

President's Performance Survey Report (Spring 09)

Faculty Senate Committee on Provost and Presidential Performance (CPPP)

Senators: M. Hoge, L. Meloy, G. Pettit, C. Pynes (chair), and M. Siddiqi

17 April 2009

Quantitative Report Introduction Summary:

273 of the 638 eligible faculty members accessed the President's survey. A total of 252 faculty members answered at least one question (compared to 192 out of 605 last year—31.7% return rate), resulting in a 39.5% return rate. The survey was conducted on-line by e-mailing each eligible faculty member a web link to complete the survey. Eligible faculty had three weeks and were given four separate reminders to complete the survey.

Questions on the evaluation survey were divided into three focus areas: Total Campus Enterprise, Academic Goals, and Personnel, Faculty Relations & Campus Issues. Demographic information, along with open comment sections, was also included in the survey. The quantitative results of the survey can be seen below in Table A: President Summary Report Data.

The Summary Report provides a quantitative review of the President's job performance for the Academic year 2007 - 2008. This table starts with the question number in column one, followed by the question text in the second column. The mean scores along with standard deviations* (SD) and the number of respondents (N) that answered each question appears followed by the no opinion/no answer numbers for each question. The results for the two prior surveys follow to the left when the question is relevant or similar.

Additionally, each focus area was broken down and analyzed based on demographic information. From the analysis of the demographic information, statistically there were no significant differences relating to gender, college/academic unit, and years of service on the responses for the focus areas. Opinions taken from the comments section were typed as written and will be provided to the President.

*Standard deviation is a measure of dispersion. In other words, it measures the degree to which responses are dispersed about the mean. The larger the standard deviation, the more the scores differ from the mean. Alternatively, if the standard deviation is small, this indicates that the scores were very close to one another. A t-test is used to assess whether the means of two groups are statistically different from each other.

Executive Summary:

Of the 52 individual questions assessing the President's performance, 11 questions had a mean score above 4, while only two had a mean score lower than 3. The President's overall rating mean was 3.62 with 242 faculty members rating the President overall.

The questions the President scored highest on were: 4.i-ii (Promoting WIU's academic mission), 9.ii-iv (fostering relationships), 18.ii and 19.ii (staff- and student activities- diversity), 21.iii-iv (accessibility to students and community members), and 23.i-ii (Quad Cities health and safety).

It should be noted that President Goldfarb scored higher than 3.5 on 75% of the assessment questions and 3.75 or higher on 30 of 52 questions—57.6%.

The two questions where President Goldfarb scored below 3 were: 14 (allocating resources to accomplish faculty research missions—2.84) and 20 (making excellent administrative appointments—2.91). Two other areas of concern were infrastructure (question 24 with a score of 3.05) and promoting policies that foster the academic unit or department (question 3 with a score of 3.06). One other low scoring area concerned working effectively with deans (question 11.ii with a score of 3.05).

These results are not surprising given the make up of the faculty comments. The comments were wide ranging with both laudatory and critical comments, but there were concerns about WIU’s infrastructure as well as comments about the President’s administrative appointments and relationships with deans. A detailed summary of the comments follows below Table A.

Some faculty commented that they did not believe the comments would be read, taken seriously or effective; some faculty wrote comments that were *ad hominem* attacks against the President. These unprofessional comments are neither useful nor relevant to the goals of the survey. Critical comments on the survey are welcomed, but they need to be relevant to the issue at hand and written in a professional tone and manner.

Overall, the quantitative data demonstrates what faculty members think is important, what President Goldfarb’s areas of strength and weakness are, and how the President’s leadership has affected them over the last year. In this sense, the survey has fulfilled its function.

Table A: President Summary Report Data

For each of the following series of questions you will be asked to rate how effective President Goldfarb is in performing various aspects of his responsibilities. The scale ranges from 1 (not effective) to 5 (highly effective). If you feel that you do not have enough information to form an opinion please select “No Opinion” or “No Answer.”

NB: When comparing unadjusted means across years, keep in mind that the 2007/2008 survey was reported on a 5 point scale and the previous two years were reported on a 7 point scale. No opinion and no answer numbers were not used in calculating the mean or standard deviation.

Q #	Question Text	Mean (Average) Score	Standard Deviation	N (Total # of Respondents for this question (no opinion/no answer*))
1.	The President actively promotes an environment for excellence in:			
	i. Scholarship	3.64	1.30	236, 13/3
	ii. Teaching	3.78	1.23	236, 12/4
	iii. Student learning	3.79	1.21	226, 22/2
2.	The President actively promotes policies that support the mission of the university relative to:			
	i. Short term strategic planning	3.88	1.24	225, 22/4
	ii. Long term strategic planning	3.87	1.30	223, 20/5

Q #	Question Text	Mean (Average) Score	Standard Deviation	N (Total # of Respondents for this question (no opinion/no answer*))
3.	The President actively promotes policies that foster the activities of your department or academic unit.	3.06	1.40	227, 21/3
4.	The President actively promotes the University's academic mission to: i. The local community ii. The western Illinois region iii. Beyond the region	4.11 4.05 3.90	1.14 1.17 1.31	230, 18/4 216, 28/7 183, 50/14
5.	The President manages the University's resources well.	3.80	1.26	230, 15/4
6.	The President actively secures funding to support university initiatives.	3.62	1.34	211, 32/5
7.	The president works effectively with the Board of Trustees in fostering the interest of: i. Faculty ii. Students iii. University	3.44 3.89 3.90	1.44 1.16 1.20	197, 43/11 180, 56/13 189, 50/10
8.	Overall, the President fosters the mission of Western Illinois University.	3.83	1.26	233, 14/3
9.	The President fosters effective relationships with: i. Government agencies ii. Potential donors iii. Alumni iv. Local Community	3.92 4.07 4.10 4.06	1.22 1.12 1.07 1.17	164, 69/18 178, 54/17 192, 45/13 214, 26/8
10.	The President fosters the highest academic standards for students at Western Illinois University	3.50	1.29	232, 13/2
11.	The President works effectively with _____ to allocate resources for your department or academic unit to achieve WIU's mission i. Provost ii. Deans	3.23 3.05	1.43 1.43	191, 50/8 193, 43/7
12.	The President works effectively with the Provost anticipating future needs (i.e., technology, infrastructure, or student services) of: i. faculty ii. students iii. staff	3.16 3.49 3.27	1.40 1.23 1.36	204, 37/8 172, 63/11 141, 88/16
13.	The President works effectively with Student Services to foster policies for: i. student leadership ii. co-curricular participation	3.93 3.90	1.10 1.14	134, 95/19 128, 98/17
14.	The President allocates resources so that your department or academic unit's faculty can accomplish research missions	2.84	1.36	221, 21/3
15.	Regarding the Quad Cities academic programs, the President provides leadership in: i. planning ii. developing iii. implementing iv. assessing	3.77 3.70 3.52 3.48	1.39 1.42 1.46 1.49	134, 92/19 128, 96/20 127, 99/19 116, 105/22
16.	The President supports faculty governance at all levels	3.43	1.40	223, 20/2
17.	Regarding faculty, the President's management practices promote: i. Excellence ii. Diversity	3.36 3.94	1.44 1.22	235, 11/1 221, 20/5
18.	Regarding staff, the President's management practices promote: i. Excellence ii. Diversity	3.44 4.00	1.45 1.23	149, 82/16 139, 89/18
19.	Regarding student activities, the President's management practices promote: i. Excellence ii. Diversity	3.69 4.00	1.29 1.10	163, 69/16 159, 72/17

Q #	Question Text	Mean (Average) Score	Standard Deviation	N (Total # of Respondents for this question (no opinion/no answer*))
20.	The President makes excellent administrative appointments.	2.91	1.41	221, 22/3
21.	The President is accessible to concerns from: i. faculty ii. staff iii. students iv. community members	3.72 3.84 4.12 4.18	1.43 1.37 1.14 1.12	223, 19/3 128, 94/23 148, 77/19 152, 73/19
22.	The President actively promotes the Macomb campus work environment to be: i. healthy ii. safe iii. pleasant	3.79 3.85 3.69	1.35 1.33 1.39	214, 28/4 224, 18/4 220, 22/3
23.	The President actively promotes the Quad Cities campus work environment to be: i. healthy ii. safe iii. pleasant	4.02 4.10 3.95	1.28 1.24 1.29	82, 131/33 84, 129/33 86, 127/32
24.	The President directs the university's physical facilities so that they meet the needs of your department or academic unit	3.05	1.36	225, 17/3
25.	Overall, I rate the President	3.62	1.30	242, 3/1

* 252 faculty members answered at least one question. Because a person could not answer a question without using the “no answer” button, the total for each question does not add up to 252.

Comments Report Introduction Summary, President's Performance:

As part of the 2008-2009 Annual Faculty Survey of the President, the 263 faculty respondents provided 213 comments. The President has received a print copy of all comments. Though the areas assessed were divided into three categories on the initial review form (total campus enterprise, academic goals, and personnel, faculty relations and campus issues), the comments often did not squarely fit into one of these categories. In light of this we have organized the comments around personal skills related to the role of President, overall job efficiency and comments about specific topics. Qualitative analysis of comments was provided to the President which organized faculty comments in similar categories for the President's ease of review. [The comments sent to the President were typed as they appeared on the survey printout, including any spelling or grammatical errors. Where a lengthy response touched upon more than one category, separate comments were placed under appropriate categories if possible, or the lengthy comment was placed either by first comment or by the primary emphasis of the entire response.]

Comments about specific topics:

There were many comments under specific topics, with several regarding the Quad-Cities campus, where the prevailing opinions were negative as to mission and resource allocation. Seven comments under this domain were on the issue of diversity with comments questioning the University's application of the concept. Several comments centered on the new PAA system where much negativity was registered. The new PAA system was called a mistaken step by a few respondents with a lack of transparency in the implementation process.

Overall job efficiency:

The predominant issues under the domain of overall job proficiency identified concerns about the campus infrastructure and fiscal needs of the University. Numerous comments described a negative impact on teaching due to poor building conditions and a lack of physical resources. These statements were often mixed with recognition that the resource needs of institutions of higher education are not being met by the state of Illinois. Declining academic standards for undergraduate education was the primary concern voiced under the student category. Concerns were noted for the development of too many programs for a University of WIU's size and mission.

Personal skills related to the role of President:

The three subcategories under personal skills of the President were leadership, relationships with faculty, and administrative appointments. President Goldfarb's leadership was evaluated positively by a large number of comments, indicating a caring, hard-working, and dedicated leader. Several comments voiced concern about less accessibility of the President over the past couple of years. Faculty also expressed concerns about the new emphasis on research productivity with few resources to accomplish same, as well as an increasing lowering of opportunities for faculty governance coupled with low faculty morale. The overwhelming concern stated in regard to administrative appointments was for the continual increase in administrative positions at a time of difficult economic conditions. Other responses related to concerns about layers of bureaucracy insulating the President from faculty and their issues. Also, one-third of the comments regarded administrative appointments which centered on Provost Office positions, with the vast majority of those being negative.

Comments Summary Conclusion:

It was clear that many respondents expressed positive feedback for the President and appreciated the hard work and leadership he has provided. At the same time it was also evident that there are concerns about resource management, including personnel and infrastructure.