

**To:** Members of the Faculty Assembly

**From:** Members of the Non-Tenure Track Faculty Committee:

Norah Mazel (Co-Chair), Christine Robinson (Co-Chair), Sheri Colcun-Trumfheller, Suzanne Cook, K.C. Craig, Christy Lofton, Ceil Malek (ex-officio), Laura Marshall, and Dana Wortman

**Date:** September 28, 2015

---

University of Colorado at Colorado Springs (UCCS)

**Non-Tenure Track Faculty Committee of Faculty Assembly  
Report of Recommendations**

Since 2007 the growth of full-time and part-time non-tenure track faculty (NTTF) has outpaced that of tenure track faculty (TTF) at UCCS.<sup>1</sup> This increase reflects a national hiring trend among postsecondary institutions and has largely been in response to the recent growth of our campus and student body. NTTF continue to make extraordinary contributions toward fulfilling the university's vision and mission through a multitude of roles including lecturer, instructor, laboratory coordinator, clinical supervisor, researcher, and librarian. Notably, many of these faculty members have dedicated years of service to UCCS, earned promotions, and demonstrated excellence in their respective roles.

Since the university has a vested interest in keeping these valuable faculty members employed at our institution, the NTTF Committee is dedicated to providing a space for NTTF members to voice concerns so that the committee might advocate on their behalf. Toward this end, the committee conducted a campus-wide survey of NTTF in 2006 and again in 2015 to gauge current working conditions and degree of job satisfaction. Since the forthcoming recommendations are largely informed by survey data, the committee is pleased to report that the 2015 survey data reflects significantly more voices among NTTF members than the 2006 data. In comparison, the 2015 data represents a 280% increase in total response rate (from 60 to 228 total NTTF participants), an even more dramatic increase in lecturer participation (from 5 to 66 lecturers), and a better distribution of responses among colleges.

The committee is also pleased to report that the 2015 survey data suggests some progress has been made in the past eight years regarding the status and working conditions of NTTF at UCCS. The committee finds a higher degree of satisfaction in the areas of academic freedom, schedule, and respect for NTTF in some departments. Other positive data is found in the area of online teaching. Individual teaching preferences were taken into account for the majority of survey participants who teach either fully online or hybrid courses, as 82% report doing so by choice.

The 2015 survey results also point to substantial areas still in need of improvement. Financial compensation remains the most prominent concern. Service components of workload, career advancement, office space, and respect for NTTF on campus are also salient areas of concern. The NTTF Committee therefore respectfully submits the following recommendations informed by survey data, as well as various committee work and anecdotal evidence.

---

First, the NTTF Committee recommends that the university makes ensuring all NTTF are compensated appropriately for their significant contributions a top priority. Some progress has been made due to recent salary adjustments for uncompensated merit and this is much appreciated. The committee holds that future salary adjustment processes might allocate the pool of funds more equitably. In the 2014-2015 salary adjustments for uncompensated merit, only 27% of the available compensation funds was allocated to NTTF when the salary adjustment model chosen by the university later revealed that at least 45% of the total amount of funds was needed to relieve compression among NTTF. The committee requests that future distributions of funds more closely align with this demonstrated need. In addition, the committee points to the need for a similar study of lecturer salaries to ensure minimum benchmarks are being met for these faculty members.

The NTTF Committee celebrates that salary benchmarks for full-time instructors continue to be adjusted appropriately for inflation and market conditions. As in years past, however, the more significant adjustments to salaries of new hires in the instructor ranks leave other pressing salary issues unresolved; in fact, they unintentionally compound the problem. The salaries of more experienced instructors, even those earning full merit pay, are dramatically surpassed very quickly. Innovative approaches to address this issue are necessary. Furthermore, the committee believes the university should address salary issues from a truly fresh perspective, as the issues are arguably more pressing in some colleges than in others. Armed with expertise in innovative and ethical business models, our institution has the potential to become a national model for compensating NTTF more appropriately across the colleges.

Second, career advancement at UCCS for NTTF is another concern requiring complex solutions. Based on survey comments and anecdotal evidence, the committee concludes there is a need for advancement opportunities beyond the senior instructor level. Additional opportunities for advancement would go a long way toward recognizing the contributions, professionalism and legitimacy of NTTF. Therefore, the committee recommends that the Associate Deans' Council, along with a task force of TT and NTT faculty, be charged with exploring opportunities for promotion beyond senior instructor with an accompanying salary increase—giving UCCS the unique opportunity to initiate this important discussion at the systemic level. For example, the task force might consider proposing new levels of instructor and a corresponding promotion sequence, such as assistant instructor (3 years), associate instructor (5 years), and master instructor (8 years). In appropriate colleges, the task force might propose an increased use of clinical teaching tracks. Whatever is decided, survey comments by NTTF suggest the need for more transparency and support within our current promotion system; therefore, the committee requests that all colleges address this now and as needed in the future.

Further, the NTTF Committee points to notable concern expressed about the existence of vastly different criteria for the promotion to senior instructor on campus. In some colleges instructors are eligible for promotion after three years, while in others instructors are not eligible until after five years, yet there is no documented explanation for this difference. Limited research by the committee indicates that some colleges know if they want to retain new faculty members within two years time, so they promote those they want to keep at three years in an attempt to ensure that end. The difference here causes an equity problem, albeit unintended, because merit pay is

based on a salary percentage, so NTTF who are promoted earlier also potentially benefit from more annual merit pay that is merely due in part to timing.

Notably, in addressing this concern, the Associate Deans' Council and proposed task force might simultaneously address the issue of uncompensated merit. For instance, one option might be to adjust the senior instructor promotional award amount relative to any adjustments made to the new hire benchmarks in the three or five years immediately prior to the faculty member's promotion. If the university wants to continue to allow colleges to determine the year of eligibility, it might consider adjusting the award amount so that it is in equal measure to the years required for eligibility. Three-year eligibility, for example, would equate to a \$3,000 award, whereas a five-year eligibility would equate to a \$5,000 award. These ideas are merely meant to begin the conversation, as the NTTF Committee trusts that the council's wealth of knowledge, perspective, and aptitude would garner more possible solutions.

Third, the committee recommends that the university conduct a comprehensive review of service agreements for instructors across colleges. Many instructors report an increase in non-teaching responsibilities at the department, college, university, and/or system level since the implementation of a 5% minimum service component across the campus. While survey comments about non-teaching responsibilities indicate that many NTTF appreciate the opportunity to be involved in other work on campus, they also indicate that in reality this work often requires more of a time commitment than allocated on annual workload plans and/or faculty responsibility statements (FRS). In fact, some survey participants report they saw an increase in service responsibilities without a corresponding decrease in teaching responsibilities. This would be problematic if found to be accurate because an increase in workload was never the intention of the inclusion of a 5% minimum service component; the original intention was to recognize the activities already being completed by faculty beyond teaching. A related concern is a difficulty in gaining clear, accurate information about how service is interpreted by specific colleges, as well as how it is being evaluated by department chairs and program directors. This ambiguity leaves NTTF uncertain about how to improve merit review service scores, so the committee suggests that the comprehensive review include the evaluation of service across colleges. Further, the committee recommends that the Associate Deans' Council be charged to work with representatives of the NTTF Committee to recommend best practices to the colleges and to assist in the adaptation of these practices to the particular circumstances of each college. Clear guidelines might also be developed for distribution to faculty if deemed necessary.

Fourth, the beautiful new Academic Office Building has certainly alleviated the need for office space for NTTF to some extent, as 14% more survey participants indicate having a private office space in 2015 than in 2006. Unfortunately, there is evidence that the issue still exists; case in point, there was a significant increase in those without an office space at all (from 0 to 40 participants)—an increase likely due in part to the higher response rates from lecturers, clinical faculty, and half-time instructors. Approximately 14% of survey participants still indicate they share a space with two or more office mates, and some even report that students often complain about feeling claustrophobic in their offices. Sharing an office with two or more colleagues renders a space inadequate for holding office hours, time that often involves advising, conferencing about projects, and discussing academic status with students, thereby raising significant concerns for faculty about student privacy rights. With this in mind, the NTTF

Committee recommends that the university finds meaningful ways to continue addressing this issue, perhaps reviewing the current use of space on campus, and ensuring that office space be taken into account whenever new construction occurs.

Finally, the survey data reveals an enduring need for cultivating more respect in some colleges and departments for the contributions of NTTF. More specifically, some survey participants suggest that their department chairs and/or program directors may strongly favor the contributions of TT over NTT faculty, a bias that potentially affects the ability to evaluate NTTF fairly. While the committee finds this issue varies widely across colleges and departments, in keeping with the university's vision to see NTTF more broadly understood, recognized and supported, the committee suggests that the university design and implement more complex and stringent standards for the evaluation of all college, department, and program heads. The NTTF Committee further recommends that individuals in leadership positions strive to consistently model the respectful treatment of faculty across ranks, while at the same time the committee wishes to recognize the significant efforts by many in this area.

The NTTF Committee sincerely hopes the university will continue to strive to understand how these areas of concern impact its ability to retain and recruit quality NTTF. Quite tellingly, 57% of survey participants indicate having worked at UCCS for 5 years or less. While this is certainly due in part to recent campus growth, it is also due to a lack of faculty retention. Thus, the committee closes with a call to action: a timely implementation of needed changes so that the university might retain faculty members who are so crucial to the university's continued success and realization of its mission.

---

<sup>1</sup> According to "Employees By Primary Job Category" (2014) by the Office of Institutional Research at UCCS

# NTTF Survey 2015

Last Modified: 03/10/2015

1. How many years have you worked at UCCS (do not include student employment unless it was teaching)?

#	Answer	Bar	Response	%
1	1		32	14%
2	2		27	12%
3	3		28	12%
4	4		30	13%
5	5		14	6%
6	6		14	6%
7	7		11	5%
8	8		7	3%
9	9		5	2%
10	10		15	7%
11	11		7	3%
12	12		6	3%
13	13		1	0%
14	14		7	3%
15	15		7	3%
16	16		3	1%
17	17		2	1%
18	18		2	1%
19	19		1	0%
20	20		0	0%
21	>20		11	5%
	Total		230	

2. What is the FTE equivalent of your appointment?.

#	Answer	Bar	Response	%
1	25% or less		26	12%
2			9	4%
3	25%		5	2%
4	30%		3	1%
5	35%		0	0%
6	40%		3	1%
7	45%		7	3%
8	50%		11	5%
9	55%		1	0%
10	60%		1	0%
11	65%		0	0%
12	70%		0	0%
13	75%		7	3%
14	80%		3	1%
15	85%		1	0%
16	90%		0	0%
17	95%		6	3%
18	100%		86	39%
19	Not sure of the FTE, but I am part time		32	14%
20	Not sure of the FTE, but I am full time		20	9%
	Total		221	

3. What is your gender?

#	Answer	Bar	Response	%
1	Female		142	62%
2	Male		80	35%
3	Transgender		0	0%
4	I choose not to answer		8	3%
	Total		230	

4. What is your college?

#	Answer	Bar	Response	%
1	Beth-El College of Nursing & Health Sciences		33	14%
2	College of Business		24	11%
3	College of Education		18	8%
4	College of Engineering & Applied Sciences		20	9%
5	College of Letters, Arts, & Sciences		118	52%
6	Kraemer Family Library		4	2%
7	School of Public Affairs		11	5%
	Total		228	

5. What is your appointment?

#	Answer	Bar	Response	%
1	Instructor		84	37%
2	Senior Instructor		55	24%
3	Lecturer		66	29%
4	Clinical Teaching Faculty		7	3%
5	Research Faculty		4	2%
6	Professional Research Assistant (PRA)		3	1%
7	Other, please specify:		9	4%
	Total		228	

6. How many different courses do you typically teach during the academic year (Fall and Spring combined)? For example, English 1000, 1150, 2020, and 2080 would be 4 different courses. (If your load includes coordinating internships, placements, etc. you will have a chance to expand on this in a later question.)

#	Answer	Bar	Response	%
1	1		30	14%
2	2		67	31%
3	3		33	15%
4	4		38	18%
5	5		21	10%
6	More than 8, please specify:		3	1%
7	6		11	5%
8	7		5	2%
9	8		8	4%
	Total		216	

7. How many total class sections do you typically teach during the academic year?

#	Answer	Bar	Response	%
1	1		16	8%
2	2		34	16%
3	3		20	10%
4	4		34	16%
5	5		16	8%
6	6		13	6%
7	7		13	6%
8	8		35	17%
9	More than 8, please specify:		28	13%
	Total		209	

8. How many credit hours do you typically teach during the academic year?

#	Answer	Bar	Response	%
1	6 or less		48	23%
2	25 - 36		36	17%
4	More than 36, please specify:		11	5%
5	7 - 12		43	20%
6	13 - 24		75	35%
	Total		213	

9. How many of the credit hours in the previous question typically are an overload?

#	Answer	Bar	Response	%
1	0		136	67%
2	1 - 3		30	15%
3	4 - 6		23	11%
4	7 - 12		9	4%
5	More than 12		5	2%
	Total		203	

11. How many students do you have in all your class sections combined in an average semester?

#	Answer	Bar	Response	%
1	Fewer than 30		57	27%
2	30 - 49		37	17%
3	50 - 99		65	30%
4	100-150		30	14%
5	More than 150, please specify:		25	12%
	Total		214	

More than 150, please specify:
172
175
164 this semester, 175 last
300-350
around 200 per semester
200
160
160
200
300
470
160
180-230
175
160-170
over 200
350
150-175
170
165
250
500-600
Lots of classes
180

12. Do you teach classes or sections of 50 or more students?

#	Answer	Bar	Response	%
1	Yes		46	22%
2	No		167	78%
	Total		213	

13. How much time per week on average do you spend preparing/grading for a course?

#	Answer	Bar	Response	%
1	2-3 hours		19	9%
2	4-8 hours		82	38%
3	9-12 hours		72	33%
4	More than 12 hours, please specify:		42	20%
	Total		215	

14. Do you have input regarding your own teaching schedule?

#	Answer	Bar	Response	%
1	Yes		180	84%
2	No		34	16%
	Total		214	

15. Are you assigned the teaching schedules that you prefer?

#	Answer	Bar	Response	%
1	Yes		153	71%
2	No		24	11%
3	Other, please specify:		37	17%
	Total		214	

16. Do you teach any online courses?

#	Answer	Bar	Response	%
1	Yes, I teach completely online courses		51	24%
2	Yes, I teach hybrid online courses		24	11%
3	No		141	65%
	Total		216	

17. Is it your choice to teach online?

#	Answer	Bar	Response	%
1	Yes		60	82%
2	No		13	18%
	Total		73	

18. How much time do you devote to your online classes per week?

#	Answer	Bar	Response	%
1	2-3 hours		5	7%
2	4-8 hours		32	44%
3	9-12 hours		22	30%
4	Other, please specify:		14	19%
	Total		73	

19. Do you receive additional compensation for teaching online?

#	Answer	Bar	Response	%
1	Yes		8	11%
2	No		65	89%
	Total		73	

20. How many students on average do you teach in your online classes per academic semester?

#	Answer	Bar	Response	%
1	Fewer than 20		19	26%
2	20 - 39		34	47%
3	40 - 80		14	19%
4	More than 80		5	7%
	Total		72	

22. Do you typically teach at UCCS during the summer?

#	Answer	Bar	Response	%
1	Yes		82	38%
2	No		131	62%
	Total		213	

23. Does your department expect you to teach in the summer?

#	Answer	Bar	Response	%
1	Yes		26	32%
2	No		56	68%

24. When you teach in the summer, do you receive:

#	Answer	Bar	Response	%
1	summer lecturer wages		42	52%
2	more than lecturers, but less than tenure track faculty in your department		26	32%
3	other, please specify:		13	16%
	Total		81	

26. Do you have responsibilities other than teaching that are part of your appointment (service, professional development, research, etc)?

#	Answer	Bar	Response	%
1	Yes		138	62%
2	No		86	38%
	Total		224	

27. What is the nature of those responsibilities? Please check all that apply.

#	Answer	Bar	Response	%
1	Advising		41	31%
2	Research		17	13%
3	Service within your department		105	78%
4	Service on college/university/system/community committees		69	51%
5	Other, please specify:		30	22%

28. What typical percentage of your workload constitutes non-teaching duties in your Faculty Responsibility Statement (FRS) / workload agreement?

Mean: 22.33%  
 Median: 20%  
 Mode: 5%  
 (127 responses)

29. Do you think that the expectations for these responsibilities are reasonable?

#	Answer	Bar	Response	%
1	Yes		103	77%
2	No		30	23%
	Total		133	

30. Are you able to meet these expectations?

#	Answer	Bar	Response	%
1	Yes		123	94%
2	No		8	6%
	Total		131	

32. Which type of employee supervises and/or evaluates you?

#	Answer	Bar	Response	%
1	Dean or Associate Dean		15	7%
2	Department Chair		115	53%
3	Tenure Track Faculty Member		19	9%
4	Non-Tenure Track Faculty Member		3	1%
5	Program Director		43	20%
6	Class Coordinator		3	1%
7	No one		13	6%
8	Other, please specify:		7	3%
	Total		218	

33. Are you included in departmental meetings?

#	Answer	Bar	Response	%
1	Yes, I attend regularly		118	54%
2	I do not attend by choice		8	4%
3	No		61	28%
4	I do not know		4	2%
5	Other, please specify:		28	13%
	Total		219	

34. Do you share an office?

#	Answer	Bar	Response	%
1	Yes, with 1 other person		43	20%
2	Yes, with 2 or more other persons		31	14%
3	No, I do not share an office		86	39%
4	I have no office to use		40	18%
5	I am not sure		1	0%
6	Other, please specify:		17	8%
	Total		218	

35. Check each item on the list with which you are unfamiliar or would not know where to find information.

#	Answer	Bar	Response	%
1	Grievance procedures		66	53%
2	Evaluation policies and procedures		47	38%
3	Promotion process		75	60%
4	Faculty Governance / Faculty Assembly		45	36%
5	Orientation for campus, college, or program		32	26%
6	Employment contracts		29	23%
7	Personnel & Benefits		19	15%
8	Campus dates and deadlines		6	5%
9	IT policies and procedures		19	15%
10	Library resources		8	6%
11	Required trainings (conflict of interest, sexual harassment, etc.)		24	19%
12	Departmental/College teaching policies		35	28%
13	Academic honor code and academic honesty policies		8	6%
14	Exemplary teaching practices		59	47%
15	Teaching with technology		37	30%

40. What do you like about your job at UCCS?

	What do you like about your job at UCCS?
Students	97 - 0.54
Colleagues	67 - 0.39
Academic Freedom	31 - 0.18 
Schedule	28 - 0.15
Teaching	27 - 0.16 
Work Environment	21 - 0.12 
Intellectual Challenge	14 - 0.08 
Classroom Facilities	4 - 0.02 
Online Classes	3 - 0.02 
Professional Development	3 - 0.02 
Class Size	2 - 0.01 
Office Space	2 - 0.01 

\*Categorized from 173 free text entry responses

41. What do you not like about your job?

	What do you not like about your job?
Salary	61 - 0.37
Parking	17 - 0.11
Lack of Respect	10 - 0.06
Communication	10 - 0.06
Advancing in Department	10 - 0.06
Office Space	9 - 0.05
Grading	8 - 0.05
Schedule	8 - 0.04
Increasing Demands	7 - 0.04
Job Security	7 - 0.04
Professional Development	8 - 0.05
Students	6 - 0.02
Politics/Climate	5 - 0.03
Campus Administration	4 - 0.02
Benefits	4 - 0.02
Department Chair/Leaders	4 - 0.03
Administrative Paperwork	4 - 0.03
FCQ	4 - 0.02
Class Size	3 - 0.02
Classroom Facilities	3 - 0.02
Online Classes	3 - 0.02
Teaching Standards	2 - 0.01

\*Categorized from 159 free text entry responses

42. How important are the following for your job satisfaction?

#	Question	Not at all important	Very Unimportant	Somewhat Unimportant	Neither Important nor Unimportant	Somewhat Important	Very Important	Extremely Important	Total Responses	Mean
1	Salary	1	9	11	6	61	64	54	206	5.55
2	Student contact	1	8	1	7	26	86	73	202	5.97
3	Preparing course content	5	5	1	11	29	91	63	205	5.82
4	Receiving mentoring	13	13	22	28	65	50	14	205	4.59
5	Quality of supervision	11	5	8	35	58	49	39	205	5.08
6	Departmental respect for NTTF	6	4	4	20	32	70	68	204	5.70
7	Professional development	7	9	10	21	47	67	45	206	5.30
8	Departmental activities	11	6	16	54	62	42	15	206	4.63
9	Working with colleagues	6	6	12	20	48	71	41	204	5.33
10	Intellectual environment	1	8	2	10	45	69	70	205	5.81
11	Personal development	5	7	5	16	40	66	65	204	5.63
12	Training/support for teaching	6	8	6	19	45	68	53	205	5.46
13	Inclusion in the UCCS community	6	6	9	25	57	62	40	205	5.28

Statistic	Salary	Student contact	Preparing course content	Receiving mentoring	Quality of supervision	Departmental respect for NTTF	Professional development	Departmental activities	Working with colleagues	Intellectual environment	Personal development	Training/support for teaching	Inclusion in the UCCS community
Min Value	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Max Value	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7
Mean	5.55	5.97	5.82	4.59	5.08	5.70	5.30	4.63	5.33	5.81	5.63	5.46	5.28
Variance	1.78	1.44	1.68	2.51	2.41	2.03	2.36	2.06	2.12	1.56	2.09	2.19	2.04
Standard Deviation	1.33	1.20	1.30	1.58	1.55	1.42	1.53	1.43	1.46	1.25	1.44	1.48	1.43
Total Responses	206	202	205	205	205	204	206	206	204	205	204	205	205

43. How satisfied are you with the following with respect to your job?

#	Question	Very Dissatisfied	Dissatisfied	Somewhat Dissatisfied	Neutral	Somewhat Satisfied	Satisfied	Very Satisfied	Total Responses	Mean
1	Salary	40	31	34	17	36	41	8	207	3.64
2	Student contact	1	3	5	12	28	85	70	204	5.93
3	Preparing course content	2	2	9	19	39	76	56	203	5.67
4	Receiving mentoring	3	11	23	54	36	55	21	203	4.76
5	Quality of supervision	4	6	13	28	38	65	49	203	5.37
6	Departmental respect for NTTF	9	12	23	32	29	59	41	205	4.96
7	Professional development	6	10	24	45	36	66	17	204	4.77
8	Departmental activities	5	3	14	70	33	57	21	203	4.86
9	Working with colleagues	2	0	5	35	36	73	51	202	5.60
10	Intellectual environment	2	2	4	23	40	85	47	203	5.66
11	Personal development	4	4	15	43	38	71	29	204	5.14
12	Training/support for teaching	6	10	24	43	41	53	26	203	4.80
13	Inclusion in the UCCS community	6	9	27	50	40	46	26	204	4.72

Statistic	Salary	Student contact	Preparing course content	Receiving mentoring	Quality of supervision	Departmental respect for NTTF	Professional development	Departmental activities	Working with colleagues	Intellectual environment	Personal development	Training/support for teaching	Inclusion in the UCCS community
Min Value	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
Max Value	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7	7
Mean	3.64	5.93	5.67	4.76	5.37	4.96	4.77	4.86	5.60	5.66	5.14	4.80	4.72
Variance	3.71	1.30	1.55	2.08	2.14	2.93	2.22	1.83	1.44	1.35	1.90	2.35	2.31
Standard Deviation	1.93	1.14	1.24	1.44	1.46	1.71	1.49	1.35	1.20	1.16	1.38	1.53	1.52
Total Responses	207	204	203	203	203	205	204	203	202	203	204	203	204

DIFFERENCE BETWEEN SATISFACTION AND IMPORTANCE OF JOB FACTORS

	How satisfied are you with the following with respect to your job?  (Mean Score*)	How important are the following for your job satisfaction?  (Mean Score*)	Difference
Salary	3.64	5.5	-1.91
Student Contact	5.93	5.97	-0.04
Preparing Course Content	5.67	5.82	-0.15
Receiving Mentoring	4.76	4.59	0.17
Quality of Supervision	5.37	5.08	0.29
Departmental Respect for NTTF	4.96	5.70	-0.74
Professional Development	4.77	5.30	-0.53
Departmental Activities	4.86	4.63	0.23
Working with Colleagues	5.60	5.33	0.27
Intellectual Environment	5.66	5.81	-0.15
Personal Development	5.14	5.63	-0.49
Training/Support for Teaching	4.80	5.46	-0.66
Inclusion in the UCCS Community	4.72	5.28	-0.56

\*Responses were ranked on a scale from Not at all Important/Very Dissatisfied (1) to Extremely Important/Very Satisfied (7)