RESULTS OF THE 2026 FACULTY MORALE SURVEY AT RADFORD UNIVERSITY

These results were assembled, analyzed, and summarized by the Faculty Senate Campus Environment Committee:

The Faculty Morale Survey (FMS) has been conducted by the Faculty Senate Campus Environment Committee (CEC) for more than 20 years. Since 2013, the FMS is conducted in years that the COACHE Survey is *not* offered.

In 2026, the survey was circulated to all full-time Teaching and Research faculty via email during March and April. In total, 248 responses were recorded using the Qualtrics application. This total number includes surveys where at least one question was answered, even if the survey was not completed. This report includes basic demographic information about respondents followed by quantitative summaries of results from the last ten years of the FMS. Each section is focused on a table, showing results from a set of related questions.

The 2026 Sample

Table 1 includes demographic and other data gathered from respondents. Faculty responding to the survey included a wide range of ranks, from every college, and from both the Radford City and the Roanoke learning sites. All the survey questions shown in Table 1 include fairly high numbers of "No Response". This is probably due to two features. First, these informational questions occur near the end of the survey, and some respondents did not complete all questions. Second, some faculty might be concerned about providing self-identifying information, especially if they have shared controversial points of view.

Table 1. Respondents to the 2026 Faculty Morale Survey.

I am…	n	%
Full Professor	81	32.7
Associate Professor	52	21.0
Assistant Professor	47	19.0
Instructor	26	10.5
No Response	42	16.9
TOTAL	248	

I am…	n	%
Tenured	125	50.4
Tenure Track	44	17.7
Special Purpose	37	14.9
Full Time Temporary	3	1.2
No Response	39	15.7
Total	248	

Table 1. (cont.)

I am also…	n	%
Clinical Faculty	15	6.0
Graduate Faculty	85	34.3
AP Faculty	6	2.4
Grad and AP Faculty (both)	3	1.2
Clinical and Grad Faculty (both)	8	3.2
No Response / None of These	131	52.8
Total	248	

I am in the College…	n	%
Davis	19	7.6
CEHD	17	6.9
Waldron	31	12.5
CHBS	47	19.0
Artis	37	14.9
CVPA	18	7.3
Nursing	23	9.3
No Response	56	22.6
Total	248	

I primarily teach at the	n	%
Radford City Site	166	66.9
RUC Site (Roanoke)	24	9.7
RHEC Site (Roanoke)	9	3.6
No Response	49	19.8
Total	248	

I have worked at Radford University for… (RUC faculty indicate since merger)	n	%
0-2 Years	20	8.1
3-5 Years	26	10.5
6-10 Years	56	22.6
11-15 Years	36	14.5
16-20 Years	31	12.5
More than 20 Years	29	11.7
No Response	50	20.1
Total	248	

In this report, results are grouped according to sets of questions connected by overarching topical themes. For each theme, a summary of the results from quantitative questions is followed by qualitative analysis from the open-ended questions.

The quantitative summaries are based on FMS questions recorded using a standard five-point Likert scale:

1 – Strongly Disagree

2 – Disagree

3 – Neutral / Neither Agree nor Disagree

4 – Agree

5 – Strongly Agree

In Table 2 and in all subsequent tables, statistically significant changes from 2024 to 2026 are highlighted only in the 2026 column: green ↑ = increase; pink ↓ = decrease ($p \leq .05$).

For each topical theme, the qualitative summary includes a pair of infographics illustrating sentiments expressed among those who chose to respond to the open-ended question(s). The infographics represent the *number of mentions*, not the number of individuals who shared that sentiment. A chart of emergent subthemes from the comments is also included.

Faculty Perception of the Department / School

By and large, what is most striking in Table 2 is the relative stability in faculty sentiment in their home departments and schools. Most questions in this section show downwardly skewed distributions. Among all questions about the department/school, faculty expressed the lowest satisfaction regarding diversity of colleagues and coworkers and this has been consistent since that question was introduced in 2020. There is one statistically significant improvement in faculty satisfaction with chair/director leadership. There are no open-ended questions regarding the Department/School, and so no qualitative analysis is included for this area.

Table 2. Questions about the Department/School

	2014	2015	2017	2018	2020	2021	2023	2024	2026	2026 sdev	2026 dist.
DEP1. My work environment is collegial at the department level.	4.04	4.11	4.00	4.06	4.10	4.05	3.83	3.90	4.04	1.228	
DEP2. I am given the opportunity to participate in decisions that affect me in my department.	3.85	4.02	3.69	4.00	4.07	3.98	3.88	3.88	4.00	1.253	
DEP3. My Chair keeps me well informed of matters important to faculty.	4.13	4.21	3.97	4.17	4.07	4.14	4.00	4.05	4.21	1.184	
DEP4. I am satisfied with the leadership of my department Chair.	4.09	4.06	3.88	3.98	3.78	3.99	3.89	3.83	4.09 ↑	1.286	
DEP5. I believe my Chair values my opinion.	4.16	4.18	3.93	4.06	3.99	4.11	4.11	3.92	4.15	1.253	
DEP7. I am satisfied with the diversity of faculty in my department.	*	*	*	*	3.48	3.04	3.21	3.37	3.47	1.207	

Faculty Perception of the College / Dean

Table 3 displays the data pertaining to faculty's perceptions of the college and dean. At the college level, sentiment has also been relatively stable over the long term. Overall, faculty perceptions of collegiality, information flow, No statistically significant differences in these topical questions were seen in 2026. There is noticeable downward skew in some questions related to the dean. The greatest opportunities for improvement in this section relate to faculty feeling they have opportunities to participate in decision making (3.41) and faculty satisfaction with diversity within the college (3.45). There were no open-ended/qualitative questions pertaining to college/dean.

Table 3. Questions about the College and Dean

	2014	2015	2017	2018	2020	2021	2023	2024	2026	2026 sdev	2026 dist.
COL1. My work environment is collegial at the college level.	3.74	3.83	3.74	3.84	4.06	4.06	3.79	3.85	3.94	1.114	
COL2. I am given the opportunity to participate in decisions that affect me in my college.	3.26	3.34	3.10	3.25	3.35	3.32	3.27	3.41	3.41	1.236	
COL3. My Dean keeps me well informed of matters important to faculty.	3.59	3.67	3.36	3.61	3.63	3.66	3.65	3.65	3.66	1.227	
COL4. I believe the Dean does all they can to meet the needs of my college.	3.53	3.67	3.38	3.53	3.76	3.79	3.80	3.80	3.80	1.268	
COL5. I am satisfied with the leadership of my college Dean.	3.65	3.70	3.46	3.62	3.66	3.82	3.77	3.75	3.77	1.336	
COL6. I believe my Dean values my opinion.	3.58	3.63	3.35	3.56	3.64	3.83	3.73	3.67	3.74	1.339	
COL7. I am satisfied with the diversity of faculty in my college.	*	*	*	*	3.52	3.00	3.19	3.36	3.45	1.199	

Faculty Perception of the Provost

Quantitative Summary.

In general, there are declining perceptions among faculty regarding the performance of the provost. The strongest declines are extremely statistically significant and focused on whether the provost values faculty opinion (PROV3) and whether the provost responds to faculty inquiries (PROV5). Although there is a decline in faculty sentiment in every question in this section, the provost's strongest area is in keeping faculty well informed (PROV1). The qualitative summary helps shed light on faculty sentiment in with regard to the provost's performance.

Table 4. Questions about the Provost

	2014	2015	2017	2018	2020	2021	2023	2024	2026	2026 sdev	2026 dist
PROV1. The Provost keeps me well informed on matters important to faculty.	2.68	2.75	3.18	3.15	3.35	3.15	2.44	3.16	3.02	1.237	
PROV2. I believe the Provost does all they can to meet the needs of my college.	3.08	2.89	3.28	3.14	3.42	3.29	2.52	2.91	2.78	1.283	
PROV3. I believe the Provost values faculty opinion.	3.24	2.93	3.38	3.17	3.43	3.50	2.43	2.81	2.45 ↓	1.345	
PROV4. I am satisfied with the leadership of the Provost.	3.33	3.00	3.46	3.23	3.53	3.46	2.49	2.97	2.76	1.345	
PROV5. I believe the Provost responds to inquiries from faculty in a timely manner.	3.13	2.87	3.31	3.08	3.38	3.32	2.71	3.17	2.76 ↓	1.237	

Qualitative Summary.

Survey question: Please comment on the effectiveness of the Provost. Do you have any suggestions for improvement?

A total of 107 participants commented on the effectiveness of the Provost. Sixty-five responses (60.7%) were negative. The most frequent criticism was that faculty input and expertise were disregarded, appearing in 44 of the 65 negative responses. Other criticisms concerned shared governance, adherence to the faculty handbook, centralized management, and the speed and implementation of major changes. Mixed responses paired favorable views of the Provost's intentions or communication with many of the same concerns.

Provost comment categories

Category	n	%	Summary
Negative	65	60.7%	Critical assessments of the Provost's effectiveness, decisions, or leadership practices.
Mixed	12	11.2%	Positive observations followed by criticism or concerns.
Positive	9	8.4%	Favorable assessments of leadership and engagement. One response also questions the pace of a calendar decision.
Suggestions	11	10.3%	Recommendations for improvement not framed as primarily negative assessments.
Neutral or uncategorized	10	9.3%	No opinion about the Provost or comments that do not directly address the question.

Negative themes about the Provost

Theme	Count	Theme summary
Disregard for faculty input	44	Respondents state that the Provost does not adequately value faculty opinions or expertise. They describe decisions made without consultation or despite faculty objections, and question whether solicited feedback has any effect. One comment states that the Provost "makes decisions without consulting faculty, or if she does she completely ignores their concerns." Others call for an actual effort to listen and respect faculty expertise.
Too many changes too quickly	23	Respondents criticize the number and speed of major changes and question whether they reflect a coherent vision or sufficient consideration of consequences. Comments describe faculty feedback as requested but not heeded, particularly on the academic calendar. They call for closer attention to the effects of changes on the people responsible for implementing them.
Centralized management and restricted communication	15	Comments criticize what respondents describe as "top-down" leadership, micromanagement, and administrative bloat. The phrase "top-down" appears three times in an unfavorable context. Respondents also question the effectiveness of Academic Affairs units and describe communication through deans and a restrictive chain of command as insulating the Provost from faculty. Some perceive that decisions are made without adequate regard for existing policy.
Bypassing shared governance	15	The phrase "shared governance" appears 15 times in the negative comments. Respondents state that the Provost bypasses established governance policies and procedures and makes decisions without meaningful faculty participation. Some describe these practices as undermining shared governance, rather than simply providing insufficient opportunities for consultation.
Departures from handbook and personnel procedures	11	Respondents state that the Provost does not consistently follow the Teaching and Research Faculty Handbook. Three comments address missed personnel timelines, five question the disregard of personnel recommendations from departments or other levels, and three criticize responses to Faculty Grievance and Appeals Committee recommendations. Some report that committee findings are rejected without an explanation.

Policy concerns about the Provost

Theme	Count	Theme summary
Academic calendar and exam schedule	14	Respondents describe changes as imposed despite objections from faculty, students, and staff. Comments question the rationale and tangible benefits, describe the final exam schedule as unworkable, and connect the changes to lower morale. One response characterizes the calendar as adopted for unexplained reasons and causing significant damage to faculty morale; another calls the new calendar "untenable."
Outside employment policy	7	Respondents criticize the policy's implementation as unilateral and insufficiently discussed with affected faculty. Comments describe its presentation as dismissive and connect restrictions to reduced opportunities for professional development and supplemental income. Some emphasize the consequences for supporting their families in the context of what they regard as low faculty pay.
Special purpose faculty reappointments	6	Comments question the transparency and consistency of decisions about three-year contracts for special purpose faculty. Respondents report that recommendations from departmental personnel committees, department chairs, and deans were disregarded without an explanation. They also describe perceived inequities across colleges and concerns about the use of established evaluation and reappointment processes.

Themes from 12 mixed comments about the Provost

Theme	Theme summary
Personal approach and institutional commitment	Respondents describe the Provost as pleasant or amicable in person and express favorable views of intentions, commitment to students, affection for Radford, and vision for the university. These observations are followed by criticism of decisions, consultation, or governance.
Communication and faculty input	Four comments praise the Threads newsletter. Five of the 12 mixed responses identify a need to consult and listen to stakeholders. Some describe feedback from those who implement and live with changes as disregarded, despite favorable views of communication or personal demeanor.
Shared governance	Comments describe a top-down institution, decisions that go against shared governance, or a "façade of shared governance." These concerns accompany positive observations about the Provost's intentions or commitment.
Calendar and outside employment	Calendar concerns appear in four mixed responses and the outside employment policy in three. Exam week is also raised. These comments echo concerns about the practical effects and implementation of changes described in the negative responses.

Themes from 9 positive comments about the Provost

Theme	Theme summary
Engagement and communication	Respondents recognize engagement with the broader Radford community through RAD talks, improved communication, attention to faculty concerns, and the Threads newsletter.
Personal approach and willingness to innovate	Comments describe the Provost as personable, caring, hardworking, innovative, and willing to try new things. Some offer broad praise for performance in a demanding role.
Institutional priorities and long-term commitment	Respondents praise the ability to navigate competing interests and limited resources while considering long-term priorities. They describe decisions as serving the university as a whole and express confidence in the Provost's commitment to its mission, sustainability, and future success.
Qualification concerning the calendar	One otherwise positive response describes some decisions, including the calendar, as rushed before their full effects were considered. This qualification is retained within the original positive classification.

Suggestions for the Provost from 11 comments

Theme	Count	Theme summary
Listen to faculty	4	Solicit faculty feedback before decisions or initiatives that significantly affect faculty, and give their perspectives meaningful consideration.
Follow governance processes	4	Adhere to current policies and procedures, share decision making, and provide consistent, visible administrative support for faculty leaders during governance deliberations.
Direct contact with departments	3	Attend departmental meetings, increase visibility in departments and colleges, and learn about local needs directly rather than relying only on reports from deans.
Exam week	3	Address concerns exam week.
Involvement at RUC	2	Be more visible and involved at the Roanoke campus.
Communication	2	Improve communication and the delivery of information.
Transparency	2	Explain both how decisions are made and the reasons for them.
Pace of change	2	Slow the introduction of initiatives, consider their implications, and resolve problems from earlier changes before adding new ones. One response calls for a moratorium on new initiatives.
Academic calendar	2	Address concerns about the academic calendar.
Recognition of institutional initiatives	1	One suggestion response also recognizes the Provost's commitment to major institutional initiatives, including the new general education program.

Faculty Perception of the President

Quantitative Summary.

Faculty attitudes toward the president are just above neutral, with all questions receiving means in the 3.4 to 3.7 range. These numbers are consistent with the 2024 results, with only a few small increases in positive sentiment and no statistically significant differences. Overall, faculty report a very positive satisfaction with the president's leadership (PRES4), which is at it's highest level since 2017.

Table 5. Questions about the President

	2014	2015	2017	2018	2020	2021	2023	2024	2026	2026 sdev	2026 dist
PRES1. The President keeps me well informed on matters important to faculty.	*	*	*	*	3.64	3.16	3.41	3.48	3.54	1.017	
PRES2. I believe the President does all they can to meet the needs of my college.	2.59	2.79	3.81	3.66	3.40	2.86	3.22	3.43	3.48	1.106	
PRES3. I believe the President values faculty opinion.	2.22	2.32	3.78	3.43	3.32	2.88	3.40	3.46	3.46	1.157	
PRES4. I am satisfied with the leadership of the President.	2.43	2.57	3.88	3.62	3.55	3.07	3.46	3.66	3.71	1.111	
PRES5. I believe the President responds to inquiries from faculty in a timely manner.	2.58	2.51	3.45	3.31	3.50	3.09	3.34	3.43	3.45	1.077	

Qualitative Summary.

Survey question: Please comment on the effectiveness of the President. Do you have any suggestions for improvement?

A total of 85 participants commented on the effectiveness of the President. Thirty-four responses (40.0%) were negative. The most frequent criticism was that the President was not sufficiently engaged in oversight of upper-level administrators, appearing in 15 of the 34 negative responses. Other criticisms concerned communication, engagement, and shared governance, as well as criticism of specific policies and actions. Mixed responses paired favorable views of the President's personal approach and commitment to the University with some of the same concerns.

President comment categories

Category	n	%	Summary
Negative	34	40.0%	Critical assessments of the President's effectiveness, decisions, or leadership practices.
Mixed	16	18.8%	Positive observations followed by criticism or concerns.
Positive	21	24.7%	Favorable assessments of leadership and engagement.
Suggestions	9	10.6%	Recommendations for improvement not framed as primarily negative assessments.
Neutral or uncategorized	5	5.9%	No opinion about the President or comments that do not directly address the question.

Negative themes about the President

Theme	Count	Theme summary
Chain of command	15	Fourteen respondents state that the President seems to delegate considerable decision-making power to the Provost and that the President should exercise more oversight over proposals that appear to emanate from the Provost's office. Included in these comments are that the President should ensure that faculty input is a part of the major-decision-making process and that transparent communication between Provost and faculty should be encouraged. An additional respondent states that the President should exercise more oversight over the vice presidents. In otherwise negative comments, the Vice President for Enrollment Management and Strategic Communication was twice singled out as effective.
Communication	14	Comments range from statements that the President is not visible to statements that, while visible, not sufficiently or effectively communicative. Respondents stated that they were not aware of the President's vision for the university or of his intentions toward a department or college. Coffees with the President are critiqued in five comments, two of which also mentioned reports to the Faculty Senate. One respondent stated that the Provost "appears pleasant" during Coffees, but both the Coffees and the reports to the Faculty Senate were described as inadequate as venues for communication between the President and the faculty and as creating an illusion of transparency rather than serving as actual fora for faculty to interact with the President.
Engagement	10	One respondent described the President as a symbolic figure who does not exercise leadership. Other comments describe him as absent from campus, uninformed, and out of touch. One respondent described him as having an unrealistic take on the University. One respondent questioned how much the President cares about the University and its faculty and students. Another respondent stated that the President has no contact with or interest in faculty. Another stated that the President does not seem focused on some serious challenges that the University is facing. Two respondents called for the President to interact or engage more with the faculty.
Policies or actions	10	Two respondents criticized the extra employment policy. One respondent expressed concern about the calendar and the final examination schedule. One respondent expressed concern about the treatment of special purpose faculty. One respondent stated that the traditional liberal arts were not treated as valuable in their own right, and three other respondents remarked that certain professional programs were in line for support and resources when resources were an issue. The President was criticized for relying too heavily of metrics and on ROI. One respondent criticized the prospect of changing to a new LMS. Two comments state that too much hiring is taking place on the upper-administrative level.
Shared governance	5	In addition to generalized statements, such as the desire that President listen to the voices of faculty responding to proposed major changes, several respondents commented that the "culture of shared governance" was under stress. Comments included that leadership was top-down and centralized, that faculty needed to participate in important decisions, and that shared governance was being "marginalized." Two respondents expressed concern that the findings of the Faculty Appeals Committee were being disregarded; one of these respondents likewise expressed concern that Grievance Committee recommendations were disregarded.

Themes from 16 mixed comments about the President

Theme	Theme summary
Personal approach and institutional commitment	Respondents describe the President as valuing our students, genuinely caring for the University and its success, and doing what he believes is best for it. The President is described as generally effective, demonstrating strong leadership, doing a good job balancing the University's many needs, and staying focused on keeping the University running. Comments describe the President as acting with integrity and not engaged in self-promotion or self-dealing. Comments also describe the President as motivational, likable, authentic, and transparent. Two respondents describe him as the "champion" of the University and its students.

Theme	Theme summary
Communication	One respondent stated the President communicates in a way that builds confidence and goodwill, and another stated that he is open to comments. Four respondents specifically mentioned Coffees with the President, with one stating that the Coffees and other avenues were used by the President to gather input from the University community. One respondent stated that they rarely heard from the President outside of the Coffees, and another stated that little or no communication comes from the President's office.
Visibility	Eight respondents commented on the President's role as the face of the University, describing him as an effective representative to the community, the region, and the Commonwealth. Comments describe him as placing value on community connections and the University's reputation and working to elevate the University's position and name. Comments also describe him as maintaining a positive presence across campus and contributing to the students' sense of belonging. One respondent commented that the President appears at many campus functions; another commented that the students know the President and that he is one of their biggest cheerleaders.
Shared governance	Two respondents commented on shared governance, recommending that the President support and reinforce shared governance. A third respondent expressed concern that recommendations of the Faculty Grievance and Appeals Committees had been disregarded. Two other respondents did not directly reference formalized shared governance processes but recommended that the president seek input on higher-level decision making from lower-level employees, including possibly from the Senates and the Senate Executive Councils. One comment stated that the absence of faculty and staff voices from the Cabinet was apparent in decision making. More generally, one comment suggest that the President does not sufficiently value faculty and staff opinions, and another suggested the President re-engage with the faculty.
Chain of command	Six of the respondents recommended more Presidential oversight of the Provost, with one suggesting that the Provost did not fully understand Radford University's culture and another suggesting leadership training for the Provost. One of these comments suggested more oversight at the senior leadership level in general. A seventh respondent also suggested more oversight of leadership in general. One comment stated that the hiring of a Chief of Staff was a good decision that had apparently led to better organization than the two previous years.
Strategic plan	Three respondents commented on the Strategic Plan, which was described as not responsive to the needs of the faculty and staff. The Plan was described as largely top-down and reflecting administrative priorities rather than the priorities of the faculty and the university community as a whole.

Themes from 21 positive comments about the President

Theme	Theme summary
Visibility and approachability	Five respondents described the President with one or more of these terms: visible, accessible, available, approachable, and present on campus. A sixth respondent expressed appreciation for regular messaging and the Coffees with the President.
Engagement with community	Three comments recognized the President's engagement with and outreach to the community. He is described as bridging the gap between the university and as having established a good relationship with small business owners. One respondent stated that the President does all he can to meet the needs of not only students and faculty but also the broader community.
Effect on campus climate	The president is described as having a vision for where he wants to take the university and as inspiring positive student, faculty, and staff feelings. One respondent described the President as having rallied the University and provided it with a sense of pride and purpose. Another stated that faculty appear to be involved and students appear to be engaged in both the classroom and the campus.
Commitment	Five respondents describe the President as truly invested in and very committed to the University and its students and faculty. Respondents describe as genuine his enthusiasm and love of the University and his commitment to a culture of care.
Specific achievements	Respondents in particular describe the President as successfully guiding the University through the enrollment cliff, as well as through the tail end of the COVID pandemic. The Highlander Tuition Promise and the President's focus on enrollment stabilization are mentioned. Another action mentioned favorably is the rescinding of additional tuition charges for students taking 17/18 credit. One respondent stated that the President had put together a great team.

Suggestions for the President from 9 comments

Theme	Count	Theme summary
Communication	3	Hold more Coffees with the President. In addition to Coffee with the President and reports to Faculty Senate, regularly communicate/provide updates to faculty on issues pertinent to faculty. Create a mechanism for providing President with feedback that assures confidentiality.
Value all programs	2	Support non-professional programs or programs that are not perceived as high ROI.
Direct contact with departments	1	Meet with individual departments.
Community Building	1	Find opportunities for university to coalesce as a whole.
Involvement at RUC	1	Increase presence at the Roanoke campus.

Faculty Perception of the Board of Visitors (BOV)

Quantitative Summary..

Historically, faculty satisfaction with the Board of Visitors has usually been fairly neutral. This might reflect the fact that many faculty are not entirely familiar with the role of this governing body. Overall, the 2026 results show a quite positive view of board leadership.

Table . Question about the Board of Visitors

	2014	2015	2017	2018	2020	2021	2023	2024	2026	2026 sdev	2026 dist
BOV1. I am satisfied with the leadership of the Board of Visitors.	2.53	2.57	3.00	3.30	3.13	2.54	2.97	3.19	3.32	.834	

Qualitative Summary.

Survey question: Please comment on the effectiveness of the Board of Visitors. Do you have any suggestions for improvement?

A total of 48 participants commented on the Board of Visitors. The responses included favorable assessments of the Board's engagement and concern for the university, criticism of oversight and decision making, and statements of limited familiarity with the Board's work. Comments also requested more opportunities for contact with students, faculty, and staff.

Board of Visitors comment categories

Category	n	% of 48
Generally positive	10	20.8%
Generally negative	19	39.6%
Neutral	19	39.6%

Themes about the Board of Visitors

Theme	Theme summary
Operations and visibility	Twelve remarks concern Board operations. Respondents describe limited knowledge of the Board's work, difficulty attending or viewing meetings, and few opportunities to interact outside scheduled Board meetings. Other comments regard the Board's operations as more transparent than those at other institutions in Virginia.
Leadership and decision making	Twenty-three remarks concern leadership and decision making. Favorable comments describe stronger investment in the university and its students and employees. Critical comments question oversight of senior administrators, the justification for decisions, and assessment of administrative initiatives. Some perceive that these initiatives draw resources from academic programs and staffing.
Suggestions for improvement	Suggestions include more campus visits between meetings, closer contact with students and employees, and stronger attention to working relationships. Respondents also propose assessing administrative initiatives, offering tuition discounts, particularly for public-service fields, expanding support for student costs and debt reduction, increasing the endowment, and giving the elected faculty representative a vote.

Quantitative Summary.

After several years of decline in faculty sentiment toward the Faculty Senate, the 2026 results show marked improvement. This is especially clear with regard to representing faculty point of view (SEN2) and responsiveness to faculty inquiries (SEN5). The distributions of results show considerable downward skew, with the highest number of responses being 4 (Agree).

Table 7. Questions about the Faculty Senate

	2014	2015	2017	2018	2020	2021	2023	2024	2026	2026 sdev	2026 dist
SEN1. The Faculty Senate keeps me well informed on matters important to faculty.	*	*	*	*	4.27	4.08	3.90	3.96	4.12	.816	
SEN3. I believe the Faculty Senate does all it can to represent faculty opinion.	3.58	3.48	3.60	3.73	4.07	3.71	3.67	3.63	4.00 ↑	1.012	
SEN5. I believe the Faculty Senate responds to inquiries from the faculty in a timely manner.	*	*	*	*	4.02	3.83	3.64	3.61	3.95 ↑	.902	

Qualitative Summary.

Survey question: Please comment on the effectiveness of the Faculty Senate. Do you have any suggestions for improvement?

A total of 57 faculty members commented on the Faculty Senate. Nineteen responses included general positive assessments and 16 included general negative assessments. No single concern was identified by a majority. Favorable comments recognize Senate presidents, the parliamentarian, individual senators, and representation of faculty concerns. Some also seek stronger collaboration between the Senate and senior administration. Recurring topics include communication, deliberation, participation, and shared governance.

Themes about the Faculty Senate

Theme	n (%) N = 57	Theme summary
Effectiveness and deliberation	9 15.8%	Comments describe the Senate as inefficient or ineffective. Respondents cite difficulty reaching compromise and revisiting decisions, particularly those involving general education. Some question whether extended deliberation affects the administration's confidence in the faculty voice.
Requests for better communication	7 12.3%	Respondents request stronger communication between senators and their constituents, especially when motions are under consideration.
Favorable views of communication	6 10.5%	Comments appreciate outreach by senators, transparency, and efforts to keep faculty informed. Publicly available materials are also described as useful for understanding issues facing the university.
Breadth of participation	3 5.3%	Respondents ask the Senate to seek a wider range of views and prevent a small number of voices from dominating discussion.
Assertiveness in shared governance	2 3.5%	Two responses describe the Senate as too passive. Related comments encourage more critical engagement with administration and stronger advocacy for faculty perspectives.

Suggestions for the Faculty Senate

Theme	Theme summary
Leadership representation	Recruit and support leadership that reflects a wider range of departments, demographics, and viewpoints.
Senate procedures	Organize motions on a semester-based schedule, allow more deliberation during meetings, follow Senate rules more closely, and consider term limits.
Faculty support and working conditions	Address research support, faculty wellness and recreation access, equitable teaching expectations, and the outside employment policy.

Faculty Perception of the Campus Environment

Quantitative Summary. Regarding the overall campus environment, many indices show relatively positive faculty sentiment. Consistently low levels of satisfaction are seen in bureaucratic procedures and compensation. Highest levels of satisfaction are generally seen in regard to physical facilities (e.g., offices, classrooms, technology, and laboratories) and benefits (e.g., health insurance, family friendly policies).

Table 8. Questions about the Campus Environment

	2014	2015	2017	2018	2020	2021	2023	2024	2026	2026 sdev	2026 dist
ENV1. The University facilitates my professional development.	3.26	3.55	3.37	3.64	3.60	3.62	3.38	3.52	3.50	1.205	
ENV2. The University provides the technology needed to do my job well.	*	*	*	*	3.95	3.98	3.77	3.77	3.79	1.170	
ENV3. The University provides other equipment and materials needed to do my job well.	3.38	3.53	3.46	3.45	3.75	3.87	3.71	3.77	3.77	1.099	
ENV4. The University's bureaucratic procedures are reasonable.	2.07	2.04	2.14	2.24	2.52	2.44	2.24	2.49	2.51	1.080	
ENV5. The University provides sufficient support for student research opportunities.	3.13	3.44	3.42	3.42	3.63	3.63	3.42	3.69	3.71	1.062	
ENV6. My workload is reasonable.	2.77	2.86	2.95	2.97	3.31	2.99	2.83	2.86	2.90	1.273	
ENV7. My office is adequate for my needs.	3.69	3.81	3.90	4.10	4.28	4.29	4.11	4.10	4.19	1.011	
ENV8. The classrooms where I typically teach are conducive to learning.	3.61	3.62	3.63	3.38	3.58	3.61	3.66	3.59	3.72	1.177	
ENV9. The University has family-friendly employee benefits.	3.17	3.46	3.46	3.73	3.82	3.72	3.74	3.79	3.73	1.129	
ENV10. The University offers programs to help invest/manage my finances effectively.	3.18	3.24	3.15	3.51	3.66	3.60	3.50	3.51	3.36	1.023	
ENV11. I am satisfied with my base salary.	2.09	2.33	2.43	2.61	2.71	2.55	2.53	2.71	2.60	1.189	
ENV12. The University provides good health benefits.	3.64	3.86	3.80	4.00	4.23	4.21	4.24	4.15	4.09	1.005	
ENV13. My overall compensation package is competitive.	*	*	*	*	2.98	2.80	2.80	2.95	2.90	1.151	
ENV14. The University engages in sufficient sustainability initiatives.	*	*	*	*	3.53	3.50	3.20	3.33	3.44	1.087	
ENV15. College and University awards to recognize faculty achievement are adequate.	*	*	*	*	3.20	3.26	3.14	3.20	3.24	1.151	
ENV16. The University provides sufficient support for faculty diversity and inclusion initiatives.	*	*	*	*	3.41	3.14	3.25	3.23	3.10	1.124	

Campus Facilities and Resources

Survey question: Please comment on campus facilities & resources (i.e. technology, equipment, materials, office, classrooms). Do you have any suggestions for improvement?

A total of 86 comments were analyzed on campus facilities and resources. Technology and technical support is the most frequently identified theme, appearing in 36 comments (41.9%), followed by classroom design and scheduling in 26 (30.2%) and facilities condition and maintenance in 21 (24.4%). General assessments appear in 20 comments (23.3%) and are usually favorable or qualified. Positive overall assessments sometimes coexist with concerns about specific spaces or services.

Themes about campus facilities and resources

Theme	n (%) N = 86	Theme summary
Technology and technical support	36 41.9%	Comments describe unreliable classroom equipment, wireless connections, and software, along with concerns about computer replacement and device restrictions. Other comments recognize improved equipment, useful resources, and responsive support staff. Requests include more dependable maintenance, clearer installation timelines, and access to suitable software.
Classroom design and scheduling	26 30.2%	Comments request movable furniture, more board space, and rooms suited to collaborative teaching. Respondents also describe mismatches between course enrollment or teaching needs and assigned rooms, limited usable space, and travel constraints between classes. Some comments acknowledge adequate rooms or access to flexible seating.
Facilities condition and maintenance	21 24.4%	Comments identify aging spaces and furniture, temperature problems, leaks, flooding, and cleaning concerns. Respondents request updates, regular maintenance, and more timely repairs. Other comments describe disruption during renovations or maintenance. Some acknowledge improvements while identifying remaining needs.
General assessments of facilities and resources	20 23.3%	These comments generally describe facilities and resources as adequate, good, or valuable for teaching and research. Some pair an overall favorable assessment with a specific concern about technology, maintenance, or space.
Office space and faculty amenities	9 10.5%	Comments describe small offices, limited privacy for student conversations, uncomfortable conditions, and a need for ergonomic furniture. Additional concerns address office sharing and water damage. Suggestions include a faculty lounge or kitchenette and improved access to everyday amenities.
Instructional resources and purchasing	9 10.5%	Requests include online teaching tools, an institution-funded platform for real-time student responses, data subscriptions, AI licenses, and student printing. Respondents also identify barriers to small purchases for supplies or student research and needs for accessibility support.
Access and campus services	7 8.1%	Comments identify parking difficulties and request better transportation between campuses. Additional suggestions address access to rooms for studying, food and other everyday services, and online health appointments.

Work Environment

Survey question: Please comment on work environment (i.e. bureaucratic procedures, workload; professional development, diversity and inclusion initiatives, sustainability initiatives). Do you have any suggestions for improvement?

A total of 69 participants commented on the work environment. The responses were predominantly critical. Heavy workloads and limited professional development resources were the main recurring concerns. Comments also addressed administrative procedures, diversity and inclusion, and sustainability. Several included suggestions for changes to recurring problems.

Themes about the work environment

Theme	Theme summary
Workload and staffing	Respondents describe heavy departmental workloads and limited time for research or professional development. Some identify a four-course teaching load each semester as a particular constraint. Suggestions include reducing workloads and hiring additional faculty and administrators.
Professional development	Comments describe limited funds for travel and conferences. Respondents identify a $900 travel allowance as insufficient in relation to airfare and conference costs and request increased support for professional development.
Administrative procedures	Respondents describe changes to online tools without sufficient training and difficulty completing travel and purchase reimbursements for faculty and students. Suggestions include clearer training, more workable reimbursement procedures, and fewer administrative steps.
Diversity and inclusion	Views differ. Five responses request more diversity and inclusion initiatives or support. Three oppose these initiatives or question their legitimacy or legality. One response describes the university as doing what it can within the current political environment.
Sustainability	Comments suggest university-level options for collecting or managing recycling, rather than assigning that responsibility to individual departments.

Compensation and Recognition

Survey question: Please comment on compensation & recognition (i.e. pay, health benefits, investments, employee benefits, faculty awards). Do you have any suggestions for improvement?

Comments on compensation and recognition describe concerns about salary adequacy, equity, and compensation for required work. Health and employee benefits receive favorable assessments, and some respondents are satisfied with their compensation. Views of recognition and awards are mixed, with comments calling for broader access to recognition and more direct forms of compensation.

Themes about compensation and recognition

Theme	Theme summary
Salary adequacy	Respondents describe salaries as falling behind inflation, living expenses, peer institutions, or professional practice. Some report needing additional income to support their families, while others express satisfaction with their compensation.
Salary equity	Comments question pay differences within and across departments and whether salaries adequately recognize experience. Some respondents perceive that percentage-based raises widen existing differences in pay.
Compensation studies	Respondents question the credibility and transparency of salary studies and the institutions used for comparison. Some report that the findings do not reflect their experience or result in meaningful changes to compensation.
Workload and uncompensated work	Comments describe required work without additional compensation, including summer responsibilities on nine-month contracts. Respondents also identify uneven teaching and service demands, limited vacation opportunities for year-round faculty, and less preparation time under the revised academic calendar.
Outside employment	Some respondents describe restrictions on adjunct teaching elsewhere as limiting their ability to supplement salaries. They also raise concerns about the possible effect on faculty retention.
Recognition and awards	Views are mixed. Some respondents seek broader recognition for non-tenured, junior, and mid-career faculty. Others describe perceived favoritism, burdensome nominations, or an emphasis on self-promotion. Suggested alternatives include salary increases, stipends, and teaching-load reductions.
Benefits and support	Health benefits receive favorable comments. Suggestions include improved dental and vision coverage, tuition benefits for dependents, childcare, retirement and tax-planning assistance, benefits programming accessible at RUC, and better enrollment support.

Generative AI Opportunities and Challenges

Survey question: What do you see as the most significant opportunities and/or challenges that generative AI presents for Radford University?

A total of 87 comments were analyzed on the opportunities and challenges of generative AI. Student learning and independent thinking is the most frequently identified theme, appearing in 32 comments (36.8%), followed by education, curriculum, and resources in 28 (32.2%) and academic integrity and assessment in 24 (27.6%). Comments identify potential uses alongside concerns about learning, institutional guidance, and broader risks. Views differ on whether AI should be adopted, restricted, or used differently across disciplines.

Generative AI opportunities and challenges

Theme	n (%) N = 87	Theme summary
Student learning and independent thinking	32 36.8%	Comments commonly express concern that AI may replace students' writing, thinking, and practice rather than support learning. Respondents describe unreviewed outputs and possible gaps in disciplinary knowledge. Other comments identify potential benefits when students retain independent judgment and use AI as an aid.
Education curriculum and resources	28 32.2%	Comments call for faculty preparation, student education, and changes to curriculum or assessment. Respondents identify needs for ethical-use guidance, support for online teaching, and access to appropriate tools. They also describe different levels of familiarity with AI and the work required to adapt courses.
Academic integrity and assessment	24 27.6%	Comments question whether work completed outside class reliably demonstrates students' learning and describe challenges in identifying or responding to unauthorized use. Suggested responses include assessment redesign and more in-person work. A differing perspective favors collective responsibility over a primary focus on detection.
Policy and institutional practices	20 23.0%	Comments request clearer institutional guidance and consistent expectations. Respondents also question faculty or administrative uses, including grading, communication, and work outside an individual's expertise. Some welcome institutional discussion of AI; others express concern about the direction or pace of adoption.
Accuracy ethics and broader risks	20 23.0%	Comments identify ethical questions and the need to evaluate outputs rather than accept them uncritically. Additional concerns involve bias, student information, environmental effects, and scams.
Applications and potential benefits	16 18.4%	Comments identify uses for AI in preparing teaching materials, improving feedback, assisting research, supporting administrative processes, and developing professional skills. Some describe benefits already experienced, while others describe possibilities. Respondents also qualify these benefits with concerns about learning and the need for disciplinary expertise.
Faculty roles and higher education	11 12.6%	Comments question whether AI may replace instruction or reduce the perceived value of a degree. Other concerns address pressure to adopt AI and graduates' preparation or reputation. Some comments identify opportunities to emphasize human interaction, research mentorship, and experiential learning.
Effects on faculty workload	8 9.2%	Comments focus on the time and effort associated with AI. Some anticipate relief from routine work, including test preparation, updated notes, and accessible materials. Others describe a learning curve, increased monitoring of student work, more assignments and grading, and greater demands on teaching.
General views and uncertainty	8 9.2%	These comments express broad support, opposition, concern, uncertainty, or limited interest without elaborating a specific issue covered above. Views include support for wider student use and a perception that negative attitudes toward AI hinder adoption.

Actions to Address Generative AI Opportunities and Challenges

Survey question: What action(s) would you take to address these perceived opportunities or challenges?

A total of 64 comments were analyzed on actions to address the opportunities and challenges of generative AI. Faculty development and resources is the most frequently identified theme, appearing in 15 comments (23.4%). Policy and consistent expectations and student education and literacy each appear in 12 (18.8%). Broader institutional concerns appear in 13 comments (20.3%) and address morale or university operations beyond AI. The table summarizes actions proposed by respondents.

Proposed actions for generative AI opportunities and challenges

Theme	n (%) N = 64	Theme summary
Faculty development and resources	15 23.4%	Comments request workshops, practical guides, expert support, and access to AI tools. Suggestions also include continued investment in AI laboratories, collaboration across departments, and preparation for online teaching. Respondents describe different starting levels of experience and interest in participating in professional development.
Broader institutional concerns	13 20.3%	These comments propose changes to compensation, workload, staffing, shared governance, and institutional priorities. Others address registration, scheduling, campus community, or student preparation. These comments do not specify an AI-related action.
Policy and consistent expectations	12 18.8%	Suggestions include an institutional policy, clear expectations for students and faculty, and guidance about appropriate use. Proposals differ in scope, ranging from responsible adoption to minimal use or restrictions on grading. Other suggestions emphasize disciplinary expertise and empirical evidence in decision making.
Student education and literacy	12 18.8%	Respondents suggest incorporating AI literacy into introductory courses, offering a dedicated course, or providing annual training. Comments emphasize appropriate use, limitations, and ethical questions alongside career preparation. Some describe direct conversations with students about both opportunities and concerns.
Faculty participation and choice	10 15.6%	Comments call for faculty involvement, recognition of teaching expertise, and meaningful governance. Some seek room for debate and individual choice about AI use. A contrasting proposal favors institution-wide restrictions to reduce inconsistent expectations.
Teaching and responsible use	10 15.6%	Suggestions include in-class work without devices, curricular changes, attention to human skills, and checking generated information. Respondents also propose using AI within existing expertise and recognizing appropriate use. Views differ on how extensively AI should be incorporated into instruction.
Academic integrity procedures	8 12.5%	Comments request understandable review pathways, consistent consequences, and procedures faculty can use confidently. Suggestions include reviewing the honor code and existing academic integrity processes. A request for reliable detection tools appears alongside uncertainty about how to enforce expectations.
Uncertainty or no specific action	8 12.5%	Comments state uncertainty about what action would be effective or provide little detail about a proposed response. Some express concern or urgency without identifying a course of action.

Radford and RUC Integration

Survey question: Please comment on the integration of the Radford campus and RUC Roanoke campus.

A total of 50 faculty members commented on integration between Radford and Radford University Carilion (RUC). Thirty-four responses (68.0%) were described as negative or critical, with concerns about campus separation, resources, planning, and travel. Eight responses (16.0%) were neutral or indicated limited familiarity. Favorable comments recognized gradual progress, opportunities in Roanoke, and potential benefits of the new building.

Themes about Radford and RUC integration

Theme	n (%) N = 50	Theme summary
Campus separation and culture	19 38.0%	Comments describe campuses operating separately and retaining distinct cultures. Some question whether a new building alone will resolve the differences or create a stronger sense of one institution.
Planning and program direction	14 28.0%	Respondents describe the merger as rushed and insufficiently informed by departmental input. Concerns include uncertainty about non-healthcare programs, future curriculum pathways, and the absence of a clear strategic direction.
Resources and amenities	11 22.0%	Comments identify differences in access to student health services, a bookstore, dining, parking, and student activities. Respondents view these differences as evidence of uneven institutional support.
Travel between campuses	9 18.0%	Respondents describe the interstate commute as tiring and difficult to coordinate with other responsibilities. Comments also identify the absence of a shuttle between campuses as a constraint.
Local identity and leadership	6 12.0%	Comments call for a clearer identity for the Roanoke location and independent leadership responsive to local or departmental needs.
Progress in integration	6 12.0%	Favorable comments describe gradual improvement in inclusion within university events and increased interaction between campuses.
Naming and institutional identity	4 8.0%	Respondents describe confusion associated with naming conventions and continuing references to Carilion and former Jefferson College structures. Some suggest changing these references to clarify institutional identity.
Clinical and community opportunities	4 8.0%	Comments recognize the benefits of clinical research, community partnerships, and clinical practicum opportunities available in Roanoke.
New facilities	2 4.0%	Comments express optimism that the new building will bring together the currently dispersed Roanoke locations.
Successful cross-campus operations	2 4.0%	These comments describe integration as successful and report that teaching and operations across campuses are working smoothly.

Overall Perception and Satisfaction Among Faculty

Quantitative Summary.

Table 9 demonstrates considerable positive upswing in faculty satisfaction with Radford University. The most dramatic improvements are in faculty perception of the university's reputation among colleagues (SAT1 and SAT11) and the public (SAT3). It is interesting to note that responses showing some of the most dramatic improvement (SAT1, SAT2, SAT3, SAT10) are on questions that also improved from 2023 to 2024, representing an ongoing trend toward more positive faculty morale and more positive perception of the university overall.

Table 9. Questions about Overall Satisfaction at Radford University.

	2014	2015	2017	2018	2020	2021	2023	2024	2026	2026 sdev	2026 dist
SAT1. My Radford colleagues express a positive attitude about the state of the university.	2.51	2.55	2.99	3.01	3.04	2.57	2.25	2.67	3.17 ↑	1.102	
SAT2. I am satisfied with the current state of the University.	2.56	2.68	3.02	3.00	3.12	2.58	2.25	2.71	3.24 ↑	1.118	
SAT3. I believe the University has a positive image in the local and regional community.	2.90	2.98	3.16	3.16	3.45	3.19	2.83	3.22	3.55 ↑	1.024	
SAT4. I believe the University helps me to succeed in my profession.	*	*	*	*	3.53	3.26	3.16	3.24	3.47 ↑	1.127	
SAT5. I believe that my teaching activities are valued here.	*	*	*	*	3.82	3.58	3.55	3.53	3.55	1.193	
SAT6. I believe that my research activities are valued here.	*	*	*	*	3.31	3.14	3.02	3.07	3.13	1.272	
SAT7. I believe that my service activities are valued here.	*	*	*	*	3.63	3.39	3.20	3.27	3.28	1.276	
SAT8. The future of this University is important to me.	4.50	4.56	4.52	4.53	4.53	4.55	4.51	4.46	4.36	.966	
SAT9. If I had it to do over again, I would still choose this University.	3.36	3.58	3.69	3.69	3.82	3.50	3.39	3.43	3.68 ↑	1.203	
SAT10. I believe morale among faculty is positive.	2.40	2.49	2.91	2.89	2.87	2.36	2.19	2.46	2.85 ↑	1.182	
SAT11. I am proud to be part of this University.	*	*	*	*	3.97	3.63	3.57	3.67	3.71	1.091	
SAT12. Overall, I am satisfied with my job.	3.25	3.47	3.60	3.56	3.81	3.42	3.35	3.35	3.56	1.125	

Miscellaneous Comments

Survey question: Is there anything that has not been covered in the prior questions, positive or negative, that you would like to express here?

A total of 50 participants provided miscellaneous comments. Forty responses (80.0%) were categorized as negative and 10 (20.0%) as positive. The comments describe concerns about workload, shared governance, student preparation, and academic priorities. One response expresses a favorable assessment of both the Provost and the President.

Themes in miscellaneous feedback

Theme	n (%) N = 50	Theme summary
Workload and recognition of required work	17 34.0%	Respondents describe increasing responsibilities without corresponding reductions elsewhere or adequate recognition and compensation. Comments connect workload to effects on health, family life, and time for research.
Leadership and shared governance	16 32.0%	Comments question whether senior administration, particularly the Provost, gives sufficient consideration to faculty views. Respondents describe decisions as centralized and relationships as increasingly strained. Comments also question whether survey results will be shared or lead to changes.
Student needs and academic priorities	13 26.0%	Respondents describe students as arriving with less preparation and greater support needs. Other comments express concern that the arts, humanities, and smaller programs receive less attention than health sciences and STEM fields.