

SENATE SURVEY OF FACULTY OPINIONS

1999

VG= Very Good/Strongly Agree G= Good/ Agree N= Neutral P=Poor/Disagree VP=Very Poor/Strongly Disagree

Two-hundred-thirty-one surveys were returned. Giving non-numerical values such as "good", "neutral", etc. a numerical value is a questionable practice and therefore no mean and standard deviation is reported. The first four columns list the percentages of responses (rounded to the nearest percent) given for each answer. For those who wish to look at a single indicator, the median is provided in the last column.

My personal impression:

	VG	G	N	P	VP	Median
1. faculty morale is	3	32	24	32	9	N
2. the Senate's focus (i.e., choice of issues) is	4	34	38	14	11	N
3. the Senate's performance in communicating faculty concerns to the University administration is	8	34	29	18	11	N

In my view:

4. the expectation that a faculty member must be proficient in all professional areas (teaching, research, and service) is	11	33	13	28	16	N
5. there should be a cost of living adjustment for satisfactory performance	45	42	6	3	3	G
6. salary increases should be based primarily on merit	24	39	14	13	10	G
7. the faculty has significant influence on University decision-making	1	6	22	37	34	P
8. the faculty has significant influence on College level decision-making	5	21	29	26	19	N
9. the faculty has significant influence on Department level decision-making	23	42	15	10	9	G
10. the University's governance system is	2	17	35	29	17	N
11. the University's spending priorities are	1	16	38	28	16	N
12. the University's administrative responsiveness to faculty concerns is	3	13	25	32	27	P

I rate:

13. the University President's job performance as	16	38	32	9	6	G
14. the University Provost's job performance as	7	24	20	20	29	N
15. my Dean's job performance as	23	32	17	13	14	G
16. my Department Head's job performance as	36	31	12	7	14	G
17. my working conditions as	11	48	21	11	9	G
18. my job satisfaction as	20	38	26	10	6	G
19. my working relations with other faculty as	39	53	6	1	1	G

down
not
AM
Stone

1999 Faculty Senate Comments:

Morale Survey:

1. I find faculty morale in my dept. to be fairly high **in spite of** adverse working conditions. I would like to explain my answer to **each** of these items on the questionnaire. Do you plan to schedule focus groups and develop your finding more fully?

2. Under Arvin's leadership, the Senate has become a "Farce"

3. He should pay more attention to improving the efficiency of the faculty in instruction. There exist far too many little "Director's" who receive release time from instruction. I could save thousands of dollars per semester in my department. He should pay more attention to the direction of University Athletics. We are heading for lots of trouble if a plan is not formulated soon and then implemented.

4. The Senate's performance this year has been very disappointing. Either it has really not addressed significant issues, or, if it has, has done an extraordinarily poor job of communicating its work to the faculty. Perhaps this last year's performance, or lack thereof, is contributing to the notion that the Senate has become ineffective and should be suspended by a new University Senate.

5. The Senate has allowed itself to be preempted by the VPAA. The Senate has lost its way in an effort to get along with the VP & Pres.

6. The problem with the Faculty Senate is a problem of leadership. The present chair seems more interested in serving as head cheerleader for Pres. Ransdell than in promoting Faculty issues.

7. #5 of course this requires that there is a standard which must be met to perform "satisfactory". This standard should not be merely the absence of official student complaints.

8. It is hard to feel satisfied when new faculty members in the University come in earning twice my salary, and especially when I know I am an educator, and I see results of that in my students everyday! This is even more frustrating since my efforts to get consulting to fill the salary gap are now being discouraged with threats of consequences if I try to earn more money.

9. As far as I can tell, the Senate is ignored by most of the most productive and active faculty. Its leadership is too easily co-opted into focusing on narrow agendas and swallowing the important issues. The Senate and its leaders need to wake up to the fact that we WKU's academic leadership is terrible. Dr. Burch is a junior high principal masquerading as an University Provost. A spirit of cooperation is fine as long as the administrators with whom the Senate cooperates are competent and reasonable. Dr. Burch meets neither of these standards, yet the Senate leadership treats her as if she demands respect and even deference, wake up!

10. Provost & President are micro-managing areas they said they would not micro-manage. Both have no support from faculty or staff

11. I feel that faculty morale is poor mainly because we are not valued by the administration. The message we get in many forms is that administrators come first, students come second, and the faculty are at the bottom. When a mass e-mail went to all faculty quoting the Institutional Review's recommendations that

WKU “ replenishes aging faculty with new blood and do so with individuals who are nationally competitive,” the faculty was publicly insulted. How can we expect our students to respect us when the administration so blatantly does not?

12. Post Tenure Review is supposed to help or get rid of ‘dead wood’ faculty. Why doesn’t the administration get rid of out-of-date dead wood Dept heads?

13. #15 Our interim (CEBS) recently helped file a sexual harassment complaint (against two male professors in Education) over an incident that should have been handled **within the unit**. The university is going to pay the price for his poor judgement and the resulting fallout.

14. Dr. Burch needs to truly delegate decision-making to her Deans. Her style of micro-managing is detrimental. Dr. Ransdell has emphasized decentralization, but it stops at the provost level.

15. Too much wait time, micro-management at provost level! Does President realize we have an academic component?

16. Faculty morale seems to be getting worse-I’m new, but that’s my take on it!

17. Faculty morale is very low due to a mishandling of a harassment some by the Dean of COE and dept head of SISTE. The tactics of the EOE director and university counsel border on gestapo tactics. Several faculty have begun looking at employment opportunities elsewhere. I don’t see how morale could be lower and morale will only improve when the University--Dean, Dept head, EOE director and counsel--treat faculty professionally and as human beings! Could the faculty senate investigate this and save us!

18. #12 It’s getting better

#14 Improving, but far too many decisions have been made by her office with little communication with/to faculty.

19. The Faculty Senate needs more dynamic leadership, not radical restructuring--the failure is one of personnel, not institutions. The current revamping of faculty governance is a shell game designed to reduce faculty participation in real decision making under the cover of augmenting their **theoretical** power. I note that almost every committee in which faculty raise true concerns is called “inefficient” and every one which rubber stamps administrative policy is “successful”--This is a clear message of an administration determined to avoid true shared governance.