30.77	30.77	30.77	3.85	3.85
Rolling	58.06	29.03	12.90	0	0
Temporary	81.82	18.18	0	0	0

### FUNDING

Faculty were asked how they fund their current research/scholarly activities. Approximately 28% of the 126 faculty who responded to that item reported they were funding their own research/scholarly activities, at least in part (e.g., “I buy books and attend conferences with my own funding”, “out of pocket”, “on my own time with my own money”). Other sources of funding include internal grants (e.g., COE, CWL, Bush grants, ACDC travel, ACDC other, EARDA and Denny), corporate and foundation grants, government grants, professional associations, departments, fellowships and speaking fees.

**BARRIERS TO RESEARCH/SCHOLARLY ACTIVITIES**

- Overall, the top barriers to faculty research/scholarly activities were: lack of time (93.08% of faculty respondents ranked this as one of the top five barriers), challenge of getting formal course release for research (51.54%), lack of funding opportunities (43.08%) and lack of knowledge regarding funding opportunities (33.85%) (see Table 10).

Table 10

*Percentage of faculty who ranked each of the following as one of the top five barriers to their research/scholarly activities*

	N	%
lack of time	121	93.08
challenge of getting formal course release for research	67	51.54
lack of funding opportunities	56	43.08
lack of knowledge regarding funding opportunities	44	33.85
lack of cross-campus research community to support partnerships and collaborations	24	18.46
lack of recognition/acknowledgement	21	16.15
lack of equipment necessary to conduct research	20	15.38
lack of graduate student to assist in research	20	15.38
lack of perceived value	18	13.85
lack of incentive	17	13.08
challenge of conducting research with undergraduate students	16	12.31
lack of personal interest	8	6.15
lack of outside interest	4	3.08

Note: 9.23% (N=12) individuals chose “no barriers” as one of their top five barriers to their research/scholarly activities

Faculty were asked to list any other barriers to their research/scholarly activities not mentioned in the list provided. Responses were content analyzed and several categories of barriers emerged including: lack of support (from College or from Department), research topic not perceived as important by others, lack of support for data analysis, lack of funding for students, difficulty in finding research partners, competing demands, issues related to work/family balance, structure of time (fast pace and lack of blocks of time), feasibility of research, distant research location, space and technology issues, IRB, IT, unawareness of process and “red tape”.

Barriers to Research and Scholarly Activities by Academic Area

- Comparing academic areas, “lack of time” was the most frequently chosen ‘top five’ barrier.
  - Arts & Sciences- Humanities: The top barriers were lack of time, lack of funding opportunities, challenge of getting formal course release for research, lack of knowledge regarding funding opportunities, lack of recognition/acknowledgement and lack of perceived value (the last 3 tied for “4<sup>th</sup>”)
  - Arts & Sciences- Sciences: The top barriers were lack of time, challenge of getting formal course release for research, lack of equipment necessary to conduct research and lack of funding opportunities.
  - Health Professions: The top barriers were lack of time, challenge of getting formal course release for research, lack of knowledge regarding funding opportunities and lack of funding opportunities.
  - Professional Programs: The top barriers were lack of time, challenge of getting formal course release for research, lack of knowledge regarding funding opportunities and lack of funding opportunities.

Table 11

*Percentage of faculty who ranked each of the following as one of the top five barriers to their research/scholarly activities by academic area, organized by total sample barriers (percentage followed by relative rank order)*

	Academic Area			
	Arts & Sciences - Humanities (Alan Silva, Dean)	Arts & Sciences- Sciences (Alan Silva, Dean)	Health Professions (Margaret McLaughlin, Dean)	Professional Programs (Susan Cochrane, Dean)
N	33	22	46	27
lack of time (1)*	<b>93.94 (1)</b>	<b>100 (1)</b>	<b>86.96 (1)</b>	<b>100 (1)</b>
challenge of getting formal course release for research (2)	<b>60.61 (3)</b>	<b>45.45 (2)</b>	<b>47.83 (2)</b>	<b>55.56 (2)</b>
lack of funding opportunities (3)	<b>66.67 (2)</b>	<b>36.36 (4)</b>	<b>39.13 (4)</b>	<b>29.63 (4)</b>
lack of knowledge regarding funding opportunities (4)	<b>24.24 (5)</b>	13.64 (9)	<b>43.48 (3)</b>	<b>48.15 (3)</b>
lack of cross-campus research community to support partnerships and collaborations (5)	9.09 (7.5)	13.64 (9)	28.26 (5)	18.52 (9.5)
lack of recognition/acknowledgement (6)	<b>24.24 (5)</b>	4.55 (12)	13.04 (7.5)	22.22 (6.5)
lack of equipment necessary to conduct research (7.5)	3.03(11.5)	<b>40.91 (3)</b>	8.70 (9.5)	22.22 (6.5)
lack of graduate student to assist in research (7.5)	3.03(11.5)	22.73 (6)	17.39 (6)	22.22 (6.5)
lack of perceived value (9)	<b>24.24 (5)</b>	9.09 (11)	8.70 (9.5)	14.81 (11)
lack of incentive (10)	9.09 (7.5)	13.64 (9)	13.04 (7.5)	18.52 (9.5)
challenge of conducting research with undergraduate students (11)	6.06 (9.5)	31.82 (5)	2.17 (12.5)	22.22 (6.5)
lack of personal interest (12)	0.00 (13)	18.18 (7)	6.52 (11)	3.70 (12.5)
lack of outside interest (13)	6.06 (9.5)	0 (13)	2.17 (12.5)	3.70 (12.5)

Note: \* when percentages were the same, the mean rank was recorded in the table. The four most frequently chosen barriers for each academic area are in bold.

Barriers to Research and Scholarly Activities by Contract Type

- Comparing contract type, “lack of time” was the most frequently chosen ‘top five’ barriers.
  - Tenured: The top barriers were lack of time, challenge of getting formal course release for research, lack of funding opportunities and lack of knowledge regarding funding opportunities.
  - Tenure Track: The top barriers were lack of time, challenge of getting formal course release for research, lack of funding opportunities and lack of knowledge regarding funding opportunities.
  - Rolling: The top barriers were lack of time, lack of knowledge regarding funding opportunities, challenge of getting formal course release for research, lack of funding opportunities and lack of cross-campus research community to support partnerships and collaborations.
  - Temporary: The top barriers were lack of time, challenge of getting formal course release for research, lack of funding opportunities and lack of recognition/acknowledgement.

Table 12

*Percentage of faculty who ranked each of the following as one of the top five barriers to their research/scholarly activities by contract type, organized by total sample barriers (percentage followed by relative rank order)*

	Contract Type				
	N	Tenured 53	Tenure Track 30	Rolling 33	Temporary 11
lack of time (1)*		<b>100 (1)</b>	<b>100 (1)</b>	<b>81.82 (1)</b>	<b>72.73 (1)</b>
challenge of getting formal course release for research (2)		<b>58.49 (2)</b>	<b>63.33 (2)</b>	<b>36.36 (3)</b>	<b>36.36 (3)</b>
lack of funding opportunities (3)		<b>50.94 (3)</b>	<b>46.67 (3)</b>	<b>27.27(4.5)</b>	<b>36.36 (3)</b>
lack of knowledge regarding funding opportunities (4)		<b>22.64 (4)</b>	<b>43.33 (4)</b>	<b>48.48 (2)</b>	27.27 (5)
lack of cross-campus research community to support partnerships and collaborations (5)		15.09(7.5)	23.33 (5)	<b>27.27(4.5)</b>	0 (12.5)
lack of recognition/acknowledgement (6)		13.21 (10)	16.67 (8)	15.15(7.5)	<b>36.36 (3)</b>
lack of equipment necessary to conduct research (7.5)		20.75 (5)	16.67 (8)	12.12(9.5)	0 (12.5)
lack of graduate student to assist in research (7.5)		18.87 (6)	20.00 (6)	12.12(9.5)	0 (12.5)
lack of perceived value (9)		15.09(7.5)	16.67 (8)	9.09(11.5)	9.09 (8)
lack of incentive (10)		13.21 (10)	6.67 (11)	18.18 (6)	18.18 (6)
challenge of conducting research with undergraduate students (11)		13.21 (10)	10.00 (10)	15.15(7.5)	0 (12.5)
lack of personal interest (12)		7.55 (12)	0 (13)	9.09(11.5)	9.09 (8)
lack of outside interest (13)		1.89 (13)	3.33 (12)	3.03 (13)	9.09 (8)

Note: \* when percentages were the same, the mean rank was recorded in the table. The four most frequently chosen barriers for each academic area are in bold.

Barriers to Research and Scholarly Activities by Years at CSC

- Comparing the number of years at CSC, “lack of time” was the most frequently chosen ‘top five’ barrier.
  - At CSC 3 years or fewer: The top barriers were lack of time, lack of knowledge regarding funding opportunities, challenge of getting formal course release for research and lack of funding opportunities.
  - At CSC 4-7 years: The top barriers were lack of time, challenge of getting formal course release for research, lack of funding opportunities and lack of knowledge regarding funding opportunities.
  - At CSC 8 or more years: The top barriers were lack of time, challenge of getting formal course release for research, lack of funding opportunities and lack of knowledge regarding funding opportunities.

Table 13

*Percentage of faculty who ranked each of the following as one of the top five barriers to their research/scholarly activities by years at CSC, organized by total sample barriers (percentage followed by relative rank order)*

	Years at CSC		
	3 years or fewer	4-7 years	8 or more years
N	29	25	75
lack of time (1)*	<b>86.21 (1)</b>	<b>88.00 (1)</b>	<b>98.67 (1)</b>
challenge of getting formal course release for research (2)	<b>41.38 (3)</b>	<b>48.00 (2)</b>	<b>57.33 (2)</b>
lack of funding opportunities (3)	<b>31.03 (4)</b>	<b>36.00 (3.5)</b>	<b>50.67 (3)</b>
lack of knowledge regarding funding opportunities (4)	<b>55.17 (2)</b>	<b>36.00 (3.5)</b>	<b>25.33 (4)</b>
lack of cross-campus research community to support partnerships and collaborations (5)	20.69 (6)	16.00 (6)	18.67 (6)
lack of recognition/acknowledgement (6)	24.14 (5)	12.00 (7.5)	14.67 (9)
lack of equipment necessary to conduct research (7.5)	13.79 (8)	4.00 (12.5)	20.00 (5)
lack of graduate student to assist in research (7.5)	10.34 (10.5)	24.00 (5)	14.67 (9)
lack of perceived value (9)	13.79 (8)	8.00 (10)	16.00 (7)
lack of incentive (10)	13.79 (8)	12.00 (7.5)	13.33 (11)
challenge of conducting research with undergraduate students (11)	10.34 (10.5)	8.00 (10)	14.67 (9)
lack of personal interest (12)	3.45 (12)	4.00 (12.5)	8.00 (12)
lack of outside interest (13)	0.00 (13)	8.00 (10)	2.67 (13)

Note: \* when percentages were the same, the mean rank was recorded in the table. The four most frequently chosen barriers for each academic area are in bold.

ONLINE INDEX

- 80.8% (N=105) of faculty responded they would make use of an online index of faculty research/scholarly interests aimed at facilitating connections between faculty with common interests (response options were 'yes' or 'no'). 93.1% (N=121) indicated they would be willing to share their own research/scholarly interests on such an index.

## GRANT-SEEKING EXPERIENCE

INTERNAL FUNDING

- Faculty reported having experience with various sources of internal funding during the past five years. The most frequently sought sources of funding were the Faculty Travel Grant (73.8% of faculty respondents sought this funding during the past five years), the Faculty Research and Scholarly Activities Grant (43.1%) and the Curriculum Development Grant (35.4%). COE grants, Bush mini-grants and the Carol Easley Denny Award were also sought by about 15-19% of faculty respondents.
- Faculty reported receiving internal funding from Faculty Travel Grants (69.2% of faculty respondents were awarded this funding during the past five years), the Faculty Research and Scholarly Activities Grant (36.9%) and the Curriculum Development Grant (30.0%). The Bush mini-grants and COE grants were awarded to about 15-17% of faculty respondents.
- Overall, sources of internal funding that were awarded at a rate of 90% or greater include the: Faculty Travel Grant, Bush mini-grant, Small-scale 3M Collaborative Student-Faculty Research Grant for STEM research, Undergraduate Faculty Research Grant, Undergraduate Faculty Research Grant, Community Work and Learning Faculty/Staff Professional Development Grant and the Arts and Humanities Collaborative Research Grant.

Table 14

*Type of internal funding sought and awarded during the past five years*

	Funding				
	Funding Sought		Funding Awarded		Rate*
	N	%	N	%	%
Faculty Travel Grant	96	73.8	90	69.2	93.8
Faculty Research and Scholarly Activities Grant	56	43.1	48	36.9	85.7
Curriculum Development Grant	46	35.4	39	30.0	84.8
COE Grant	24	18.5	19	14.6	79.2
Bush mini-grant	23	17.7	22	16.9	95.7
Carol Easley Denny Award	19	14.6	11	8.5	57.9
Small-scale 3M Collaborative Student-Faculty Research Grant for STEM research	11	8.5	10	7.7	90.9
Graduate Faculty Research Grant	9	6.9	7	5.4	77.8
COE Seed Money	7	5.4	5	3.8	71.4
Sister Antoine O'Brien Award	6	4.6	4	3.1	66.7
Undergraduate Faculty Research Grant	5	3.8	5	3.8	100
EARDA Pilot Research Study Grant	5	3.8	3	2.3	60.0
Large-scale 3M Collaborative Student-Faculty Research Grant for STEM research	5	3.8	2	1.5	40.0
Community Work and Learning Faculty/Staff Professional Development Grant	5	3.8	5	3.8	100
Arts and Humanities Collaborative Research Grant	1	0.8	1	0.8	100

Note: \* Rate indicates the percentage of funding that was sought and awarded (N awarded/N sought).

Table 15

*Type of internal funding sought and awarded during the past five years by academic area*

	Arts & Sciences- Humanities (Alan Silva, Dean)					Arts & Sciences- Sciences (Alan Silva, Dean)					Health Professions (Margaret McLaughlin, Dean)					Professional Programs (Susan Cochrane, Dean)				
	Sought		Awarded		Rate*	Sought		Awarded		Rate*	Sought		Awarded		Rate*	Sought		Awarded		Rate*
	N	%	N	%	%	N	%	N	%	%	N	%	N	%	%	N	%	N	%	%
• Faculty Travel Grant	23	69.7	22	66.7	95.7	18	81.8	16	72.7	88.9	31	67.4	30	65.2	96.8	23	85.2	21	77.8	91.3
• Faculty Research and Scholarly Activities Grant	14	42.4	12	36.4	85.7	10	45.5	9	40.9	90.0	20	43.5	16	34.8	80.0	11	40.7	10	37.0	90.9
• Curriculum Development Grant	8	24.2	7	21.2	87.5	7	31.8	5	22.7	71.4	20	43.5	19	41.3	95.0	11	40.7	8	29.6	72.7
• Arts and Humanities Collaborative Research Grant	1	3.0	1	3.0	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0.0
• Graduate Faculty Research Grant	0	0.0	0	0.0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0.0	4	8.7	2	4.3	50.0	5	18.5	5	18.5	100.0
• Undergraduate Faculty Research Grant	2	6.1	1	3.0	50.0	2	9.1	2	9.1	100.0	1	2.2	1	2.2	100.0	0	0.0	1	3.7	0.0
• Sister Antoine O'Brien Award	2	6.1	1	3.0	50.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0.0	3	6.5	2	4.3	66.7	1	3.7	1	3.7	100.0
• Carol Easley Denny Award	6	18.2	3	9.1	50.0	3	13.6	2	9.1	66.7	9	19.6	5	10.9	55.6	1	3.7	1	3.7	100.0
• EARDA Pilot Research Study Grant	0	0.0	0	0.0	0.0	1	4.5	1	4.5	100.0	4	8.7	2	4.3	50.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0.0
• COE Grant	3	9.1	3	9.1	100.0	5	22.7	4	18.2	80.0	11	23.9	9	19.6	81.8	5	18.5	3	11.1	60.0
• COE Seed Money	0	0.0	0	0.0	0.0	1	4.5	1	4.5	100.0	6	13.0	4	8.7	66.7	0	0.0	0	0.0	0.0
• Small-scale 3M Collaborative Student-Faculty Research Grant for STEM research	1	3.0	1	3.0	100.0	9	40.9	9	40.9	100.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0.0	1	3.7	0	0.0	0.0
• Large-scale 3M Collaborative Student-Faculty Research Grant for STEM research	0	0.0	0	0.0	0.0	4	18.2	2	9.1	50.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0.0	1	3.7	0	0.0	0.0
• Community Work and Learning Faculty/Staff Professional Development Grant	1	3.0	1	3.0	100.0	1	4.5	1	4.5	100.0	2	4.3	2	4.3	100.0	1	3.7	1	3.7	100.0
• Bush mini-grant	7	21.2	6	18.2	85.7	3	13.6	3	13.6	100.0	10	21.7	9	19.6	90.0	3	11.1	4	14.8	133.3

Note: \* Rate indicates the percentage of funding that was sought and awarded (N awarded/N sought).

Approximately 37% of faculty respondents reported that their experiences with grant-seeking at the College of Catherine were ‘somewhat positive’ or ‘very positive’ while 17% reported their experiences were ‘somewhat negative’ or ‘very negative’. (Responses here do not distinguish between ORSP, COE, ACDC, Development etc. It was a question about general grant seeking.)

- Those who have been at CSC for 4-7 years were significantly more positive about their grant seeking experiences at CSC than those who have been at CSC 8 or more years.
- There were no significant differences based on contract type or based on academic area.

Table 16

*Experience with grant-seeking at the College of St. Catherine (total sample and by academic area, years, and contract type)*

	N	M	SD	Very or somewhat positive %	Very or somewhat negative %
Total sample	120	3.34	1.03	36.9	16.9
Academic area					
Arts & Sciences - Humanities (Alan Silva)	30	3.33	.99	42.4	18.2
Arts & Sciences - Sciences (Alan Silva)	22	3.55	1.06	50.0	18.2
Health Professions (Margaret McLaughlin)	44	3.20	1.05	30.4	17.4
Professional Programs (Susan Cochrane)	23	3.43	1.04	33.3	14.8
Years at CSC					
3 years or fewer	25	3.32	.90	27.6	6.9
4-7 years	25	3.84	1.18	60.0	12.0
8 or more years	70	3.17	.96	33.3	22.7
Current contract type					
Tenured	50	3.36	1.05	41.5	20.8
Tenure Track	28	3.61	1.26	50.0	16.7
Rolling	31	3.26	.77	30.3	12.1
Temporary	9	3.00	.50	9.1	9.1

Note: Response scale 1=very negative, 2=somewhat negative, 3=neither negative nor positive, 4=somewhat positive, 5=very positive.

#### EXTERNAL FUNDING

- Approximately 19% of faculty respondents have sought funding from governmental funding sources, 19% from foundations and 4% from corporate funding sources. Approximately 12% of faculty respondents have been awarded funding from governmental funding sources, 13% from foundations and about 2% from corporate funding sources.
- As reported by the faculty who completed this survey, the rate of funding from government sources, corporate funding sources and foundations was 60-68%. (ORSP staff have records of the actual funding rate, which is higher than what is reported here.)

Table 17  
*Type of funding sought and awarded in the past five years*

	Funding Sought		Funding		Rate* %
	N	%	N	%	
	Government funding sources	25	19.2	15	
Corporate funding sources	5	3.8	3	2.3	60.0
Foundations	25	19.2	17	13.1	68.0

\* Rate indicates the percentage of funding that was sought and awarded (N awarded/N sought).

#### BARRIERS TO GRANT-SEEKING

- Overall, the top barriers for grant-seeking were: lack of time (73.9% faculty ranked this as one of the top five), challenge of getting formal course release for to write grant proposal (36.9%), not knowing where to go for assistance (29.2%) and challenge and/or hassle of managing grant (25.4%).

Table 18  
*Percentage of faculty who ranked each of the following as one of the top five barriers to their grant-seeking*

	N	%
lack of time	96	73.9
challenge of getting formal course release to write grant proposal	48	36.9
not knowing where to go for assistance	38	29.2
challenge and/or hassle of managing grant	33	25.4
challenge of getting formal course release to manage grant	28	21.5
challenge of developing partnerships/collaborations	28	21.5
perceived lack of institutional support	26	20.0
perceived lack of sustainability of work in post-grant period	21	16.2
lack of communication regarding funding opportunities	21	16.2
lack of funding opportunities	21	16.2
lack of incentive for grant-seekers	11	8.5
lack of personal interest	9	6.9
lack of value of grant-seeking	8	6.2
lack of recognition/acknowledgement for grant-seekers	5	3.9

Note: 10% (N=13) individuals chose “no barriers” as one of their top five barriers to their grant-seeking

Faculty were asked to list any other barriers to seeking grants that were not mentioned in the list provided. Responses were content analyzed and several categories of barriers emerged including: lack of support (from College and from Department), unawareness of grant-seeking process, research topic not perceived as important by others, lack of support for data analysis, lack of funding for students, difficulty in finding research partners, competing demands, issues related to work/family balance, feasibility of research, distant research location, and “red tape”.

Barriers to Grant Seeking by Academic Area

- Comparing academic areas, “lack of time” was the most frequently chosen ‘top five’ barrier to grant seeking.
  - Arts & Sciences- Humanities: The top barriers were lack of time (75.8% faculty chose this as one of the top five barriers to seeking grants), not knowing where to go for assistance (45.5%), challenge of getting formal course release to write grant proposal (30.3%) and challenge and/or hassle of managing grant (21.2%).
  - Arts & Sciences- Sciences: The top barriers were lack of time (86.4%), challenge of getting formal course release to write grant proposal (40.9%), challenge of getting formal course release to manage grant (36.4%) and challenge and/or hassle of managing grant (31.8%).
  - Health Professions: The top barriers were lack of time (69.6%), challenge of getting formal course release to write grant proposal (37.0%), challenge of developing partnerships/collaborations (34.8%) and challenge and/or hassle of managing grant (23.9%).
  - Professional Programs: The top barriers were lack of time (74.1%), challenge of getting formal course release to write grant proposal (44.4%), not knowing where to go for assistance (33.3%) and lack of communication regarding funding opportunities (33.3%).

Table 19

*Percentage of faculty who ranked each of the following as one of the top five barriers to grant seeking by academic area, organized by total sample barriers (percentage followed by relative rank order)*

	Academic Area			
	Arts & Sciences - Humanities (Alan Silva, Dean)	Arts & Sciences- Sciences (Alan Silva, Dean)	Health Professions (Margaret McLaughlin, Dean)	Professional Programs (Susan Cochrane, Dean)
N	33	22	46	27
lack of time (1)	<b>75.8 (1)</b>	<b>86.4 (1)</b>	<b>69.6 (1)</b>	<b>74.1 (1)</b>
challenge of getting formal course release to write grant proposal (2)	<b>30.3 (3)</b>	<b>40.9 (2)</b>	<b>37.0 (2)</b>	<b>44.4 (2)</b>
not knowing where to go for assistance (3)	<b>45.5 (2)</b>	9.1 (11)	26.1 (5)	<b>33.3 (3.5)</b>
challenge and/or hassle of managing grant (4)	<b>21.2 (4)</b>	<b>31.8 (4)</b>	<b>23.9 (4)</b>	29.6 (5)
challenge of getting formal course release to manage grant (5)	15.2 (8)	<b>36.4 (3)</b>	19.6 (7)	22.2 (7)
challenge of developing partnerships/collaborations (6)	9.1 (11.5)	22.7 (6.5)	<b>34.8 (3)</b>	14.8 (10)
perceived lack of institutional support (7)	15.2 (8)	22.7 (6.5)	21.7 (6)	22.2 (7)
perceived lack of sustainability of work in post-grant period (8)	15.2 (8)	27.3 (5)	10.9 (8.5)	18.5 (9)
lack of communication regarding funding opportunities (9)	18.2(5.5)*	4.5 (12.5)	10.9 (8.5)	<b>33.3 (3.5)</b>
lack of funding opportunities (10)	18.2 (5.5)	18.2 (8.5)	8.7 (10.5)	22.2 (7)
lack of incentive for grant-seekers (11)	9.1 (11.5)	13.6 (10)	4.3 (13.5)	11.1 (11)
lack of personal interest (12)	3.0 (13.5)	18.2 (8.5)	8.7 (10.5)	0.0 (13.5)
lack of value of grant-seeking (13)	12.1 (10)	4.5 (12.5)	6.5 (12)	0.0 (13.5)
lack of recognition/acknowledgement for grant-seekers (14)	3.0 (13.5)	0.0 (14)	4.3 (13.5)	7.4 (12)

Note: \* when percentages were the same, the mean rank was recorded in the table. The four most frequently chosen barriers for each academic area are in bold.

Barriers to Grant Seeking by Contract Type

- Comparing contract type, “lack of time” was the most frequently chosen ‘top five’ barrier to grant seeking.
  - Tenured: The top barriers were lack of time (77.4%), challenge of getting formal course release to write grant proposal (39.6%), challenge and/or hassle of managing grant (28.3%), challenge of getting formal course release to manage grant (24.5%) and lack of funding opportunities (24.5%).
  - Tenure Track: The top barriers were lack of time (80%), challenge of getting formal course release to write grant proposal (56.7%), not knowing where to go for assistance (40%), challenge of getting formal course release to manage grant (30%) and challenge of developing partnerships/collaborations (30%).
  - Rolling: The top barriers were lack of time (69.7%), not knowing where to go for assistance (42.4%), challenge and/or hassle of managing grant (27.3%), challenge of getting formal course release to write grant proposal (24.2%) and lack of communication regarding funding opportunities (24.2%).
  - Temporary: The top barriers were lack of time (54.5%), not knowing where to go for assistance (27.3%), perceived lack of institutional support (27.3%), challenge of getting formal course release to write grant proposal (18.2%), challenge and/or hassle of managing grant (18.2%), lack of communication regarding funding opportunities (18.2%) and lack of funding opportunities (18.2%).

Table 20

*Percentage of faculty who ranked each of the following as one of the top five barriers to grant seeking by contract type, organized by total sample barriers (percentage followed by relative rank order)*

	Contract Type				
	N	Tenured 53	Tenure Track 30	Rolling 33	Temporary 11
lack of time (1)		<b>77.4 (1)</b>	<b>80.0 (1)</b>	<b>69.7 (1)</b>	<b>54.5 (1)</b>
challenge of getting formal course release to write grant proposal (2)		<b>39.6 (2)</b>	<b>56.7 (2)</b>	<b>24.2 (4.5)</b>	<b>18.2 (5.5)</b>
not knowing where to go for assistance (3)		17.0 (8.5)	<b>40.0 (3)</b>	<b>42.4 (2)</b>	<b>27.3 (2.5)</b>
challenge and/or hassle of managing grant (4)		<b>28.3 (3)</b>	20.0 (7)	<b>27.3 (3)</b>	<b>18.2 (5.5)</b>
challenge of getting formal course release to manage grant (5)		<b>24.5(4.5)*</b>	<b>30.0 (4.5)</b>	15.2 (7)	<b>0.0 (13.5)</b>
challenge of developing partnerships/collaborations (6)		20.8 (7)	<b>30.0 (4.5)</b>	21.2 (6)	9.1 (10)
perceived lack of institutional support (7)		22.6 (6)	23.3 (6)	12.1 (9)	<b>27.3 (2.5)</b>
perceived lack of sustainability of work in post-grant period (8)		17.0 (8.5)	16.7 (8)	18.2 (8)	9.1 (10)
lack of communication regarding funding opportunities (9)		13.2 (10)	10.0 (10)	<b>24.2 (4.5)</b>	<b>18.2 (5.5)</b>
lack of funding opportunities (10)		<b>24.5 (4.5)</b>	10.0 (10)	6.1 (11.5)	<b>18.2 (5.5)</b>
lack of incentive for grant-seekers (11)		11.3 (11)	10.0 (10)	0.0 (13.5)	9.1 (10)
lack of personal interest (12)		7.5 (13)	3.3 (13)	9.1 (10)	9.1 (10)
lack of value of grant-seeking (13)		9.4 (12)	6.7 (12)	0.0 (13.5)	0.0 (13.5)
lack of recognition/acknowledgement for grant-seekers (14)		1.9 (14)	0.0 (14)	6.1 (11.5)	9.1 (10)

Note: \* when percentages were the same, the mean rank was recorded in the table. The four most frequently chosen barriers for each academic area are in bold.

Barriers to Grant Seeking by Years at CSC

- Comparing the number of years at CSC, “lack of time” was the most frequently chosen ‘top five’ barrier to seeking grants.
  - At CSC 3 years or fewer: The top barriers were lack of time (65.5%), not knowing where to go for assistance (41.4%), challenge of getting formal course release to write grant proposal (37.9%) and challenge and/or hassle of managing grant (27.6%).
  - At CSC 4-7 years: The top barriers were lack of time (80%), challenge of getting formal course release to write grant proposal (52%), challenge of developing partnerships/collaborations (36%), not knowing where to go for assistance (32%) and challenge of getting formal course release to manage grant (32%).
  - At CSC 8 or more years: The top barriers were lack of time (76%), challenge of getting formal course release to write grant proposal (32%), challenge and/or hassle of managing grant (27.6%) and not knowing where to go for assistance (24%)

Table 21

*Percentage of faculty who ranked each of the following as one of the top five barriers to grant seeking by years at CSC, organized by total sample barriers (percentage followed by relative rank order)*

	N	Years at CSC		
		3 years or fewer	4-7 years	8 or more years
lack of time (1)		<b>65.5 (1)</b>	<b>80.0 (1)</b>	<b>76.0 (1)</b>
challenge of getting formal course release to write grant proposal (2)		<b>37.9 (3)</b>	<b>52.0 (2)</b>	<b>32.0 (2)</b>
Not knowing where to go for assistance (3)		<b>41.4 (2)</b>	<b>32.0 (4.5)</b>	<b>24.0 (4)</b>
challenge and/or hassle of managing grant (4)		<b>27.6 (4)</b>	20.0 (7)	<b>26.7 (3)</b>
challenge of getting formal course release to manage grant (5)		13.8 (8)	<b>32.0 (4.5)</b>	21.3 (6.5)
challenge of developing partnerships/collaborations (6)		17.2 (6)	<b>36.0 (3)</b>	18.7 (9)
perceived lack of institutional support (7)		20.7 (5)	12.0 (8.5)	22.7 (5)
perceived lack of sustainability of work in post-grant period (8)		13.8 (8)	24.0 (6)	14.7 (10)
lack of communication regarding funding opportunities (9)		13.8 (8)	8.0 (10.5)	20.0 (8)
lack of funding opportunities (10)		6.9 (11.5)	12.0 (8.5)	21.3 (6.5)
lack of incentive for grant-seekers (11)		6.9 (11.5)	8.0 (10.5)	9.3 (11.5)
lack of personal interest (12)		6.9 (11.5)	0.0 (13.5)	9.3 (11.5)
lack of value of grant-seeking (13)		3.4 (14)	4.0 (12)	8.0 (13)
lack of recognition/acknowledgement for grant-seekers (14)		6.9 (11.5)	0.0 (13.5)	4.0 (14)

Note: \* when percentages were the same, the mean rank was recorded in the table. The four most frequently chosen barriers for each academic area are in bold.

## NEEDS

- Faculty were asked how confident they are in their ability to do several tasks related to applying for and managing a grant.
  - Faculty respondents seemed to be least confident about seeking out funding sources for research/scholarly activities (33.1% chose ‘not at all confident’), sustaining the work post-grant (33.1%), and developing a grant budget (29.2%).
  - Faculty seemed to be most confident about conducting research (57.5% chose ‘very confident’), developing a research project/proposal (43.8%) and writing a proposal (39.2%).

Table 22

*Confidence in ability to conduct research and grant tasks*

	Not at all confident		Somewhat confident		Very confident	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Seek out funding sources for research/scholarly activities	43	33.1	64	49.2	18	13.8
Sustain the work post-grant	43	33.1	62	47.7	19	14.6
Develop a grant budget	38	29.2	70	53.8	16	12.3
Administer the grant	36	27.7	58	44.6	31	23.8
Seek institutional support	36	27.7	70	53.8	19	14.6
Write a proposal	17	13.1	56	43.1	51	39.2
Conduct the evaluation/assessment	17	13.1	67	51.5	39	30
Develop a research project/proposal	10	7.7	59	45.4	57	43.8
Conduct research	7	5.4	41	31.5	75	57.7

Note: Response scale was 1=not at all confident, 2=somewhat confident, 3=very confident.

- Faculty were asked how interested they were in having specific topics covered in CSC grant workshops. Most faculty were interested, at least somewhat, in all the topics listed.

Table 23

*Interest in following topics for future CSC grant workshops*

	Very interested		Somewhat interested		Not at all interested	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Developing a grant budget	51	39.2	59	45.4	12	9.8
Seeking institutional support	48	36.9	61	46.9	13	10
Sustaining the work post-grant	47	36.2	64	49.2	13	10
Panelist of successful grant-seekers	46	35.4	62	47.7	14	10.8
Developing a research project/proposal	44	33.8	61	46.9	19	14.6
Writing a proposal	43	33.1	61	46.9	19	14.6
Evaluation/assessment	43	33.1	68	52.3	12	9.2
Administering the grant	42	32.3	70	53.8	11	8.5

Note: Response scale was 1=very interested, 2=somewhat interested, 3=not at all interested.

- ½ of the faculty respondents indicated they have attended a grant workshop at CSC. Approximately ½ have attended a grant workshop somewhere else.

Table 24

*Grant workshop experiences (N and % who responded 'yes')*

	Have you attended a grant workshop at CSC?		Have you attended a grant workshop, other?	
	N	%	N	%
Total	65	50.0	64	49.2
Years at CSC				
3 years or fewer (N=29)	11	37.9*	17	58.6
4-7 years (N=25)	13	52.0	18	72.0
8 or more years (N=75)	41	54.7	29	38.7
Current contract type				
Tenured (N=53)	31	58.5	25	47.2
Tenure Track (N=30)	17	56.7	20	66.7
Rolling (N=33)	14	42.4	13	39.4
Temporary (N=11)	2	18.2	4	36.4
Academic area				
Arts & Sciences - Humanities (Alan Silva) (N=33)	11	33.3	15	45.5
Arts & Sciences - Sciences (Alan Silva) (N=22)	13	59.1	12	54.5
Health Professions (Margaret McLaughlin) (N=46)	25	54.3	19	41.3
Professional Programs (Susan Cochrane) (N=27)	15	55.6	17	63.0

Note: \*Percentages are calculated with N of the category. For example, 37.9% of those who have been at CSC 3 years or fewer have attended a CSC grant workshop.

OFFICE OF RESEARCH & SPONSORED PROGRAMS
---

- Faculty were asked if they have found the ORSP staff to be helpful in various ways. (45% or more faculty responded 'NA' to each item.) 80% or more of faculty respondents who reported they had worked with ORSP staff, reported they found the ORSP staff to be clear in their communications, helpful in answering my questions, helpful in offering feedback, timely in processing paperwork, helpful with CSC business office forms, helpful in the grant application process, timely in responding to questions/concerns and helpful in guiding one through the internal grant approval process/form.

Table 25

*Evaluations of the ORSP staff*

	Responses			
	Yes		No	
	N	%	N	%
clear in their communications	40	90.9*	4	9.1
helpful in answering my questions	38	86.4	6	13.6
helpful in offering feedback	30	85.7	5	14.3
timely in processing paperwork	34	85.0	6	15
helpful with CSC business office forms	25	83.3	5	16.7
helpful in the grant application process	27	81.8	6	18.2
timely in responding to my questions/concerns	35	81.4	8	18.6
helpful in guiding me through the internal grant approval process/form	29	80.6	7	19.4
helpful in developing my grant budget	25	78.1	7	21.9
helpful in directing me to institutional support	25	78.1	7	21.9
knowledgeable about grant opportunities in my field	35	72.9	13	27.1
helpful in developing my proposal	21	72.4	8	27.6
helpful in facilitating partnerships/collaborations	17	65.4	9	34.6
knowledgeable about my research/scholarly activities	27	64.3	15	35.7
helpful in focusing my research/scholarly activities on specific objectives and outcomes	16	61.5	10	38.5

Note: For all items, 59 or more people selected "NA" and 25 or more did not respond to the items. The percentages calculated in this table are based on the number of people who responded 'yes' or 'no' to each item.

**APPENDIX**

**Office of Research and Sponsored Programs**  
**Needs Assessment and Research Interests**  
**Faculty Survey**

The Office of Research and Sponsored Programs (ORSP), currently staffed by Beth Koenig and Kirsten Walters, seeks to promote and facilitate faculty/staff research and to assist faculty/staff in seeking, applying for, and managing grants from government funding sources. ORSP is charged with developing policies to ensure integrity in research and compliance with federal and state regulations. ORSP is also responsible for budgetary oversight of all academic research/program grants, both public and private, awarded to CSC faculty and staff.

**The purposes of this survey are to:**

1. determine the research/scholarly interests of CSC faculty.
2. assess the needs of CSC faculty as they pursue research/scholarly interests and seek funding opportunities.
3. determine ways in which the ORSP can best address the research/scholarly needs of CSC faculty.
4. assess ORSP's current services

The data collected will be used to assess the research/scholarly needs of CSC faculty and staff and to improve the services of the ORSP. The data may also be used to compare research/scholarly activities and support services at CSC with those of similarly situated institutions. The data will be treated anonymously and the survey results will be reported to the ORSP. The results may be shared with high-level CSC administrators including the Deans and the Senior Vice President, and may be used for research and/or shared with an external audience such as a professional organization. In submitting the survey, you are consenting to have the data used for purposes of ORSP work and research. If you have questions about the survey, please contact Kirsten Walters at x8822 ([kswalters@stkate.edu](mailto:kswalters@stkate.edu)) or Beth Koenig at x8820 ([bkoenig@stkate.edu](mailto:bkoenig@stkate.edu)). If you have questions regarding Human Subjects Protection, please contact IRB Chair John Schmitt at x7739 ([jsschmitt@stkate.edu](mailto:jsschmitt@stkate.edu)).

**RESEARCH INTERESTS:**

For question 1 please answer according to the following scale:

1=not at all, 2=somewhat, 3=very much

1. How much do each of the following research/scholarly activities, as outlined in the CSC faculty constitution and by-laws, appeal to you:
  - a. discipline-based research
  - b. research on teaching and learning
  - c. creative work

Please answer according to the following scale:

1=very dissatisfied, 2=somewhat dissatisfied, 3=neither satisfied nor dissatisfied (neutral), 4=somewhat satisfied, 5=very satisfied

- 2a. How satisfied are you with the **quantity** of research/scholarly activities you are doing.
- 2b. How satisfied are you with the **quality** of research/scholarly activities you are doing.
- 2c. How satisfied are you with the **type** of research/scholarly activities you are doing.
3. I would make use of an online index of faculty research/scholarly interests aimed at facilitating connections between faculty with common interests. (yes/no)
4. I would be willing to share my own research/scholarly interests on such an index. (yes/no)
5. Describe the research/scholarly activity you are engaged in using a few key terms (for example: Among women and birth, culturally-competent health care.)

6. How do you fund your current research/scholarly activities?
7. What percentage of your time (no more than 100% total during the academic year) do you devote to the following:
- teaching/advising = \_\_\_\_\_%
  - research/scholarly activities = \_\_\_\_\_%
  - service = \_\_\_\_\_%
- (The three categories above should total 100%)
8. How much of your time, during the summer, do you typically devote to research/scholarly activities? (pick one)
- 0 – 10 hours/week
  - 11 – 20 hours/week
  - 21 – 30 hours/week
  - 31 – 40 hours/week
  - More than 40 hours/week
9. Have you incorporated any of your research/scholarly activities into your teaching? If so, how?
10. Do you involve undergraduates in your research/scholarly activities? If so, how?
11. Do you involve graduate students in your research/scholarly activities? If so, how?
12. Rank the top five barriers to your **research/scholarly activities**. **If there are no barriers to your activities, please select “no barriers” in the first field and leave the remaining items blank.** (1=strongest barrier, 2=next strongest barrier, etc):
- no barriers
  - lack of time
  - challenge of getting formal course release for research
  - challenge of conducting research with undergraduate students
  - lack of graduate student to assist in research
  - lack of equipment necessary to conduct research
  - lack of cross-campus research community to support partnerships and collaborations
  - lack of funding opportunities
  - lack of knowledge regarding funding opportunities
  - lack of personal interest
  - lack of outside interest
  - lack of incentive
  - lack of perceived value
  - lack of recognition/acknowledgement
13. List any other barriers to your research/scholarly activities not mentioned above.

## GRANT-SEEKING EXPERIENCE:

14. I have *sought* internal (CSC) funding for research/scholarly activities from the following sources in the past five years (Check all that apply)
- Faculty Travel Grant
  - Faculty Research and Scholarly Activities Grant
  - Curriculum Development Grant
  - Arts and Humanities Collaborative Research Grant
  - Graduate Faculty Research Grant
  - Undergraduate Faculty Research Grant
  - Sister Antoine O’Brien Award
  - Carol Easley Denny Award

- i. EARDA Pilot Research Study Grant
- j. COE Grant
- k. COE Seed Money
- l. Small-scale 3M Collaborative Student-Faculty Research Grant for STEM research
- m. Large-scale 3M Collaborative Student-Faculty Research Grant for STEM research
- n. Community Work and Learning Faculty/Staff Professional Development Grant
- o. Bush mini-grant

15. I have **obtained** internal (CSC) funding for research/scholarly activities from the following sources in the past five years. (Check all that apply)

- a. Faculty Travel Grant
- b. Faculty Research and Scholarly Activities Grant
- c. Curriculum Development Grant
- d. Arts and Humanities Collaborative Research Grant
- e. Graduate Faculty Research Grant
- f. Undergraduate Faculty Research Grant
- g. Sister Antoine O'Brien Award
- h. Carol Easley Denny Award
- i. EARDA Pilot Research Study Grant
- j. COE Grant
- k. COE Seed Money
- l. Small-scale 3M Collaborative Student-Faculty Research Grant for STEM research
- m. Large-scale 3M Collaborative Student-Faculty Research Grant for STEM research
- n. Community Work and Learning Faculty/Staff Professional Development Grant
- o. Bush mini-grant

16. I have **sought** external funding for research/scholarly activities in the past five years from the following sources. (Check all that apply)

- a. government funding sources
- b. corporate funding sources
- c. foundations

17. I have **obtained** external funding for research/scholarly activities in the past five years from the following sources. (Check all that apply)

- a. government funding sources
- b. corporate funding sources
- c. foundations

18. Rank the top five barriers to your **grant-seeking**. **If there are no barriers to your grant-seeking, please select "no barriers" in the first field and leave the remaining items blank.**

(1=strongest barrier, 2=next strongest barrier, etc):

- a. lack of time
- b. challenge of getting formal course release to write grant proposal
- c. challenge of getting formal course release to manage grant
- d. challenge and/or hassle of managing grant
- e. not knowing where to go for assistance
- f. challenge of developing partnerships/collaborations
- g. perceived lack of institutional support
- h. perceived lack of sustainability of work in post-grant period
- i. lack of communication regarding funding opportunities
- j. lack of funding opportunities

- k. lack of personal interest
- l. lack of incentive for grant-seekers
- m. lack of recognition/acknowledgement for grant-seekers
- n. lack of value of grant-seeking

19. List any other barriers to your grant-seeking not mentioned above.

20. What has helped to facilitate your external grant-seeking process?

For questions 21, please answer according to the following scale:

1=very negative, 2=somewhat negative, 3=neither negative nor positive (neutral), 4=somewhat positive, 5=very positive

21. How would you rate your experience with grant-seeking at the College of St. Catherine.

For question 22, please answer according to the following scale:

1=not at all confident, 2=somewhat confident, 3=very confident

22. How confident are you with your ability to do the following:

- a. Seek out funding sources for research/scholarly activities.
- b. Develop a research project/proposal.
- c. Write a proposal.
- d. Develop a grant budget.
- e. Conduct research.
- f. Administer the grant.
- g. Seek institutional support
- h. Sustain the work post-grant.
- i. Conduct the evaluation/assessment.

## NEEDS:

23. Have you attended grant workshops at CSC in the past? (yes/no)

23a. If you did attend a CSC grant workshop, did you find it helpful? why or why not?

24. Have you attended a grant workshop elsewhere in the past? (yes/no) If so, where?

If you did attend a grant workshop elsewhere, did you find it helpful? why or why not?

For question 25, please answer according to the following scale:

1= very interested, 2=somewhat interested, 3= not at all interested

25. How interested are you in seeing the following topic addressed at future CSC grant workshops:

- a. Developing a research project/proposal
- b. Writing a proposal
- c. Developing a grant budget
- d. Administering the grant
- e. Seeking institutional support
- f. Sustaining the work post-grant
- g. Evaluation/assessment
- h. Panelist of successful grant-seekers

26. List any topics that interest you that are not mentioned above.

For question 28, please answer yes or no for each item

28. In working with the ORSP Staff, I found them to be
- a. knowledgeable about grant opportunities in my field
  - b. knowledgeable about my research/scholarly activities
  - c. helpful in guiding me through the internal grant approval process/form
  - d. helpful in developing my proposal
  - e. helpful in focusing my research/scholarly activities on specific objectives and outcomes
  - f. helpful in facilitating partnerships/collaborations
  - g. helpful in the grant application process
  - h. helpful in developing my grant budget
  - i. helpful with CSC business office forms
  - j. helpful in answering my questions
  - k. timely in responding to my questions/concerns
  - l. timely in processing paperwork
  - m. clear in their communications
  - n. helpful in directing me to institutional support
  - o. helpful in offering feedback

## DEMOGRAPHICS:

29. How long have you been at CSC?

- 3 years or fewer  
 4-7 years  
 8 or more years

30. How long have you been professionally employed in higher education (including time at CSC and elsewhere)?

31. What is your current contract type?

- Tenured  
 Tenure Track  
 Rolling  
 Temporary

32. In which area are you primarily housed?

- Arts and Sciences (Alan Silva, Dean)  
 Please choose:  Humanities  
 Sciences

Health Professions (Margaret McLaughlin, Dean)

Professional Programs (Susan Cochrane, Dean)

33. With what level of students do you work? (Check all that apply)

- certificate  
 associate  
 bachelor  
 graduate

If you have any questions/concerns or would like to know more about research/scholarly activities and/or grant opportunities at CSC, please contact Beth Koenig ([bkoenig@stkate.edu](mailto:bkoenig@stkate.edu) or x8820) or Kirsten Walters ([kswalters@stkate.edu](mailto:kswalters@stkate.edu) or x8822) in the Office of Research and Sponsored Programs.