

# FSU Faculty Poll Results: May 2011

Please note that for this survey and the General Faculty Bargaining Unit contract, all employees are considered faculty.

533 responses were received from May 17-24, 2011.

## Please indicate your primary College/Unit

3	1%	APPS/CTL/ODDL
189	38%	Arts & Sciences
32	7%	Business
26	5%	Communication and Information
6	1%	Criminology and Criminal Justice
36	7%	Education
15	3%	Engineering
19	4%	Human Sciences
15	3%	University Library
6	1%	Learning Systems Institute
10	2%	Mag Lab (NHMFL)
1	0%	Motion Picture Arts(Film)
27	5%	Music
5	1%	Nursing
3	1%	Panama City Campus (all areas)
1	0%	Science & Public Affairs (Inst for)
43	9%	Social Sciences and Public Policy
15	3%	Social Work
8	2%	University School (FSUS)
28	6%	Visual Arts, Theatre, and Dance
7	1%	Other (not listed above)

## Salary Priorities:

**UFF-FSU faculty negotiators want your input on salary priorities. Which of the following salary priorities should be a high priority for the UFF-FSU faculty negotiating team?**

**Please check all that apply. Percent of all choices that were checked / Percent of respondents selecting this choice.**

456	39% / 84%	Across-the-board raises for cost-of-living increases
307	26% / 58%	Adjustments to address market inequities, compression, and inversion
72	6% / 13%	Discretionary increases based on administrator judgment
293	25% / 54%	Merit raises based on annual performance and departmental procedures
37	3% / 6%	One-time annual bonuses for merit
4	0% / 0%	Other

**In dividing up a fixed amount of money for salary increases, top priority should be given to (pick one):**

283	53%	Keeping up with the cost of living
102	19%	Providing incentives for recent meritorious job performance
144	27%	Correcting existing salary inequities, including compression and inversion

**Instead of allocating money to faculty raises based on administrative discretion, the University should allocate funds to a formal merit increase program based on annual evaluations.**

151	29%	Strongly agree
179	34%	Agree
112	21%	Neutral
54	10%	Disagree
28	5%	Strongly disagree

**Faculty salary increases based on administrative discretion should continue for which of the following reasons? Please check all that apply: Percent of all choices that were checked / Percent of respondents selecting this choice.**

341	23% / 65%	Counteroffers in response to documented external offers
192	13% / 37%	Endowed/named chairs
301	20% / 57%	Equity adjustments
299	20% / 56%	Extraordinary achievements
365	24% / 69%	Increased duties and responsibilities
14	1% / 1%	Other

**Should administrators be allowed to award pre-emptive discretionary salary increases to selected faculty members in order to pre-empt the seeking of outside offers?**

169	32%	Yes
211	40%	No
142	27%	Not sure

**Do you have any comments on salary priorities?**

113 21%

there are no easy solutions for salary issues at the present time. Wisdom is needed for dealing with the very small pool. Across the board seems to be the least desirable choice.

I have a minor administrative role with no salary benefit. I think the administrators, like the Chair, gives up research to keep up with the administrative duties. I think it is fair for such people to be compensated.

I have recently heard again of individuals seeking offers from other universities just so they might pursue a counter offer. This could easily become a trend and such offers should be looked at very carefully. If faculty are looking for other jobs, they should be doing so because they plan to leave, not to use it just to get a counter offer.

I am tired of being one of the lowest paid faculty members in my college and watching others go on job searches EACH YEAR for new offers to fund their own raises! (It's not fair when these folks have no intention of leaving FSU; yet their job searches take them away from their FSU duties!!)

When those who can seek better salary elsewhere are the only ones leaving, we are left with only those who cannot see employment elsewhere.

Cost-of-living and equity adjustments should be a BIG PRIORITY

No questions on SPP? Good end, terrible means.

raises should not even be considered if the budget is forcing other faculty to be fired.

Oh, for Pete's sake--with my salary adjusted for inflation, I would have been far better off to remain an elementary school teacher, would have surely been promoted to principal, and now be long retired!

Salary Increases to professors whose salaries were not increased in the last 5-7 years despite outstanding performance

no

I remember many years ago when a Fine Arts dean was given a pre-emptive raise that exceeded the 9-month salary of most assistant professors and many associate professors. Nothing was more detrimental to faculty morale over a long period of time than this one act.

We have historically had several instances of productive people leaving to take offers elsewhere of up to twice what they were making here. There are at least 3 problems with this: 1) The loss of high quality people and specialized knowledge, 2) The impact on morale, 3) Difficulty in Recruiting (persons I contact on the outside tell me they are not interested in joining us because salaries will not keep up w/ inflation, yes we have that reputation). Salaries should not be static for extended periods. They also should not be exclusively across-the-board raises. Managers need to be able to address outstanding performance as well historical problems (compression, inversion, etc.)

Since the legislature deemed it necessary to establish a 3% pay cut this time around, it would be nice if the university could help off-set this with a cost of living increase.

Too much opportunity for abuse in our department

The Union has done a poor job in negotiating higher salaries and salary adjustments. Our former provost certainly played a large part, but the union cannot continue to deny that other unions across the state have negotiated higher salaries at their campuses. As such, I believe we need a new union and new union leadership.

Engineering is woefully behind in salaries. An example: an Associate Professor will make approximately \$85K upon promotion...most universities are hiring Assistant Professors with NO experience at \$85K.

ATB increases NOW!!

Non-tenure track positions that are renewed should be considered for pay increases based on merit and cost of living.

covering the 3% reduction is crucial.

Current structure incentivizes faculty seeking outside job offers. A poor way to keep best faculty.

in my program, up to 85% or more of course sections are typically taught by contingent faculty, mostly adjuncts and grad students. Adjuncts typically receive \$2700 per course, with no benefits. THAT is where salary increases really need to occur if we are to stay afloat.

Tenured faculty do not have the luxury of doing research, etc. without extensive support from NTT faculty. Ignoring their salary issues, working conditions, etc. will also result in a "brain drain" from their ranks and tenured faculty, TA's, and adjuncts will have to take up the slack. I would like to see the union begin to focus on NTT faculty issues as they have been ignored for far too long...the priority has always gone to those who are TT

If compression and inversion weren't such a problem, the relative randomness of department-level merit awards would not be such a problem. I wouldn't care if my colleagues decided one year I should be ranked lower than junior faculty, even though I've published a lot, if I felt like my base salary was otherwise competitive. I also think that any reasonable discussion of this issue has to consider the fact that some fields--all of the humanities and some of the hard sciences--are in steep hiring declines (In 2011 history, my field, saw the fewest number of advertised jobs since 1981, a notoriously dismal year). What this means is that the offer/counter-offer game is simply no longer possible. Meanwhile, other fields (Education, econ, business, etc.) are booming. A fair system would affirm the value of the humanities and hard sciences by accounting for this market-based inequity. As things stand, there's no sign of any short or long-term improvement in the job market for these fields which means that what has been the principle way for sr. faculty to get a pay increase no longer exists.

Get us on par with the REAL world. Starving Artist's are one thing but comp at this university is just pathetic.

There's never any money for merit raises, so all that faculty time spent on merit reviews and recommendations each year could be better spent elsewhere.

Nothing else matters. The low salaries at FSU make the institution a laughing stock among all professional groups, including those employed by said institution. none

should not be a choice between COLA and merit pay. Both should be prioritized

Policies of only offering raises as counter offers does not reward loyalty to the University.

I'm actually leaving FSU because another university made an offer that doubles my current salary; FSU couldn't even attempt a counteroffer. So, obviously, there's a big problem at FSU when this sort of situation can exist. If FSU wants to keep productive faculty, the university need to bring salaries up dramatically.

We really need to get across the board increases merely to make up for a lack of cost-of-living increases over the past several years. The situation is particularly bad for longer-serving faculty.

Merit raises need to be our priority. We're losing our best people and that's the only way to stop the bleeding.

The administration has been talking about adjusting for compression and inversion for decades. It's time to act upon those words!

It is embarrassing that administrators receive generous salary increases, especially in the face of faculty layoffs.

Oy, the SPP was handled poorly. And it was handled poorly because UFF-FSU assumes that administrators are evil.

Salary and job security are the two fundamental issues that the union should concern itself with.

The faculty member should not have to demonstrate an external offer for a salary adjustment. Having to take the time of colleagues with interviewing is false and bad for career relationships. Administrators should recognize good achievement and inequity across pay scales.

Permit 9 month faculty the OPTION of receiving their salary paid out over 12 months. Most universities do this. It is ridiculous that FSU does not.

After five years of no raises of any sort, any kind of salary increase for all faculty would be welcome. In order to not exacerbate existing inequities, it might be interesting to go for a fixed dollar amount--\$3000 or \$5000 for example, rather than basing the increases on percentages where the rich get richer and the poorer get very little.

pre-emptive salary increases saves the university money in the long run b/c you don't then have to search and hire (at a higher initial salary).

I think issues of salary compression and inequity across universities is a critical issue facing FSU. It is problematic when assistant professors are brought in

making \$15,000 more than associate professors who are extremely productive, bringing in grants, and are making a service contribution to their unit. It is also eroding FSU faculty cohesion and collaboration when deans cannot make a pre-emptive discretionary salary increases.

Across the board/COLA. I don't much trust administrators or crazy merit schemes.

cost of living should be high as well as adjustments due to compression. Young faculty are paid closer to market, and faculty that have been here a long time as full Profs. are most underpaid.

If we don't at least get cost-of-living/inflation raises, which we haven't for some time, all of the other programs are just smoke and mirrors for cutting the pay of most faculty members. My career has taken off but the system has not rewarded me for doing my job well.

counteroffers are an extremely inefficient way to address compression/inversion; the new full professor promotion opportunity is better, should be further developed

I'm tired of having no cost of living or merit raises - especially because I keep having more and more responsibilities heaped on my already overburdened plate. The bonuses have been nice, but have nothing to do with the long-term and don't factor in when looking at future raises. I know the economy is bad and the legislature keeps cutting more and more. Frankly, though, I'm tired of being told over and over that I need to just suck it up and work through the rough patch. The rough patch has gone on for too long. I'll be looking for another job this fall.

The most destructive stance of the UFF on salary issues is its aversion to discretionary money in the pot for administrators to use in effective ways. I believe the reason for this is that the leadership of UFF does not trust the administrators. This is too bad. My experience is that most Chairs and Deans would make good decisions for that money were it available. The raise should be an equal mixture of across the board, merit, and discretionary, as it was in the 1980's.

We need more \$ for all purposes.

It is time to be realistic and allow administrators discretion. The current approach that limits them is a mistake.

We are screwed no matter what!

This is all moot; we may never see another salary increase of any kind.

Merit increases based on departmental evaluations have in the past favored friends and buddies of the chairs. There is no just way of ranking faculty. Hence, raises should be across the board, either with a fixed dollar amount or a given percentage.

No, they should be able to respond to actual offers. However, the offers do not need to be formal offers from the university. They could be informal. That is, extended by the department chair via email.

eliminate people staying on after DROP and there would be a large pot of money for everyone

There is a plan afoot to offer sustained performance raises for full professors. There is no mention of associate professors that have been in grade for a long time that shoulder a large teaching burden to allow younger faculty more research time.

There are already salary inequities based on dept. or program. At least we should all get the cost of living increase.

We are going backwards in income earning, now losing benefits in addition to no raises for years.

Sleeping with other people has rarely improved s relationship

If FSU wants to remain competitive, the University needs to have the flexibility to reward the best faculty with salary increases. Across-the-board increases are sometimes necessary, especially after a long period of no raises, but when used exclusively, cost the University quality faculty when they see they are not rewarded any more than under-performing faculty.

Cost of living increases across the board for all faculty should outweigh efforts to award merit-based pay.

Morale suffers when "worker bees" feel they are falling behind cost of living increases.

Everyone should have a raise in an equitable manner.

As an assistant professor who is also doing all program duties, any administrative work should also be for extra pay. It's ridiculous the amount of work I'm asked to do, but yet, I'm expected to produce the same amount of research as my other colleagues who do NOT have the same administrative duties.

Everybody's too low. I believe there should be equity adjustments, but only systematic ones, so that they get to everyone whose underpaid and not just those who are friends with administrators.

this is very important, the one above

we shouldn't have to go off on an interview to get a raise. then you've got one foot out the door already....

Given all the problems of the last few years it is wonder any of us are staying at FSU.

A equitable formal review process should be in place for each unit (and not just the college).

Merit awards are great and deserved, but the optics of having no cost-of-living increases year after year does a greater disservice to the university both in recruiting and in retention. It is the lack of consistent raises, not the lack of merit raises, which will have me looking for jobs elsewhere.

salary inversion/compression

I have seen discretionary increases abused, going to counteroffers for positions that colleagues had not intention of taking. Equity adjustments might make such practices unnecessary.

Deans and chairs are in a good position to identify faculty members that would be most difficult to replace with respect to their productivity and contributions to a department/college. Efforts to reward such faculty BEFORE they seek other offers should be encouraged. This likely requires that Deans have some discretion, which only is a problem if we assume that Deans cannot be trusted.

Only the "stars" get salary increases and awards. The in-the-trenches teachers, daily doing superb classroom work, do not get salary increases unless they lobby hard to get "best Teaching" award. I am tired of the star system, and the amount of organization and lobbying it takes to get salary increase under the current discrepant "salary increases" policies

compression is killing the School of Communication.

I believe that administrative discretionary salary increases have an important place in an overall plan for raises and adjustments, but they should be secondary in importance to across-the-board salary increases and merit raises determined by faculty evaluation committees.

In light of the 3% contribution towards retirement and lack of across-the-board raises in recent years that affected everyone equally, I feel any money should go to everyone equally. 9% would be a nice start.

We need to fix many issues, and all are important, but we should try not to slide backwards -- deal with cost of living -- before doing too much to solve the rest.

Cost of living is number one, especially for those earning under \$100,000 per year.

Salary is always an issue. The failure for the salary to stay concurrent with cost of living results in the outside offer search by faculty. In the end the outside offer is always less cost effective as it results in a salary bump, but also reduced teaching responsibility, and typically direct research funding. By maintaining cost of living, the small percentage increase to salary will translate into a reduction of the large financial burden on department and Deans, not to mention continuity and strength of FSU, experienced by the outside letter.

Salary should be more closely tied to teaching loads.

In general, I believe that merit based increases are better than across the board increases. But salaries are such a disaster that, frankly, anything would be an improvement.

As a tenured faculty member, I would like to see our NTF get better treatment on salaries. Some of our "permanent" full-time NTF are working for ridiculously low salaries.

In the college of social sciences, I do not think our ideological dean supports or has ever acted to address "equity adjustments." Making this the number one priority seems important because it is crucial for retaining faculty in a way that does not give the dean ability to play favorites, deciding what 'counts' as achievements, increased duties, or appropriate reasons to hand out endowed/named chairs.

The University should try to avoid large disparities in salary among peers in a giving unit having similar CVs. It is not possible that a successful salary negotiation at the very beginning of your career at FSU would define your entire income for the rest of your career, regardless of your accomplishments.

I am spending valuable time seeking external offers in order to get a raise. I have been here four years without an increase, and was hired in at a very low rate. I don't want to play this game. I don't apply for jobs I wouldn't think of taking, so this whole thing feels like a game of chicken - entirely counterproductive. My salary is below market value, and far below my colleagues in our recently merged college.

Why was the updated (April 2010) revision to Appx J (FLORIDA STATE UNIVERSITY CRITERIA AND PROCEDURES FOR PROMOTION FOR LIBRARIANS not incorporated into the current CBA? The committee that created the revision worked on a time crunch to allow inclusion in (the then 2010) new bargaining, revised CBA.

In departments that have high numbers of lost faculty, administrators should be able to preemptively assign raises to preserve the integrity of the department. Given the abysmally low salaries at FSU, every effort should be made to increase faculty pay wherever possible.

It's a mess at FSU, has been for years; I don't see it improving in the near future.

Merit raises are certainly "nice"; when there has been one raise in five years the priority has to be across-the-board so everyone will share in whatever meager raises there might be.

Correcting existing salary inequities, including compression and inversion

I am a full-professor in the <snip> dept. I've been here for almost 30 years, have 3 book publications and more articles published than anyone in the dept. Yet, I am paid the lowest among my colleagues at the same rank (by \$10,000) and junior faculty make almost as much as I do. <snip>

With the new mandatory %3 contribution to retirement benefits, my recent promotion raise is practically enullified.

NO salary for 3 months out of 12 is ridiculous. Should FSU strive to be a true research institution summers should be devoted in supporting faculty research. COFRS and other salary support systems are insufficient and travel money for faculty an embarrassment. Inequities between programs and departments need to be corrected. Faculty with lowest salaries is hurting the most and not able to keep up with increasing living expenses. Junior faculty has no reason to stay with increased responsibilities and salary freezes.

To suggest that merit should be based on annual evaluations is to assume that all departments appropriate manage this process; this is simply not true and would result in faculty who should not receive merit increases receiving them anyway.

If we could only keep up with the cost of living for now until the economy improves, this would be satisfactory for now.

Too much potential for abuse. We need a salary policy, not ad hocery.

We have some ridiculously high salaries. Some of us are barely getting by meanwhile.

Use departmental committees to discuss this issue

Salary increases should be based on merit and not on longevity -- especially in these times when those who continue to outperform others should be rewarded.

It would be nice just to have a cost of living increase

There is total neglect of the many in favor of rewarding a small few cronies. This has to stop.

I question the message we're sending when budgets for agencies all around us are shrinking and other state employees are not getting raises (they're taking cuts) and we're thinking of salary increases. I think it is fortunate that FSU faculty salaries were not included in the Gov's We Have a Right to Know website posting state agency salaries. Salaries for many faculty in our college have been increased quite a bit in the last few years. I'm not sure the public would understand. I'm not opposed to increases for cost of living but the state's economic indicators seem to point to further decline in our situation.

Because of the new law regarding 3% contribution to the pension, I support Barron's initiative for the university to cover the increased cost.

Salary compression is extremely damaging to faculty morale. Faculty who have served for many years are often earning less than new hires of junior faculty. In the College of VATD salaries are already among the lowest in the university, compounded by compression it really hurts.

Cost of living increase are important because we are about to enter an inflationary period that will seriously reduce our purchasing power.

Annual evaluations are same as admin discretion. In my department, annual evaluation is solely done by dept head!!

Hence it is subject to "pay back" by a malicious dept chair who cannot abide disagreement with her point of view.

I left the second question blank because I don't endorse the notion of a single priority. All three have to be addressed on a continuing basis.

Given the expanded and at times inequitable loads in my unit, I feel that there should be an equitable assesment for salary purposes.

This is selfish, but I was offered to apply for a job <snip> I would have been given 20 thousand more in Salary, but my family decided Tallahassee is better us at this time. I could have gotten the offer and used it for a raise, but I would have found that disloyal <snip> I am the lowest paid faculty member <snip>.

I would like to see the salary differences between colleges addressed. I see no reason why I (with a Ph.D.) should make 10-15K less than some one in the Arts and Sciences because I am in the College Visual Arts, Theatre, and Dance. For example, I recently saw a hire for a visiting Assistant Professor in French for 70K a year. I make 56,500. Other public Florida Universities do pay more in the arts. FSU as the flagship school for the arts in Florida should not be underpaying its faculty.

until the process for administrative discretion is explicit, this process can be impacted by favoritism, etc.

Focus on equity and cost of living. Merit increases based on collegial input and annual evaluations are good, too -- better than administrative discretionary increases.

Yes but they are too lengthy to discuss here.

When junior faculty see the stagnant salaries and expanding inversion driven in no small part by years of no increases - whether it be COL or merit - they see no reason to remain here (not to mention the assaults by the state legislature - 3% cut for example). Many Universities around the country continued to provide BOTH merit and col increases over the past few years. Multiple junior faculty have told me that they fear being that miserable underpaid senior person - each year they remain here, they are losing future financial security. It is only logical that they leave FSU as soon as possible.

None other than the above

## Non-salary Bargaining Priorities:

How much emphasis should the faculty bargaining team assign to each of the following non-salary issues below?

### Domestic partner benefits?

80	15%	None
88	17%	A little
202	38%	Some
100	19%	A lot
56	11%	All it can

### Childcare facilities on or near campus?

94	18%	None
96	18%	A little
176	34%	Some
113	22%	A lot
43	8%	All it can

### Parking?

154	30%	None
95	18%	A little
154	30%	Some
73	14%	A lot
45	9%	All it can

### A just cause or similar standard for non-renewal, requiring that non-renewal only be for good reason

41	8%	None
41	8%	A little
128	25%	Some
187	36%	A lot
121	23%	All it can

### Multi-year contracts for non-tenured faculty

50	10%	None
63	12%	A little
156	30%	Some
156	30%	A lot
100	19%	All it can

### New position classifications with new titles for non-tenure track faculty?

99	19%	None
97	19%	A little
175	34%	Some
85	16%	A lot
62	12%	All it can

### The FSU administration has suggested that promotion and tenure procedures need revision to increase emphasis on international reputation. Do you agree or disagree with this suggestion?

57	11%	Strongly agree
129	25%	Agree
152	30%	Neutral
122	24%	Disagree
55	11%	Strongly disagree

### The FSU administration has suggested that promotion and tenure procedures need revision to require more outside letters. Do you agree or disagree with this suggestion?

40	8%	Strongly agree
99	19%	Agree
173	33%	Neutral
145	28%	Disagree
64	12%	Strongly disagree

### The FSU administration has suggested that university-wide faculty performance evaluation scales be refined to provide greater detail, for example, including ratings of Outstanding, Excellent, Good, Satisfactory, and Below Satisfactory. Do you agree or disagree with this suggestion?

82	16%	Strongly agree
186	35%	Agree
127	24%	Neutral
80	15%	Disagree
51	10%	Strongly disagree

**If the FSU administration used a 5-point faculty performance rating scale with a forced distribution so that only 20% of the faculty could be placed in each category, in which category would your rating probably be?**

181	34%	Top 20%
143	27%	Next 20%
63	12%	Middle 20%
9	2%	Next 20%
3	1%	Bottom 20%
126	24%	Not sure

**The FSU administration has suggested that last year's layoff arbitration decision shows a need for revision of layoff procedures. Do you agree or disagree with this suggestion?**

92	18%	Strongly agree
228	43%	Agree
106	20%	Neutral
50	10%	Disagree
49	9%	Strongly disagree

**The FSU administration has suggested that procedures for reporting outside activities and conflicts of interest be revised such that the faculty member is responsible for certifying every year whether there is a conflict of interest. Currently the faculty member reports these things when there is reasonable chance an outside activity might create a conflict of interest. Do you agree or disagree with the administration's suggested change?**

38	7%	Strongly agree
129	25%	Agree
191	37%	Neutral
102	20%	Disagree
62	12%	Strongly disagree

**The FSU administration has suggested that 2nd- and 4th-year reviews be established for Assistant Professors. Do you agree or disagree that such reviews should be established?**

49	9%	Strongly agree
192	36%	Agree
129	24%	Neutral
96	18%	Disagree
61	12%	Strongly disagree

**Do you have any additional comments on bargaining priorities for issues other than salaries?**

81 15%

Untenured faculty do need proper signal of their progress.

Suppose you are in a five member department. Then you must have one outstanding, one excellent, one good, one satisfactory and a loser???? Want an insane idea.

A forced distribution for evaluation is much like grading on a curve. It assumes that you are hiring some individuals that are "inferior" from the beginning and are not going to perform at high levels, ie that you are selecting your sample from a normally distributed population.

I received zero support prior to tenure, so anything that would REQUIRE departments and colleges to support faculty would be a huge step forward for FSU.

Assistant Prof. evaluations are vital and assurances should be in place that all Departments are mentoring and evaluating properly. Tenure should only be for those who are deserving, and that justifies defense of the tenure system.

peer evaluation and tenure endorsement should play a stronger role...the tenure process needs more faculty input

Some of these questions are squishy. For example, do the "5-point scale" questions refer to what's known as the "gross" annual evaluation or to a separate merit evaluation, which in many units covers a multiple of years (although assessed annually). Also, does the "just cause" question refer to tenured/tenure-track faculty AND non-tenure track faculty? I would have different answers to these different forms of the questions.

I think it is absolutely ridiculous to place so much emphasis on faculty performance as though there were some huge problem in that area. Why are we being placed on the defensive here? Any state that has such distorted educational priorities is damn lucky to have any decent faculty working in its universities, and it very well may not soon if they continue in this aggressive posture. Essentially, they will establish standards that will be meaningless in practice, since they will never be able to keep the faculty that their high standards demand, as anyone who meets them will migrate to other states where they will be rewarded and treated much more kindly. And, by the way, why do we even care about merit pay when there is no money? The whole conversation looks like a giant red herring to me.

Annual evaluations are done already.

no

2nd year review is too early; 4th year review is probably too late. What is really needed are administrators with the guts to send 1-year non-renewal letters to faculty with little pragmatic hope of achieving tenure, rather than letting the system take care of this issue 4 years down the line.

In the past, the University seemed to think that Non-Tenure-Track faculty could be dismissed at the end of their annual appointments without cause. A few years ago I read the textbooks used for the MBA program at FSU. One of the books discussed the idea of "implied contracts". That if a person has been employed for an extended period, without a specific end-date or terminal milestone, then there is an implied contract of continued employment. The employer cannot end the contract unilaterally, but must demonstrate that either the individual is not performing acceptably or that there is a need for down-sizing due to budgetary problems and develop a plan for that. I think in recent years, the University has moved more toward this position which I believe is the responsible thing. Of course, to be able to handle budget crunches, one frequently does need to dismiss long-term employees. This means that annual evaluations should be performed such that low-performing employees know that if there is a crunch, they will be first impacted and can either improve their performance or start looking for other opportunities. In my division at the MagLAB we do perform annual evaluations with more grades than simply satisfactory/unsatisfactory.

If 2nd and 4th year reviews are used, current 3rd year review in my area needs to be deleted.

Some means needs to be developed to identify tenured dead wood and either get them to resume working or to buy them out.

Especially if additional reviews are used to prepare faculty for future promotion and tenure application

More paper work is NOT the answer. Good leadership is the solution.

Nothing else matters except salaries. All else is smoke.

Current policy overly relies on the student reported evaluations of performance that only capture some dimensions of the instructors performance. This policy tends to penalize instructors who take on the large required service courses which often have ambitious syllabi and are unpopular with students, yet these courses are critical to the University's mission.

Raising the bar on faculty expectations would not appear so troubling if faculty were also rewarded for their efforts.

2nd and 4th year reviews, and NOT 1st and 3rd year reviews.

In some disciplines, the time between paper submission and acceptance is quite long. For example, in my field the BEST case scenario is that we get a decision in 3 months. Most journals, however, take 4 to 6 months. Thus, I could see a second year review working against some assistant professors in some departments. The appearance would be that they are unproductive, when that may not be the case at all.

Tenured faculty need more review to encourage productivity.

Yes. Why is the administration always seen as an enemy? Any way to work with them for the greater good?

I would hate for promotion and tenure practices to be changed across all departments in a way that is insensitive to individual fields' cultures/practices.

Chairs should work up, based on tenure/promotion practices at peer/aspirational institutions listed in departmental QERs, a set of good practices for tenure and promotion. Deans should approve them. Practices should be revised as needed.

See comments above.

KOCH BROTHERS DEAL = BIG-TIME DISGRACE

A single 3rd year review is sufficient.

Having an additional review on top of the annual review is an administrative burden that takes away time from completing research and writing without which tenure cannot be achieved.

I would like to see an end to the "Assistant In" title to something more in line with comparable universities and recognizable when applying for jobs elsewhere.

E. Barron may be the best president FSU has ever had. However he inherited a mess and a horrible economic situation and a culture that does not value education.

Are these changes to make the system better or are they ways to trip up faculty and/or find ways to fire people? After what happened over the past few years it is hard to trust. This is the real issue.

concerns over suggested changes to T&P mostly reflect concern that this would not raise the quality of information in some disciplines, and make FSU less attractive to potential new asst profs

The P&T process does need some revision - especially in the locating of peer institutions and outside reviewers (far too few reviewers). I don't think 2nd and 4th year reviews will fix the issue though - especially a 2nd year review (faculty would have been employed at FSU for a year and a half by the time it was due - far too much stress and work for little reward). The process for the annual reviews is already arduous in my department, and adding an extra college-level review would just make it worse. I think time and energy should be spent on helping assistant professors get their research done instead - course release, semester off to write the book, etc.

Regarding international reputation, in some areas people can have very visible careers within the country, yet not be well-known internationally.

International reputation criterion should not be an unfunded mandate---it costs a lot of travel money to maintain an international reputation. If the administration wants that as a factor in judgment they need to support it. I spent 10K of my own money last year maintaining an international reputation. The lack of funding for research travel is a major reason I will seek other employment.

Anything that can be done to make the chair less unilaterally powerful with respect to tenure and promotion decisions and raises will be a good thing. In general chairs have too much power over individual faculty conditions of work.

Academic freedom - clearer guidelines needed for taking money from donors who wish to maintain influence in hires and evaluations.

Why does the union have so much power in bargaining, I think the union is worthless!

International reputations are an anomalous standard in a university system that actively discourages international students by permanent denial of in-state tuition status to them no matter how long they are here. UFF should work against that rule.

I think Outstanding, Excellent, and Good being above Satisfactory are too many levels. One or two is enough - and if two, the top category should be for something truly outstanding for that year, like being named a fellow, or winning a national or international award.

I was disappointed to not see the union take a stronger position on the role of defined benefit plans. It is likely that defined benefit plans are actually the low cost alternative since they allow for risk to be diversified at the fund level rather than at the individual level. I don't think this discussion received much, if any, attention during the last legislative session.

- blurring the line between tenure/tenure-track and non-tenure track faculty by titles does not help non-tenured but may pave the way to cancel tenure all together.

- for promotions and pay raises, more emphasis on outside evaluations, publication records and h-indices may help to raise the standard at FSU.

The formal rules for 'Binders' should be reduced in line with other Universities.

- FSU Administration should be streamlined.

I left several questions blank because I didn't have enough info to judge. E.g., the question re: international rep: this seems to be something that s/b left to discretion of depts and fields who best know the range of expertise in the field. In our dept's merit eval instrument, we have a category for nat'l and internat'l rep, but eval committee takes these on a case by case basis because of the varying practices in different fields...

Disagree with closure of departments or consolidation of depts without bargaining.

I believe that strong mentoring should go with additional mandated reviews for Assistant Profs; then and only then would it make sense to me.

I also insist that the University come up with a better way to evaluate teaching, such as mandatory reviews periodically.

Need more power going back to faculty, instead of high to mid-level administrators with their own paternalistic visions for everyone below them

for the last question: the Assist Profs should attend the April "folder workshop" in the 2nd year also, to see exactly the goal towards they are reaching.

Third year reviews take a LOT of time. Doing it in the 2nd and 4th would be time away from doing research. Ridiculous.

Requiring "international recognition" discriminates against women as well as fields that have its strongest scholars in the U.S., like "African American Studies." I believe we should have a 3rd year review rather than 2nd and 4th year reviews, but either way, they should be done inside of the department, and the candidate should be protected from indiscriminate and arbitrary firings at this level by administrators.

2nd and 4th year reviews should be implemented only if they're tied to 2-year contracts.

Administration should be terminated if they were involved in the layoff decisions - what a catastrophe they brought on themselves and the university.

I believe that the contract requires that promotion and tenure procedures be posted on the department website. The last time I checked, this was not true for some colleges.

Also, I believe that each department (not just college) should have separate promotion and tenure requirements as well as annual evaluation expectations and procedures.

The CBA should have clear criteria for defining a financial crisis under which faculty layoff occur.

layoff procedures: not clear what admin mean here: I strongly disagree to make it easier for them to fire people at their will without the wrongdoing of the faculty.

Tenure is already tough on assistant professors AP in the current funding climate (in bio ~5-10% funding rate), putting more stress on AP does not help to select promising researchers.

no

A third year review for assistant professors is enough.

The standards for my department at this point do not include citations --only sheer production of published material, and this too might well be adjusted.

It is generally not a good idea to ratchet up expectations even more at a time when the faculty are already under so much stress. It drives morale even lower. If we all got research/teaching support, then fine. BUT, that isn't the case. The university system is already looked down on by the larger academic community. We can't even recruit head-to-head with other universities because of the state's reputation and lack of resources.

sabbaticals--- at present, they are VERY hard to come by and seem to be biased toward a limited number of departments

The third year review is traditional at most schools. It provides enough detailed information to the department in order to make an educated decision and judge the educational and research credentials of the asst. prof without increasing the paperwork burden. At yr 3, most faculty are either on track or unlikely to receive tenure. At yr 2, it is impossible to tell. At yr 4 it is too late for any changes to be made.

Faculty with National reputation need not document International reputation. These cannot be separated. Lumping faculty in 5 groups equally is a very bad idea. It will mean 20% is poor no matter how good excellent these faculty members are in teaching and research. It may be an indication for "weak" departments, but counter productive to excellent and strong departments.

Regarding items 7-9 under non-salary: In my area we get 0 support for research other than the opportunity to compete for CRC grants. This does not compare with other people in my field teaching at R1 universities at the same career level.

Regarding item 13: why? would this eliminate the 3rd year review?

P&T standards and procedures need to be standardized and transparent.

Only if that would lead to a more effective mentoring of the new Faculty member by his/her Department.

I would suggest that any increased performance demands be met with demands for increased pay.

It is a sign of being completely unhinged from micro-theory on incentives if the administration believes that after 5 years with no raises that they should be talking about raising the bar for tenure and promotion and annual reviews...do these people understand incentives structures?? So the message is "We know we haven't even been keeping you up with inflation for the past 5 years and we know that we are going to continue cutting your benefits but let's talk about raising the bar for the one last means that you have of getting a raise (promotion) -- classy"

All these reviews and no money. If once upon a time the state paid our retirement because we had no raises, it seems to me that the least the FSU administration can do under the same circumstances is to cut back on the bureaucracy. Added burden, no reward, and third year review is generally sufficient to give good advice.

Third-year reviews are more than sufficient.

I don't understand the implications of many of these issues, therefore I have marked "neutral"; more education is need for faculty to become more astute on these issues.

maybe a 4th year review, to have an idea about how likely one is to get tenure, or to know what year to go up for tenure.

Who cares about parking? More of us should walk or take the bus anyway.

A more refined university-wide rating scale is potentially useful, but also a potential tool of abuse and another reason for departments and colleges to try to "game" the system.

If there are more reviews, they should not take too much time to prepare. The tenure and promotion binder model would put too much pressure on the professor at a time when he or she is completing the semester and has many other things to juggle.

I've seen forced ranking in industry and it was messy at best, I can't see this mode working in academia. Although, it would be nice to highlight the uselessness of some tenured faculty.

Every year I'm amazed that parking shows up on people's lists of concerns. Parking should not be on the union's list of priorities. It is unrelated to important job conditions.

The term "faculty performance" needs to be better defined. Some faculty are excellent teachers, or carry a far greater service load than their colleagues. Assignment of responsibilities and variations in departmental assignment procedures do not always allow all faculty to be equally "productive" in the same areas. For instance designing and implementing new degree programs, while very productive and time consuming does not seem to count for much on the "productivity" scale. Productivity seems to often be considered what is flashy and highly publicized rather than what is considered quality work in a given field.

I want to clarify my position on lay-off procedures. The Admin needs to improve its procedures, not to amend the CBA which helped defeat the lay-offs.

The performance evaluation procedures need more outside or objective criteria to complement internal based evaluation procedures.

We need more outside letters to balance reliance on internal evaluation. The 'old boy/girl' network is alive at FSU. No point to achieving spectacularly here (as I have done) as it is not rewarded.

Some of these questions cannot be answered well without additional information. For instance, it might be helpful to revise tenure procedures but it depends on what these are. Does it mean that people need another book or some other kind of accomplishment which marks more production without any measure of the quality of the production? If so I would disagree and point to the national discussion on such issues. If however service and teach began to play the role they should in tenure especially at this time of reduced faculty numbers then I would agree with this change. In my department we have gone from 14 to 8.5 faculty. Obviously, this means a great deal more work for the remaining faculty. Given that much of the administrative work falls on junior faculty who are also not being paid as much both in comparison to the other faculty and nationally but are yet held to hire standards for tenure there should be some real thought put to what the purpose of tenure procedures are. These should be tied to the current situation of the university.

I think there are already too many reviews and evaluations. The time spent on this is now seriously affective our primary responsibilities of research and teaching.

again, at this point, there are no parameters for an administrator identifying annual performance level. It is possible to submit a binder for a subsequent year with minimal changes and receive the same outcome as the year before, top marks, same letter with almost same wording, and the same 3-5 minute meeting/review

I like the idea of second and fourth year reviews. Three years is too long. As long as the requirements for the second year review are not through the roof, I think it's a good idea. And in that case, the administration should be very clear about what is expected discipline by discipline. And that means giving CLEAR QUANTITATIVE INDICATIONS OF HOW MANY ARTICLES AND/OR BOOKS (or progress on a book) IS REQUIRED! I'm sick of seeing very nebulous tenure guidelines!



## General Survey Questions:

### Generally speaking, I'm satisfied with the way things are going at FSU.

12	2%	Strongly agree
123	23%	Agree
102	19%	Neutral
175	33%	Disagree
117	22%	Strongly disagree

### Faculty morale is high at FSU.

7	1%	Strongly agree
49	9%	Agree
83	16%	Neutral
209	40%	Disagree
180	34%	Strongly disagree

### Administrators should have greater discretion to allocate salary raises to faculty.

45	9%	Strongly agree
124	24%	Agree
125	24%	Neutral
126	24%	Disagree
103	20%	Strongly Disagree

### Merit raises in my department/unit, when provided, are based on specified criteria and standards.

72	14%	Strongly agree
189	36%	Agree
121	23%	Neutral
77	15%	Disagree
59	11%	Strongly disagree

### FSU administrators have inappropriately high salaries compared with FSU faculty.

212	41%	Strongly agree
133	25%	Agree
137	26%	Neutral
30	6%	Disagree
11	2%	Strongly disagree

### The elevators, restrooms, ceilings, and other physical properties in my building are in good condition

74	14%	Strongly agree
189	36%	Agree
72	14%	Neutral
105	20%	Disagree
86	16%	Strongly disagree

### Faculty and staff parking is satisfactory at FSU.

47	9%	Strongly agree
191	36%	Agree
91	17%	Neutral
121	23%	Disagree
78	15%	Strongly disagree

### My department/unit has faculty-approved merit assessment procedures.

109	21%	Strongly agree
219	43%	Agree
108	21%	Neutral
48	9%	Disagree
27	5%	Strongly disagree

### My department/unit has up-to-date merit assessment procedures.

100	19%	Strongly agree
192	37%	Agree
128	25%	Neutral
63	12%	Disagree
33	6%	Strongly disagree

### Merit assessment procedures in my department/unit are satisfactory.

74	14%	Strongly agree
176	34%	Agree
128	25%	Neutral
91	18%	Disagree
45	9%	Strongly disagree

**Faculty can tend to family care needs without fear of being penalized.**

96	19%	Strongly agree
240	47%	Agree
118	23%	Neutral
46	9%	Disagree
16	3%	Strongly disagree

**Faculty have enough say in academic governance in Faculty Senate, colleges/units, and departments/units.**

24	5%	Strongly agree
164	32%	Agree
150	29%	Neutral
120	23%	Disagree
61	12%	Strongly disagree

**I have enough time to move forward on my research or creative agenda.**

27	5%	Strongly agree
168	32%	Agree
96	18%	Neutral
156	30%	Disagree
73	14%	Strongly disagree

**My job demands sometimes cause problems in my personal or family life.**

60	11%	Strongly agree
216	41%	Agree
93	18%	Neutral
127	24%	Disagree
27	5%	Strongly disagree

**I can give sufficient time to my students.**

38	7%	Strongly agree
225	43%	Agree
118	23%	Neutral
110	21%	Disagree
28	5%	Strongly disagree

**Faculty loyalty to this university is rewarded.**

7	1%	Strongly agree
43	8%	Agree
143	27%	Neutral
168	32%	Disagree
160	31%	Strongly disagree

**I hope to spend the rest of my career at FSU.**

68	13%	Strongly agree
147	28%	Agree
156	30%	Neutral
83	16%	Disagree
68	13%	Strongly disagree

**When I came to this university, I planned to spend the rest of my career here.**

101	19%	Strongly agree
161	31%	Agree
116	22%	Neutral
106	20%	Disagree
42	8%	Strongly disagree

**I feel loyal to this university.**

67	13%	Strongly agree
197	38%	Agree
110	21%	Neutral
74	14%	Disagree
68	13%	Strongly disagree

**I felt more loyalty to FSU in the past than I do today.**

101	19%	Strongly agree
130	25%	Agree
125	24%	Neutral
119	23%	Disagree
48	9%	Strongly disagree

**Teaching assignments in my department/unit are done equitably.**

81	16%	Strongly agree
218	42%	Agree
113	22%	Neutral
62	12%	Disagree
45	9%	Strongly disagree

**If cuts to core academic faculty and staff compensation costs are unavoidable, which do you prefer as the best way to accomplish cost savings?**

302	59%	Furloughs (mandatory unpaid leave)
123	24%	Layoffs
41	8%	Pay rate reductions
42	8%	Other

**Please comment on your response to the previous question.**

125 23%

The university is not sustainable at present funding levels and with the current control of the political power structure. Something has to change - furloughs may be the best way to hang on to see if change is possible.

It has been so long since there has been a "real" base pay merit increase that it is difficult to say how it would be handled by administrators at this point.

I see a LOT of staff that do not take their job seriously and seem to take it for granted. We could work more efficiently without some of them. As for faculty, those who are burned out should be encouraged to rejuvenate their lives.

Furloughs with the ability to use accrued sick and vacation time.

Reduction of numbers of administrators. Also, university needs to decide if it is a research I university or a community college -- and reduce certain departments accordingly

Salaries at FSU are now so low, that further lowering them (via furloughs or pay reductions) will lead to FSU losing its best professors.

Faculty should have input on layoffs within the unit, based on real productivity - not just the college administration's rubber-stamping of supposed productivity as shown in merit files

Bridge with non-recurring (sweep surpluses) and pray for rain.

My college has too many non-tenure track faculty.

Departments should be required to justify their existence.

all choices seem inappropriate

Do you really think the administration cares what faculty think about this and many other issues?

Hard to comment in general. I expect there are some parts of FSU where one response would be best and others where another response would be best.

Furloughs do not affect the retirement rate while reductions do. Layoffs destroy the positive inertia of a unit while furloughs only delay it.

I am not sure what would be best. Any one of the above "solutions" would place an incredible strain on my family. I am certain any others are in the same position.

I assume layoffs would affect those faculty members that the University can live without.

Close or eliminate poorly performing units to cut budget.

Furloughs don't address recurring cuts. Rate reductions encourage faculty to find other positions.

Cut entire departments rather than bleeding all of them

The specific method should be based on the facts at hand. For example, furloughs only make sense if the outlook for the next year is positive. Pay rate reductions are always bad in my estimation. Layoffs affect a few people very severely, but may be better for the whole. Again, it depends on outlook.

I prefer furloughs to layoffs or pay cuts, as we are already stretched too thin on faculty and staff. However, furloughs are simply a disguised pay cut for faculty since we won't work any fewer hours - every faculty member already works around double the hours than we are paid to work. Staff are the only ones who would actually get to work fewer hours if they were furloughed.

1) Attrition

2) Find a mechanism for effectively getting rid of tenured turkeys (note the word 'effectively' which distinguishes the suggestion from the current system)

Eliminate as many administrators as possible. The growth of the administration while reducing faculty numbers is shameful.

Spreading out the "pain" to all faculty no matter what their position, tenure, or productivity, could risk driving more high performers away, which is bad in the long run

Work stoppage. I took a 25% pay cut to work at the university vs private industry employment.

There are a lot of faculty currently being protected by the union who do not deserve to be faculty at FSU (based on the quantity of their work)

There is no such thing as a Furlough. You continue to work. Furloughs are more akin to band aids than addressing specific problems.

If the university looks to furloughs as a cost-saving measure, the reality is that it would merely be a big decrease in pay, as performance expectations would not likely be adjusted accordingly. The university needs to take a hard look at more efficiencies in administration and then at poor performing units. Shared sacrifice sounds okay (to many) in principle, but it means the university handicaps its strong, high-performing units and threatens their hard-earned reputations merely to spare the poor performing units.

We need to recognize and reward our best and brightest.

Begin with those whose salaries are over 100k annually.

Everyone should be affected equally.

I am not in the financial position to take many more hits to my already meager salary. So, while I have said furloughs in the past, I have to change my answer to layoffs. Of course, since I plan on leaving FSU in the next 3 years, my opinion should be taken with a grain of salt.

save the jobs.....

There are bad performers at this institution. We all know who they are. They should not be protected, even if they are full professors.

There is no need for cutting these costs. It is time that the rich part of the university: student housing, food services, parking and athletics start contributing towards the core mission of the university. If there are no professors there is no need for student housing.

Unfortunately for me, the furlough would be catastrophic for my family - I base this on having friends and the California system and seeing what happened there - unfortunately I don't have a good alternative suggestion - I would suggest that pay rate reductions that are graded might make the most sense, so those of us who make considerably less can still afford to pay the rent, for medication, and go see the doctor when we are sick

But furloughs should not occur during summer time, or during holiday break. Rather, furloughs should occur during the 9-month academic year so to accurately convey the message that there is not money to pay the faculty to do their regular jobs. Furloughs during non-teaching months helps to hide the impact while STILL requiring faculty to keep up with research and other non-teaching duties.

Close DSC!

Protect the academic core (i.e., faculty) as at other universities, cut administrators and staff.

In the past I felt great loyalty. Under Abele NONE, But it is coming back. Loyalty was ONLY rewarded if it was loyalty to Abele and Travis.

Haven't we already been taking pay cuts the last five years?

the union should promote faculty use of public transportation and carpools, esp. w/ new Nova2010 route system going into effect; we need fewer cars on our roads, not more parking spaces on campus

I can't cope with pay cuts when I'm already dealing with a reduced quality of life due to no cost-of-living raises for multiple years. I'm single and have a young child to support.

If furloughs go into effect, then I think these \*must\* happen on days that faculty \*teach\* classes as well as on research days. It's unfair to require faculty to take mandatory unpaid leave while simultaneously expecting faculty to continue their research during that time. Why not just cancel all classes and effectively shut down the university for a day or two - giving everyone the day off and making a public statement for the legislature.

For faculty, I believe furloughs are the same as pay rate reductions. If faculty are furloughed, will assistant professors have different tenure standards because of the furlough? Doubtful. We would more than likely be expected to work the same amount, but with less pay.

It's better for morale to lay off less productive faculty, or close units, than to reduce the pay of everyone, making everyone less content and less motivated.

Reduce administrator's compensations first. They keep on assigning more work for faculty and stuff for the same or lower pay.

Furloughs must be "contract based"---that is, if a faculty member is on a 50% research and 50% teaching contract, then half the furlough time must be taken from the classroom. Otherwise furloughs are not only unjust but invisible to taxpayers constituents.

Every unit has those who don't do their fair share.

The greatest drain on my time at FSU is constant busy-work to respond to the increasingly intrusive and inappropriate demands of SACS regulations. UFF should work to modify the power and priorities of SACS to mess up higher education.

We can no longer afford further pay rate reductions or furlough. This year the retirement plan got chopped. Next year, most likely, it is the health insurance.

Furloughs sound better than they are in practice, since the federal rules governing them are so strict. If I am furloughed during the academic year, I cannot have any contact with my students or do ANY of my usual activities. It isn't clear if I can even work on my research on my own since that is an activity supported by the university. And the cost savings for furloughs aren't as great as they seem since many (most?) people apply for unemployment compensation for the furlough period.

if times of furlough can be determined by the individuals.

Eliminate unfilled lines and non-tenure track faculty.

Let's all take a "hit" to maintain our university.

Keep staff and require concessions from the highest ranked faculty first or on a prorated basis. Eliminate programs in an EQUITABLE way based on performance measures that are PUBLIC and negotiable, rather than across the board cuts. Some programs (high-quality, new cutting edge, etc.) can be drastically hurt if cuts are applied across the board.

A furlough indicates I still have a job. Layoffs are out of the questions, and pay rate reduction would be forever.

reorganizing also can add efficiency and cost savings

Rules should not be changed after faculty left a previous life to come to FSU. If tenure and promotion was part of the reason to come to FSU, it should be honored.

Furloughs + firing of the deans

It is imperative that C&G faculty and staff be exempt from compensation cuts, as their externally-funded budgets are not necessarily as tight as the E&G funds (in some cases, flush with funds), and these people are much more mobile (as are their funds). Cuts to C&G faculty made under the misguided guise of "fairness" or "sharing the pain" would be just plain assinine.

Furloughs are the best way to avoid permanent damage. The other methods will still cause harm later when the economy recovers

Furloughs should be implemented on a sliding scale by salary, not by rank. Even one furlough day for the highest paid administrators would save the university more money than several days of across-the-board furloughs for lower paid faculty and staff.

do not reduce actual salaries or they will never come back

At least with a furlough one could pursue other work or personal projects. Pay reductions make everyone feel depressed. Layoffs can ruin lives.

I prefer none of the above. Instead of asking how already underpaid faculty and staff can receive less, why don't we instead reduce the number of administrators and reduce their exorbitant salaries and travel allowances?

After years of no cost of living raises and no merit pay and now a 3% reduction to go to pension I simply can't afford unpaid leave or pay rate reductions. I'd have to leave the university and take another job that is offering me more so I might as well take the chance on the layoff.

eliminate positions/departments/sub specialties

Furloughs for all, especially for the higher paid administrators.

Keep people hired if at all possible. Use attrition and retirement. (Offer early retirement options)

Furloughs and pay rate reductions are unacceptable and reflect badly on the University. Layoffs of tenured faculty should be avoided at all costs -- that too reflects very badly on the University.

I support a furlough as a one time event rather than a long term pay rate reduction. If the economic conditions change, I would hope that salaries would be able to continue at the current pay rates. Layoffs would be the least desirable unless there are significantly underperforming units or faculty/staff members. In such cases, these units could be eliminated. The problem with the previous approach, as I understand it, is that the administration did not do an effective job of identifying quality of performance indicators in making the cuts.

Eliminate some administrators. Make sure we get an appropriate amount of money (tax) from businesses that operate on campus (i.e. Starbucks).

pay rate reductions put us all at a lower point going forward; layoffs too are irreversible

The problem with across-the-board cuts (like furloughs) is that it treats all units and all faculty the same when they are in fact quite different. Some faculty have ample opportunities to relocate to other prestigious jobs (and some units are filled with such faculty). If they get the same treatment as everyone else, they will be more likely to leave, and the remaining faculty will, on average, be less accomplished. If the administration is protecting excellence, they should resist across-the-board solutions.

I don't see how any of the forementioned measures can be taken in my department. We are understaffed as it is. Reducing pay will prompt faculty to re-enter the private sector where more money can be made.

Don't know

pay rate reductions are hard to rescind

At least on furlough you have time to do research and write the papers that FSU is constantly expecting; it seems a more equitable way of responding to cuts cuts to administration

The current method is to eliminate new hires--unacceptable.

loyalty to the university is easier than to the state government but hard to separate

Cut some high-level administrators.

Lay off non-productive faculty and professional staff and trim the excess support staff

If cuts are unavoidable, after all other avenues have been considered and implemented, I would prefer to see us all share the burden in a way that will have least impact on the future.

I would rather eliminate less prestigious departments/units than make cuts to prestigious ones.

There will be a time where one must ask should we support academics via the professor system or should that money go into the auxiliary units. In addition, what constitutes a viable department, or perhaps are all departments viable? I see many overlapping departments (comp science for instance) that should be combined. Do we need to support low performing departments that are not academic centers of excellence or are outdated. Perhaps I am an academic snob, for this I apologize

That's the only way the students won't suffer (at least in the short run).

furlough, if done during the academic semesters

Spread the cuts evenly, don't sacrifice the careers of individual faculty

Look at administrators before looking at faculty. Then look at the faculty members making six figure salaries before coming after the lowest paid faculty members.

None of the above are pleasant to think about, but I can't afford a pay cut. If I'm going to work for less money, I'd rather have time off to do the research FSU I'm supposed to be doing but can't because of job duties and no financial support.

I would want the furlough days to be teaching days -- unfortunately, if Floridians don't realize that by cutting expenses they are cutting services (teaching), then our budget will continue to be cut.

reorganize departments

Because of the vast amount of inequity in salaries, any across the board cuts unfairly target those who are already suffering the most. Any changes must take into account equity issues and essentially take from the rich instead of the poor!

Decrease the size of the administration, which has grown dramatically at the expense of Faculty and academic activities.

Just about everything about my position here pleases me except for my extremely low pay. I have great colleagues, a congenial environment, and love my work. But I had to answer all of the merit questions with "neutral" because I have no idea what procedures are in my department. Why? I got here four years ago and have seen absolutely no raises of any kind.

There are some faculty whose job performance is unsatisfactory. They should be fired.

The questions in this survey about the validity of merit procedures is ridiculous given that there has not been merit in half of a decade...leave it to a union to want to fight over a procedure that has effectively no purpose.

Layoffs create a situation where building back up isn't a foreseeable future solution (2-5 years); when administrators get cut the same percentage as line faculty and bonuses are refused then I may accept pay rate reductions, in addition the pay isn't that equitable to begin with, take a cut?

The budget crisis committee is discussing several options, most of which do not correspond to your three options.

Furloughs are usually temporary but the others are not.

There should be a minimum salary below which there is no cut. The "staff" in our Department are SO underpaid they can't stand to lose more. The "higher paid" faculty wouldn't be affected as much.

Save jobs!

Administrator positions can be cut back. Staff moral and work ethic is poor compared to faculty and needs to be addressed.

Furloughs for administrators first.

Furloughs do not solve a problem, they only delay the inevitable -- recurring funds are required to address cuts. Pay rate reductions will penalize low-paid employees. Unfortunately, laying off employees is the only method of minimizing the impact.

I would probably work anyway while on furlough which is almost like a pay rate reduction except with the pay rate reduction you would be expected to work but at a lower rate.

Furloughs are the lesser of these evils. Less permanence, time off may be used productively for non-FSU tasks, and layoffs are devastating.

Reduce the number of administrative positions.

Shortening the semester and contact hours. The state, not the faculty, needs to feel the burn for cutting education funding. Legislators will only respond if they feel (and care) that students will get less instruction.

Tighten the belt for all administrators regardless of ranking (in the same degree as faculty and staff are to be affected )

We can't cut any more than we have already cut. People like me are greatly underpaid if you compare my experience, devotion to teaching, etc. with others either in my type position or with public school teachers - even in Florida.

Rather than across the board cuts, examine further eliminating units where savings can be realized and where performance measures are not as high as other units. Re-prioritize spending (do we need more seating on Landis Green, can capital dollars be reallocated to other budget categories? Examine the distribution of the indirect rate - very little comes back to PIs or our college and yet our college is expected to pay for grant expenses such as printing reports, supplies, conference materials, etc. Sponsored Research Services continues to offer fewer services (preaward) and shifts much more of the workload onto the PI or staff submitting the grant - yet they hold the bulk of the indirect.

Lay-offs for a few choice deadwood positions would be more productive than across-the-board furloughs, though I know they aren't allowed.

Maintain every tenured faculty position until FSU develops the methods to fully fund them.

I'd prefer to see cuts to administrative pay before any other cuts.

If the cuts are structural, i.e. not to get through a finite period of resource scarcity, then I favor layoffs based on a transparent and participatory process of assessing strengths and weaknesses and importance of the university's different programs.

eliminating poorly performing units.

In unit, due to administrative decisions, some faculty are not forced to teach overloads to accommodate the reduction through retirement of faculty.

reduction in salary for administrators.

Feel that furloughs will do the least damage to faculty morale.

there has been NO merit pay since our procedures were instituted.

Furloughs permit the least disruption of lives.

In this survey, administrative discretion is mentioned a fair amount. It is as if the faculty would trust administrators to be fair in judging merit and other matters. Many administrators are simply not trusted.

I prefer to see layoffs avoided.

**Please rate your feelings toward the UFF-FSU Chapter, using the following choices:**

178	34%	Very positive
186	35%	Somewhat positive
80	15%	Neutral
53	10%	Somewhat negative
22	4%	Very negative
7	1%	Not sure

**Has an FSU colleague ever asked you to join the United Faculty of Florida (UFF)?**

455	88%	Yes
50	10%	No
10	2%	Not sure

## **Administrator Evaluations:**

**President Barron's job performance has been**

159	30%	Outstanding
279	53%	Good
50	10%	Fair
7	1%	Poor
2	0%	Unacceptable
25	5%	Not sure

**Former Provost Abele's job performance as provost was**

42	8%	Outstanding
117	23%	Good
106	20%	Fair
61	12%	Poor
148	28%	Unacceptable
46	9%	Not sure

**Interim Provost Bradley's performance as provost has been**

54	11%	Outstanding
162	32%	Good
71	14%	Fair
22	4%	Poor
6	1%	Unacceptable
199	39%	Not sure

**Dean Rowe's job performance has been**

77	15%	Outstanding
160	31%	Good
73	14%	Fair
30	6%	Poor
14	3%	Unacceptable
162	31%	Not sure

**My dean's/director's performance has been**

101	20%	Outstanding
164	32%	Good
83	16%	Fair
62	12%	Poor
89	17%	Unacceptable
16	3%	Not sure

**My department chair's or immediate supervisor's performance has been**

186	37%	Outstanding
179	35%	Good
76	15%	Fair
25	5%	Poor
29	6%	Unacceptable
11	2%	Not sure

**It is time for my College to have a new Dean.**

142	28%	Strongly agree
70	14%	Agree
118	23%	Neutral
103	20%	Disagree
83	16%	Strongly disagree

**It is time for my Department/Unit to have a new Chair/Director.**

62	12%	Strongly agree
47	9%	Agree
114	23%	Neutral
134	27%	Disagree
147	29%	Strongly disagree

**I am familiar with the issues raised by the Koch Agreement, the 2008 Memorandum of Understanding between FSU Trustees and the Koch Charitable Foundation, that has been in the news in recent weeks.**

160	30%	Strongly agree
256	49%	Agree
38	7%	Neutral
19	4%	Disagree
7	1%	Strongly disagree
46	9%	Not sure

**The issues raised by the Koch Agreement concern me deeply as a faculty member.**

168	32%	Strongly agree
136	26%	Agree
77	15%	Neutral
52	10%	Disagree
23	4%	Strongly disagree
62	12%	Not sure

**As I understand it, the Koch Agreement presents a significant threat to areas of traditional faculty influence.**

140	27%	Strongly agree
118	23%	Agree
65	13%	Neutral
87	17%	Disagree
26	5%	Strongly disagree
75	15%	Not sure

**The Koch Agreement is significantly different from other donor agreements.**

90	18%	Strongly agree
150	29%	Agree
72	14%	Neutral
34	7%	Disagree
11	2%	Strongly disagree
154	30%	Not sure

**I feel that the Koch Agreement includes adequate safeguards for areas of faculty prerogatives.**

19	4%	Strongly agree
88	17%	Agree
93	18%	Neutral
106	21%	Disagree
82	16%	Strongly disagree
123	24%	Not sure

**The FSU administration has effectively dealt with the public relations issues arising from recent publicity about the Koch Agreement.**

39	8%	Strongly agree
149	29%	Agree
126	25%	Neutral
79	15%	Disagree
48	9%	Strongly disagree
70	14%	Not sure

**All things considered, the working or professional climate for faculty in my College/Unit is positive.**

69	13%	Strongly agree
206	39%	Agree
97	18%	Neutral
108	20%	Disagree
47	9%	Strongly Disagree

**All things considered, the working or professional climate for faculty in my Department/Unit (if applicable) is positive.**

112	22%	Strongly agree
218	43%	Agree
73	14%	Neutral
68	13%	Disagree
41	8%	Strongly disagree

**Which of the following best describes the impact on FSU of legislative budget cuts during the 2010-11 academic year?**

12	2%	No real impact
67	13%	A small but important negative impact
165	31%	A moderate negative impact
280	53%	A large negative impact

**Did you actively seek alternative (non-FSU) employment during the 2010-11 academic year?**

147	28%	Yes
352	67%	No
23	4%	Not sure

**Do you plan to actively seek alternative (non-FSU) employment during the 2011-12 academic year?**

179	34%	Yes
213	41%	No
127	24%	Not sure

**What is your position classification?**

67	14%	Assistant Professor
122	25%	Associate Professor
165	34%	Professor
5	1%	Eminent Scholar
2	0%	Lecturer
1	0%	Instructor
28	6%	Assistant In ____
25	5%	Associate In ____
16	3%	Research Associate
0	0%	Instructor Librarian
5	1%	Assistant University Librarian
7	1%	Associate University Librarian
4	1%	University Librarian
5	1%	Assistant Scholar/Scientist/Engineer
4	1%	Associate Scholar/Scientist/Engineer
4	1%	Scholar/Scientist/Engineer
0	0%	Specialist, Computer Research
3	1%	University School Instructor
3	1%	University School Assistant Professor
0	0%	University School Associate Professor
2	0%	University School Professor
11	2%	Other

**My assigned duties involve:**

83	16%	Mostly research
105	20%	Mostly teaching
53	10%	Mostly service
216	42%	About an even balance of teaching and research, with some service
59	11%	A diverse combination with no area dominant
2	0%	Not sure

**Are you in a tenured or tenure-earning position?**

394	76%	Yes
121	23%	No
3	1%	Not sure

**Which of the following best describes your normal annual appointment?**

413	79%	9-month contract
91	17%	12-month contract
14	3%	Other
3	1%	Not sure



**What Department/Unit do you consider your primary appointment? (For nondepartmentalized colleges/units, this may be the college/unit.)**

3	1%	Accounting
0	0%	Aerospace Studies (Air Force ROTC)
2	0%	Anthropology
5	1%	Art
0	0%	Art Education
3	1%	Art History
3	1%	Askew School of Public Administration
18	4%	Biological Science
4	1%	Chemical and Biomedical Engineering
12	3%	Chemistry and Biochemistry
1	0%	Civil and Environmental Engineering
5	1%	Classics
8	2%	Communication
6	1%	Communication Science & Disorders
5	1%	Computer Science
7	2%	Criminology and Criminal Justice (all areas)
5	1%	Dance
18	4%	Earth, Ocean, and Atmospheric Sciences
0	0%	Dedman School of Hospitality
7	2%	Economics
5	1%	Educational Leadership and Policy Studies
10	2%	Educational Psychology and Learning Systems
4	1%	Electrical and Computer Engineering
17	4%	English
7	2%	Family and Child Sciences
3	1%	Finance
9	2%	FSUS (all areas)
1	0%	Geography
12	3%	History
1	0%	Industrial and Manufacturing Engineering
7	2%	Information
5	1%	Interior Design
6	1%	Learning Systems Institute
5	1%	Library & Information Studies
11	3%	Magnet Lab (NHMFL)
7	2%	Management
7	2%	Marketing
15	3%	Mathematics
0	0%	Military Science (Army ROTC)
5	1%	Mechanical Engineering
16	4%	Modern Languages and Linguistics
27	6%	Music (all areas)
5	1%	Nursing (all areas)
4	1%	Nutrition, Food, and Exercise Sciences
1	0%	Ocean & Atmospheric Prediction (Ctr)
4	1%	Panama City (all areas)
3	1%	Philosophy
19	4%	Physics
4	1%	Political Science
9	2%	Psychology
3	1%	Religion
5	1%	Retail Merchandising and Product Development
4	1%	Risk Management, Insurance, Real Estate, & Legal Studies
4	1%	Scientific Computing
13	3%	Sociology
2	0%	Sport Management
2	0%	Statistics
13	3%	Teacher Education
6	1%	Theatre
7	2%	Urban and Regional Planning
37	8%	Other

**Do you have any comments on anything else that concerns you as an FSU faculty member?**

98

18%

Challenging times!

The options for assigned duties above does not include primarily teaching and service with little adequate time left for research!! Many of us are in that category.

The question about whether an FSU colleague has ever asked us to join UFF, should indicate "if you are not a member". As written, for those who are long time members, no one asks anymore!

I am a Co-chairperson for the <snip>. My workload is unsustainable.

All resource allocation seems to be driven by solely undergraduate credit hours. However, faculty are evaluated based on Research I University status -- with yet higher bars ever to be raised. This is an intolerable situation. The university wants the best of both worlds and is balancing it on the backs of faculty and staff.

in 15 years, moral in our college has never been so low. Although we may be better off fiscally than many other units, a lack of administrative leadership and seeming disregard for all other concerns has left many of us wishing we were elsewhere.

I love my department. I am hopeful that we will see improvement in the administration of the university now that we have a new president and provost. I distrust the legislature and governor completely. How all of these things will impact my future at FSU remains to be seen. I would love to stay, but I will not hesitate to leave if things continue to be tense year after year. It is unbearable to feel under siege every year. Even if nothing truly catastrophic happens, it feels like long, grinding trench warfare. The psychological toll has been immense, and it is unacceptable. Either it changes, or I am out of here.

I believe the academic reputation of the university is at stake.

I am from a working class family, and I have been a union member for almost 20 yrs. I have long been appalled that the union failed to recruit more widely unless in a crisis mode. Now, it's just symbolic to me.

no

I feel the UFF FSU has done little to support the needs of Panama City faculty.

The Koch Agreement must be repealed.

The College of Arts and Sciences needs a new Dean to replace the current Dean because he has lost the confidence of the faculty in the College.

It is hard to address nuances in a poll of this kind, no matter how carefully it is designed.

I think Pres. Barron is generally doing an outstanding job in an extremely difficult situation. Koch issue is troubling--but I would need to understand Barron's options more carefully before judging him too harshly.

Appalling facilities in my department hamstringing our outstanding faculty. We want to pursue excellence, but are limited to pursuing survival.

Excellence is the best way to retain the best students and faculty, and we need to pursue actions needed to achieve excellence.

The <snip> department chair lacks vision, integrity, and leadership capabilities. He uses Theory X leadership practices from the 1960s. My way or the highway. He thinks the more times he says things and the louder he says things that they then become true.

Abele's criteria for teaching evaluation are counterproductive. Instructor popularity can be achieved by covering less material in class, giving easier exams and grading leniently. The true measure of teaching effectiveness is what students learn.

Six or seven years ago somebody compared student/faculty ratios in our history department to those of other ACC (an admittedly random category) institutions and found that, at the time, we had the poorest. Since that time, we've lost net about six or seven people who have not been replaced. So, at best, we still have an atrocious student/faculty ration, or it's gotten worse. Either way, the situation has an enormously degrading effect on faculty morale.

The proposals to add new demands for international standing for assistant professors (when no international travel money is available), and to add reviews at second and fourth year seem excessive, especially given FSU's low faculty salaries, layoffs, lack of raises, high class sizes, and financial desperation to the extent of taking Koch money with strings attached. We already have annual performance reviews, plus a third year review, plus the fifth year review. Why not cut back on reviews freeing up faculty time to do actual work, instead of adding yet MORE reviews?

Can UFF goals be revised to better serve the departments and university, rather than being focused on the paying members?

Salaries.

Yes, the dean of the college of education. She lacks vision as to what scholarship is, other than her own, is closed to new thinking unless it comes from her inside group and becomes extremely defensive when questioned. Her leadership qualities are non-existent.

more merit. less across the board raises. less protection of suboptimal faculty. more rewarding of performance.

President Barron seems to be trying hard, and he is a definite improvement over the prior president, but the state budget situation and attitude toward higher education (and education in general) in Florida does not give one much hope for the future.

What does it say to the UFF when only a third of FSU faculty are members of the union? It should say that you're not providing enough value and that you need to change something. Why not engage non-members in dialogue about what's wrong with the UFF rather than blasting us with emails intended to make us feel guilty about joining a group of people who have very different priorities?

I am concerned that my Dean has created a new program to duplicate courses that are offered by my department.

Communication between admin levels is actively discouraged. A student can go complain to the Dean or Provost, but ironically, a faculty member cannot.

I love FSU. Great students. Non tenure faculty are treated poorly in some units.

KOCH BROS

The inbred group of Bradley and all in the provost office, Travis and Carnaghi need to go. Bradley and Travis have lost all respect from the faculty. Travis is continuously lying. The Arts and Sciences Dean's office is run very poorly.

I will not join UFF because I believe that UFF is not using its funds effectively in combating the state-level governance attacks on higher education.

Where are the results of the evaluation of Dean Travis's performance and why is he still dean?

When, and only when the UFF charges all faculty members the same flat membership fees, I will join.

Not having any cost of living raises for 5 years, cost of FSU tuition going up 15% per year over the last 3 years, taking 3% of retirement away from the state = and no comment from administration as to the details of the legislature's decisions and how it will impact us. Changes are coming July 1 and we have to financially plan for our families.

Permit 9 month faculty the option of receiving their salary over 12 months. This is VERY important, and would cost FSU very little to implement.

I am very concerned as to the direction the university will take with the (to be appointed) Provost and Dean of faculties; administration seems unstable, though Barron is cause for optimism.

Until there are either COLA/cost of living increases, everything else is irrelevant. More creativity is needed by everyone to get that raise done.

Graduating students cannot get jobs. I don't know what we can do about this but it certainly is discouraging to teach, be more and more pressured to produce results with respect to student outcomes, and then to find the lack of employment among graduates.

Role all procedures back by about thirty years and life would be much better. At least there was still some common sense in the air.

Arts and sciences is too large. And Scott Tamm is the dean and there are too many assistant deans. What does the Dean of Faculties do? What does the Graduate Dean do. Never have figured that out.

For me the main issue is salary. I am not going to make it financially if I don't get cost-of-living increases and more opportunities for summer teaching.

lol, even I was looking for social work in the list of units this year! poor social work faculty...

Honestly, there are so many things that concern me that I can't list them here. Some include: 1) mass migration of asst. professors to other institutions; 2) funding cuts - we must find other sources of funding rather than relying on the legislature all the time - they clearly can't be trusted; 3) the P&T process; 4) salary; 5) research funding and support; 6) ability to recruit high quality graduate students (our stipends are \*embarrassingly\* low - roughly 50% of what other comparable departments are offering in competing institutions); 7) the hiring freeze and our inability to hire tenure-track replacements when folks leave for better jobs; 8) continuity in the program when a high percentage of faculty leave; 9) reputation of the program in the field when so many faculty leave; 10) generally discouraging administration; 11) the way that more and more responsibilities keep going to everyone when folks leave - we're stretched too thin already; 12) administration moving too slowly to address faculty concerns; 13) the way student SPOTS are used in faculty evaluation and retention; 14) lackluster communications in my department and college; 15) a consistent and persistent privileging of student needs over faculty needs at every opportunity (I understand that it's important to minister to student needs, but feel that doing so at the expense of faculty every time is shortsighted and irresponsible; this is one of the major reasons so many asst. profs. are leaving FSU); 16) not enough money for professional development; and many more.

I'm very, very tired and don't feel that my department or college is providing the support I need to effectively do my job (research, teaching, or service). Yet I'm still being held to standards that were put into place for individuals with teaching loads that were half of what I have and who received more support for their research. I am so incredibly frustrated, and next year promises to be far worse. Help never seems to come; when it does, it is too little, too late to do much good.

It's frustrating too, that President Barron is doing some really great things. I really appreciate his communications with the faculty and know he is working hard to raise money from donors and improve FSU's reputation publicly. I also greatly appreciate his commitment to compensating employees for the 3% retirement cut the state is exacting. My frustration is because I'm not sure if his arrival will have been in time to save this university.

I am leaving the University because of the current situation, and I am very happy to do so.

The only reason I am not actively on the job market right now is that I am sticking around for the FRS defined benefit pension. Working conditions in my department are terrible. Incompetent staff, corrupt and/or weak administrators, good faculty demoralized and rapacious faculty bullies empowered by dept admin.

If you want the best people to stay, make their pay and benefits better and their working conditions fair. It's really simple.

The political leadership of the state has very little appreciation of what we do as FSU faculty members, of the value we bring to the state

Lets not get obsessed by the Koch thing. I think it is a red herring. We can't get anything done if we're too busy being outraged.

The terrible student:faculty ratio is hurting us and is a ticking time bomb that will cause serious problems in the near future.

(See SACS above) - The amount of administrative time (and salaries for people to cope with it) required by compliance with intrusive SACS meddling is the biggest threat to academic excellence at FSU--bigger than budget issues.

I am not happy with the lack of merit criteria insisted on by the UFF. The SPP was clearly unworkable since there was no ranking by merit.

I don't understand how a dean can get the lowest (or next to lowest) rating for 4 years straight and no action taken. This is not a bunch of incompetent people who are rating her. Dean Collier has destroyed the College of Human Sciences. She fails to recognize the value of having competent people around her and instead criticizes and punishes those who are doing well and/or who might be a threat.

The president's latest disingenuous Koch letter admits, in the last paragraph, that in the future steps will be taken to avoid this type of problem.

This is insufficient; what is needed is a completely revised Koch Agreement.

You left out social work on above question!

- all universities have agreements between donors and universities but the Koch-agreement was 'unusual/ unprofessional', thus, harming future donor/FSU relations.

- FSU became more attractive for top students because the money-crises all over US but missed the chance to take advantage (during the last 2-3 years).

International Programs needs better, newer, younger, more dynamic leadership. The present chrony system is unsatisfactory because the person in that leadership role is staying on after DROP and is fixed in his ways of milking the system for all that he can.

Faculty numbers are not being maintained adequately to serve teaching graduate and undergraduate programs. Responsibility for academic programs is being taken away from faculty by administrators. FSU has suffered a series of negative impacts to its reputation at the hands of administrators. Our ability to recruit top young faculty has suffered.

The climate at FSUS has taken a major turn for the worse since the appointment of Dr. Wicker as the school's director.

Incompetence and an unwillingness to change are rife, from top management down; this is the most unprofessional organization I have ever encountered.

Child care, child care, child care. I think this is a huge issue for retention of women faculty, and for men as well.

I also feel strongly that parking should be very low priority. I'd much prefer the union focus on salaries and resources like child care. Parking is just a convenience, not a necessity.

Administrative positions, particularly Deans, should have a fixed term of service, and reappointment to additional terms should require a formal faculty evaluation with a threshold below which reappointment will not be given. This would go a long way to restore the balance of power between the faculty and the Deans.

An academic program without tenure track faculty should not be allowed. The program for interdisciplinary computing (PIC) should be eliminated as it reduces the ability of the faculty to control curriculum.

FYI, I've taken a tenured position at another r1 beginning next fall

When the University's hands are tied due to legislated budget constraints, the path out is through generation of external money. My Center, through hard work, is rocking with external funding, while other departments are moaning. Faculty need to be encouraged and enticed in some tangible way to enhance their extramural fund raising (proposal writing, etc.) activities. Right now, there is little incentive other than generating summer salary for a tenured faculty member to increase their effort in raising external funds.

Morale has improved since Barron got here.

the lack of support for faculty/programs that are inundated with accreditation reporting demands which often duplicate what we have to report for SACS/GPC/QR/IEP; on the one hand the University values having accredited programs, but then does not provide adequate resources to respond to accreditation reporting/program evaluation demands

The FSU bargaining team rocks! I really feel confident that the new co-chairs of bargaining are doing a kick-ass job!!! Jack Fiorito shows great leadership!!!!

While I think President Barron is doing an excellent job, and the recent retirements of Provost Abele and Dean Rowe are good for the University, I would like to see other Administrators (i.e. Deans) removed or reassigned. (specially those such as Travis and Rassmuessen who are liabilities to the University)

Replacement of deans is critical.

There are a great number of questions regarding the fairness of merit pay, but it appears that we have had no money for merit raises over the past several years. First, I would like to know if others have received merit monies during this time period. I am a highly productive faculty member but have only received two merit increases in my decade or so at FSU.

I'm tired of the UFF scare tactics

I am in a new technology area, Design, that needs additional funding to become the best in the field.. the budget has negatively affected the growth of the area.

The College of Arts and Sciences must change the way it deals with faculty grants and fellowships to provide more flexibility and less penalization for time off to pursue funded research.

It is a shame for those none UFF members sharing the benefits gained by the Union but not want to join it.

I do NOT want to see the College of Music merged with any other College Unit.

I am most concerned about proposals to make employees pay more of their health insurance costs. This would be a major pay cut.

I am concerned about the structure of the application process for the new salary compensation award for full professors who have been at FSU for a long enough period to cause severe compression.

Legislative conservatism that profoundly affects the university. Universities need to strive for autonomy not service to the politicians' need to be re-elected. This is dependent upon an independent governing board of the university. I am also irritated at the nonsensical competition for state dollars that exists in program redundancy in Florida universities: an outstanding case is having two medical schools in close proximity, and both competing for the same small pool of funds.

President Barron's efforts to make transparent decision-making processes and the results of these is to be commended. As is his respect for faculty governance. More transparency and respect for faculty governance is needed at college levels. A work environment consisting of veiled threats and a constant feeling that the work you are doing is always considered second-rate no matter what you do or achieve has become more of the norm than the exception. A bright point in my professional life this year has been the hiring of my unit's chair. The professionalism and respect for faculty, staff and students he has brought into the unit has created a work environment that supports and recognizes my strengths as well as others in the unit. He has accomplished so much in terms of building faculty trust and respect for each other.

FSU has filled virtually all senior admin appointments internally--the default should be external. Also, admin budget/salaries/staff continues to increase, whereas the number of (especially tenure-track) faculty continues to decrease--those trends should be reversed. Finally, UFF would have more members if its membership dues were not so high!!!

Resources are going down. Expectations for faculty are going up (tenure, etc). Expectations and standards for students are being pushed down. Too many good faculty are leaving (or looking to leave) because of outside offers and/or they are just tired of a poor working environment.

The future.

Offering a 12 month salary option (division of nine monthssalary into twelve) would lessen the burden on the faculty. University of California offers this option. Teh effect is a lower tax burden and a greater ability to manange money.

I love my job and my students. My positive attitude is largely due to being left alone to teach and work with students. I get very little help and assistance from the Department or college but that's actually a blessing in disguise. I did however, receive two major awards last year for teaching, the first real recognition that I've received.

We need raises, stupid !

It concerns me that the upper admin is raising the standards on tenure at a time when they cannot support our research. This concerns me very much!

The limbo of NTT promotions. Some guidelines have been created and forward progress made, but a large segment of the tenure-earning line faculty seem scared that NTT are/will take over. Deans and Directors need classes and functions done, they hire NTT people...why hold it against highly qualified and productive individuals?

The situation in the Economics Dept. is indicative of a more general erosion of academic integrity and scholarly standards at FSU. An over-riding emphasis on the pursuit of funding from external sources has distorted our scholarly mission and betrayed the humanitarian aims of higher education in Florida.

In response to the book "Academically Adrift", universities need to reevaluate the learning system in universities. Along those lines, I believe strongly that the importance given to student evaluations STRONGLY undermines the learning environment. Even though I personally receive very good teaching evaluations, I believe professors are more likely to "lower the bar" to ensure good evaluations. I've seen it where I went to school and I see it here at FSU. This is really quite damaging to the learning environment and gives power to the students. The result is that they learn less. This process should be changed so that professors do not fear repercussions from raising the bar to a level that is challenging to students.

We need funding for summer session teaching.

Can salary distribution be extended over 12-months?

We need more time for research.

We have lost 5 faculty positions in the last 5 years, with no hope for getting back these positions. We are operating with a skeleton program of course offerings.

RE the Koch agreement, I agree with Fink in the NYT: Barron is doing his best, but Rasmussen is at best tone-deaf. And Benson comes across as a sycophant: his response probably did the most harm.

Job security has been my concern lately.

The Department of Anthropology and its faculty have been treated unfairly, unjustly, and underhandedly.

I love my job and I do not want to leave it. But due to the fact that after close to 28 years in the teaching profession I am earning a beginner teaching salary, I feel I must start looking into other options for employment. I love FSU, I serve my students well, and I thought I would retire here. Now I do not think I will be able to.

No raises for 5 plus years, not even cost of living and the cost of living is rapidly going up.

Perhaps examine the procedures for changing a contract into terminal contract - right now it can be accomplished without cause.

Great survey, thank you.

Is there any chance of a pay raise, especially given the fact that we will now contribute to retirement, which in effect means that we have taken a pay cut? Do we know how the process of working with donors is proceeding?

The inmates run the prison. There is virtually little if no leadership -- certainly none that I would consider effective or professional

I'm interested in seeing the final results of this poll.

My dean and department chair have long past their "sell by" dates. They are destroying the college, department. Their decisions are based on personal likes and dislikes and not on performance.

University Libraries is not listed as a Department/Unit in the previous question, which is my primary appointment.

Yes but this is not the proper forum to discuss.

I prefer not to identify the department of which I am a member. I do not trust that my negative comments about my dean would have no negative consequences for me.

**Thank you for completing the basic FSU Faculty Poll for May 2011. Watch for announcements of results coming soon. If you are NOT a UFF member, please skip to the end of the poll and click on the *submit* button.**