



Missouri State
UNIVERSITY

Faculty Concerns Survey 2010

A Biennial Report from the Faculty Concerns Committee

Survey Subcommittee

Karen Buzzard

Jef Cornelius-White

James Philpot

Sharmistha Self

Joan Test

Michelle Visio

Faculty Concerns Committee

Sharmistha Self (Chair), Jef Cornelius-White (Secretary), Karen Buzzard, Sam Dyer, David Hays, Christopher Herr, Judith Martin, Duat Vu, Yili Shi, Melody LaPreze, Duane Moses, Steve Olson, James Philpot, Melissa Burnett, Vicki Dunlop, Joan Test, Randy Wallace, Patricia Cahoj, Mike Craig, Keith Ernce, Ye (Angel) Wang, Kelli Farmer, Mike Hudson, Mary Newman, Roberto Canales, Patricia Webb, Brooks Blevins, Patrick Scott, Elizabeth Sobel, John Strong, Dan Kaufman (*Fall sub: Johnny Washington*), Dan Crafts, Reza Herati, Raj Jutla, Tom Kachel, Kyoungtae Kim, Emmett Redd, Mike Roling, Yang Wang, Cameron Wickham, Tracy Stout, Michelle Visio, Terrel Gallaway (Ex-officio)

Table of Contents

I. Executive Summary

II. Narrative Report

- **Purpose**

Learn how the Faculty Concerns Survey aims to assess faculty perceptions related to morale and university productivity to advocate for improved shared governance and advocacy.

- **Measure and Participation Rate**

Learn how the Faculty Concerns Survey used 88 items, including one qualitative prompt, with some updating and additions for the current context.

- **Current Context and Review of 2008 Findings**

Read about current contextual factors, review some key findings that had changed in 2008, and learn information about participation rates.

- **Overall Results**

Includes responses to items of overall satisfaction, most satisfied areas, least satisfied areas, and faculty turnover indicators.

- **Public Affairs Integration**

See how faculty members generally believe that they integrate the three components of the Public Affairs Mission into their work.

- **Grade Inflation and Deflation Pressures**

See whether faculty agree or disagree about feeling pressure to inflate/deflate grades and identify the sources of such pressure.

- **Longitudinal Results**

See how the 2010 results compare with results since 1997. Consider a special focus on changes in faculty perceptions since 2008.

- **Results by College**

See results by college, especially useful for deans, the Provost, and faculty interested in college morale. Wide variability was observed in some cases.

- **Results by Department**

See results by department, especially valuable for identifying perceived areas of strength and weakness at the departmental level.

- **Qualitative Assessment**

Learn the common themes in the open-ended comments including further description of the quantitative results.

III. Conclusions and Recommendations

IV. Caveats

V. Appendixes of Tables (<http://www.missouristate.edu/FacultySenate/56739.htm>)

Executive Summary

Faculty perceptions of conditions that support work productivity varied considerably by condition, but were more similar than different in comparison with 2008 and appeared to improve in a similar number of ways as decline. However, in broad areas such as perception of the direction that the University is heading and overall satisfaction with being a Missouri State University faculty member, the results show substantial declines. Likewise, in certain areas, such as in a variety of issues related to compensation and the performance of the President and Board of Governors, the report finds substantial declines.

The results of the 2010 Faculty Concerns Survey show that the areas of greatest satisfaction relate to how classes have been assigned, congeniality of colleagues, performance of department heads, and support provided by the Taylor Health Center, the Library, Computer Services, and the Education Technology Center. Faculty members seem cautiously optimistic about the Faculty Center for Teaching and Learning. One needs to keep in mind that this has been a new addition since the last survey, which means it does not allow any longitudinal comparison in perception.

The areas of lowest satisfaction in the 2010 survey are compensation items, such as future salary prospects, salary differentials across campus, and the way discretionary monies are used to reward merit/equity, levels of shared governance, and the performance of the Board of Governors.

In terms of change in perception since 2008, the results show that, in order of magnitude, the top five areas of greatest negative change has been in faculty perception of the general quality of performance of the Board of Governors, future salary prospects, the direction the University is moving, the handling of discretionary funds, and the performance of the University President. While the current president began four months prior to the survey, qualitative comments reveal that a few faculty members were referring to the past President.

The qualitative results yielded information about sources of dissatisfaction for some faculty, including concerns about performance of administrators, faculty compensation, increase in workload, insufficient resources, and the diversity mission. Some respondents expressed favoring a union because of administration performance concerns. Some faculty expressed hopefulness about the future under the new President. The qualitative data illuminates some details of specific areas in need of improvement.

The report concludes with recommendations from the Faculty Concerns Committee to help improve conditions associated with work productivity and morale.

PURPOSE

The *Faculty Concerns Survey* (FCS) reports faculty perceptions of university conditions that support faculty morale and university productivity. This survey is administered biennially, and is one way of meeting the Faculty Concerns Committee's mission to serve as a board for continuous review of faculty rights and responsibilities, invite items of concern, and initiate and advocate for faculty and administrative discussions. Data collected over a 12-year span (1997 to 2010) are reported within this summary. The Survey can provide useful information to determine successes and improve conditions for university productivity.

MEASURE

The 2010 Survey contained 88 items. Most items used scale anchors from (1) *extremely dissatisfied* to (5) *extremely satisfied*, with (3) being *neutral*. A few questions used the scale (1) *strongly disagree* to (5) *strongly agree*, with (3) being *neutral*. Faculty members were invited to provide additional comments, which served as a qualitative component. Longitudinal data is also provided for most items on the survey. The survey was administered electronically. Four hundred and eight faculty responded to the survey, representing a participation rate near 58%. The survey was administered in November using the list of faculty provided by the Faculty Senate office. Some faculty were inadvertently not invited, a situation that was remedied as quickly as possible when brought to the Faculty Concerns Committee's attention. Faculty Concerns has asked the Faculty Senate Executive Committee to work with administration to assure that an accurate contact list for faculty is available to Faculty Senate. Additionally, the survey was accidentally redistributed to some faculty in early December by a person outside the Faculty Concerns Committee, which yielded more participants. Multiple statistical tests were run to determine whether the initial sample was different than the new sample. No tests showed significant differences, so the entire sample was used.

Tables corresponding with all discussions are in the Appendixes which will be available online at the Faculty Concerns portion of the Faculty Senate Website after this report's presentation to Senate: <http://www.missouristate.edu/FacultySenate/56739.htm>. With such large sample sizes, most changes could be considered statistically significant, but for the purposes of discussion, a change near 0.4 - 0.5 on the 5.0 scale, (e.g., medium effect size $d = 0.5$) was termed substantial as it represents a more tangible, obvious difference.

CURRENT CONTEXT AND REVIEW OF 2008 FINDINGS

The 2008 Faculty Concerns Survey was expected to get faculty feedback and opinion on how new initiatives introduced in 2006, particularly those related to the compensation criteria and college-cost structure model, had fared. Across the University, a total of 421 faculty participated in the 2008 Faculty Concerns Survey representing an estimated participation rate of 59%. The main findings were:

- A majority of items measured showed statistically significant improvements in comparison to the 2006 ratings, with the largest, most tangible improvements observed concerning faculty satisfaction with their deans' performances, their base salaries, and the merit system.

- While satisfaction improved in many compensation-related areas, typically the changes do not represent that the faculty are satisfied, but more that they are less dissatisfied.
- Several areas such as the direction the University is moving, the level of shared governance, the perceived performance of the University President, and the degree to which administration follows written university policies showed strong association with overall faculty satisfaction.
- Integration of the public affairs mission components into faculty's work were among the most endorsed items, indicating broad engagement with the mission.
- When faculty did identify experiencing grade inflation (30%) or deflation (10%) pressures, they identified student retention initiatives and the merit/faculty evaluation process as the most frequently occurring sources of that pressure.
- Reduction in the likelihood of faculty members considering leaving the university, especially as compared with 2006.
- The qualitative comments revealed that although generally the faculty members were more satisfied in 2008 compared to 2006, there were some specific areas in need of improvement.

The year 2010 also experienced its own share of new initiatives and changes. The past biennium has been a financially difficult one for the State of Missouri and, consequently, Missouri State University. Colleges and departments have had to cut back in significant ways to deal with budgetary pressures. Additionally, the university has undergone a major change in leadership with the resignation of President Nietzel and the hiring of President Cofer.

OVERALL RESULTS

The overall results can be evaluated several ways. First, we can consider the responses to question items #1 (Direction the University is moving) and #4 (Overall satisfaction with being a Missouri State faculty member). These two questions perhaps best summarize a faculty member's overall perceptions. The 2010 mean responses to these questions were 2.82 and 3.52, respectively. These means represent a slightly less than neutral level of satisfaction with the University's direction and a modest level of overall faculty satisfaction with being a MSU faculty member.

It can also be revealing to look at relationships between these general items, level of shared governance and Board of Governors, President, and academic administrator perceived performance. Table VIII provides these correlations. Clearly, all of these relationships are significantly, and for the most part strongly, associated.

We can also evaluate faculty satisfaction perceptions by identifying the satisfaction areas with highest and lowest mean satisfaction values. In 2010, the ten satisfaction areas showing the highest mean values (mean values in parentheses) were:

- Assignment of your classes: extent to which they match your interests (3.98)
- Services and faculty use of Taylor Health and Wellness Center (3.96)
- Libraries: facilities and support available to faculty (3.89)
- Congeniality of colleagues (3.87)
- Computer Services: facilities and computer help desk support available to faculty (3.86)
- General quality of Missouri State faculty (3.86)
- Libraries: facilities and support available to students (3.81)
- Education Technology Center: facilities and support available to faculty (3.75)
- Computer Services: facilities and computer help desk support to students (3.71)
- Extent to which promotion and tenure criteria are defined and made known (3.66)

Eight of these areas were also in the top ten satisfaction areas from the 2008 faculty survey. The two new areas to the top ten list are extent to which promotion and tenure criteria are clear and Education Technology Center's facilities and support for faculty.

In 2010, the ten satisfaction areas showing the lowest mean values (mean values in parentheses) were:

- Future salary prospects (1.85)
- Salary differentials that exist across Missouri State University (1.93)
- Abolition of cost of living increases in favor of pay for performance/equity (2.08)
- The way discretionary monies are used to reward merit/equity (2.25)
- General quality of performance of Board of Governors (2.31)
- Procedures by which equity adjustment salary decisions are made (2.35)
- Procedures by which performance/merit salary adjustments are made (2.36)
- Level of shared governance (2.46)
- Compensation for overload courses (2.48)
- Current nine month salary (2.55)

Eight of these ten satisfaction areas are compensation related, showing broad concern for economic factors. The two not related to compensation concerned faculty perception of the performance of the Board of Governors and level of shared governance. Seven of them were also in the bottom ten satisfaction areas from the 2008 faculty survey. The three new items in the bottom ten list are current nine month salary, level of shared governance, and the performance of the Board of Governors.

Finally, it can be argued that actions speak more clearly than words. Faculty who are truly dissatisfied have the option of seeking alternative employment, and four survey items examine potential faculty turnover resulting from dissatisfaction (means; percent agree/strongly agree):

- I often think about leaving the University (3.09; 46.0% agree or strongly agree)
- I plan to retire from Missouri State within the next five years (2.31; 23.6% agree or strongly agree)
- I am actively looking for other academic positions elsewhere (2.29; 18.3% agree or strongly agree)

- I plan to leave Missouri State within the next year (2.01; 7.5% agree or strongly agree)

Nearly half of the participants stated they often think about leaving, and nearly 1/4 plan to retire in the next five years. Actively looking and immediate plans to leave were endorsed by less than 1/5 and 1/13 of respondents, respectively. While mean responses to these turnover pressure questions all rose from 2008 to 2010, these means are nevertheless similar (within about 0.10 point) to their mean values in 2008. Like on other items, responses vary by college.

Table VIII provides correlations between these turnover pressures, satisfaction with the perceived direction of the University, overall satisfaction, level of shared governance and performance of administration.

These correlations show that:

- the plan to retire within the next five years has small or no relationships with the other factors while often thinking about leaving, planning on leaving this year, and actively looking for other positions are more strongly related to these factors.
- the strongest relationships are between perceived overall satisfaction and often thinking about leaving and actively looking for other positions, between satisfaction with level of shared governance and often thinking about leaving and actively looking for other positions, between performance of Board of Governors and often thinking about leaving and actively looking for other positions.
- planning on leaving the University this year and overall satisfaction are also relatively strongly related.

While correlation does not imply causality in any direction, faculty retention is clearly related to these broad perceptions of university direction, overall satisfaction and administration performance.

PUBLIC AFFAIRS MISSION

Faculty were generally neutral to the statements regarding the University's and faculty's pursuit of the University's public affairs mission (means; percent strongly agree/agree):

- I believe the University does well in showing its accountability to the public affairs mission (3.15; 43.1% agree or strongly agree)
- I believe the faculty have a good understanding of the public affairs mission (2.94; 37.5% agree or strongly agree)
- I find it challenging to integrate...public affairs mission into my work (2.86; 36.7% agree or strongly agree)

These were new questions in this year's survey, replacing three questions focusing on the individual components of the University's public affairs mission, which had shown that most faculty endorsed that they generally integrated the components in their work (means of 3.7 or higher). Surveys prior to 2008 did not evaluate the public affairs mission. The 2010 results show that the majority of faculty believe that the university could do better in showing its accountability to the mission and in helping faculty have a good understanding of it. Many, though a minority, found it challenging to integrate in their work.

GRADE INFLATION AND DEFLATION PRESSURES

On average, faculty indicated little perceived pressure to inflate or deflate grades, though some did, particularly regarding inflation (means; percent agree/strongly agree):

- I feel pressured to inflate grades (2.83; 38.6% agree or strongly agree).
- I fell pressured to deflate grades (2.00; 8.6% agree or strongly agree).

While faculty identified different reasons for feeling such pressure, the ones that stood out most frequently were pressure from administrators, by faculty evaluation process, for student retention or for some reason not offered as an option on the questionnaire.

LONGITUDINAL COMPARISONS

Tables III-V of Appendix 1 present longitudinal results for the last 13 years in question order, by descending order of mean, and by magnitude of recent change. Questions labeled #1 and #6 assess perhaps the broadest dimensions. Results on these items show that faculty perception of the direction the university has decreased substantially from 2008. Overall satisfaction also decreased significantly but not as much and still represents some satisfaction on the 5.0 scale and in relation to the historical record. Another noticeably phenomenon is that faculty perceptions scores across the gambit of conditions the survey measures were generally similar from 2008 to 2010.

Whereas faculty reported some satisfaction with many work conditions in 2010, faculty satisfaction with the quality of the Board of Governors, the performance of the President, and use of discretionary monies have diminished. Satisfaction with the Board of Governors has not been this low since the surveys began (in the last 13 years), and satisfaction with the President has not been this low since 2003 or before (perceptions with President Keiser). In particular, faculty are concerned about salary issues such as the abolition of the cost of living in favor of merit/equity, the future of raises, and the salary differentials across campus. The following questions represented the greatest change in faculty perception since 2008:

- General quality of performance of Board of Governors (-.80);
- Future salary prospects (-.68);
- Direction University is Moving (Priorities, etc.) (-.54);
- Way discretionary monies are used (-.49);
- Performance of the University President (-.45);
- Level of shared governance (-0.41);
- Abolition of cost of living raises in favor of merit (-0.40).

Faculty satisfaction with the general quality of MSU faculty, congeniality of colleagues, assignment of classes, and services such as Taylor Health Center, the Libraries, and computer services have generally remained stable among the most satisfied areas.

RESULTS BY COLLEGE

In order to provide a descriptive view of perceived morale and work conditions within the colleges, the following comparisons show areas that are perceived as reflecting substantially more or less satisfaction (+/- .40) within a college as compared with the university mean. These comparisons help identify potential problems and bright spots within each college compared with

the general university conditions. Please see Table VII through XIV for more specific information.

College of Arts and Letters (COAL)

COAL faculty generally reported perceptions similar to those found across the University. However,

- Faculty in COAL are less satisfied with their teaching loads (-.48),
- Faculty in COAL are less satisfied with Salary differentials that exist across the university (-.45), and
- A greater percentage of faculty in COAL are actively looking for other academic positions elsewhere (+.43).

College of Business Administration (COBA)

In two ways COBA faculty viewed conditions considerably more favorably than did those found across the university. They were

- Less concerned (but still more concerned than not) about salary differentials that exist across MSU (+.83), and
- More favorably viewed the performance of their college associate dean (+.46).

However, COBA faculty perceived nine conditions substantially lower than the university means. They included:

- Performance of the Provost (-.50)
- Custodial maintenance of facilities (-.53)
- Performance of the EOO (-.53)
- Observation of policies in hiring faculty and staff by EEO (-.48)
- Performance of the Associate Provosts (-.41)
- Availability of research opportunities (-.43)
- Observation of policies in hiring administrative personnel by EEO (-.41)
- Computer service support for faculty (-.40)

College of Education (COE)

COE faculty expressed substantially higher level of satisfaction in one area as compared to the university means

- Library holdings (+.42)

In contrast, they expressed substantially lower satisfaction in the following areas:

- Performance of the college dean (-.99)
- Performance of the college associate dean (-.75)
- Procedures by which policies are made for your college (-.70)
- Allocation of summer teaching (-.63)
- Reimbursement for attending conferences (-.62)
- Use and effect of per-course or unranked faculty in your department (-.53)
- Procedures by which performance salary decisions are made (-.45)
- Personal office facilities (-.45)
- Quality of criteria used to make merit/equity decisions in your department (-.45)

- Content of policies in your college (-.44)
- Congeniality of colleagues (-.41)

College of Health and Human Services (CHHS)

Faculty in CHHS expressed substantially more satisfaction in six areas and substantially less satisfaction in no areas:

- Custodial maintenance of facilities (+.55)
- Quality of criteria used to make merit/equity decisions in your department (+.51)
- Procedures by which performance salary decisions are made (+.50)
- I feel pressure to inflate grades (-.50), meaning less grade inflation pressure.
- I believe the faculty have a good understanding of the public affairs mission (+.42)
- Faculty Center for Teaching and Learning (+.40)
- Use and effect of per-course or unranked faculty (+.40)

College of Humanities and Public Affairs (CHPA)

CHPA faculty perceptions varied substantially from the average across the university in many ways. Some areas were viewed with more satisfaction, particularly concerning facilities:

- Classroom facilities (+.75)
- Personal office facilities (+.75)
- Physical plant (+.73)

However, in many more ways, 27 ways to be specific, morale and conditions that support work productivity were viewed with substantially less satisfaction, particularly in broad strokes and as concerns the library, administrators' performance, assignment of teaching load and committees, procedures for merit decisions, and others. As conditions are too numerous to list, those supervising, participating in, or interacting with CHPA are strongly encouraged to review the specific results presented in Appendix 2. There appear to be many potential problem areas. Here are few broad examples that convey the generally less satisfactory perceptions:

- Direction the university is moving (-.51)
- Overall satisfaction with being a MSU faculty member (-.48)
- I often think about leaving this University (+.63), meaning more faculty think about leaving in CHPA than in the university at large.

College of Natural and Applied Sciences (CNAS)

CNAS faculty responded with more satisfaction than faculty across the university in seven ways:

- Congeniality of colleagues (+.54)
- Reimbursement for conference attendance (+.51)
- I often think about leaving this University (-.51), meaning that less faculty think about leaving in CNAS
- Support for research (+.43)
- Overall satisfaction with being a MSU faculty member (+.42)
- Availability of research opportunities (+.43)

- Abolition of cost of living increases in favor of pay for performance/equity (+.41)

They were substantially less satisfied in only one way:

- Personal office facilities (-.59)

Also, they found the public affairs mission more challenging to integrate (+.55).

Libraries

- Faculty in the library viewed conditions and morale similar to faculty across the university. However, they expressed more satisfaction with regards to:
Custodial maintenance of facilities (+.66),
- Personal office facilities (+.52),
- Classroom facilities (+.47),
- Procedures by which merit salary decisions are made (+.47), and
- I feel pressured to inflate grades (-.40), meaning Library faculty feel less grade inflation pressure.

They expressed less substantially less satisfaction with

- Performance of the college associate dean (-.78) (note however that sample size was 9 instead of 18 for most questions, and the meaning of the question may have been harder to interpret within the library hierarchy),
- Use and effect of per-course or unranked faculty (-.50),
- Performance of Assistants to the President (+.44), and
- Extent of feedback regarding reasons for promotion and tenure decisions (-.40).

In summary, perceived work conditions and morale varies across colleges, with some areas reflecting gross or obvious differences. In general, faculty members in COAL, CNAS, CHHS, and the Libraries have fewer conditions that are viewed with substantially less satisfaction and/or more conditions that are viewed with substantially more satisfaction than the university at large as compared with faculty in COE, CHPA, and COBA. Faculty members in COBA expressed substantially lower satisfaction primarily in a limited number of areas, which relate to entities outside the college. In contrast, faculty in COE expressed substantially lower satisfaction primarily in a limited number of areas, which are internal to the college. Faculty in CHPA expressed substantially lower satisfaction in many different areas. It may be helpful for the Provost and administrators and faculty from all colleges to review the Appendix of Tables to best determine how to respond to the various areas.

RESULTS BY DEPARTMENT

Appendix 3 presents results by department. Like with the college results, the final column of the tables show the difference between the university mean and the unit mean. Differences of .40 or more approach a medium effect size, or more obvious difference. Smaller differences may or may not be statistically significant, but are unlikely to represent as noticeable a difference. These department by department results can be very valuable for identifying perceived areas of strength and weakness. While all departments with sample sizes smaller than 5 were not reported individually, but only collectively as "Other," attention should be given to small sample sizes (5-14), in which one or a few people may still over-represent on one or more items.

QUALITATIVE ASSESSMENT

Respondents were given the opportunity to provide additional comments at the end of the survey. Comments were provided by 107 faculty members. An analysis of the comments revealed 174 units or separate ideas. Of these units, 169 were sorted into 27 categories. Categories were further collapsed into themes. The remaining 5 units were unique and could not be placed into a category.

The most common themes identified were:

- Upper administration performance concerns (34/19.4%). This theme was sometimes tied to problems found in the state audit, insufficient faculty compensation, inefficient management of the budget, poor communication, lack of leadership, low faculty morale, and disregard for shared governance. Upper administrators mentioned, in order of frequency, were the Board of Governors, the Provost, and the President. Some respondents indicated they were referring to the immediate past President and not the current President. Other administrators mentioned less frequently were some Department Heads and Deans. Some respondents (3/1.7%) expressed favoring a union because of administration performance concerns.
- Dissatisfaction with faculty compensation (20/11.4%). This theme was sometimes tied to low faculty morale, dissatisfaction with the merit system, heavy workload, lack of resources, inequity with other colleges and university, inequity across colleges and departments within the university, perceived waste of money in other areas on campus, and intention to seek employment elsewhere.
- Increase in workload (14/8%). Faculty perceive that more demands are made on their time with fewer resources available to them. This theme was sometimes connected to an increase in committee meetings and advisement loads. Less time is available for scholarly activities and mentoring of graduate students.
- Unclear, confusing or not useful public affairs mission (12/6.9%).
- Negative view of the merit system (9/5.1%). This theme was sometimes connected to faculty morale, faculty workload in administering the system, especially when monies are not available for merit pay, and bias in evaluating faculty work for merit.
- Limitations in evaluating the President because of his short time here (6/3.4%).
- Insufficient work resources (4/2.3%). This theme was connected to fewer support personnel to assist faculty, lack of research space and supplies, insufficient funds for graduate students, and little to no funds to attend conferences.
- The diversity mission (4/2.3%). This theme was sometimes tied to the perception that administration may not be hiring qualified individuals to handle the mission to increase diversity in faculty and staff. Other respondents indicated that the student culture is not inclusive to minority groups.
- Faculty unappreciated, under-valued, and/or not respected by administration (4/2.3%).
- Hope about direction of the university under the new president (4/2.3%).

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Faculty expressed some satisfaction, but less overall compared with 2008, in being a Missouri State University faculty member. Perceptions of conditions related to university productivity varied in terms of level of satisfaction, with many items staying the same, improving or

declining. Nevertheless, faculty members are clearly more concerned about compensation related factors now than in 2008. They are more concerned about the direction the University is moving. Additionally, many are concerned about the performance of administration, particularly at the President and Board of Governors levels, and about the level of shared governance.

When looking across the colleges, one finds many similarities in the way faculty perceive morale and conditions supporting work productivity, particularly in terms of the top and bottom areas. However, there are some striking differences in comparison to the university mean, which are discussed above and are visible in greater detail within the Appendixes of Tables online. These relative values represent strengths and weaknesses for administrators and faculty to celebrate or work to improve. Particular attention should be paid to faculty perceptions of conditions in COBA, COE, and CHPA, where there were several areas that showed substantially less satisfaction as compared to the university at large.

The Faculty Concerns Committee suggests the following recommendations and welcomes further discussion and utilization of the findings in ways that might improve faculty conditions in specific situations or by specific groups.

1. The University community has been working on two large initiatives that address cyclical concerns and demands forethought and reaction to important considerations: A long-term strategic plan and a budget review and decision-making process. Given the budgetary situation at the state level during fall 2010, some faculty concern about financial matters might be expected. However, given that the survey showed a substantial drop in faculty's perceptions of not only compensation-related items, but also the direction the university is moving in and the level of shared governance, both administration and faculty are encouraged to work cooperatively to address these important issues.
2. The survey found increasing concerns with future salary, cost of living adjustments, and internal and external equity. Fair pay considerations are important in their own right. Additionally, compensation clearly relates to many conditions associated with university productivity, including satisfaction and retention of faculty even though other factors (e.g., shared governance, perceptions of administrator performance) showed stronger relationships (see Table VI in Appendix 1). We encourage appropriate planning to remedy this situation.
3. Our new President has the opportunity to address the substantially lower perception of the performance of the President and Board of Governors as compared to historical patterns.
4. While many conditions are shared across the university, each college has areas that have been uniquely identified as different from the conditions viewed across the university. The Provost, Deans, Department Heads, and faculty are strongly encouraged to make intentional and transparent use of the relative findings by college to celebrate successes or address concerns. Blogs, all-college meetings, advisory committee meetings, written responses to faculty, strategic planning, departmental meetings, or other methods are all examples of how administrators and faculty may work to improve conditions at the college level.
5. Department heads, Deans, and faculty involved with each academic department are encouraged to explore the levels of reported satisfaction or agreement with conditions that support university productivity and morale and their similarity or difference related

to the average across the University. These results may help generate perceived strengths and weaknesses to address and may be found in Appendix 3. Furthermore, we recommend that the Faculty Senate Executive Committee discuss the potential utility of the college and departmental data with the Academic Leadership Council. Faculty morale and work conditions could be improved or celebrated through deans' review of the college and departmental findings with their department heads and advisory councils.

6. Specific centers and service provides on campus (e.g., Equity and Diversity, Bear Claw, Computer Services, etc.), which are specifically addressed in this survey of faculty perceptions are encouraged to review both the University and College data to see how their performance stacks up. This data can be instrumental in improving perceived performance. Comparisons should be made by each of these units in relation to
 - a. how other units are evaluated,
 - b. how they were evaluated in 2008 or before, and
 - c. how they are differentially or similarly perceived across the colleges.
7. The Faculty Concerns Committee recommends that the Faculty Senate Executive Committee distribute an email with a link to this report and its appendixes of tables on the Faculty Senate Website to all administrators, the Board of Governors, the faculty, and representatives from the Staff Senate and Student Government. In this way, people may be informed, discuss, and draw their own conclusions as to the meanings and potential course of actions that might follow.

CAVEATS

The past biennium has been a financially difficult one for the State of Missouri and, consequently, Missouri State University. Departments have been cutting or considering cutting human and other resources and most employees have gone without raises in response to a state budget crunch for years. While announcements were made on and after January 19, 2011 about potentially better budget scenarios, this situation may have affected faculty satisfaction.

A new president began in August 2010. Thus, in addition to economic uncertainty, there may have been uncertainty related to a leadership transition. Even though historical data shows that new deans, academic vice presidents/provosts, and presidents have usually received higher, not lower satisfaction, upon first evaluation, faculty members may be unable to determine accurately their satisfaction with the president, which may have further affected satisfaction scores.