

# **President and Provost Biennial Assessment Report 2014**

## **Faculty Concerns Committee**

**Subcommittee Members:  
Joe Hulgus, Shurita Thomas Tate  
February 25, 2014**

## **2014 President and Provost Biennial Assessment Faculty Concerns Committee Report**

The Faculty Concerns Committee is charged by the Faculty Senate to conduct an Administrative Assessment. The assessment consists of three parts: 1) the President and Provost Assessment, 2) the Department Head and Dean Assessment (the IDEA assessment), and 3) the Department Conditions Evaluation. Over the past 5 years, the Faculty Senate, President, and Provost Office have worked together to create assessment instruments that can produce quality data to improve university leadership and conditions that support faculty morale and productivity. This current report describes the assessment of only the President and Provost Office.

The President and Provost Assessment, conducted online, was made available from January 13, 2014 to January 24, 2014. Completed on-line surveys consisted of 117 responses out of a total faculty pool of 714, reflecting a 16.39% response rate. In comparison, the response rate was approximately 36% in the 2011 survey. The majority of questions pertaining to President and Provost Office leadership were identical to the questions appearing in the previous two reports (2011 and 2009), which allowed for comparisons across time. As in past surveys, qualitative questions regarding the performance of the President and Provost focused on leadership actions pertinent to faculty morale, productivity, and shared governance. In addition, the faculty commented on the President's and Provost's activities related to faculty morale, development, productivity, and support for students. For this review period the faculty were asked to provide feedback about President Clif Smart and Provost Dr. Frank Einhellig. It should be noted that the last evaluation of Mr. Smart and Dr. Einhellig were done shortly after they were named Interim President and Interim Provost in July of 2011. Thus, this is the first evaluation of both men after the Board of Governors selected them to permanently occupy their previous interim positions.

### **President and Provost Findings**

Responses to quantitative items appear in Tables 1 through 3. Overall, responses were relatively consistent between the 2011 and 2014 surveys. Table 3 notes the percent change on the mean value of items between 2011 and 2014, with the 2011 values used as the base value. All mean responses in Tables 1 and 2 fell above the midpoint of 3 (neutral) on a scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). The reader will also note that the percentage of responses in the "agree" to "strongly agree" scale points from Tables 1 and 2 generally ranged between 60-70%. You will also note that for both the President and Provost, few items varied in excess of 5.0% (either increase or decrease). While generally similar trends were seen for the President, two notable departures should be mentioned. First, there were significant gender differences between male and female faculty on several questions, necessitating the presentation of results by gender of respondent. Second, as will be noted in Table 3, there were more items for the President that changed in excess of 5.0% than was seen for the Provost.

The Provost's ratings ranged from a mean of 3.58 ("... supports shared governance in seeking, considering, and integrating faculty input to make decisions.") to 3.90 ("...promotes appreciation of diversity based on cultural, individual and ideological differences" and "Overall, the MSU Provost does a good job."). The one item that diverged more than 5.0% in mean value from the 2011 findings (-5.1%) pertained to the question, "Overall, I agree with how the Provost is handling the current budget situation." The mean value for that question this time around was 3.72 (s.d. = 1.12), while the mean value in 2011 was 3.92.

As noted, the results for the President were a bit more complex than for the Provost. Mean values for the 12 items assessed pertaining to the President ranged from 3.31 to 4.03 for men and 3.94 to 4.49 for women (and from 3.58 to 4.24 overall). Further, dispersion of scores for men tended to be greater than for women (i.e., standard deviations for men ranged from 0.93 to 1.27, while for women it ranged from 0.67 to 0.97). When comparisons were performed, men and women significantly differed on three questions: (1) "... decisions and actions have strengthened the research environment at Missouri State University" ( $t = -3.275$ ,  $df = 110$ ,  $p < .001$ ), (2) "The Presidents long-range plans, initiatives and priorities support long-term interests of the University." ( $t = -3.482$ ,  $df = 110$ ,  $p < .001$ ), and (3) "Overall, I agree with how the President is handling the current budget situation." ( $t = -3.262$ ,  $df = 110$ ,  $p < .001$ ) (NOTE: all comparison Alpha levels were adjusted using a Bonferroni procedure to adjust for the experiment-wise error rate inflation). In all three cases, women rated the President significantly higher than did men. Additionally, there were 4 items that diverged more than 5.0% between the 2011 and 2014 assessments for the President, reflecting increases on all 4 items. The specific items were, "6. The President has been an effective ambassador to the local and state communities in promoting the public affairs mission." (+6.17%), "7. The President supports and promotes the integration of the public affairs mission into the life of the University community." (+8.05%), "8. The President promotes appreciation of diversity based on culture, individual and ideological differences" (+5.43%), and "9. The president raises awareness of events, opportunities and legislative decisions that impact the University" (+6.80%).

Content analyses, conducted on qualitative responses, were used to group faculty responses into common themes. Identified themes revealed University leadership strengths and areas of faculty concern and dissatisfaction. Provost-related comments pertaining to faculty morale, development, productivity, and support for students fell into seven major categories: Appreciation (7), Stagnation/Lack of Change (5), Morale (2), Structural Issues (5), Leadership (4) Salary and Related Issues (3), and Miscellaneous (3). Provost-related comments pertaining to formulating policies, planning, support for faculty governance, and/or communicated future priorities fell into four categories: Tenure and Promotion-Related (3), Structural (6), Appreciation (5), and Miscellaneous (2). Comments about the President's activities relevant to promoting the University's interests to external constituencies fell into four categories: Appreciation (13), Athletics-Related (4), Structural (5), and Miscellaneous (1). Finally, comments about the president's abilities related to the morale, commitment, and productivity of University faculty grouped into seven categories: Appreciation (13), Structure (5), Athletics-Related (4), Stagnation/Lack of Change (3), Salary and Related (3), Dissatisfactions (5), and Miscellaneous (2). The summary themes and specific responses provided by faculty appear in Appendix A. Themes included Some themes appeared to be recurrent: appreciation, structural issues, stagnation/lack of change, and salary issues. Others appeared unique to the position in question. For the Provost, leadership emerged; for the President, athletics-related issues and general dissatisfactions arose. As noted, these summary themes and the specific faculty responses are listed in Appendix A.

### **Summary Comments:**

In broad strokes, both the quantitative and qualitative results appear to be relatively consistent. There appears to be relative stability in how both the Provost and President are viewed and evaluated. One theme emerging from the qualitative results for both President and Provost (tending to capture the

largest number of comments for both) is appreciation. It appears that a significant portion of faculty like and appreciate the job that both these administrators are doing. That said, there are also some concerns about (a) holding too firm to the “status quo” and (b) emphasizing athletics-related development in apparent favor to academic development. Finally, while faculty note some progress on salary issues, concerns about salary and tenure/promotion issues persist.

### **Limitations**

As with any undertaking of this sort, there are some limitations that should be kept in mind when interpreting these results. First, it is unclear to what degree these results are truly representative of the entire faculty, given the rather low response rate of 16.39% versus 36% in the previous survey cycle. No attempt was made in this survey (or in any other survey cycle) to select a random or other type of representative sample to more fully ensure a greater measure of generalizability. Thus, conclusions based on these results should be considered in light of the response rate. Additionally, qualitative results should be kept in perspective. That is, while attempts were made to group faculty comments into meaningful groups, no full-fledged qualitative analysis (say, according to Grounded Theory) was undertaken. Thus, qualitative group labels may or may not fully reflect underlying themes and/or constructs. Further, individual comments offered by faculty should be taken as such – one individual’s opinion – and weighted appropriately.

Table 1: Summary of Quantitative Survey Items for the Provost, Spring, 2014 (N = 117)

Question	2014 Mean	S.D.	% Agree & Strongly Agree	2011 Mean	2009 Mean	2007 Mean
1. The strength of academic programs has improved under the Provost's leadership.	3.63	1.07	59.4%	3.64	2.91	2.93
2. The Office of the Provost effectively conducts, supports, and funds activities to improve teaching and learning.	3.78	1.08	68.7%	3.75	3.28	3.30
3. The Office of the Provost effectively conducts, supports, and funds activities to improve research productivity.	3.68	1.06	60.9%	3.75	3.22	3.41
4. The Office of the Provost clearly communicates policies and procedures to faculty.	3.70	1.08	66.4%	3.81	2.90	2.80
5. The Provost supports shared governance in seeking, considering and integrating faculty input to make decisions.	3.58	1.13	57.5%	3.75	2.80	2.98
6. The Provost supports performance appraisal (e.g., tenure, promotion, compensation) procedures that are fair and conducive to faculty development.	3.75	1.02	66.7%	3.68	3.02	3.00
7. The Office of the Provost promotes appreciation of diversity based on cultural, individual, and ideological differences.	3.90	1.05	69.5%	3.97	3.61	3.81
8. The Office of the Provost raises awareness of accomplishments, opportunities, and activities across campus.	3.83	1.00	67.8%	3.82	3.46	3.60
9. The Office of the Provost supports and promotes the integration of the University's public affairs mission into the work of the faculty.	3.87	0.95	68.7%	3.83	3.63	3.60
10. Overall, the MSU Provost does a good job.	3.90	1.06	72.2%	4.03	3.06	
11. Overall, I agree with how the Provost is handling the current budget situation.	3.72	1.12	61.2%	3.92	2.93	

Scale: 1 (strongly disagree); 2 (disagree); 3 (neutral); 4 (agree); 5 (strongly agree).

Table 2: Summary of Quantitative Survey Items for the President, Spring, 2014

Question	2014 Mean	S.D.	% Agree & Strongly Agree	(overall for both men and women)		
				2011 Mean	2009 Mean	2007 Mean
1. The University has improved under the President's leadership.						
Men	3.87	1.20	70.5%	3.96	3.72	3.64
Women	4.41	0.78	86.3%			
2. The President's decisions and actions benefit the quality of education, civic-mindedness, and well being of Missouri State students.						
Men	3.72	1.19	65.6%	3.90	3.55	3.54
Women	4.27	0.85	82.3%			
3. The President's decisions and actions have strengthened the research environment at Missouri State University. (**)						
Men	3.31	1.13	44.3%	3.46	3.46	3.62
Women	3.94	0.97	62.8%			
4. The President supports shared governance in seeking, considering and integrating faculty input to make decisions.						
Men	3.49	1.23	52.5%	3.90	3.04	2.98
Women	4.16	0.83	76.5%			
5. The President has clearly communicated a rationale pertinent to budget and policy decisions.						
Men	3.92	1.15	77.4%	4.13	3.68	3.23
Women	4.35	0.76	86.5%			
6. The President has been an effective ambassador to the local and state communities in promoting the public affairs mission.						
Men	3.97	1.05	72.2%	3.89	3.97	3.98
Women	4.35	0.80	80.4%			
7. The President supports and promotes the integration of the public affairs mission into the life of the University community.						

Men	3.98	1.01	75.4%	3.85	3.82	3.67
Women	4.39	0.72	86.2%			
8. The President promotes appreciation of diversity based on culture, individual and ideological differences.						
Men	3.95	1.07	72.2%	3.87	3.76	4.02
Women	4.31	0.84	86.3%			
9. The president raises awareness of events, opportunities and legislative decisions that impact the University.						
Men	4.03	0.93	78.7%	3.97	3.90	3.89
Women	4.49	0.67	90.2%			
10. The president's long-range plans, initiatives and priorities support the long-term interests of the University. (**)						
Men	3.64	1.21	60.7%	3.88	3.43	3.41
Women	4.33	0.82	86.3%			
11. Overall, the MSU President does a good job.						
Men	3.92	1.21	70.9%	4.04	3.63	
Women	4.45	0.70	92.2%			
12. Overall, I agree with how the President is handling the current budget situation. (**)						
Men	3.69	1.27	67.2%	3.98	3.32	
Women	4.35	0.77	86.3%			

Scale: 1 (strongly disagree); 2 (disagree); 3 (neutral); 4 (agree); 5 (strongly agree).

Table 3: Percent Change in Item Mean Scores 2011 to 2014

President		Provost	
Item	% Change	Item	% Change
1	3.79%	1	-0.2%
2	1.54%	2	0.8%
3	3.47%	3	-1.9%
4	-3.33%	4	-2.9%
5	-0.73%	5	-4.5%
6	6.17%	6	1.9%
7	8.05%	7	-1.8%
8	5.43%	8	0.3%
9	6.80%	9	1.0%
10	1.80%	10	-3.2%
11	2.72%	11	-5.1%
12	0.00%		



Appendix A: Qualitative Results

**PLEASE COMMENT ON ACTIVITIES OF THE PROVOST THAT PERTAIN TO FACULTY MORALE, DEVELOPMENT, PRODUCTIVITY, AND SUPPORT FOR STUDENTS**

APPRECIATION (7)

STAGNATION/LACK OF CHANGE (5)

MORALE (2)

STRUCTURAL ISSUES (pertaining to program/department/college organizational issues) (5)

LEADERSHIP (4)

SALARY AND RELATED ISSUES (3)

MISC. (3)

**PLEASE COMMENT ON ACTIVITIES OF THE PROVOST THAT PERTAIN TO FORMULATED POLICIES, PLANNING, SUPPORT FOR FACULTY GOVERNANCE, AND/OR COMMUNICATED FUTURE PRIORITIES.**

TENURE AND PROMOTION-RELATED (3)

STRUCTURAL (6)

APPRECIATION (5)

MISC. (2)

**PLEASE COMMENT ON THE PRESIDENT'S ACTIVITIES RELEVANT TO PROMOTING THE UNIVERSITY'S INTERESTS TO EXTERNAL CONSTITUENCIES (E.G., DONORS, LEGISLATORS, AND THE BROADER SPRINGFIELD AND STATE COMMUNITIES).**

APPRECIATION (13)

ATHELETICS-RELATED (4)

STRUCTURAL (5)

MISC. (1)

**PLEASE COMMENT ON THE PRESIDENT'S ACTIVITIES RELEVANT TO THE MORALE, COMMITMENT, AND PRODUCTIVITY OF UNIVERSITY FACULTY**

APPRECIATION (13)

STRUCTURAL (5)

ATHLETICS-RELATED (4)

STAGNATION/LACK OF CHANGE (3)

SALARY AND RELATED (3)

DISSATISFACTIONS (5)

MISC. (2)

**PLEASE COMMENT ON ACTIVITIES OF THE PROVOST THAT PERTAIN TO FACULTY MORALE, DEVELOPMENT, PRODUCTIVITY, AND SUPPORT FOR STUDENTS**

*APPRECIATION FOR THE PROVOST*

Frank has always been a trusted leader among the faculty. In his role as Provost, he seems to be able to balance the hard choices of the position and the relationship with the faculty. While the previous Provost created an antagonistic atmosphere at times, Frank seems to have recreated trust in the administration. Frank and Clif are view favorably by the faculty, which is quite a challenge.

It handles issues in a fair manner

It is my perception only, but having a leader be present in activities or department meetings when asked to participate throughout the University setting, not just for news media events is most important. Thankfully, Dr. Einhellig does!

The Provost has been a good communicator and that has helped significantly with faculty morale - open, direct, stays informed.

I like his research bulletin--it seems to show a focus on faculty accomplishments.

Funding opportunities are great!

My observations of fellow faculty indicate that morale has improved since President Smart and Provost Einhellig began their tenure.

*NOTHING NEW*

It's very hard to decipher if anything new or interesting is happening that promotes the goals of the university. Research support is the same or less than what it was 2-5 years ago. Student expectations don't seem higher or better (less so). Maybe that's not terrible given the personal circumstances of the provost, but it would be nice if the office were positioned to do more big picture improvements.

Not a new or innovative idea since he took over. Every year is a repeat of the last.

It seems to me that the Provost is just holding the status quo. It would be nice to see more coming out of his office.

Very rigid and stuck in old mindset. Needs to entertain more progressive ideas and consider the future of higher education. Under the current provost's leadership, it feels like the university is going backward.

### *MORALE*

It does not help morale when the Provost's Office overturns a tenure decision without going thru the formal appeal process.

In line with MSU's commitment to international programs, I suggest that faculty morale and productivity could be improved by re-instituting the \$1,000 travel grant for participation in international conferences.

### *STRUCTURAL ISSUES*

Will not address overlap of BMS and Biology courses - which is not good for our students.

I think the Provost should require every administrator to teach at least one class each semester. When people stop teaching they lose touch with the challenges that faculty face in the classroom and it makes it easy to issue orders that make the job of the faculty more difficult. Another thing that would do wonders for faculty moral is to address the bloated administration we have. Conduct an audit where every administrator has to show how they either directly support faculty or students, and conduct satisfaction surveys to show whether the faculty and (remainder lost due to character limits)

I think we need more education and faculty development related to preventing/reporting hostile work environments and bullying among faculty.

Wish we could stop the annual performance evaluation numerical evaluations-- frustrating & demoralizing.

The faculty writing retreats are invaluable to the morale of tenure track faculty!

### *LEADERSHIP*

Do we have a Provost? Don't see or hear much of him.

The provost does not appreciate the issues facing teaching undergrads, He raises the size of GEP101 classes without regard for what all the literature says about keeping such courses smaller to improve student success and retention.

I am aware of activities, but not really about 'accomplishments'

We need strong leadership to upgrade our graduate programs, especially in education. Poor enrollment in Early Childhood Education, Elementary Education, Educational Administration, and MSED in Secondary Education continues. Potential graduate students continue to stay away from MSU and enroll at other universities. We need our leaders to tell faculty to revise the program offerings and stop funding low enrolled graduate programs.

### *SALARY AND RELATED ISSUES*

I believe the Professor Salary Incentive Program must be handled carefully. If they award too many professors too little incentive, it will turn the program into a negative. If they award too few professors, it will hurt response in later years.

I would like to see faculty salaries being raised to the national average to become a serious priority again; this priority seems to have been dropped, and we are lagging further and further behind. Faculty salaries especially in the College of Arts and Letters are seriously below what they should be, even for our most productive faculty. This is strongly affecting morale.

Provost needs to fully support departmental recommendations regarding tenure decisions, particularly when the department does not recommend tenure.

### *MISC*

I really can't think of any activities from the Provost's office that improve morale, etc.

I have not been at MSU very long so I do not feel I can comment too extensively.

Why bother? This evaluation is worse than a bad joke; it is a prime example of the depths to which "shared governance" has descended at this university.

### **PLEASE COMMENT ON ACTIVITIES OF THE PROVOST THAT PERTAIN TO FORMULATED POLICIES, PLANNING, SUPPORT FOR FACULTY GOVERNANCE, AND/OR COMMUNICATED FUTURE PRIORITIES.**

#### *TENURE AND PROMOTION-RELATED*

It does not help support formulated policies and faculty governance when the Provost's Office overturns a tenure decision sidestepping the formal appeal process.

I think the provost's office did a good job trying to help with T&P this year, but while the ideas were good in theory, it made the process a bit more stressful than necessary. I just wish it had been

introduced differently (i.e. incorporated into depts slowly, rather than something new right when the big applications were due).

### *STRUCTURAL*

The re-organization of courses and course menus under the recent Gen Ed reform has led to a dramatic decline in enrollments in some departments, including Religious Studies. This is a real downer for faculty morale in the department, which prides itself in what most of the time are the highest reaching evaluations in CHPA

It seems to me that there is not much of a sense of the university moving forward under the current provost. Under the immediate past provost, there were too many new policies being pushed in rapid succession. Under this provost, I think that the pendulum has swung to the other extreme, and nothing much new is happening.

It would be nice if the Provost would rein in the Deans and their 'initiatives'. It grows a bit tiring wasting time and resources on activities that only build a Dean's resume.

The updated gen-ed seems like a bad idea- especially how it was carried out by the committee (though this wasn't directly the Provost's fault, there should have been some monitoring, just to see how badly it was going).

If diversity of ideological differences are important, start having more representation of people who have non-liberal values. Also, diversity means one thing at this university, black. Just take a look at all the emails we get from the office of diversity and inclusion. It makes anyone who isn't black feel devalued and criminal. I thought those were bad things to do to an innocent person, especially based on their race. We don't really encourage trying to understand

The Provost is a good and ethical man who has served this University well, and I honor him for his contributions. But his inability to plan for the future and his dependency on inept associate provosts indicate that it is time for him to go.

### *APPRECIATION*

The Provost office does a good job with coordinating the P&T workshops so that guidelines and policies are clear.

everything looks good

generally he does well here

The provost is doing a good job -- a huge improvement over the last provost.

The Provost keeps the long range planning goals as well as various empirical data (e.g. trends, enrollment, etc.) in mind when articulating priorities.

*MISC.*

Not a clue hard to tell if he does any of this. he does send, or his secretary sends out monthly blurbs of little importance to the faculty.

I have not been at MSU very long so I do not feel I can comment too extensively.

**PLEASE COMMENT ON THE PRESIDENT'S ACTIVITIES RELEVANT TO PROMOTING THE UNIVERSITY'S INTERESTS TO EXTERNAL CONSTITUENCIES (E.G., DONORS, LEGISLATORS, AND THE BROADER SPRINGFIELD AND STATE COMMUNITIES).**

*APPRECIATION*

He does an outstanding job.

I trust that President Smart is operating in a manner that has the University's best interests at heart.

I believe that the President has done well, but I am afraid of the extreme focus on athletics, to the extent of \$20mil being spend on facilities, including a football stadium for a team that is very bad.

President Smart seems to be well-respected and admired by many. This is very good for the university.

The President seems to do an excellent job lobbying for the interests of MSU in the state government.

he is doing an excellent job

\_Has been very active in this area.

Very involved and approachable.

I think that the president is doing a good job -- a huge improvement over the last couple of presidents.

President Smart has made a signifcant effort to engage the external constituencies - doing a great job there.

The President is media-savvy and communicates well with the public.

I think we are doing pretty good at this ... there are so many things to highlight, so I think we should seek out ways to continue to do that aren't overwhelming with information (like Mind's Eye .. it's great!).

President Smart does an outstanding job of tirelessly advancing the university's brand.

## ATHELETICS-RELATED

We do not need enhanced athletic facilities for a small segment of our student body. We do not need to be in NCAA Div-1AA athletics.

Athletics continues to be the administration's highest priority, at the expense of education. The administration signals to students that the only reason to attend MSU is to get a bigger paycheck. Nothing has changed during the past several decades.

excessive support to the various athletic activities--particularly football. When there is no cost to students, there is still a very small percent who attend. Also, since we have a large number of non-traditional students, who must work on weekends, even if they were interested, they could not participate. Also the salary differential between coaches and faculty is indefensible.

My only concern about Mr. Smart is his continued focus on athletic programs. Let focus on ACADEMICS and make that our priority, not a football team or stadium that looks good. We are an institution of HIGHER EDUCATION not an athletic club.

## *STRUCTURAL*

He was hired to appease the local Springfield community and to make up for not getting a court appointment. Nixon likes him so I guess that makes everything ok.

Pres. Smart does almost everything well. However, the increase of student fees to pay for improvements of facilities will reduce our competitiveness and recruitment of new students. He also needs to reduce the athletic drain on our inadequate support from the state.

I think the cronyism of his appointment undermines the University's claimed value of "ethical leadership" and regionalizes the University to the Springfield area. Also, becoming MU's lacky (Pharm-D, engineering) detracts from our stature. We're becoming an MU extension.

I have only been here one semester. In this time I am not aware of the presidents activities. It has only been one semester, but it has been one semester, so perhaps some more communication. What happened to 'cliff notes?'

I wish external money could be found to build necessary buildings. Funding by student tuition assumes sustained consistent income from student tuition if what I believe will be unpredictable times. Until federal budget issues such as health care and massive deficits, funding of higher education will be at risk for significant cuts.

## *MISC.*

I have not been at MSU very long so I do not feel I can comment too extensively.

**PLEASE COMMENT ON THE PRESIDENT'S ACTIVITIES RELEVANT TO THE MORALE, COMMITMENT, AND PRODUCTIVITY OF UNIVERSITY FACULTY**

*APPRECIATION*

The president is viewed as an open and honest leader. While there has been open opposition among faculty with prior presidents, Clif Smart has actually been able to reverse this into an atmosphere of - trust-. I view this as an extraordinary accomplishment and very good for the university.

Faculty morale seems better than ever since I've been at the university, and I credit Clif Smart for much of that. We are very

The President is consistently humble and collegial toward faculty - this does much to improve morale and organizational trust among faculty.

Awesome job!!

Faculty support is high due to the president's personal character and his efforts to provide transparency regarding the University's finances.

Excellent on all these categories.

He gives raises, which seems to make people happy. But when the budget is flat, those raises come at a cost somewhere. Otherwise, I've not seen much from him. But isn't the President supposed to be MSU's outward appearance and the Provost take care of the internal stuff?

The President is involved and promotes the university and supports the faculty.

I appreciate the faculty budget committee and transparency of his administration.

Definitely keeps faculty interests in mind, even as he juggles difficult decisions about priorities.

I think Pres Smart has done a good job at addressing concerns that he has heard voiced and tries to be very accessible with everyone. I think his notes and tweets are very supportive, but honest of our situation.

My observations of fellow faculty indicate that morale has improved since President Smart and Provost Einhellig began their tenure.

The best president I've served under!!

*STRUCTURAL*



Will not address overlap of BMS and Biology courses - which is not good for our students.

I do not agree with the administrative creation of what amounts to a new rank above that of full professor.

While this administration is not openly hostile to faculty, as previous ones have been, it rewards faculty on the basis of increasing students' likelihood of getting a job rather than educating students. Public affairs = getting jobs for students. Every policy is based on not losing a single tuition dollar. lucky to have him.

Too much emphasis is being place on online courses.

I think more should be done to improve morale.

### *ATHLETICS-RELATED*

We do not need enhanced athletic facilities for a small segment of our student body. We do not need to be in NCAA Div-1AA athletics.

Again, the athletics focus is harmful to faculty morale. Saying that a vote of 500+ students to enact a \$20mil plan is a tad absurd. Money of that magnitude could have huge benefits to academic facilities across campus.

Again, let's focus on academics. Put more money into academics over athletics.

The president is too committed to non-academic endeavors of the university. While he hasn't gone on a building spree to the degree that former-president Neitzel did the latest athletics venue changes seem entirely unneeded and the methods of funding seem underhanded. Maybe his development activity shows me to be wrong about this though? The university has plenty of building space so let's figure out how to use it better. \_\_I do appreciate the emphasis on salaries.

### *STAGNATION/LACK OF CHANGE*

I would make the same comment on the president that I made about the provost, that is, that it doesn't seem like much new is being accomplished at the university in the past two or three years.

(sigh). Morale, commitment, and productivity are no longer getting worse at MSU, thanks to President Smart and others. I wish I could say that things were getting noticeably better. Perhaps the previous decline needs to stall for awhile and then the upward progress can set in.

The President and his initiatives have absolutely no impact on the day to day work of myself and others I've talked with. Definitely less intrusive than the past two Presidents and that's a good thing.

### *SALARY AND RELATED*

I believe the Professor Salary Incentive Program must be handled carefully. If they award too many professors too little incentive, it will turn the program into a negative. If they award too few professors, it will hurt response in later years.

Raise our salaries.

I would like to see faculty salaries being raised to the national average to become a serious priority again; this priority seems to have been dropped, and we are lagging further and further behind. Faculty salaries especially in the College of Arts and Letters are seriously below what they should be, even for our most productive faculty. This is strongly affecting morale.

### *DISSATISFACTIONS*

He does not have a clue what academics are or how to improve the university except to add more buildings and athletic facilities. He is concerned more with cramming in students so the numbers look good but the quality suffers with ill-prepared students. He bought us off with a couple of minimum raises and we are still well below our peer institutions in faculty salaries. We have a bunch of older entrenched faculty because they never made enough to retire-very little new blood.

The President "says one thing and then does another." President Smart promised the Art and Design faculty that no matter the cost, he would make sure that all of the problems associated with the operation of the BRIK City complex to make it a safe working environment for students, faculty, and staff would be addressed. The current problems are far from being resolved, yet President Smart is now claiming that there is no more money left to correct the problems of BRIK City and this is after he has proclaimed that these facilities are the best in the state or nation. The (remainder lost due to character limits)

A pervasive culture of sullen incompetence exists among the staff members at MSU. I had great hopes that Clif would begin to clean up this mess but, instead, he has perpetuated it. Example: Praising the Internal Audit group for catching the bookstore embezzler instead of punishing them for missing the problem for several years. Jeff Morrissey and Ed Choate are both incompetent, but Clif has done nothing to either improve their performance or speed their departures. The actions of their incompetent subordinates are a major

Administrative bloat is not unique to MSU and neither is the crushing effect it has on faculty morale. We are forced to do more and more with less and less while MSU continues to hire administrators who do nothing but suck up funds and create frustration for the faculty. Conduct an audit using an outside firm. Find out exactly what each administrator does and if it doesn't directly support either the students or the faculty, eliminate that position. Stop being afraid of the cost of sending administrators back to the faculty. Better to pay them more (remainder lost due to character limits)

I am duly grateful for the leadership President Smart has provided to the entire University since the bow tie guy quit. But his focus on advancing the university brand to the near exclusion of "producing

educated persons" has begun to vex the university faculty. Someone should prioritize education. Sadly, it is not the Provost or his minions.

*MISC.*

No specific comments but certainly nothing negative.

I have not been at MSU very long so I do not feel I can comment too extensively.