



Faculty Survey of Success and Engagement

2022-2023 Committee on Faculty Concerns

Chair: Andrea Applegate

Co-chair: Michael Kyle

Members: Elizabeth Walker, Alan Schick, Grace Jackson-Brown, Leslie Baynes, Jennifer Pratt, Suneeta Thomas, Carl Keller, Jin Seo, Rebecca Rast, Kewman Lee, Jay McEntee

Introduction

The Committee on Faculty Concerns, as directed by the Faculty Senate, exists to discuss with the University Administration matters pertaining to remuneration, professional advancement, faculty-administrator relationships, and working conditions. It serves as the vehicle through which the faculty, Faculty Senate, and Administration may initiate issues or matters of concern for discussion and consideration and invites the submission and receive items of concern from faculty members, administrators, or groups of the same for discussion. The Committee consists of members from every college and the library.

In the past, the Committee has deployed two separate surveys on alternating years to provide information to interested parties – the Faculty Morale Survey and the Academic Administrators Assessment. This year, the committee chose to renovate the survey into a single, annually distributed survey named the Faculty Survey of Success and Engagement. This will allow for more frequent sampling regarding the same topics to identify concerns and track follow-up in a timely manner. This report describes the aggregate data obtained from the new survey.

The objective of the study was to examine faculty members' attitudes toward several aspects of MSU including:

- [Recruitment and Hiring](#)
- [Benefits](#)
- [Diversity, Equity, Inclusion, and Accessibility](#)
- [Empowerment and Representation](#)
- [Job Security and Working Conditions](#)
- [University Culture](#)
- [Pay and Compensation](#)
- [Skills and Career Advancement](#)

Methods

The Faculty Survey of Success and Engagement was created using several resources including previous Faculty Morale survey items, Academic Administrator Assessment items, Harvard Graduate School of Education’s Faculty Job Satisfaction Survey, and the US Department of Commerce Job Quality Toolkit. The purpose of creating a new survey was to streamline questions while combining the two previous survey instruments into a single survey. The committee also wanted to allow for open-ended questions by inserting a comment box at the end of each section. A copy of the survey instrument is available in [Appendix A](#).

Instrument

The survey was divided into eight sections corresponding to the aspects listed in the introduction as well as a final ranking question listing the eight sections to identify the order of importance for focus/need for the next year. Each section contained four to eleven questions utilizing a Likert-scale with a range of 1-Strongly Disagree, 2-Disagree, 3-Neither Agree Nor Disagree, 4-Agree, and 5-Strongly Agree. Following the Likert-scale questions was a comment box corresponding to the section. The University Culture section also included an open-ended question regarding the main reason for continuing as MSU faculty.

Distribution

All faculty, as defined by Banner identification, were utilized to create the population file for distribution utilizing Watermark (previously EvalKit). This included tenure or tenure-track faculty, clinical faculty, instructors, and per-course instructors. If coded as dean or associate provost, surveys were not distributed to these administrative roles due to the Banner identification. The survey was sent via email from Watermark with individualized links, preventing duplicate responses, with a response window of two weeks – spanning March 9th to March 23rd, 2023. The total number of recipients was originally listed at 1,126. This did include faculty from other MSU campuses, including West Plains, which were filtered and deleted prior to data analysis.

Completion Rate and Participant Demographics

Demographics were not asked in the survey instrument itself, but instead were gleaned from Watermark data utilizing Banner identification. This was in an effort to maintain privacy and to prevent survey takers from feeling concern that they could be identified by their responses. Through the two-week period, 302 faculty members responded, resulting in a 26% response rate. Not all faculty answered all questions or left comments. Associate Professors comprised the majority of respondents (see Table 1). The number of respondents per college were also captured (see Table 2), with smaller areas, such as the Library, being small enough to be a risk for identification. MCHHS had the highest number of surveys sent, followed closely by RCOAL, but the College of Business was the top responder with 32.1% of responders weighing in.

Table 1 – Response by Position Title (n=291)

<i>Position Title</i>	<i>Percentage</i>
<i>Per course Instructor</i>	9.62%
<i>Instructor</i>	5.15%
<i>Senior Instructor</i>	7.90%
<i>Assistant Professor</i>	16.15%
<i>Associate Professor</i>	24.74%
<i>Professor</i>	20.27%
<i>Distinguished Professor</i>	1.03%
<i>Clinical Instructor</i>	0.69%
<i>Clinical Assistant Professor</i>	4.12%
<i>Clinical Associate Professor</i>	1.72%
<i>Clinical Professor</i>	0.34%
<i>Department Head</i>	5.15%
<i>Associate Dean</i>	1.37%
<i>Visiting Instructor/Professor</i>	1.03%

Table 2 – Response by College

<i>College</i>	<i>Surveys sent</i>	<i>Responders</i>	<i>Response Rate</i>	<i>Rank</i>
<i>Health & Human Services</i>	228	67	29.4%	4
<i>Arts & Letters</i>	206	61	29.6%	3
<i>Education</i>	150	35	23.3%	5
<i>Business</i>	137	44	32.1%	1
<i>Natural & Applied Sci</i>	136	30	22.1%	6
<i>Humanities & PA</i>	129	41	31.8%	2
<i>College of Agriculture</i>	33	5	15.2%	7

Data Analysis

Reports for data analysis were generated by Watermark, which provided quantitative analysis for Likert-scale questions including frequency, percentage, mean, and standard deviation. The open-ended questions, comprised of comment boxes for each section, were distributed to Committee members by sections who identified themes across survey sections, selected comments to reinforce themes and patterns, and summarized results. The overall tone of the comments was also analyzed, determining percentages of positive, neutral, or negative comments.

Results

The result of the survey and analysis are included here. Each of the eight sections contains quantitative and qualitative data from the respective aspect of MSU identified in the survey. Quantitative data totals are found in [Appendix B](#).

Recruitment and Hiring

Survey results regarding recruitment and hiring showed that the majority of faculty (58.94%) agreed that MSU implements qualification-based hiring practices. When asked about MSU policies and procedures for onboarding, responding faculty most often chose Neither Agree Nor Disagree (115/302); and the majority of respondents disagreed with MSU policies and procedures for retention being successful (41.39%). See Table below for statistical analysis results.

Statement	Mean	Standard Deviation	Response Rate
<i>MSU recruits faculty from diverse sources of talent</i>	3.50	1.5	26.82%
<i>MSU hires acceptable numbers of support staff to meet faculty needs.</i>	2.88	1.16	26.82%
<i>MSU implements qualification-based hiring practices.</i>	3.54	1.01	26.82%
<i>MSU policies and procedures for onboarding are successful.</i>	3.21	0.98	26.82%
<i>MSU policies and procedures for retention are successful.</i>	2.79	1.08	26.82%

The comments for recruitment and hiring were reviewed and analyzed. A total of 104 comments were submitted which provided insight into respondents' concerns and thoughts regarding the section. Of these 104 comments, 70% were expressing concerns and criticism, while 3% provided positive feedback.

The principal theme identified in this section by respondents (30/104) was the issue of underpaid salaries in both retention and in recruitment. The following statements are representative of this sentiment:

- *The university needs to update salary levels for many departments, as we are unable to recruit qualified faculty members, or retain members after they have been hired. This is a problem that has become exacerbated as cost of living in Springfield has increased and the pay structure for Missouri state has remained stagnant.*
- *Salaries are a factor limiting recruitment and retention of high-quality faculty. I do recognize the administration's efforts to raise salaries, but this is a reality that I have observed.*

- *Relatively very low salaries, particularly as one moves up the rank ladder, hurt retention*
- *MSU consistently seeks to not hire the best, but to hire the cheapest. In other words, it's as if we want to be the K-Mart of higher education.*
- *Faculty salaries lag FAR behind comparable institutions AND inflation and WILL lead to faculty leaving.*
- *University policy about making salary ranges evident in job postings makes it very difficult to get job postings on many websites that could reach potential candidates.*
- *Regarding retention, although the cost of living increases have been a step in the right direction, it is not enough to even meet the cost of living increases in recent times. In addition, consistently, wages at MSU are below those of comparable colleges. Finally, equity requests are denied, even when provided strong evidence that MSU pays below the market value in high-demand professions and when it will make recruitment and retaining qualified faculty difficult at best.*
- *Once hired to the University little is done to retain highly qualified faculty, the salaries at this state University are well below other public universities in the State and across the nation.*
- *We are some of the lowest paid professors in the country for a state university, and cost of living has been rising steadily every year in Springfield - and really shouldn't be a "selling" point for new hires anymore. Initial hiring pay is vastly different depending on the field you teach in and it creates the sense that the university prioritizes.*
- *Retention at this university is a joke. Only I wish it were laughable. And the problem is the largely due to the truly embarrassing level of compensation we receive here (and if you countered in your mind with "but Springfield's cost of living is so low" then you're part of the problem).*
- *The support staff that are employed with the university are woefully underpaid. We can't expect people to work for wages that don't support cost of living and family needs.*

The other two major themes from recruitment and hiring were diversity and lack of training issues, with 30/104 comments dedicated to these two topics, 15 comments for each. The following statements are representative of these sentiments:

- *In order to find and retain diverse faculty members, a stronger infrastructure needs to be developed to support these hires. Start by hiring diverse higher administrators. That lets outside academics know that the university is serious about retention and the needs of BIPOC individuals.*
- *I noticed that requirement for diversity statements was removed from current advertisements. These statements, while being only a minimal requirement, helped send a signal of acceptance and support to potential applicants that embody and/or value the principles of diversity, equity and inclusion. Without this requirement, we may lose the potential to recruit applicants who may display strengths that will help prepare competent professionals who support and serve diverse communities and cultures.*
- *Hiring diverse or representative faculty is lessened when diversity statements are removed without consultation with hiring committees and the implications are non-trivial.*
- *We say we prioritize diversity experience in hiring, but if the administration doesn't care about that when it comes down to the final decision.*
- *MSU loses some of our best people continually. Do we ask deep questions about why they are leaving? In particular when we lose faculty of color, it would be nice to find out why so action steps can be taken to minimize future departures.*
- *On the diversity question: We hire oodles of people who have degrees from MSU. This is a problem.*
- *As technology has increased over the past few years, the need for qualified and competent IT departments has grown. The number of competent IT support staff is lacking with disparity from college to college. Additionally, more technology is required as faculty have been encouraged to be more innovative and engaging with this generation of students. More staff in the FCTL or even an instructional designer per college would be extremely helpful.*
- *Onboarding could be improved. I came from another university and was thankfully familiar with academia. Still, organized mentoring within the department could have been better. Very much as "learn as you go" type of system which is not very efficient.*

- *Since COVID, technology, programs, and equipment, have become even more essential for all faculty and instructors. More one on one training for different software should be available so those teaching can focus on content rather than programming software and troubleshooting software and equipment.*
- *Onboarding lacks structure and thorough training. Many procedures and policies are not conveyed, mentioned, or clarified, so when situations come up later, faculty members have to resort to going through multiple levels of personnel to figure out the appropriate procedures.*

Benefits

Survey results regarding benefits revealed that the majority of faculty agreed that health benefits (62.58%) and additional health benefit options (62.91%) were acceptable. When asked about mental health benefits (126/302), childcare benefits (196/302), and eldercare benefits (217/302), responding faculty most often chose Neither Agree Nor Disagree. See Table below for statistical analysis results.

Statement	Mean	Standard Deviation	Response Rate
<i>MSU tailors benefits to the diverse needs of MSU faculty.</i>	3.33	1.02	26.82%
<i>MSU health benefit options are acceptable.</i>	3.53	1.02	26.82%
<i>MSU additional health benefit options (cafeteria plan, wellness benefit, classes, etc.,) are acceptable.</i>	3.65	0.93	26.82%
<i>MSU mental health benefits are acceptable</i>	3.16	1.03	26.82%
<i>MSU paid time off benefits are acceptable.</i>	3.42	0.94	26.82%
<i>MSU retirement savings programs are acceptable.</i>	3.45	0.99	26.82%
<i>MSU financially supports learning and continuing education.</i>	3.29	1.02	26.82%
<i>MSU childcare benefits are acceptable.</i>	2.83	0.84	26.82%
<i>MSU eldercare benefits are acceptable.</i>	2.87	0.76	26.82%
<i>MSU provides acceptable financial planning and wellness education to faculty.</i>	3.31	0.91	26.82%
<i>MSU encourages benefit enrollment and usage.</i>	3.85	0.87	26.82%

The comments for benefits were reviewed and analyzed. A total of 93 comments were submitted which provided insight into respondents' concerns and thoughts regarding the section. Of these 93 comments, 92.4% were expressing concerns and criticism, 2.2% were neutral or N/A, while 5.4% provided positive feedback.

The principal theme identified in this section by respondents (14/93) was the lack of awareness that childcare, eldercare, or mental health options were available or that they are unacceptable (10/93). The following statements are representative of this sentiment:

- *I am unaware of mental health, Childcare and eldercare benefits.*
- *I have no that there is an "eldercare" benefit----it would be interesting to hear more.*
- *Many of these things either don't exist or there isn't a clear and easy way to find them to gain access.*
- *More support with childcare and eldercare would be great.*
- *There are no childcare benefits. I would have to pay an unattainable price for childcare at MSU's facilities.*
- *What childcare and eldercare benefits? If MSU cared about faculty and staff health, a membership to the fitness center would be included as a benefit of employment.*

The secondary theme identified in this section by respondents (12/93) was the issue of continuing education. The following statements are representative of this sentiment:

- *Many of us are in positions that require yearly continuing education to maintain licensures and credentials. Additionally, we need to take continuing education regarding teaching and pedagogy. These efforts obviously require time outside of work and extra funding. Our faculty development funds have been progressively reduced over the years and this sends a message that leadership may not value this aspect of our profession.*
- *Other universities offer two semesters of tuition for children, not just 15 credit hours.*
- *Why can't staff and faculty use 15 credit hours at Greenwood? Why only 7.5 hours?*

- *Why do we only get 15 credit hours a year, and not a semester - and how many of us actually use this to its full potential? If we don't use these hours, why can we "cash them in" of transfer them as a gift to someone in our extended families or to support a student who can't afford to go to college?*

Diversity, Equity, Inclusion, and Accessibility (DEIA)

Survey results regarding benefits revealed that the majority of faculty agreed that access to equity policies and practices is provided (69.86%). When asked about using mentoring, coaching, and sponsorship to advance diverse faculty, a majority (125/302) of responding faculty most often chose Neither Agree Nor Disagree. There was no statistically significant difference in Agree or Disagree in response to empowering faculty to speak out against bias and discrimination. See Table below for statistical analysis results.

Statement	Mean	Standard Deviation	Response Rate
<i>MSU provides access to the organization's equity policies and practices.</i>	3.77	0.92	26.82%
<i>MSU has acceptable resources to increase inclusion.</i>	3.38	1.09	26.82%
<i>MSU has acceptable resources to increase accessibility.</i>	3.37	1.11	26.82%
<i>MSU has acceptable resources to resolve inequities.</i>	3.00	1.20	26.82%
<i>MSU empowers faculty to speak out against bias and discrimination without fear of retaliation.</i>	2.96	1.28	26.82%
<i>MSU offers meaningful levels of DEIA training to all faculty.</i>	3.30	1.00	26.82%
<i>MSU uses mentoring, coaching, and sponsorship to advance diverse faculty.</i>	3.33	1.00	26.82%
<i>MSU policies and procedures reduce stigma and misunderstanding in DEIA.</i>	3.12	1.11	26.82%

The comments for DEIA were reviewed and analyzed. A total of 88 comments were submitted which provided insight into respondents' concerns and thoughts regarding the section. These comments were categorized as being exclusively positive (4, 4.5%), neutral or mixed (23, 26.1%), or exclusively negative (61, 69.3%) with respect to the university's approach to DEIA issues. The 'neutral or mixed' category included many comments that expressed positivity regarding the university's intentions or approaches to DEIA issues, with reservations about follow-through or criticism about the outcomes. Five themes stood out among the comments: discrimination, accessibility, mentoring, the role of MSU with respect to DEIA in the current political climate (especially at the state level), and skeptical impressions of DEIA efforts at MSU.

The principal theme identified in this section by respondents was accessibility issues (17/88) with physical accommodations being the most common concern. The following statements are representative of this sentiment:

- *There are way too many doors, offices, and buildings that are not accessible to those with disabilities*
- *More resources are needed to increase building accessibility, improve bathrooms, etc.*
- *Accessibility is atrocious in older buildings.*

The second main theme identified in this section expressed skepticism or misgivings regarding MSU's DEIA efforts or posited that there was reverse discrimination (14/88). Several of these comments expressed that MSU's DEIA efforts have gone too far. The following statements are representative of this sentiment:

- *I'm all for inclusion of everyone, and in agreement of limitations on DEI*
- *MSU is more focused on DEI than it is on the fundamentals of education*
- *MSU has over done it with DEIA*

Respondents' comments identified mentoring as the third main theme of this section (11/88) with comments mainly discussing the Bear Bridge Mentoring Program for Diverse Faculty (or interpreted to be about this program), there was complete agreement about its positive value, including the work of Dr. Judith Martinez in leading it.

Empowerment and Representation

Survey results regarding empowerment and representation revealed that the majority of faculty were not in agreement with these statements. There was no statistically significant difference in Agree or Disagree in response to faculty being given a voice through formal structures that protect the workforce or MSU ensuring that faculty can organize and/or be represented. The majority of respondents disagreed with MSU effectively responding to faculty concerns (51.33%). See Table below for statistical analysis results.

Statement	Mean	Standard Deviation	Response Rate
<i>MSU gives faculty a meaningful voice through formal structures that protect the workforce.</i>	2.89	1.21	26.82%
<i>MSU ensures that faculty can organize and/or be represented and have access to senior leadership.</i>	3.02	1.23	26.82%
<i>MSU adequately assesses faculty satisfaction and engagement.</i>	2.81	1.23	26.82%
<i>MSU effectively responds to faculty concerns.</i>	2.61	1.18	26.82%

The comments for empowerment and representation were reviewed and analyzed. A total of 78 comments were submitted which provided insight into respondents' concerns and thoughts regarding the section. The responses were largely negative, with 94.87% of responses, while the remaining four comments were positive.

While the themes in this section are related to each other, the category of shared governance could be considered to be the nexus that ties them together. 13/78 written responses (16.6%) were judged to be primarily concerned with the shared governance between the administration and the faculty. The following statements are representative of this sentiment:

- *I think it's become clear throughout the realignment process that faculty governance is not really being considered or implemented.*
- *Shared governance has devolved at this institution to mere theatre. Access to "senior leadership" is provided, while transparency and "input-gathering" are constantly emphasized by those in administration. However, it is clear that the faculty are relatively powerless and their input is ignored. That we can voice concerns and are constantly asked for input is meaningless if faculty voices make no difference to how even issues that should be the purview of faculty are resolved.*
- *It may be time for faculty to begin considering collective bargaining to ensure representation.*
- *The entire realignment process being devoid of faculty highlights the true organizational structure of MSU. The faculty senate is supposed to be an outlet for shared governance but the administration will make unilateral decisions with bad data and bad input.*
- *Faculty Governance is a joke when deans decide to create or split positions in a parking lot conversation with one faculty member without addressing the faculty unit about it. Read the Department Head manual that says the Head is responsible for the actions of search committees made up of faculty members and then tell me we have meaningful faculty governance!*
- *It has become too easy for the administration to ignore faculty governance. Shared governance is less shared than the policies imply.*
- *This year's whole "re-alignment" process shows that there is no concern for shared governance. We wanted to hire a woman of color for provost, but that qualified person wasn't hired. Then we hired a provost without a search process. Those two came in with what looks like a pre-determined plan with a facade of faculty governance. Looks like the Provost is rehashing what he did at his previous university.*

Concerns about shared governance at MSU were expressed in terms of management style and decision-making as a closely related theme in responses (7/78), indicating that they felt the management style was a top-down approach.

- *Most administrators here, from the President down to the department heads, are usually very autocratic. They do not believe in shared governance, and they act accordingly. They make shows of "transparency," "cooperation," etc. through "town halls," etc., but these events function merely as pretenses of*

communication. At their best, these are events at which faculty learn of decisions that the administration has already made. (But the administration usually prefers to make decisions and then to present them, via electronic communication, as faculty are grading final exams and heading into a break.) Most of the "town halls," etc. are not actually exchanges between "townspeople." They are empty briefings. Most of the time is devoted to an information-free report from administrators (as at this semester's town hall about realignment). A small amount of time is reserved for Q&A, during which the administrators continue to refuse to share any information. These events are typical, furthermore, of the administration's general manner of "working with" faculty. I could provide many more examples. To offer just one more, I'll talk about committees, work groups, etc. established by the central administration to address issues in which faculty have very big stakes. Such groups are often large--ten people, a dozen people--but often include only one or two faculty members; the other members are administrators. Again, I could offer many more examples of the very top-down, autocratic administrative style here. And hand-delivered promotion letters, faculty lunches, free coffee from Starbucks, etc. are not substitutes for actual shared governance.

- I was shocked when I came here to find MSU so top heavy. Admin reigns over faculty who have little to no voice. Faculty are treated very poorly.
- Changes are given top-down from administration, with faculty only offered window dressing as pretend engagement.
- The university (college) has become more autocratic during my time here. Faculty seem to have less voice and control than previously.
- MSU is under an autocratic leadership. Everyone I spoke with did not approve the Provost and EVP's hiring process. VP research is someone who does not even have a PhD or any sorts of formal research, paper, and grants writing experience.
- President Smart runs this university like a dictatorship. He doesn't care about faculty input. When Senate raised concerns about the Provost search he couldn't handle it so he created a position. He communicates with faculty through press releases. Often we have to find out what is going on in our own university through the News Leader. Perhaps this is how we should also communicate our concerns.

A second main theme with respondents was input, and although they acknowledged that the administration does hold meetings to discuss policies, the faculty indicated that they do not believe upper management really seeks their input in decisions (14/78). The following statements are representative of this sentiment:

- The ongoing "realignment process," especially with regard to the COAL-CHPA merger, show that faculty input is largely for show. Administration pretend to be taking faculty input but then do what they want.
- I often feel upper-admin decisions are pre-destined and our input is solicited only for show.
- Administration at MSU is more interested in the appearance of faculty input than actually giving faculty a voice on their governance. We created the position of EVP without consulting faculty. We hired a provost with a fake search in which 2 of the 3 candidates withdrew resulting in the position being handed to the President's intended choice all along. Faculty opinions are endlessly solicited through vehicles (like this survey) such as surveys, committees, town hall type meetings and other qualitative mechanisms. However, these are clearly mere devices to mislead faculty into believing they were consulted. The reality is that we have no say in things such as who our administrators are, what the administrative agenda is, our LMS system or our input on "realignment" because said input is not valued or considered seriously, we have an attorney as a President who is little more than a political lobbyist with political aspirations, an EVP who is his likely successor who is equally as politically minded and equally as unqualified to run an institution of higher education. Our provost is a hit man, indeed, a dinosaur from the 1990's complete with dated tools of downsizing (like the "Balanced Scorecard," which has been laughed out of the managerial literature in the last 2 decades). It's insulting to morale and it is destructive to our original mission of creating educated people. However, administration will continue to claim that data collection of faculty opinions is equivalent to giving faculty a voice. The reality, which is well known by the rank and file faculty, is that administration makes the decisions then pretends to consult faculty to give the appearance of a voice (while summarily ignoring those voices).

- *This has been a rough year or two. I feel like change is already decided without the faculty's input truly considered. It is given lip-service, but that is about it. We are administration heavy and that creates a massive imbalance and doesn't serve us financially or academically. This has been a rough year or two. I feel like change is already decided without the faculty's input truly considered. It is given lip-service, but that is about it. We are administration heavy and that creates a massive imbalance and doesn't serve us financially or academically.*
- *It often feels like faculty are invited to participate in discussions but that the decision has already been made by higher administration. It feels condescending and makes me not want to attend or give effort toward future meetings or surveys like this one. "Being heard" gets old if no one ultimately considers what is said.*
- *It feels upper administration usually has mind made up before faculty input is sought.*

One of the main themes of governance among respondents was that while faculty input was sought by administration, the concerns were not addressed effectively by administration or Faculty Senate (19/78). The following statements are representative of this sentiment:

- *I have seen what happens to this survey: it is conducted; a committee diligently prepares a report; it is presented to Senate; perhaps a vague resolution is adopted; the report disappears for all intents and purposes. Please make this survey matter.*
- *Faculty have a voice, but it's not "meaningful." MSU responds to faculty concerns, but not "effectively." Faculty can say things, but much of the time it appears that there is no meaningful change as a result.*
- *The university does not really respond to faculty concerns unless there is a legal risk of not doing so.*
- *All previous attempts to address concerns with [College] department heads and the Dean have been ignored and pushed aside. The Dean or the previous Provost never addressed earlier evaluations of department heads that indicated issues and concerns with management style. This behavior only encourages frustration and a lack of effort to communicate concerns from the faculty and staff further. I am aware of issues with both the . . . department heads. Yet, all concerns provided by the faculty, staff, and students have been completely disregarded and ignored by upper management.*
- *We have surveys all the time, but nothing changes except new surveys.*
- *I do believe they acknowledge that faculty have concerns but often the follow-through to address and resolve the concerns will not occur.*
- *I honestly don't know what the "formal structures" are for faculty voice - other than faculty senate, which seems kind of distant.*

Finally, while most of the responses conveyed a negative voice, four of them were judged to have a positive tone, and although they were not considered to be a theme, they are presented here in the interest of fairness. Those comments were:

- *There was a specific problem administrator in 2022 and I was really impressed by the speed and sufficiency of the response.*
- *I appreciate John and Zora meeting with folks around campus. I hope changes are coming!*
- *I think President Clif Smart had issues in the past with responding to faculty concerns, but I believe with the addition of Dr. Jasinski, the response to faculty concerns has drastically improved. Hopeful for Zora Mulligan as well...Dr. Jasinski seem to really care about people in general and this shows great leadership in my opinion.*
- *Absolutely agree.....we are part of a great university.*

Job Security and Working Conditions

Survey results regarding job security and working conditions showed that the majority of faculty agreed that MSU policies and procedures promote job security (55.96%) and ensure that faculty have safe and sanitary working conditions (52.99%). The majority of respondents disagreed with MSU anticipating and responding with agility to reduce job strain for faculty (48.68%). See Table below for statistical analysis results.

Statement	Mean	Standard Deviation	Response Rate
<i>MSU policies and procedures promote job security.</i>	3.40	1.06	26.82%
<i>MSU ensures that faculty have safe and sanitary working conditions.</i>	3.28	1.19	26.82%
<i>MSU policies and procedures ensure that faculty are psychologically safe, without fear of intimidation or neglect.</i>	3.08	1.19	26.82%
<i>MSU anticipates and responds with agility to reduce job strain for faculty.</i>	2.62	1.12	26.82%
<i>MSU protects faculty data and information.</i>	3.51	0.92	26.82%
<i>MSU offers clear and reasonable workload policies to all faculty.</i>	2.92	1.19	26.82%
<i>MSU offers acceptable flexible and/or remote work options.</i>	3.38	1.15	26.82%

The comments for job security and working conditions were reviewed and analyzed. A total of 105 comments were submitted which provided insight into respondents' concerns and thoughts regarding the section. Of these comments, 94.3% were expressing concerns and criticism, and 5.7% provided positive feedback.

The principal theme identified in this section by respondents (39/105) was the concern of job strain with issues related to "bullying" and lack of workload policy. The following statements are representative of this sentiment:

- *I would say that workload contributes to job strain and the inability to retain qualified faculty. Consideration and modifications to the workload should occur based on the specific discipline, class size, and level of students. The current workload is designed as a one size fits all and this is not appropriate. This contributes to faculty dissatisfaction and the inability to retain qualified faculty.*
- *MSU keeps asking us to make bricks without straw: more work with less support and even less money--not even enough to keep up with inflation. One small example: purchasing cheap, buggy software instead of quality software for admin and teaching.*
- *Again, my issues are with [the Dean]. Lately they have been intimidating faculty and staff into attending events outside our regular schedules, such as on weekends or disrupting faculty teaching schedules. A recent example was the so-called Professional Development half-day, when they told faculty to adjust their syllabi to allow for taking the half day off from their assigned courses or other appointments. They claimed they were not "advocating for you to cancel classes," which is complete nonsense because what kind of classroom activities can happen without the professor...Nevertheless, they explicitly threatened to withhold travel funding from anybody who didn't attend. That's a nice way to punish faculty who are dedicated to their classes and want to actually do their jobs.*
- *The half-day itself was a joke. They didn't even have anything planned when they announced the date. The actual activity was announced much later, and it turned out to be workshop on Generation Z students hosted by somebody who had recently finished grad school and doesn't seem to have ever actually taught a college-level class. If the dean wanted somebody who was an expert on generational differences they could have found one in [College] who would have given a much better presentation. Or they could have just checked out FCTL Showcase. But again, I don't think they were actually interested in providing a meaningful experience for the members of the college. They just wanted to do something so that they could claim they did something.*
- *Workloads are very uneven. Some professor teach nothing or low numbers of students for "community work" or "service" They really use the time to complain about what is actually working or to bully other hard working colleagues. It is very discouraging.*
- *Labor is not equally distributed with faculty- some faculty are doing so much more work and some faculty (often those with tenure) are not doing much, especially as it relates to student success and retention. Students figure out the faculty that are supportive of them, which only furthers the gap of workload, because students seek out the faculty that will help and support them and they don't even bother with the faculty that don't support students.*
- *Faculty in my department typically work 60-hour workweeks, including teaching, research, and service. I have no days off during the regular semester. It's Spring Break, and I've spent it grading; I spend my weekends*

grading and furiously doing my research in preparation for conferences. There is no such thing as a real break for faculty during the regular semester

- *There is often a difference between the workload policy and the implementation/honoring of that policy. There are many faculty who are working unpaid overloads. A previous version of this survey revealed a huge problem in this area. I am disappointed to not see that issue being specifically addressed in this survey.*

The second most-commented theme in this section was focused on safety and sanitary work conditions (37/105).

Respondents are concerned over the unsanitary conditions of the buildings in which they work, are frustrated in the lack of janitorial staff, length of time in which it takes to have repairs looked at/finished, and concerns about mold seems to be a common theme. Faculty are also concerned in terms of their physical safety when it comes to students. Statements below discuss some of the concerns:

- *I do not feel psychologically safe, or sometimes even physically safe, in regard to student complaints. The culture has changed at MSU regarding faculty and student relationships, with faculty facing increasingly open hostility for maintaining academic standards. Students may even make threats to faculty and face no consequences. Some students attempt to intimidate faculty and should be made to face consequences for that behavior.*
- *Safety - this campus is not a safe place for women. Be it female students or faculty. Be it physical safety or safety from discrimination and prejudice.; Female professors (myself included and some that I know) are intimidated by misbehaving aggressive male students.*
- *The lack of concern for safety of employees working in McDonald Arena is astounding. When addressed, Clif Smart seemed to not care at all. That building is dangerous.*
- *I teach in [Hall]. In [location], there has been a leak in the roof since I've worked here (20xx) and it has NEVER been fixed. Buckets are placed on the floor to keep the water contained, but the water soaks the ceiling right next to a light fixture and presents a MULTITUDE of health and safety concerns, ranging from electrical shock to black mold growing in the ceiling tiles. This is disgusting and reflects poorly on the university. Imagine giving a tour to perspective students and their family and have to "nervously" laugh off the fact that we have black mold in-and-around our classrooms. And yes, I've reported this issue on multiple occasions (as in, every time it rains). We also have a mouse infestation in [Hall] that hasn't been addressed after several reports being made. A commercially bought glue trap is NOT going to cut it*
- *Hill Hall continues to not be cleaned well. People have emailed this concern many, many times and nothing changes. The classroom floor will have a spill or dirt on the floor that exists the entire semester. I have cleaned spills/dirt or even students before it was done. I'm certainly not above cleaning, but if someone is supposed to be cleaning and it's not being done well that's a problem. Hill Hall is brand new and you'd never know it-- paint is peeling from the wall. Looking across campus there is Glass Hall. Education students often already feel a lack of support for their profession even during their studies and the building the study in confirms their importance or lack thereof.*
- *I know this seems petty, but lack of progress on the south campus underpass has been extremely frustrating for both faculty and students. I know there have been complications, but the lack of communication about the work on the underpass has been surprising. It was just the last week that lights on the parking lot around campus were turned back on---left us for months leaving night classes trying to navigate a construction zone and parking lot (that has greatly deteriorated) in the dark.*
- *Strong Hall has serious mold problems; MOLD in Strong Hall; We did not have janitorial staff in Strong hall for months leaving the bathrooms absolutely disgusting. Faculty and staff were cleaning them themselves. Additionally, it took months to fix the sinks in one of the women's bathrooms. for nearly a full semester (during flu season) there was only one working sink out of three. Finally, strong hall is full of mold; There is mold all throughout Strong Hall, including the classrooms where we teach (Strong 407 and Strong 408), as well as faculty offices*
- *I strongly disagree that a sanitary work environment is ensured - we have multiple ceiling tiles in our offices and classrooms growing black mold. With REPEATED work orders and even those saying it's been 'completed' but the mold still remains. (Kampeter)*

- *Workspace is not consistently sanitary. Sludge has been falling from my air vent for years with many complaints and requests to get it fixed. Service professionals have come and looked at it and done nothing that has changed the falling debris.*

The third main theme in this section is concerning psychological safety of faculty, mainly in the area of intimidation (20/105). In several cases, respondents did not differentiate between physically safe (question above) and being psychologically safe in their responses. The following statements are representative of this sentiment:

- *Full professors seem to do very little while most of the workload is held by untenured faculty. Full professors are also allowed to use intimidation, threat, etc.*
- *Many people fear retaliation at least in a certain college since several people have been fired without cause already... The lack of merit pay is also hurting unprotected faculty (non-tenured and adjunct) who are doing the workload within many departments with almost no recognition.*
- *I personally feel put at risk due to proximity to student conduct issues (which are not about my behavior), but where formal advice or feedback is near zero. I feel like asking questions in this area is very dangerous for me.*
- *The physical security on this campus is unacceptable. We do not have a campus police force, nor do I ever see patrols.*
- *I have been highly disappointed in my working conditions and workload. I have absorbed the workload of two other people without promise of new hirer or increase in pay. I have placed several reports about working conditions for myself and students with little to no response. I work in potentially dangerous conditions regularly and probably in the presence of black mold. I have been intimidated in the work place without serious consequences for the workplace bully. I have witnessed the tenure and promotion process turn into a process less about someone's merit and qualifications and more about whether that person is liked or doesn't rock the boat.*
- *The University is built on an authoritarian model that mobilizes the twin poles of fear and favor. Those who are loyal to the powers that be (regardless of the ethics of a situation) are rewarded, and those who raise concerns (no matter how legitimate) of any kind are punished, dismissed, or threatened with firing. This problem is especially epidemic in the Reynolds College of Arts and Letters under the autocratic rule of Shawn Wahl. Any attempt to report wrongdoing or policy violations is met with swift retaliation, especially in RCOAL.*

University Culture

Survey results regarding university culture showed that the majority of faculty agreed that MSU respects values, and trusts faculty (44.70%) and communicates long-range plans to faculty (45.04%). When asked about MSU preparing for and actively managing change in the marketplace, a large number (107/302) of responding faculty most often chose Neither Agree Nor Disagree. See Table below for statistical analysis results.

Statement	Mean	Standard Deviation	Response Rate
<i>MSU respects, values, and trusts faculty.</i>	3.10	1.26	26.82%
<i>MSU prepares for and actively manages change in the marketplace for higher education successfully.</i>	2.98	1.12	26.82%
<i>MSU long-range plans are well communicated to faculty.</i>	3.08	1.24	26.82%
<i>MSU senior leadership encourages transformation and innovation from faculty.</i>	3.03	1.18	26.82%

The comments for university culture were reviewed and analyzed. A total of 83 comments were submitted which provided insight into respondents' concerns and thoughts regarding the section. Of these comments, 90.36% were expressing concerns and criticism, 4.82% were partially positive, and 4.82% provided positive feedback.

The principal theme identified in this section by respondents was really the lack of university culture. The following statements are representative of this sentiment:

- *We don't have one, because we don't have a brand.*

- *There is a university culture?*
- *I think the University culture is to have great PR. Surface level action, but highly resistant to cultural changes that may be difficult to tackle.*
- *There does not seem to be a lot of university culture on campus - you can walk around campus any week night after 4pm and no one is around. When I worked at other universities, the quad and the main campus center was the hub of clubs, community events, student hang-outs, etc. There doesn't seem to be a lot of incentive for students to stay and hang around, nor the faculty or staff. I think many people are burnt out post-Covid and getting a "free coffee at Starbucks" or a "heartfelt thank you" at a meeting doesn't feel like enough to cover all the changes and hard work the faculty and staff have put in over the last few years. It is hard to look at how high upper-admin salaries are compared to the instructors, per-course, and staff salaries are - when they are often the ones working, interacting with students on a daily level, and keeping things afloat. I do think the things like the communal college events help with this!! The library beer event was a great way to meet other faculty members, or see others we haven't since the pandemic started. The Faculty Writing Retreats have also been a great place and have felt rewarding and like the university cares about our productivity.*

A second theme that emerged was the distrust of administration and the concern that the network favors certain demographics. The following statements are representative of this sentiment:

- *Culture feels like it strongly benefits certain personality types and particularly, men.*
- *Still a male-dominated field in my discipline. Even the student recognize it, and I think it impacts our grad students going into the field.*
- *It's the Old Boys Network for sure*
- *The culture is heavily good old boy and conservative. Others are not at all welcomed. Women are not well represented in leadership positions. Most office workers are females. In my school, most instructors are females, whereas tenured faculty are mostly male. In general, though, whether female or male, the culture here does not respect faculty.*
- *Even though faculty are assured that there will be/is transparency in the realignment process, everything is very secretive and the 'good ole boy' network is acting in full force. The chair of the realignment committee is working for his own personal advancement goals, not for the good of the university.*
- *As it stands now the administration is almost entirely inbred. They work to protect each other and their own retirement system. Employee complaints to equity and inclusion are not investigated properly and swept under the rug to protect administrators who are behaving unethically.*
- *That administration does things without discussing with faculty, like the merging of colleges, tells me that there is no openness.*
- *The continuing lack of any real transparency regarding the merger of COAL and CHPA is demoralizing for faculty, and indicates the administration's lack of investment in those departments and programs.*
- *Feels that faculty input is less valued in some colleges. For example- sending out a survey for faculty AFTER administrators already made decisions.*
- *The current culture, brought about by Clif Smart, is one of distrust and uncertainty.*
- *I feel supported in my department, but do not always trust upper administration's motives. I understand there are many changes that need to happen and I support that. I feel that trust is not strong between faculty and upper administration and would be afraid to speak out publicly in fear of being labeled a "troublemaker".*
- *The realignment and agility efforts were not managed well. It created a culture of distrust. There will be unhappy people with this undertaking no matter what you do, but this process created university wide panic that was probably not needed.*
- *There are a lot of changes going on right now and many of the people in charge of those changes are pretty new around here. I don't have a lot of confidence that they understand MSU or have its best long-term interests in mind.*
- *University Culture is at an all time low! Administrators seem committed to doing whatever it takes (including being untruthful/underhanded) to maintain or move up in their position/ranking within the University. I have not experienced anything like this at the University in past decades. Integrity is lacking so much so that I am*

not proud to be a part of this University at this time. That is extremely difficult for me to say as I have always been proud to be faculty at Missouri State. I too believe ageism is being experienced by senior faculty.

Innovation and the lack of encouragement from administration rounded out the third theme for this section. Statements regarding this included:

- *MSU does not encourage transformative thinking and innovation. I feel that MSU does not have the vision to compete with other major universities in the state or to attract students from the surrounding states.*
- *MSU leadership does encourage innovation but often at the risk of incurring faculty burnout. There is only so much we can do with the time and resources we have. We need realistic and manageable tactics to tackle recruitment, retention, student success, etc.*
- *Trust for faculty is low when faculty are neither consulted nor informed about decisions that impact them. Tone regarding inflexibility of faculty is often accusatory without regarding the inflexibility of existing systems and limited incentives to be flexible. Leadership does encourage and support innovation, at least in my experience so far, but the tone is that this may only be true for a limited time due to budgetary constraints.*
- *Whether or not MSU promotes transformation and innovation from faculty, I don't get the sense that many of my colleagues are that motivated/interested in this. It's very much a status quo culture*
- *The awards should be based on merits and not on who has somebody to recommend. A rubrics of performance indicators should be clear and transparent.*

When asked the main reason for continuing as faculty with MSU, an open-ended question, the responses were mainly focused along 13 major themes. There was a total of 291 respondents; as this was a mandatory question and required to continue the survey, there were 26/291 responses that were not usable for data analysis - 4 entered only punctuation marks or nonsensical responses, 3 entered a response expressing anger that a response was mandatory for the item, 2 entered "no comment," and 17 entered "off-topic" responses (26 total, 3.8%).

Of the total 285 responses to this item, 177 (62.0%) were generally positive comments (of those 177, 17 included a negative comment), 59 were generally negative (20.7%), and 49 (33%) were neutral.

<i>Reason</i>	<i>Response (percentage)</i>
<i>Relationships with/fond of colleagues, students, and/or department</i>	59 (20.0%)
<i>Enjoy their job/rewarding work</i>	51 (17.5 %)
<i>Geographic location/attachments to the area</i>	31 (10.7 %)
<i>Tenured, inertia/invested at MSU, continuing for retirement benefits</i>	30 (10.3%)
<i>Poor academic job market/lack of other opportunities</i>	20 (6.9 %)
<i>Like the administration/senior leadership</i>	10 (3.4 %)
<i>Like the flexibility they have at MSU</i>	9 (3.1 %)
<i>Financial reasons</i>	8 (2.7%)
<i>MSU's/their program's reputation</i>	7 (2.4%)
<i>Not going to stay/seeking other opportunities</i>	6 (2.1%)
<i>Thinking about leaving/exploring job market</i>	5 (1.7%)
<i>They are MSU alumni</i>	4 (1.4%)
<i>Feel valued/recognized at MSU</i>	3 (1.0%)

Pay and Compensation

Survey results regarding pay and compensation were the lowest, as a section, of the survey. Analysis revealed that the majority of faculty did not agree to any question in this section. When asked about MSU assessing and updating policies to reduce pay inequities by gender and race, a large portion (123/302) of responding faculty most often chose Neither Agree Nor Disagree. The majority of respondents disagreed with MSU providing competitive faculty wages (68.88%), ensuring compensation practices were equitable and transparent (45.69%), and that MSU demonstrates fairness and recognition by compensating faculty for improving performance (56.59%). See Table below for statistical analysis results.

Statement	Mean	Standard Deviation	Response Rate
<i>MSU provides competitive faculty wages.</i>	2.13	1.14	26.82%
<i>MSU assesses and updates policies to reduce pay inequities by gender and race.</i>	2.77	1.17	26.82%
<i>MSU assesses and publishes pay ranges, segmented by meaningful demographics.</i>	2.93	1.08	26.82%
<i>MSU ensures that compensation practices are equitable and transparent.</i>	2.60	1.18	26.82%
<i>MSU demonstrates fairness and recognition by compensating faculty for improving performance.</i>	2.31	1.15	26.82%

The comments for pay and compensation were reviewed and analyzed. A total of 109 comments were submitted which provided insight into respondents' concerns and thoughts regarding the section. Of these comments, 89% were expressing concerns and criticism and 11% represented positive feedback, neutral statements, or constructive suggestions for improvement.

Faculty provided the most feedback regarding the perception that MSU does not offer competitive pay when compared to other academic institutions or to similar jobs in the community marketplace, such as clinical positions. Faculty submitted 44 comments, the majority of which (30/44) referenced how MSU does not offer competitive wages to peer institutions. The following statements are representative of this sentiment:

- *Faculty salaries are not at CUPA or AAUP averages!*
- *Our pay is sadly lagging behind peer institutions and appears that it will never be competitive*
- *It has taken me two equity applications to increase what I earn to the bare minimum of what scholars at other institutions are earning as full professors. It's shameful*
- *This is the tough one -- the issue that made me frequently consider leaving MSU even though I like it. We lag way behind relative to peer institutions on this. I get that Springfield cost of living is lower, but even with that factored in, we're lagging ...*
- *We have outdated categories for some faculty lines, especially those related to health care education. As a result, we struggle to attract those with the appropriate training, and we often lose any we do attract to better paying positions elsewhere. MSU needs to update the pay scale so they can be offered competitive compensation in response to market forces...*
- *For many of the fields, we are lagging behind in the market*
- *The pay structure of Missouri state is absolutely pathetic. While some departments are paid at much higher rates due to market conditions. Those same market conditions are ignored by other colleges, and or departments*
- *Faculty are not paid equitably compared to their counterparts in practice. Attracting and retaining faculty that are experientially qualified as well as engaging with students will require the university to improve pay/benefits packages for faculty/staff.*

Faculty offered a combined total of 40 comments related to compensation equity (15) and performance compensation, including merit-based pay practices (25). Regarding equity, gender disparity, and college disparity, comments included:

- *Gender is a huge disadvantage for pay*
- *The institution has refused to release information on pay broken down by race and gender*
- *So much of this is determined at the College level that some of these questions are difficult to answer. If you are denied an equity adjustment that was at the college level not university*
- *It bothers me that I have to argue for an equity adjustment instead of the department head or dean advocating for me. They have the numbers and know the value of those who contribute the most to the organization. Seems a little backwards to me.*
- *Pay is not consistent. Some departments have faculty salaries substantially higher than other departments*

- *Discrepancies in pay for employees of equal rank are present and can be widely unequal. Such salary discrepancies are rarely justified.*
- *Equity, especially for long-term employees, is not addressed adequately. First, the pool for equity raises usually does not contain enough to make meaningful changes. Second, how the pool is distributed should not simply be at the whim of one person. In my department, most people don't attempt to ask for equity adjustments because of "horror" stories from others who have tried...*
- *I don't see a real pay for performance model right now otherwise I'd be getting a merit-based raise*
- *We have largely no structural systems for individual compensation to faculty for improving performance*
- *.... if I work really hard and do a great job for my students and my advisees and perform great service for my department and college, I will get paid the exact same number of dollars as I would if did the bare minimum.*
- *MSU is good about reducing pay inequities among people of the same rank, which is something other colleges and universities do not do - so that is a very important positive.*

The third theme identified in this section focused on the confusion regarding raises and compensation transparency (7/109).

- *I'm not sure how often raises are considered*
- *The only way I know what anyone makes is by looking at a 2-3 year old Blue Book of data. I have no idea what a "pay range" looks like for my department or college*
- *Most of the compensation practices have been through "word of mouth" instead of publicly available to everyone.*
- *...finding specific and meaningful salary comparisons across colleges, ranks and departments is challenging. Why should we have to go through our dept head for this information? This diminishes the perception of transparency.*

Skills and Career Advancement

Survey results regarding skills and career advancement showed that the majority of faculty agreed that MSU provides ongoing and timely performance reviews (58.28%) and offers free or low-cost options to advance skills for faculty (51.32%). When asked about MSU supporting faculty serving in administrative roles, a large number (136/302) of responding faculty most often chose Neither Agree Nor Disagree. See Table below for statistical analysis results.

Statement	Mean	Standard Deviation	Response Rate
<i>MSU offers multiple ways for faculty to gain skills and progress in their roles.</i>	3.27	1.07	26.82%
<i>MSU offers free or low-cost options to advance skills for faculty.</i>	3.34	1.02	26.82%
<i>MSU supports faculty serving in administrative roles.</i>	3.16	0.99	26.82%
<i>MSU provides ongoing and timely performance reviews and promotions.</i>	3.54	1.01	26.82%

The comments for skills career and advancement were reviewed and analyzed. A total of 56 comments were submitted which provided insight into respondents' concerns and thoughts regarding the section, making this the second lowest response rate for comments in the eight sections. Of these comments, 59% were expressing concerns and criticism and 14% represented positive feedback and 37% were neutral or unrelated.

From the written responses, it is clear that the FCTL is recognized by the faculty as an important resource offering helpful training programs. It was mentioned specifically in about 35% (12/56) of the responses, with most of these expressing positive sentiments. The following statements are representative of this sentiment:

- *Nothing but compliments for our FCTL*
- *[The] FCTL is a great resource*
- *The FCTL does provide free professional development courses which are great and useful*
- *I benefitted from many FCTL workshops*

- *The times often conflict with teaching schedules and/or responsibilities*
- *It often feels like trainings are offered at times that do not work with teaching classes*
- *I would like more variety from the FCTL*
- *They do not directly pertain to my field, but I have found them helpful.*

A primary theme regarding personal development was funding. Many of the respondents believe skills training and professional growth are underfunded (8/56). Comments discussing this concern include:

- *There are limited funds for participation in conferences and professional development opportunities outside of MSU.*
- *Faculty funds don't cover even one conference a year.*
- *Reimbursement for faculty travel in our college is an embarrassment.*
- *With decreased travel funding, many faculty have to refrain from engaging in opportunities for skill advancement.*

In addition to funding issues, there is a concern that current workloads leave a limited amount of time to pursue the opportunities that do exist. Comments along this line appeared in over 10% (6/56) of the returned surveys and included:

- *I have been in need of industry training for years, but because of my workload I just cannot.*
- *I just wish I had more time to take advantage of the classes.*
- *There is no way to offset the necessary investment of time.*
- *I am compelled to spend too much time on things that do not advance my career.*

In regard to support for faculty members serving in administrative roles, the written feedback ranged from neutral to negative. Slightly over 10% (6/56) of the returned surveys included comments related to this area, from which two primary themes emerged, both indicating inconsistencies across campus.

- *Most faculty-level administrative roles (e.g., area coordinators, heavy-duty committee chairs) are uncompensated and carry no course releases.*
- *Coordination and program management should be compensated.*
- *While teaching load reductions for administrative roles are helpful, many times departments cannot fill those teaching roles, therefore faculty are unable to participate if their position is vital to a program.*
- *The head system leads to fiefdoms that keep faculty from gaining administrative experience without becoming a career administrator.*
- *I know there are leadership trainings out there but they are not made known to most faculty.*
- *I would like to see clearer pathways for professional development. The PAL's program is excellent, but could there be a 'next level' program?*

Focus/Need for Next Year

The eight aspects focused on in this survey ranked, from 1-8, in order of importance for focus/need within this next year, with 1-most important and 8-least important. This was done in hopes that it may help Faculty Senate, administration, and faculty come together to highlight plans for change and communicate work being done in these areas. The information contained in the Results section can be used to guide efforts in these aspects as we move forward into the next year.

Table 3 – Ranked Focus/Need for Next Year

<i>Position Title</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>Ranking</i>
<u><i>Pay and Compensation</i></u>	2.15	1
<u><i>Job Security and Working Conditions</i></u>	3.80	2
<u><i>Benefits</i></u>	3.88	3
<u><i>University Culture</i></u>	4.08	4
<u><i>Recruitment and Hiring</i></u>	4.58	5
<u><i>Empowerment and Representation</i></u>	4.70	6
<u><i>Diversity, Equity, Inclusion, and Accessibility</i></u>	4.95	7
<u><i>Skills and Career Advancement</i></u>	5.36	8

Appendix A – Survey Instrument

□

Appendix B













