

CHAPTER 3

Changes at Southeastern Oklahoma State University since November 1993

On November 1-3, 1993, Southeastern Oklahoma State University received a Comprehensive Visit from The Higher Learning Commission: A Commission of the North Central Association of Colleges and Schools. The Evaluation Team found irregularities in Southeastern Oklahoma State University's system of governance and its relationship to assessment and planning. The Evaluation Team recommended a focused visit, stating "this focused visit should include the demonstrated integration of faculty into a clearly defined structure of shared oversight with the administration for the processes of program review, assessment, and institutional planning."¹ A Focused Visit was planned for November 9-10, 1998. The 1998 Team's evaluation² found Southeastern Oklahoma State University had addressed the concerns of the 1993 Team's visit. However, they reported the following concern and five suggestions.

Concerns

In accepting the responsibility for shared governance, the faculty have also accepted an increased workload. Without some relief and/or support, the team is concerned whether the effort can continue.

Suggestions

Staff an office of institutional research and assessment to support efforts in planning, program review, and assessment. Such an office can and should provide collection and analysis of a variety of institutional data.

Develop a process for peer review and recommendation of faculty applications for promotion at the department and/or school level.

Develop a process for formal review and recommendation of curriculum proposals at the department and/or program level.

Review structure, policies, and procedures of shared governance on a periodic basis to assure efficiency and effectiveness, to reduce overlapping responsibilities, and to ensure appropriate interaction. The structure, policies, and procedures currently in place, while addressing shared governance, appear cumbersome and potentially redundant.

Reemphasize assessment processes by, for example, conducting in-service training for faculty. Designs and protocols can always be improved and assessment can become more effective.

The following is a topical summary of events that chronicle Southeastern Oklahoma State University's response to correct the irregularities that concerned the 1993 Evaluation Team and the concern and suggestions of the 1998 Evaluation Team.

Shared Governance

In February 1995 the Faculty Senate made the following recommendations to the Vice-President for Academic Affairs.

- 1) The Faculty Appointing Committee would become a standing committee of the Faculty Senate.
- 2) Standing committees would elect chairs from their membership. Administrators would be liaisons no longer eligible for chair positions.
- 3) Oversight of the committee system would be transferred from the Institutional Research and Planning Committee to the Faculty Senate.
- 4) The Faculty Senate should conduct an annual survey of the faculty to advise the administration of faculty budget priorities.

In February 1996 the faculty voted to approve the committee restructuring proposals. In August 1996 the Faculty Senate Committee on Committees forwarded the first Faculty Senate Appointments to standing committees to the Vice-President for Academic Affairs. In October 1996 the faculty approved the expansion of the responsibilities of the Faculty Senate to include:

- 1) Creation of new committees.
- 2) Deletion of unnecessary committees.
- 3) Modification of committee function statements.
- 4) Modification of the membership of committees.³

The first formal charges were assigned to Faculty Senate Committees in December 1996. The Board of Regents of Oklahoma Colleges on July 1, 1997, appointed Dr. Glen D. Johnson as the 16th President of Southeastern Oklahoma State University. He met with the Faculty Senate on July 9, 1997, for the first time. Following the meeting with the President, the Faculty Senate in September 1997 created the Computer Technology Committee. In June 1998 President Johnson addressed the Faculty Senate concerning the Fiscal Year 1998-99 Budget. Formal presentations were made by the General Education Committee, the Faculty Senate Budget Committee, the Faculty Long-Range Planning Committee, and the Institutional Research and Assessment Committee. The Faculty Senate accepted the reports. Since then, annual Faculty

Senate Forums on Shared Governance have been held August 26, 1998; September 22, 1999; October 10, 2000; August 30, 2001; and August 27, 2002.

Planning

The Strategic Planning Initiative began in July 1997 shortly after President Johnson became president. In December 1997 President Johnson appointed administrators, faculty, and staff to the Planning and Resource Council. In April 1998 a retreat, which included administrators, faculty, staff, and students was held to finalize “Vision 2002: Innovation and Collaboration.” Similar retreats have been held each April. At the April 2001 retreat refinements were made to “Vision 2002,” leading to “Vision 2005.” As part of the attempt to address the concerns of the 1993 Evaluation Team regarding the linkages between shared governance, assessment, program review, and planning, the University hired Dr. Edward Penson as a consultant. In the summer 1998 Dr. Penson conducted a communication audit at the University. Whether a symptom or a cause, communication problems seemed to be directly related to the lack of Shared Governance perceived in the NCA 1993 site team report. The results of Dr. Penson’s study led to a restructuring of the University’s offices (for detailed information regarding the University’s restructuring, see Chapter 8, p.).

Restructuring

In November 1998 the University began the process of reorganization of the Administrative structure began. The primary purpose of this restructuring effort was to organize according to function and flatten the structure. The center piece of the reorganization was the merger of the School of Arts and Letters and the School of Science and Technology into the School of Arts and Sciences in Spring 1999.

Assessment

In February 1997 the Executive Vice-President for Academic Affairs and Assistant Vice-President for Academic Affairs met with the Faculty Senate Committee on Committees to assign to the Faculty Senate the responsibility for integrating assessment into the standing committee structure, possibly by the creation of a new standing assessment committee, and the responsibility of creating a new educational technology committee. In April 1997 the Faculty Senate revised the function of the Institutional Research and Planning Committee to include assessment, and the name of the committee was changed to Institutional Research and Assessment Committee. Minutes for the committee are posted at website www.sosu.edu/st/committees/irac/IRAC.

An Assessment Colloquium for Faculty and Administrators was held on March 7, 2001. At that time, awards to outstanding assessment reports (as determined by the IRAC) were given to two departments in the School of Arts & Sciences, and one each in the School of Business and the School of Education and Behavioral Sciences. This has become an annual acknowledgement. Another Assessment Colloquium was held for Faculty and Administrators on October 2, 2002. Dr. Cecelia Lopez, then of The Higher Learning Commission, was the guest speaker. She also met individually with the North Central Steering Committee, the Institutional Research and Assessment Committee, and the General Education Committee. On July 5, 2001,

Dr. Charles Weiner was named Director of Assessment. At that time an assessment group comprised of faculty representing the individual schools as well as General Education and the Graduate programs was formed. These Assessment Specialists functioned both as liaisons between the departments and the Director of Assessment and as advisors to the Director on matters of assessment. In September 2002 the IRAC recommended separating into two, smaller, more functional committees. On November 12, 2002, with the approval of the Faculty Senate Committee on Committees, the IRAC separated into the Organized Research and Program Review Committee and the Institutional Assessment Committee. This move was approved by the Faculty Senate at the November 2002 meeting. The newly formed IAC was staffed and functional by Spring 2003. Minutes of the IAC may be found at www.sosu.edu/st/committees/Institutional_Assessment/Institutional_Assessment.

The IAC designed a rubric for evaluating assessment plans and reports and evaluated all the undergraduate and graduate academic programs. Overall rankings were determined by the categories of *Exemplary*, *Established*, *Developing*, and *Undeveloped*. The committee determined that 57% of the programs were ranked as *Established*, or higher, 28% of the programs were ranked as *Developing*; and 15% of the programs were ranked as *Undeveloped*.⁴ This is discussed in more detail in Chapter 7.

General Education

In September 1994, members of the General Education Task Force were appointed by the Vice President of Academic Affairs. In February 1995 the Curriculum Committee approved the new general education program; however, the Academic Council, later that month, did not approve the program; and it was referred to a conference committee comprised of four members of the Curriculum Committee and four members of the Academic Council. After some modifications, the new program was approved by both the Curriculum Committee and the Academic Council and was implemented for first-time entering freshmen in August 1995. A General Education Committee was formed in Fall 1996 and charged with oversight of the General Education program. The committee began meeting in February 1997. Minutes are reported at the website www.sosu.edu/st/committees/gened/minutes.

During her visit, Dr. Lopez discussed at length The Commission position on General Education. To meet The Commission's expectations throughout the remainder of the 2002-2003 Academic Year and beyond, Southeastern made a commitment to reenergize its General Education program. The first step was to employ a Director of General Education. It was decided that the Director of General Education must be a tenured member of the faculty, and have a strong record of teaching in general education and in student advisement. It was also decided that this person must be adept at building rapport among faculty and leading faculty in program development. The appointed person for this position is responsible for the following:

- The administration of the general education program.
- General education program development.
- Instructional program management.
- Training of faculty.
- Service to the institution, profession, and the public.
- Syllabi revision and coordination.

- Working with the Director of Assessment in assessing general education.
- Working with the Dean of the School of Arts and Sciences, the Committee on General Education, and the Faculty Senate.⁵

The appointment of a Director of General Education was accomplished in February 2003 with the selection of Dr. Bryon Clark, Professor and Chair of the Department of Biological Sciences.

Teaching Load Reduction

In an effort to address the concern from the 1998 NCA Team Evaluation Report that the faculty be granted workload relief for involvement in shared governance processes, Southeastern Oklahoma State University has granted faculty teaching load reduction for both Administrative duties related to Shared Governance, and to development of technological pedagogy. In Spring 2003 the following teaching loads have been re-allocated according to the stated Administrative duties:

| | |
|---------------------------------|----------|
| 1 Graduate Director | .25 |
| 6 Assessment Specialists | .25 each |
| 1 Faculty Senate Chair | .25 |
| 1 Faculty Senate Archivist | .25 |
| 1 Director of Honors | .50 |
| 1 Director of Freshman Programs | .50 |

In addition to the teaching load reduction, the Faculty Senate Archivist was provided an office and a student worker to support the archivist's ongoing activities. Through the Center for Instructional Development and Technology (CIDT), five faculty members received re-allocation time to develop courses with enhanced technology.

Tenure Review

The Office of Academic Affairs, in conjunction with the Faculty Senate, conducted a review of the tenure and promotion policies during Spring 2003. Several changes were made in the policy to ensure the policy was in compliance with the Board of Regents of Oklahoma College's policies, and to address some faculty concerns about the old promotion and tenure procedures. The new tenure and promotion policies can be referenced in section 4.6 of the Academic Policies and Procedures Manual.⁷

Other Concerns

In addition to the major concerns of the 1993 and the 1998 Evaluation Teams, the 1993 Evaluation Team voiced concerns about other areas of the University. The following explicates the University's attempt to address these issues:

Terminal degrees and the use of adjuncts

The 1993 Evaluation Team suggested priority attention should be given to increase the number of faculty with doctorates and to avoid the continuous need to depend upon adjuncts. As of Fall 2002, the University employed 142 full-time faculty; 17 additional faculty were classified as temporary full-time (TFT); and 65 were adjuncts. Of the 142 full-time faculty, 103 (72.5%) have doctorate degrees. This compares to 51.7% of the full-time faculty who had terminal degrees in 1993. Adjuncts and TFT comprised 36.6% of the FTE on campus. There were also some specific questions about the number of qualified personnel with terminal degrees in the departments of Psychology, Health, Physical Education and Recreation, and Sociology. Currently the Department of Behavioral Sciences, (newly merged Departments of Psychology and Sociology) has fewer faculty combined than in 1993, however, all but one faculty has a terminal degree. The number of faculty with terminal degrees is still a concern in the Department of Health, Physical Education and Recreation (HPER).

Salary Card

The 1993 Evaluation Team recommended exceptions to the salary card to attract and retain doctoral-level faculty appropriate for programs offered by the Institution. On May 12, 2000, President Johnson formed the Faculty Salary Card Task Force. Members of this Committee were the Vice President for Academic Affairs, the Vice President for Business Services, the Assistant Vice President for Academic Affairs, the Dean of the School of Business, and 2 faculty members. The Faculty Card Task Force was charged with developing criteria and identifying instances when payment off the faculty salary card is needed to recruit and/or retain faculty. The goal was to ensure the long-term viability of our faculty in response to specific recommendations from the Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education. The new policy for salary card exceptions was approved by the Faculty Senate (March 14, 2001) and can be found in the Academic Policy and Procedures Manual under section 5.2.1 – Salary.⁶ In Fall 2002 there were eleven exceptions to the salary card: one in Computer Science and Technology, six in Finance and Accounting, and four in Management, Marketing, and Business Information Management.

Secretarial and Technician Services

The 1993 site team had a concern about the use of faculty to perform basic secretarial and technician services because of a lack of adequate instructional funding. This remains a concern.

Maintenance and Repair of Buildings

The major concerns and related recommendations from the 1993 Evaluation Team in regard to physical resources were (1) a need for long-range strategic planning for facility maintenance, renovation and construction; (2) a lack of large lecture halls that seat 100 or more students; (3) better control of heating and air conditioning systems; and (4) a plan to utilize class scheduling as a means to control space needs and related parking space requirements. Campus development, space planning, architectural design, energy management, and environmental control are integral components of the overall Southeastern's planning process. The Campus

Master Plan (the Plan), which has been under development since 1998, is the essential resource document for facility and campus planning. The Plan is a comprehensive document of 17 sections.⁷ Numerous references to the Plan are contained in, and will be formally addressed, in Chapter 6.

Learning Resource Center

The 1993 Evaluation Team suggested the Learning Resource Center be enlarged. The location of the Learning Center has not changed, and available space is still a concern. However, the staff has expanded some. In 1993 the Learning Center had a director, senior clerk, English liaison, Math liaison, three graduate assistants, and student employees. Currently, the Learning Center has a director, temporary part-time receptionist, administrative assistant/reading and English lecturer, administrative assistant/math lecturer, English liaison, Math liaison, two graduate assistants, and student employees.

Minority Recruitment

The 1993 Evaluation Team recommended an aggressive plan for recruiting and retaining minority faculty. Southeastern has been aggressive in recruiting minority faculty to campus. The hiring of a Director of Diversity and a Multicultural Coordinator has proven to be successful steps in the process. Further discussion over minority recruitment and diversity will be found in Chapters 6 and 9.

Personnel Files

The 1993 Evaluation Team suggested the University coordinate all official personnel files in a single location that includes all documents relative to terms and conditions of employment. This is done in the Department of Human Resources.

Student and Part-time Staff

The 1993 Evaluation Team suggested the University continue to monitor the responsibilities assigned to students and other part-time staff members to ensure confidentiality and privacy of academic, financial, and personal information within the University's system. This continues to be monitored.

Library

Through the efforts of the VPAA, the library has not been as affected by the recent budget cuts. In 2002 a Strategic Plan for the Library was developed in accordance with Vision 2005. The plan proposes an increase in funding from the current 3% to 6% of the Education and General budget.⁸ Additional information concerning the Library will be discussed in Chapters 6 and 7.

Quality of Computers

The 1993 Evaluation Team had a concern about the quality and availability of computers for students and faculty. In 1993 there were two computer labs on campus, and most faculty did not have a computer in their office, or even one available for their use. Ten years later there are 452 computers available for students across campus, both in multiple labs and the library. All Faculty and Staff have a computer in their office or workstation. The University also received a Title III grant to fund the Center for Instructional and Developmental Technology for a total of \$1,748,339 to be distributed over five years at approximately \$349,600 a year.

Reserve Fund

The 1993 Evaluation Team questioned whether the reserve fund impacted the operation and maintenance of the University. The State Regents guideline (not mandated) is that the reserve fund balance should be 1/12 (8.33%) of the operating budget. In FY 2003 the reserve was 8.6%. The University has been above the 8.33% mark in past years. This past year, however, because of budget reductions, the reserve fund was used to cover expenditures.

Assessment of Business Majors

The 1993 Evaluation Team found that formal assessment to improve student learning in the School of Business was lacking. In the last ten years, the School of Business has embarked upon two accreditation initiatives in which assessment is a vital component. In June 2000 the School of Business was accredited by the Association of Collegiate Business Schools and Programs (ACBSP). They are currently seeking accreditation by the Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business International (AACSB). To meet new accreditation standards for their learned societies and The Higher Learning Commission, the School of Business has developed, and now uses, several types of assessment methods. These include standardized assessment instruments, a student satisfaction survey, student internships, and the results from national certification exams, employment data, advisory boards, and benchmarking. In April 2003 at AACSB's annual conference new guidelines were disseminated in the area of assessment. The School has incorporated those assessment criteria in their updated School assessment plan. The School will be in pre-candidacy beginning with the Spring 2004 semester.

Large Number of Programs

The 1993 Evaluation Team expressed concern about the large number of programs offered at the University with a limited budget. This remains a concern, especially given the current budget crisis.

Survey of Faculty and Staff Regarding Changes Since 1993 & 1998

In Fall 2002 the following survey was submitted to the faculty of Southeastern Oklahoma State University to determine the perceived effectiveness of the changes in the University since 1993 and 1998.⁹ Part of a longer survey, the following questions appropriately address the specific concerns of the changes in Shared Governance and Planning at the University.

Survey Questions

A survey was administered to evaluate the faculty's perception of changes in the University brought about by the 1993 and 1998 North Central visits. For years of service faculty were divided into three groups: 0-5; 6-10; 10+ years. It is important to note that the 14 survey questions measure one's perception. Perceptions will be different depending on the years of service to the University. The results bear this out since changes were made before, during, and after the 1998 Focused Visit. Faculty who have been here five years or fewer don't know another system. As a University community the results of faculty who have been here 6+ years were of particular interest. Those percentages have been studied and discussed as to how well the culture of shared governance has been inculcated at Southeastern.

The numbers on the questions correspond to the numbers on the survey. A Likert Scale was used to answer the questions. The questions with the results are as follows:

How would you evaluate the changes in the following areas of the university, since you have been employed here using the scale

a=greatly improve b=improved c=the same d=worse e=much worse

NCA Chapter 3 Data and Analysis

11. Perception of administration structure of the University (N = 187)

| Respondents | greatly improved | somewhat improved | same | worse | much worse |
|--------------------|-------------------------|--------------------------|-------------|--------------|-------------------|
| 0-5 years | 4% | 50% | 43% | 3% | 0% |
| 6-10 years | 9% | 38% | 33% | 13% | 7% |
| 10+ years | 12% | 52% | 15% | 15% | 6% |
| Average | 8% | 48% | 32% | 9% | 3% |

Over the past ten years the administration structure has changed dramatically. Two schools merged into one, and the functions and duties of the administrators were changed. A majority of the respondents answered favorably when asked about the administrative structure. Fifty-four percent of the faculty who have been at Southeastern 0-5 years responded favorably, and 64% of the faculty who have been here 10+ years also responded favorably. The reason for this was that the 0-5 faculty hadn't known any other structure, and the 10+ faculty have witnessed the changes over the past ten years.

12. Perception of general education (N = 179)

| Respondents | greatly improved | somewhat improved | same | Worse | much worse |
|--------------------|-------------------------|--------------------------|-------------|--------------|-------------------|
| 0-5 years | 3% | 40% | 55% | 2% | 0% |
| 6-10 years | 5% | 38% | 52% | 5% | 0% |
| 10+ years | 10% | 55% | 25% | 10% | 0% |
| Average | 6% | 45% | 44% | 5% | 0% |

The faculty response to this question mirrors years of experience. Those faculty who have been here 10+ years were the ones who were instrumental in developing the new general education program. The results for that group of faculty were consistent with what would have been expected. The responses for all groups demonstrate the viability of our general education program.

13. Perception of use of assessment to maintain and develop academic programs (N = 176)

| Respondents | Greatly Improved | somewhat improved | same | Worse | much worse |
|--------------------|-------------------------|--------------------------|-------------|--------------|-------------------|
| 0-5 years | 3% | 43% | 49% | 5% | 0% |
| 6-10 years | 14% | 46% | 33% | 7% | 0% |
| 10+ years | 10% | 60% | 19% | 9% | 2% |
| Average | 8% | 49% | 35% | 7% | 1% |

The University has made a commitment to assessment. The positive results are an indication that the culture of assessment has spread across campus. Once again, the group with 10+ years was very positive (70%) in its perception of assessment. The results also indicated that the faculty as a whole sees a positive pattern in the use of assessment to maintain and develop academic programs. Overall, very few negative responses were reported.

14. Perception of faculty role in maintaining and developing academic programs (N = 171)

| Respondents | greatly improved | somewhat improved | same | Worse | much worse |
|--------------------|-------------------------|--------------------------|-------------|--------------|-------------------|
| 0-5 years | 4% | 41% | 51% | 4% | 0% |
| 6-10 years | 10% | 40% | 43% | 5% | 2% |
| 10+ years | 7% | 54% | 27% | 7% | 5% |
| Average | 6% | 45% | 41% | 5% | 3% |

A high measure of agreement across all experience levels of faculty was observed. Eighty-six percent of all faculty members reported either no change or a small improvement in the faculty's role in maintaining and developing academic programs. Very few negative responses were reported.

15. Perception of tenure/tenure review process (N = 147)

| Respondents | greatly improved | somewhat improved | same | worse | much worse |
|--------------------|-------------------------|--------------------------|-------------|--------------|-------------------|
| 0-5 years | 0% | 20% | 76% | 2% | 2% |
| 6-10 years | 2% | 21% | 64% | 13% | 0% |
| 10+ years | 10% | 43% | 39% | 6% | 2% |
| Average | 4% | 28% | 61% | 6% | 1% |

The results indicated that the tenure/tenure review process could become an issue for concern. To address this issue the Vice President for Academic Affairs and the Faculty Senate has reviewed and modified the policy.

16. Perception of promotion process (N = 165)

| Respondents | greatly improved | somewhat improved | same | worse | Much worse |
|--------------------|-------------------------|--------------------------|-------------|--------------|-------------------|
| 0-5 years | 0% | 13% | 77% | 10% | 0% |
| 6-10 years | 2% | 26% | 59% | 10% | 3% |
| 10+ years | 9% | 46% | 27% | 18% | 0% |
| Average | 4% | 27% | 56% | 13% | 1% |

The results indicated that the promotion process is an issue of concern to the faculty. The Vice President for Academic Affairs and the Faculty Senate have recently reviewed and modified the relevant policies.

17. Perception of the Faculty Senate in addressing faculty concerns to the administration (N =157)

| Respondents | greatly improved | somewhat improved | same | worse | much worse |
|--------------------|-------------------------|--------------------------|-------------|--------------|-------------------|
| 0-5 years | 0% | 32% | 67% | 1% | 0% |
| 6-10 years | 10% | 36% | 40% | 12% | 2% |
| 10+ years | 23% | 38% | 23% | 14% | 2% |
| Average | 10% | 35% | 45% | 9% | 1% |

Sixty-one percent (61%) of the faculty with 10+ years of experience noted the improvement in the role of the Faculty Senate in presenting concerns to the administration. The least experienced faculty members (67%) reported no change in the role of the Faculty Senate in addressing faculty concerns to the administration. Once again those results compared favorably with the faculty who have the most tenure and have witnessed the changes in the governance system.

18. Perception of faculty role in determining budgets (N = 154)

| Respondents | greatly improved | somewhat improved | Same | worse | much worse |
|--------------------|-------------------------|--------------------------|-------------|--------------|-------------------|
| 0-5 years | 2% | 24% | 67% | 7% | 0% |
| 6-10 years | 0% | 29% | 51% | 15% | 5% |
| 10+ years | 2% | 31% | 53% | 7% | 7% |
| Average | 1% | 28% | 58% | 9% | 4% |

The majority of respondents in each of the experience categories indicated that the role of faculty in determining budget was the same since their initial employment at the University. However, those with the lengthiest tenure (33%) exhibited the greatest percentage of some degree of improvement (33%).

19. Perception of the use of assessment and/or program review in determining budget (N = 152)

| Respondents | greatly improved | Somewhat improved | Same | worse | much worse |
|--------------------|-------------------------|--------------------------|-------------|--------------|-------------------|
| 0-5 years | 2% | 22% | 68% | 8% | 0% |
| 6-10 years | 3% | 38% | 49% | 15% | 5% |
| 10+ years | 6% | 46% | 29% | 17% | 2% |
| Average | 3% | 34% | 48% | 13% | 2% |

There is a direct relationship between years of experience and the perception that assessment and program review have been utilized in budget determination at the University. While approximately two thirds (68%) of those with five or less years of experience perceived no change, 52% of those with 10+ years of experience indicated somewhat or greatly improved.

20. Perception of the quality of shared governance (N = 157)

| Respondents | greatly improved | somewhat improved | Same | Worse | much worse |
|--------------------|-------------------------|--------------------------|-------------|--------------|-------------------|
| 0-5 years | 2% | 34% | 58% | 6% | 0% |
| 6-10 years | 8% | 37% | 34% | 13% | 8% |
| 10+ years | 7% | 52% | 25% | 9% | 7% |
| Average | 5% | 41% | 41% | 9% | 4% |

Again, there is a strong relationship between the length of tenure at the University and the perception of the quality of shared governance. While 58% of respondents with five or less years of experience indicated no change, 59% of those with 10+ years of experience perceived improvement in the shared governance process.

21. Perception of faculty-administrative communication (N = 167)

| Respondents | greatly improved | somewhat improved | Same | Worse | much worse |
|--------------------|-------------------------|--------------------------|-------------|--------------|-------------------|
| 0-5 years | 1% | 39% | 56% | 1% | 3% |
| 6-10 years | 12% | 41% | 21% | 24% | 2% |
| 10+ years | 13% | 58% | 20% | 0% | 9% |
| Average | 5% | 44% | 37% | 9% | 5% |

With the exception of those with five or less years of experience, a significant majority of respondents indicated that faculty-administrative communication has improved. Seventy-one percent (71%) of faculty with 10+ years of experience at the University perceived that communication channels between administration and faculty had improved at Southeastern.

22. Perception of faculty participation in university long-range planning (N = 155)

| Respondents | greatly improved | somewhat improved | Same | Worse | much worse |
|--------------------|-------------------------|--------------------------|-------------|--------------|-------------------|
| 0-5 years | 5% | 34% | 56% | 3% | 2% |
| 6-10 years | 10% | 35% | 42% | 8% | 5% |
| 10+ years | 13% | 58% | 20% | 0% | 9% |
| Average | 9% | 43% | 40% | 3% | 5% |

On average, 52% of the respondents indicated an improvement in faculty participation in university long-range planning. As expected, those with the most experience perceived the greatest degree of improvement. It is possible that those with such experience may have been more likely to participate in planning at the university level than those with less experience.

23. Perception of faculty participation school long-range planning (N = 149)

| Respondents | greatly improved | somewhat improved | Same | Worse | much worse |
|--------------------|-------------------------|--------------------------|-------------|--------------|-------------------|
| 0-5 years | 0% | 36% | 54% | 7% | 3% |
| 6-10 years | 3% | 49% | 34% | 3% | 11% |
| 10+ years | 10% | 55% | 27% | 4% | 4% |
| Average | 4% | 46% | 40% | 5% | 5% |

The results (65%) again indicated that faculty with 10+ years of experience at the University have seen their role increase in the long-range planning process. Fifty-two percent (52%) with 6-10 years of service to the University perceive a positive relationship in their participation to long-range planning.

24. Perception of faculty participation in departmental long-range planning (N = 153)

| Respondents | greatly improved | somewhat improved | Same | Worse | much worse |
|-------------------|------------------|-------------------|------|-------|------------|
| 0-5 years | 3% | 38% | 54% | 3% | 2% |
| 6-10 years | 23% | 39% | 30% | 3% | 5% |
| 10+ years | 17% | 45% | 32% | 6% | 0% |
| Total | 13% | 41% | 40% | 4% | 2% |

Once again 62% of the faculty with 10+ years indicated that their role has increased in the long-range planning process at the departmental level. Sixty-three percent (63%) with 6-10 of service perceive a positive relationship in their participation to long-range planning at the departmental level. A somewhat smaller percentage (41%) for those faculty with 5 or less years of experience indicated that they have less say in long-range planning than their peers who have been at the University longer.

Summary of the Results

The results consistently demonstrated that the University's commitment to shared governance is operational. The strongest indicator comes from the faculty who has been on campus for 10+ years. This group of faculty has seen the changes occur and become workable. The main reason that faculty with 6-10 years of experience didn't see as much benefit as the 10+ group was that their tenure on campus began after the 1993 Comprehensive visit when many of the changes began to occur. It was after the 1993 visit that the Faculty Senate began to take a proactive approach to participating in the governance process.

The results did indicate an area of concern in regard to the newer faculty members. While benefiting from the changes, they are not experiencing the processes as are their peers; and therefore, they have been unable to grow as a participant in the system. The Vice President for Academic Affairs has requested from the deans that departments make a concerted effort to integrate new faculty in the decision making process.

References

- (1) 1993 Self-Study Team Report (*see file folder #8*)
- (2) 1998 Focus Visit Self-Study Team Report (*see file folder #9*)
- (3) Faculty Senate Minutes (www.sosu.edu/st/senate/minutes.htm)
- (4) Institutional Assessment Committee Report (*see file folder # 10*)
- (5) Director of General Education Job Description (*see file folder #11*)
- (6) Academic Policies and Procedures Manual (*see file folder #1*)
- (7) The Campus Master Plan (*see file folder #12*)
- (8) A Vision of the Future: Henry G. Bennett Memorial Library, Strategic Plan 2002-2007 (*see file folder #13*)
- (9) North Central Accreditation Self-Study Survey (*see file folder #14*)