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Abstract

The National Study of Faculty Leadership is conducted by the Center for Higher Education at Ohio University. The purpose of the study is to investigate faculty’s role in shared governance and to collect information about faculty leaders generally. The inaugural survey of the study, the Faculty Senate Leader Survey (FSLS:09), targeted faculty senate chairs with endorsement from the American Association of University Professors in 2009. The FSLS: 09 collected information from senate leaders regarding the characteristics of the faculty senate and critical issues in higher education from the perspective of the faculty senate leader. The FSLS: 09 was sent to faculty senate leaders at doctoral and master’s institutions across the nation. This report focuses on the responses from senate leaders at master’s institutions.

Survey Overview

The National Study of Faculty Leadership
The National Study of Faculty Leadership investigates faculty’s role in shared governance and to collect information about faculty leaders. Department chairs, program coordinators, senate leaders, and deans are examples of the faculty leaders who are being studied. The inaugural survey of the Study of Faculty Leadership is the Faculty Senate Leader Survey.

Description

The Faculty Senate Leader Survey collects information from senate leaders regarding critical issues of concern to faculty, and the characteristics of the faculty senate/assembly. The survey also provides senate leaders an opportunity to voice their concerns and opinions on the current state of higher education. The survey consists of 41 items across 9 sections: (a) demographics and background, (b) critical issues
facing higher education, (c) public trust, (d) scope of responsibilities, (e) budget, (f) policies, (g) faculty opinions, (h) leadership, and (i) final thoughts.

A list of master’s and doctoral institutions was extracted from the Carnegie Classification of Institutions of Higher Education using the National Center for Education Statistics Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS). Faculty senate leaders were identified at each institution and were contacted via email requesting their participation in this study. These individuals received an electronic survey in which they could choose whether or not to participate in the study. The data were collected using a web-based survey application.

The sample consisted of 434 faculty senate leaders. Approximately 207 senate leaders of master’s institutions and doctoral institutions responded to the survey, yielding a 47% response rate. A total of 105 senate leaders of master’s institutions completed the survey.

This report focuses on responses from faculty senate leaders at master’s institutions. The report provides information regarding demographics and background information of faculty senate leaders; senate leaders’ opinions of critical issues in higher education, and information on faculty senates in general.
Survey Results

1. Are you...

- 59% Male
- 41% Female

The majority of faculty senate chairs are male.
2. What is your age?

The majority of senate leaders are between the ages of 45 and 64. A very small percentage (2%) of senate chairs are under the age of 35.
3. What is your race/ethnicity?

The overwhelming majority of faculty senate chairs are White.
4. How long have you been a faculty member at your institution?

Most have been faculty members 5 to 10 years at their institutions. Only 2% have been faculty for less than 5 years.
5. What is your academic discipline?

Faculty senate leaders represent a variety of disciplines. For example, 21% were from the humanities, 19% were from the social sciences, and 12% were from business. Agriculture (1%), computer science (2%), and law (4%) had the lowest representation.
6. In your opinion, has there been an erosion of public trust in U.S. higher education?

The majority of faculty senate chairs at master’s degree-granting institutions believe there is an erosion of public trust in U.S. higher education. The 65% who believed there was erosion in public trust were asked to identify the most likely cause of the erosion. Fifty percent believe that institutions operating more like a business is the cause for the erosion of public trust, 37% believe it is due to increasing tuition rates, 8% believe conducting research for private/commercial interests rather than the public's interests is the cause, and 4% believe making bachelor degrees necessary to obtain jobs has contributed to an erosion of public trust.
7. Does the administration at your institution provide the faculty senate with enough time to consider issues relevant to faculty as they arise?

When asked if the administration at their institution provided the faculty senate with enough time to consider issues relevant to faculty as they arise, 57% of the faculty leadership said yes. However, 33% said sometimes, and 10% said no.
8. How would you rate the effectiveness of the faculty senate at your institution?

Twenty-four percent of faculty senate leaders rated their senate as being very effective, 39% rated their senate as effective, 32% rated the senate somewhat effective, and 4% rated their senate as not at all effective.
9. How influential is the faculty senate in selecting executive level leadership (e.g., president, chief academic officer, vice-presidents) at your institution?

The majority of faculty senate leaders reported that their senates were somewhat influential in selecting executive-level leadership at their institutions. An additional 21% reported the senate was very influential. Twenty-five percent of respondents reported their senate had no influence at all.
10. Faculty senate is composed of:

- Faculty only: 57%
- Faculty and administrators: 18%
- Faculty, administrators, and students: 11%
- Others (please specify): 14%

More than half of faculty senates are composed of faculty only.
II. The members of faculty senate/assembly are elected by:

Most representatives are elected by academic departments (33%). About 29% of chairs indicated that senate representatives are elected by their colleges/schools, and 19% by all faculty members at their institution.
12. Are contingent faculty eligible to serve on faculty senate at your institution?

Contingent faculty members are not eligible to serve on faculty senate in more than half of the institutions represented in the survey.
13. Does the faculty senate/assembly at your institution interact with the following organizations/groups?

The majority of faculty senates at master’s degree-granting institutions sometimes interact with the following organizations: student senate/council (50%), alumni associations (52%), and faculty senates at other institutions (54%). However, 61% of faculty senate chairs indicated that they never interact with the AAUP national organization, 51% never interact with their AAUP chapter, and 44% never interact with state legislators.
14. What is the length of term for senate/assembly members?

The most commonly reported term length for faculty senate chairs is 2-3 years (91%). Only 2% reported more than 5 years as the length of term for their institution’s faculty senate chair.
15. Are expectations for tenure and promotion increasing at your institution?

Nearly 81% of chairs believe that the expectations for tenure and promotion are increasing at their institution; 18% believed that expectations are not increasing, while 1% are unsure.
16. Are there enough tenure-track faculty to support academic programs at your institution?

Sixty-one percent indicated there are not enough tenure-track faculty members to support academic programs at their institution.
17. Is there a university-level policy on faculty workload at your institution?

The majority (87%) indicated that there is an institutional-level policy on faculty workload at their institution.
18. Are diversity and equity policies effectively implemented at your institution?

When asked if diversity and equity policies were effectively implemented at their institution, 69% said policies are effectively implemented. Seventeen percent said that polices are in place, but they are not implemented. Eleven percent said that there were limited polices at their institutions, and 3% said that there were no diversity and equity policies at their institution.
19. How would you rate faculty understanding of the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA) at your institution?

When asked to rate the faculty’s understanding of the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA), 58% said faculty were somewhat knowledgeable, 29% said they were knowledgeable, and 13% said they were not at all knowledgeable.
20. To what degree do you think faculty at your institution are satisfied with the executive-level administration's performance in leading the institution?

When asked to rate how satisfied the faculty are with the executive-level administration's performance in leading their institution, 17% were very satisfied, 35% were somewhat satisfied, 31% were somewhat dissatisfied, and 17% were very dissatisfied.
21. How would you rate overall faculty morale at your institution?

When asked to rate the morale at their institution, 43% said it was moderate, 28% indicated very high or high morale, and 29% said indicated was very low or low morale.
22. How would you rate the amount of authority that faculty have in the assessment and evaluation of student learning at your institution?

Seventy percent of faculty senate chairs believe faculty members have a lot of authority in the assessment and evaluation of student learning; 30% feel there is limited authority.
23. How involved are faculty members at your institution in student-affairs-sponsored activities?

When asked to rate faculty members’ involvement in student-affairs sponsored activities, 11% said very involved, 57% said somewhat involved, and 30% said rarely involved.
Most faculty senate leaders have served as senate chair for at least one year (37%), and 36% have served as senate chair for 2 to 3 years.
25. Would you consider serving another term as senate leader?

When asked if the faculty senate chairs would consider serving another term, 45% said yes; 26% said yes, but not right away; 24% said no; and 5% said they were unsure.
26. Did you feel prepared to handle the responsibilities and duties as leader of the senate at your institution?

Sixty percent felt prepared for the position, 37% felt somewhat prepared for the position, and 3% did not feel at all prepared.
27. Do you think that merit pay is distributed equitably at your institution?

Thirty-nine percent of senate leaders indicated their institutions does not have a merit pay system, 21% indicated merit pay is somewhat equitable at their institution, 18% indicated merit pay is inequitable, 11% indicated merit pay is somewhat inequitable, while another 11% indicated merit pay is equitable.
28. Are you a member of the President’s Cabinet at your institution?

Approximately 34% of faculty senate chairs are members of the President’s cabinet.
29. How often do you meet with the president of your institution?

Nearly 15% meet with the president weekly, 43% meet monthly, 3% meet quarterly, 35% meet as needed, and 4% never meet with the president.
30. How often do you meet with the chief academic officer of your institution?

Nearly 29% meet with the chief academic officer weekly, 41% meet monthly, 1% meet quarterly, 26% as needed, and 3% never meet with the chief academic officer.
31. How often do you meet with the chief financial officer of your institution?

Eight percent meet with the chief financial officer weekly, 12% meet monthly, 6% meet quarterly, 45% as needed, and 29% never meet with the chief financial officer at their institution.
Other than the senate/assembly, what other venues are available for faculty to voice their concerns and issues at:

Response Text

1. Many committees and through the Union.
2. We use the newspaper.
3. On one of the many university committees, working groups and task forces. The Administration really does try to take the "shared" part of shared governance seriously. That's why I enjoy my tenure as chair of the Senate so much.
4. AAUP, general faculty meetings
5. Faculty are represented on a range of committees. There are quarterly meetings with the Chancellor for all faculty.
6. None at present time.
7. Through administrative channels: programs, departments, and schools to Provost and President.
8. Walk in their office
9. Electronic "Suggestion Box"; Ombuds Office; Central Administration is relatively open to faculty interactions one on one
10. Faculty council (only faculty)
11. school/college/department meetings
12. None really. We underwent an overhaul of our system, under my leadership a few years ago. We created a system of committees under the Senate, with the compromise being the suspension of an independent (powerless but noisy) "Committee on Faculty". The new Provost has not been keen on sharing governance and there is much talk of needing to bring back the COF, sadly. So that outlet may return. Time will tell.
13. In the last two years, if faculty have a concern they can ask to be heard by the Provost; otherwise, senate is the venue by which faculty are expectation to bring issues forward.
14. Faculty participation on committees & tasks forces allow input at various levels Apr
15. University Review Committee, Faculty Review Committee, College Councils Academic Freedom, Ethics and Grievance Committee, Ombudsperson
16. University Standing committees and advisory councils
17. Faculty council; departments; email
18. Each school has its own Faculty Assembly
19. Faculty union (United Academics)—AAUP
20. Faculty Senate conducts a Confidence in Administration poll every spring. Several colleges have senates. There is a general faculty meeting each semester where faculty can interact with the president.
21. we have a faculty union
22. general faculty meetings; presidential forums; union
23. Reviews of Deans and Chairs, Grievance Committees
24. Faculty Assembly
25. Governing faculty meetings at the College and Department levels.
26. Standing committees of the faculty
27. We are engaged in a collective bargaining campaign through AAUP at our university.
28. Through various committees and of course the usual dysfunctional administrative structure.
29. Faculty Association...a quasi union
30. semi-annual faculty meetings; direct email; via department chairs; annual visits by President and provost to school faculty meetings
31. Departmental, school/college, and university-wide committee structure
32. Board of Governors
33. Campus Executive Faculties, School Executive Committees, general faculty meetings.
34. A newly elected faculty union. Also via regular administrative channels, upward from Dept. Chair to Dean to Provost.
35. on committees and with deans and department chairs
36. President occasionally has town hall meetings. Faculty contact local AAUP chapter.
37. College meetings, occasional university wide meetings, AAUP
38. AAUP
39. "Chain of command"
40. Committee on Governance, Academic Freedom and Tenure Committee

41. Direct conversation with Provost or President May

42. AAUP, Evaluations of Administrators

43. There are appeals boards, and the president and provost maintain open lines of communication
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44. That's about it.

45. College governance bodies

46. President holds town halls. Faculty can directly contract president & provost via phone or email or through the senate. Occasionally the president communicates via university wide emails but prefers more direct contact.

47. Ombudsmen, Faculty Rights and Responsibilities (faculty and deans are elected by senate members)

48. Each of the schools, colleges, and the libraries have their own faculty assemblies or equivalent units. Plus there are lots of committees at all levels through which faculty have opportunities to contribute.

49. Two unions represent the faculty with regard to pay, benefits, workload structure, P/T requirements, and polices, grievances, etc.

50. Through their deans to the Provost's Council of Deans.

51. None

52. None

53. Broadcast emails are used somewhat frequently. Each college has a faculty council that can be v. effective within that college.

54. Annual evaluation of the president, development of strategic plan every three years Letters or e-mails to administration and board.

55. The only other I can think of is at the department level. Chairs can bring concerns to deans and deans to upper administration.

56. Through our faculty collective bargaining unit (COHE) and through our Department Head.

57. University-Wide Town Hall Meetings, College Assemblies

58. The general faculty meetings held at the beginning and end of the year.
59. Faculty Union

60. Colleges have their own assemblies and faculty can voice their concerns in these groups.

61. Issue forums

62. Union, student newspaper

63. Departmental meetings, Campus wide faculty meetings, E-mail president/provost

64. Emails to the President and Provost; President has also held university wide meetings for faculty to present concerns.

65. A UNIVERSITY WIDE "TOWN HALL MEETING" | TO WHICH ALL ARE INVITED AND A FRACTION CARE TO ATTEND

66. Faculty members go up the line to their supervisors and the supervisor's supervisor, but comments are ignored constantly.

67. Senate standing committees

68. University Grievance Committee for Faculty, Affirmative Action Officer Anonymous hot-line

69. Faculty have two seats on the board of trustees and representation in most Board committees

70. AAUP