

FSU Faculty Poll: May 2012 (with comments)

Please note that for this survey and the General Faculty Bargaining Unit contract, all employees are considered faculty. FSU-Panama City faculty are also part of the General Faculty Bargaining Unit. These data represent 510 responses to a web-based poll conducted by the UFF-FSU Chapter. These responses were received from May 16th to May 23rd and constitute approximately 31% of the Bargaining Unit.

Please indicate your primary College/Unit

179	38%	Arts & Sciences
26	6%	Business
38	8%	Communication and Information
8	2%	Criminology and Criminal Justice
31	7%	Education
15	3%	Engineering
12	3%	Human Sciences
3	1%	Learning Systems Institute
15	3%	Mag Lab (NHMFL)
1	0%	Motion Picture Arts(Film)
19	4%	Music
8	2%	Nursing
2	0%	Office of Distance Learning
2	0%	Panama City Campus (all areas)
0	0%	Science & Public Affairs (Inst for)
43	9%	Social Sciences and Public Policy
16	3%	Social Work
19	4%	University Library
5	1%	University School (FSUS)
23	5%	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.

421	37%	Across-the-board raises for cost-of-living increases
323	29%	Adjustments to address market inequities, compression, and inversion
67	6%	Discretionary increases based on administrator judgment
270	24%	Merit raises based on annual performance and departmental procedures
42	4%	One-time annual bonuses for merit
5	0%	Other

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

241	47%	Keeping up with the cost of living
103	20%	Providing incentives for recent meritorious job performance
164	32%	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.

140	28%	Strongly agree
166	33%	Agree
119	24%	Neutral
45	9%	Disagree
29	6%	Strongly disagree

Faculty salary increases based on administrative discretion should continue for which of the following reasons?

Please check all that apply:

315	22%	Counteroffers in response to documented external offers
182	13%	Endowed/named chairs
305	21%	Equity adjustments
284	20%	Extraordinary achievements
356	24%	Increased duties and responsibilities
13	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?

175	35%	Yes
200	40%	No
129	26%	Not sure

Do you have any comments on salary priorities?

142 28%

- We have had NO raises for 5 years and have had our retirement cut twice. Priority needs to be made for systematic cost of living adjustments or we will never gain ground. Assistant professors in Biological Science make more than Associate Professors since there have been no raises. This is the class of individuals that needs compression adjustment. Also our postdocs are getting jobs that have higher salaries than that of our Associate Professors.
- Programs like SPP are fatally flawed because they do not take current salary level into account. Adjustments should be based on just how much the person is underpaid, not just on some across the board equivalent based on time in service.
- Most all members have stagnated salary wise and all should be addressed.
- Don't want to give people incentive to look around, but hard to monitor how the administrators hand out money. Some cases in this College of dubious awards in the past.
- Any merit bonuses or raises should be based on multiple years performance and not just one year. It could be that a person had outstanding performance on the last 4 out of 5 years, but the current year may not have been "meritous". This is what happened to me this past year because I was on sabbatical and even though the sabbatical shouldn't have impacted my evaluations, my chair agreed that it did. As a result, based on the criteria that the merit bonus was on 2011 performance, I was not awarded a bonus. If the bonus had even been based on the last 2 years, my chair said I would have received one.

- The lack of regular salary increases for strong performance is absolutely terrible, as is the signal being sent that in order to get a deserved raise the only way to do it is to seek a job elsewhere. We are losing too many good faculty, and being left with mediocre ones, with such an approach.
- Salary inequities must be addressed if we are to attract and keep the best faculty.
- If cost of living had been maintained, there would be less inversion. Looking forward, keeping up with the cost of living will avoid future inversion. Without it, the problem only gets worse.
- compression for full profs is getting very severe; some of my colleagues at full prof level are below the average salary at all ranks
- Pre-emptive counteroffers are highly prone to abuse, favoritism, etc. They also overly encourage a culture of external job-seeking, discouraging loyalty and favoring the mobile, not the valuable.
- re #3 above, allocate funds to a formal merit increase program based on annual evaluations, this would make sense if evaluation process was not conducted by the department chair (administrator), which is frequently not the case
- Across-the-board increases are wasted on those faculty at FSU who are well-compensated.
- I believe in rewarding most those who have contributed the most (merit) but everyone needs something more to keep up with the cost-of-living - it may be that achieving both of these goals is not possible at present.
- What happened to the Salary Plan for Professors? If that was a one-year flash in the pan, it was extraordinarily unfair.
- I believe inequities from compression and inversion must be corrected. Faculty with years of experience at FSU will continue to leave if these issues are not resolved. These faculty have important institutional history and often take on tasks new faculty (who are correctly focused on research) are not willing to assume. Who will do these tasks of faculty leave?
- Salary Inequities should be examined and the systematic nature of who has lower salaries should be investigated.
- It seems as though this kind of salary increase could be easily abused, with administrators awarding raises to people who are favorites.
- Address inequities in the Associate Professor rank
- The situation has become so dire that any morsel has little overall effect. Peer based evaluations in my unit are no better than an administrator sole
- General faculty are generally left out of priorities.
- Socialism is dead; merit should be our top priority.
- no
- There's been too much emphasis on behalf of the lowest levels of faculty (i.e., lectures) and too little on the highest (i.e., research active tenured & tenure track faculty). FSU is losing important faculty who improve its national reputation and replacing them with lectures.
- while it is easy to argue salary inequities, the salary base salary was set a hire and most peoples expenses are i ncheck with base. However, cost of living increases has eroded that base salary for all. A salary bump for counteroffers is legititmate and reflects the quality of th individual (in effect merit)
- Giving discretionary authority to administrators is only useful when they use good judgement in using it. Not all counter offers make sense, achievements evaluation is subjective and not all chairs merit a raise. Fortunately, I have found the current administration has much better judgement than prior administrators at this University. I believe that you should slowly negotiate a more flexible pool of discretionary authority and evaluate the rationality of the administration with the discretionary funds.
- I am not opposed to allowing some administrator judgment in allocating increases. But first, we need to keep up with the cost of living for all, then look at major inequities and counteroffers.
- Short-term, the problem is retaining rising stars. Long-term the problem is systemic

depression of pensions for all faculty from deteriorating salary levels. Foregone pension contributions will haunt people the rest of their (retired) lives ;)

- Difficult and extra workloads should be rewarded--
- Across the board increases without considering inequities, merit, etc., are antiquated.
- Some of us are being paid far less than colleagues of equal rank with equal responsibilities in other departments.
- The current approach to merit is a fine idea but a counterproductive practice. There is no certainty, year to year, that merit money will be awarded. Without the certainty that merit will be available each year, the practice is arbitrary and no real incentive. Combined with the looming salary inversion, which only gets worse the longer one stays here, the money lost as a function of no cost-of-living raises for multiple years overshadows the benefit of any single year merit bonus. Further, departmental merit processes (for my department) are neither transparent nor consistent. Merit awards will not keep me from seeking a job elsewhere. Stable and dependable salary increases, even if relatively small, will.
- In times like these when so many have received little or no pay raises for so long, the union must address the fundamental issue of cost-of-living increases first. It's an obvious priority and a fair one. After that, salary compression and inversion is also a very high priority.
- GET US ACROSS-THE-BOARD RAISES!!!
- Compression/inversion is a HUGE problem. We have tenured professors making less than new assistant professors and yet shouldering a much heavier burden of work just to keep departments running. It's difficult for morale to think that these people, with their years of service who are mentoring the new assistant professors through the tenure process are somehow worth less to the university (at least as indicated by salary).
- Another major salary inequity is that FSU (unlike three other state universities) does not have same sex benefits.
- There is no equitable way to rank faculty according to merits. In the past the friends of the Chair were meritorious, the remainder not.
- pension funds contributions by the state should be maintained at the current level - not to be reduced to 3%.
- Requiring documented external offers before a raise can be offered to someone with high market value is likely not a highly effective way to keep the best performers. Once a faculty member has gone through the interview process at another school, met with faculty, dept. heads, and deans at that school, and that school has gone to the trouble to make an offer, the faculty member already has one foot out the door. He or she is already dissatisfied with the situation here or he/she wouldn't go to the time and trouble of interviewing somewhere else. Plus, once you've received an offer from somewhere else you're going to be reluctant to turn it down to stay where you are. You'll get a reputation for interviewing just to get raises from your current school and other places will stop interviewing you. If you want to stop the brain-drain from FSU, we have to be able to bump people up when they are publishing in their field's top journals and, therefore, gaining market value. We have to allow people to exercise some judgement about that. We can figure out what the top journals in an area are. All you have to do is look at where the faculty at the top schools in that field are publishing.
- Salary inequities are worse in some areas of the university than in others. These should be targeted and redressed on a priority basis.
- Unfair.
- This practice leads to faculty going on job interviews unnecessarily. This negatively affects the morale of others who don't want to engage in this practice. Raises should be based on merit, not manipulative bargaining
- Limiting merit raise money to an arbitrary percentage of faculty should be fought. It sends a terrible message to faculty and the public that only X% of faculty are meritorious. If there is no choice, departments should have the option of merit pay for the top 50% teaching evaluation, research evaluation, and service evaluation separately. One who is meritorious in all 3 categories could get three aliquots of merit raise. The amount of raise for each category would not have to be the same at departmental discretion.

- Administrative decision making is terrible for units with inept administrators.
- merit system is flawed and favoritism is the sole means for defining merit
- Address Salary inequity due to Compression and inversion should be first priority.
- In general, I believe women in the college of engineering are discriminated against in terms of salary.
- Need to be competitive and keep our best faculty members
- All types of increases include pros and cons. For example, dept merit and administrative increases allow for capricious evaluations based on personal relationships rather than academic achievement. Yet, across-the-board increases do not recognize achievement nor penalize those whose work is poor.
- we need more of them
- Salary and job security are the only priorities for me. There are no other bargaining priorities. Too often, my concern is that the union allows itself to be sidetracked on these issues by tertiary issues and concedes ground on these ones.
- The model by which assistant professors are given relatively attractive salaries to lure them to FSU and then given every incentive to leave as their salary languishes is a recipe for retaining only those without the achievements that catalyze external offers.
- Individual academic units should have faculty-determined (or at least faculty approved) procedures for assessing annual performance and merit. I think merit pay is a good thing, but determining merit should not be in the hands of any one person.
- Counter-offers will be less problematic once inversion and compression are dealt with.
- I'd like to see salary increases based on merit and good performance. However, the process has been badly compromised. Instead of a free election for the committee that does the annual evaluations, for the current year we were only given the choice of voting by email to continue or not with the existing committee, which has a highly questionable track record (i.e., these people gave themselves the highest bonus raises last year even though [a few] of them brought in no external funding, etc.; in fact, the members of our faculty that brought in the most external funding were placed in the lowest of the 6 categories for bonuses: what's wrong with this picture!!!).

However, in order to vote as directed by email for the establishment of a new committee, each faculty member requesting that would have to reveal their name to the chair of the existing evaluation committee, which only [a few] people were brave enough to do and did at their peril (but to no avail). The system for merit evaluation in [snip] needs to be run for now by an external, non-biased committee until a fair method for the establishment of the Committee can be put in place and executed. *[Note: This comment slightly edited to protect the anonymity of the respondent.]*¹

- The notion of pre-emptive offers allows too much discretion to Deans deciding who they believe is meritorious. They often do not know, although they nonetheless have convictions based on biased notions.
- As more people leave it should be obvious we are falling further and further behind our 'peers'
- Merit pay is a joke as it is implemented. We had several people got it who do nothing or are actually detrimental to the School/College. This includes a Director who applied for another position at a lesser school, didn't get the position, and then checked out of the game for 6-12 months. She then dumped her work on the faculty at the last minute. Is this meritorious behavior?
- The policy of responding to counteroffers seems to be abused. I've seen too many faculty member go out to get an offer just to get a salary increase. Significant recruiting of the faculty member should be evident in order to begin to justify a counter-offer.
- For a long time, i thought that merit increases were the most important thing, but after being at FSU for 10 years with almost no merit raises in the whole College of Music, I've got to go with getting everyone more money and correcting for compression/inversion.

¹ Comments were edited if they included a) identifying information regarding the respondent or b) unconstructive personal attacks.

- Annual departmental evaluations (and hence any resulting raises) are vulnerable to intradepartmental politics, but junior faculty are understandably reluctant to be whistle-blowers. Suggest deans can only get honest insights into this issue by meeting with retiring or retired faculty.
- I am very disappointed with the state of faculty compensation. If I was a junior faculty member I would be actively searching for a position outside of FSU.
- This would be very subjective, and the money may go to those who are Deans'/Chairs' favorites.
- There is too much inequity within the same department. Years of experience should have some bearing on compensation.
- I really appreciate President Barron's commitment to "undoing" the cuts the governor made to retirement last year (and to any influence UFF had too!), and hope something similar is able to happen again this year. It seems like everything is getting more expensive these days, and money is tighter everywhere, so cost of living raises are very important. But merit raises are a big issue for me too, as are maintaining promotion raises. Have all of the DROP issues been dealt with?
- The needs are so great across the board it's hard to know where to start. Without tying \$ to some kind of performance, it doesn't encourage high achievement. However, across the board raises are necessary as well for morale and the fact that each year we get nothing, we fall further and further behind.
- Research on organizations and inequality reveals that a key predictor of happiness is the extent to which people receive compensation comparable to their peers. Hence, compression & inversion issues need to be dealt with if morale is to EVER improve at FSU.

One problem with administrators being allowed to award pre-emptive discretionary salary increases is that we have corrupt administrators who play favorites (without respect to merit).

- There should be a publication listing all of the various methods the different departments/colleges on campus use for their Merit process that is available for everyone to read.
- Reinstate SPP.
- As someone who has received letters the last four years that I would receive merit \$ if it became available, and even with a raise for promotion and tenure taking effect in the fall, I will still be making more than 5000 dollars less than the assistant professor down the hall who does not have a book out yet. It is discouraging.
- Outside offers are important to reduce the faculty.
- this is probably the most morale-damaging area for my faculty. All of the research-active faculty in my department are threatening to get outside offers to get salary raises. The fact that this is the only EFFECTIVE method for getting salary increases forces the faculty to have one foot out of the door. Meritorious performance is a goal now to get a better outside offer rather than to get a performance- or merit-based increase at FSU.
- the current system of counter-offers seems silly, once one has an offer most is lost already for FSU.
- Fixing compression/inversion inequities should be the #1 priority at this point in time.
- Without documented external offers, pre-emptive increases look too much like administrator judgments.
- no. survey covers it well.
- junior faculty salaries that are higher than those who have been here for years are grossly unfair
spousal hires are grossly unfair
- Cost of living increases would be more effective in helping to minimize future salary inversion, as well as, perhaps minimize the likelihood that faculty feel they need to go on the market to get a raise.
- I am hesitant to support merit bonuses because too many faculty seem unable to distinguish merit from assigned duties. If the merit process could be streamlined and equitable and actually awards merit rather than people who are exaggerating or including

their typical job duties then I might support merit.

- The reduction in retirement contributions is a serious issue. In reality, I view this as this as a critical long-term pay cut/salary reduction. I take planning for my future very seriously. I am a loyal, hard-working, contributing faculty member. Every year, I am contacted by other universities trying to lure me to fill their position openings. Until now, I have not pursued any other solicitation. I kept telling myself to dig deeper, work harder, and this difficult time for FSU shall pass. Unfortunately, it seems to be getting worse. The message is "do more for less, and by the way we are going to cut your retirement – ANNUALLY!" Who would stay at FSU under those conditions? Because saving for my future seems outside of my control here at FSU, counter to what I was told it would be when I was hired here, and insufficient for retirement, I will indeed follow up on recruitment efforts elsewhere unless this issue is corrected swiftly.
- new responsibility goes with increase
- I agree that objective, transparent procedures should guide salary increases, but we should not seek to have a system that entirely removes dean/chair discretion-- deans/chairs often are in a good position to know which faculty are most in demand and would be most difficult to replace. We should not tie the hands of deans/chairs too much.
- The focus should not only be on salary but on total compensation. It is extremely disappointing to see another cut to ORP retirement. While I never liked the problems associated with not receiving raises, I used to be able to say "at least the retirement plan is a good benefit" -- no longer.
- The merit system seems to be subject to manipulation and lack of transparency/accountability. We should ALL be notified of who gets what and the justification. In other words, transparency and accountability are lacking.
- Salary increases are an important means to maintain morale for those who are making FSU a better place. As for offers from outside, by the time a person has a "documented offer" it's too late. Most of the negotiation is done way up front before any documentation occurs.
- silly area since we are only experiencing cuts.
- Salary increases should be for those who are dedicated and stay at FSU. If people want to leave, they should be wished well, not rewarded for showing they are dissatisfied here.
- There appears to be discrepancies in salaries for equitable positions (i.e. non-tenured track) in addition to inequitable distribution of workload.
- I think the union distrusts administrators and believe they will abuse discretionary money. I think not, Chairs and Deans need discretionary to make significant adjustments to highly meritorious faculty and those doing significant and important departmental administration.
- The merit fiasco of last year demonstrates that administrators cannot be trusted to allocate funds equitably.
- Pre-emptive raises are a total scam. Normally I would opt for merit, MAYBE counteroffers, but not in these times. I don't know what "extraordinary achievements" are and I don't think anyone else does either--maybe we can get these defined in bargaining--Noble prize? Pulitzer? AAAS Fellow election?
- JOB ONE: Incremental cost of living increases. It is most important that we spend as much money as possible on this.
MERIT: Administrative discretion, tied to internationalization, grant/contract \$\$, research/creative work, teaching, service.
ANNUAL EVALUATIONS: Ditch the current system, it's meaningless. Instead tie these to grant/contracts (dollar values, ratio of attempts/awards, attempts, etc), research/creative work, internationalization efforts(i.e. participation in a cooperative agreement), teaching, service.
- make sure offer to new hire is comparable to UF.
- Across the board raises and job security should always be the union's top priorities.
- Compression and inversion are so bad in my department that the first year faculty earn more than some full professors. This is incredibly bad for morale.
- Salary inversion for very productive faculty is serious problem for the university. While this is on the administrative radar, it should be a priority.

- If there is a severely limited amount of money to distribute, it should go to across-the-board, but ideally most years there should be some across-the board and some individual merit awards to high achievers.
- If people are interested in leaving then they should do so; as people often times do not wish to leave but will go on the market just to get an offer then for the University to counter. This is unethical in my opinion
- We work the hardest and are the poorest paid faculty members in the country!
- The pay inequities are problematic, including the hiring rates between men and women-- at least in my case. I only found out this last year that I was hired on the same day for the same position as a man, and he was hired in at 10K higher. When I learned of this and brought it up with my chair, he said that it was because the man had more administrative experience than I, but I had plenty of experience, too, and my job description/assignment of responsibilities actually required a lot more work.
- Obliviousness to Faculty achievements and contributions is part of FSU academic culture. This does not bode well for its future, and we are already seeing the consequences of this culture, in a progressively weaker institution: academically, economically and institutionally, despite all the laudable efforts from our President.
- It is patent that raises, if any, will be minimal. Under such circumstances, monies should be devoted to cost of living expenses.
- We need to try and do something to make up for the recent changes to the pension system - the university needs to contribute more than 5%. I do realize this was mandated by the legislature, but even so...
- My salary just decreased by another 2.5% through the employer ORP contributions.
- Counter offer are unproductive and waste faculty time here and at other institutions.
- By the time someone has an offer it may be too late.
- The current policy of not allowing pre-emptive counteroffers has been destroying my department. By the time a person has a counter offer, he/she and his/her family are already mentally relocated to their new home. Furthermore, successful pre-emptive counteroffers are likely to be much smaller than required counteroffers after a formal raid.
- Free market. Let admin. do their jobs. If you want a raise, go out and get another offer. Then be prepared to take it if you don't get a counter offer. MERIT, MERIT, MERIT! Not across the board.
- We should be paid equally to equal universities in the country.
- cost of living is the greatest need
- The salaries at Florida State University are disgusting. They are the lowest in the State and Nation and reflect the complete disregard the State has for education.

Even worse, the salary inequities within the same positions for the same responsibilities are obscene. For me personally I was brought in at \$20,000 lower than the next equivalent hire, even though I had an additional advanced degree.

- COST OF LIVING AND COMPRESSION AND INVERSION
- gender inequity
- All above depends on trust in administrators which now is low
- The above question about "administrative discretion" does not apply to our department. Our chair/dean does not give raises due to outside offers or equity adjustments--unless he shares your scientific perspective. How can the union stop "old boy network" favoritism?
- It is obvious that there are no easy solutions to salary inequities at present. No scheme is going to help many at the present time because there is no raise pool.
- I was hired in 2007, and have not had one salary increase. Our department has hired two new faculty at significantly higher salaries. I have extraordinary achievements, I have been nominated for teaching awards. Compression is demoralizing, and must be addressed.
- Awarding merit is important and the market has mechanisms in place to do that: faculty can get a counteroffer.

That said, at a minimum, the university have a responsibility to keeping salaries up with inflation.

- Raises should be given to fairly compensate faculty who do their job well, and have exceptional reviews by students consistently.
- Correcting the new tax on State employees effected by reductions to retirement savings should be top priority;
I would oppose a formal, competitive compensation adjustment program as it required binder building and other off-task activities. If recognition can be given for true excellent in teaching, research or service without requiring "scrap-booking" and "scrap-book" reviewing that may be worth pursuing.
- In my experience, the fairest course is for administrators to award raises based on scholarly performance and productivity.
- yes, absolutely --it is a ridiculous system that keeps costing FSU good faculty members that the only real way to get a substantive raise these days is to have to seek another position.
- Clearly, with no COLA raises in forever, this should be the highest priority. Not bonuses. Not one-time payments. Actual increases in base. FSU is bleeding its high value faculty.
- Strongly agree with pre-emptive strikes. Don't wait till person is in bed with other university
- Any increases based on administrative discretion strike me as problematic because they are less transparent and more open to abuse. In my college, they have not been awarded in an equitable way, based on thoughtful, unbiased considerations of faculty members' accomplishments and contributions to the university.
- I have been at FSU for 30 years and make less than most entering Assistant professors right out of graduate school. Cost of living for us is not at all current and this is an extremely demoralizing situation.
- I believe the practice of seeking outside offers only to use as leverage for counter-offers is unethical. Faculty raises should be merit-based and counteroffers for retention should not be made.
- a salary raise to compensate for the latest downturn in our retirement benefits would be awesome!
- no
- Work on reversing the changes to the pension system that were passed by the legislature and Gov. Scott over the last few years.
- The business world pays for performance. So should we.
- The listed priorities are all important, but correcting/reducing inversions would be my highest priority. Nothing is more demoralizing than realizing that 20+ years of experience, productivity, and promotions has had a negative effect on your wage.
- Merit evaluation procedures require improvement.
- First, correct existing inequities, including compression and inversion, and then cost of living increases, followed by merit-based job performance vis a vis contributions to the successes of programs that arise within the individual's collaborative faculty-to-graduate students & their teams' successes.
- The University needs to make a concerted effort to address morale-killing inequities in salary, caused by compression/inversion
- Linking raises to outside offers encourages people to look for other opportunities while demoralizing people who want to stay. We WANT people chasing the brass ring, but those who succeed automatically have a chance to leave. We can gain a recruiting and retention advantage over other universities by moving past this counter-productive policy.
- FSU should have a system for rewarding excellence and hard work.
- I think it will become a slippery slope if we start chasing competitive bids for our faculty. The productive people should be rewarded for their outstanding work along the way and then we wouldn't have so many looking for work elsewhere.
- It is important to retain the best faculty, particularly those who are adept at raising research dollars. Discretionary salary adjustments, including pre-emptive increases, are

necessary to prevent the departure of more top faculty.

- First priority for me is correcting existing salary inequities, including compression and inversion,
- We won't keep outstanding faculty and won't be a top university unless we pay competitive salaries. It should be the top priority.
- In principle, it would be good to have both pre-emptive discretionary increases and merit increases. However, my experience at FSU is that such increases are awarded on the basis of the "spoils" system and have little to do with actual merit/performance.
- Salaries should be re-based to address the rampant salary compression issues immediately.

Non-salary Bargaining Priorities:

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

Multi-year contracts for non-tenured faculty?

77	15%	None
75	15%	A little
170	34%	Some
92	18%	A lot
84	17%	All it can

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

102	20%	None
100	20%	A little
156	31%	Some
78	16%	A lot
62	12%	All it can

Domestic partner benefits?

60	12%	None
61	12%	A little
164	33%	Some
115	23%	A lot
99	20%	All it can

Childcare facilities on or near campus?

78	16%	None
78	16%	A little
173	35%	Some
114	23%	A lot
52	11%	All it can

A pre-tenure research release for Assistant Professors?

82	17%	None
81	16%	A little
176	36%	Some
109	22%	A lot
47	9%	All it can

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

47	10%	None
51	10%	A little
153	31%	Some
140	29%	A lot
95	20%	All it can

The FSU administration has suggested that the "satisfactory" category in annual performance evaluations be expanded to 3 categories: Substantially Exceeds FSU's High Expectations, Exceeds FSU's High Expectations, or Meets FSU's High Expectations. Do you agree or disagree with this suggestion?

71	14%	Strongly agree
158	32%	Agree
132	26%	Neutral
73	15%	Disagree
65	13%	Strongly disagree

The FSU administration has suggested that the 2010 layoff arbitration decision shows a need for revision of layoff procedures. Do you agree or disagree with this suggestion?

62	13%	Strongly agree
168	34%	Agree
173	35%	Neutral
40	8%	Disagree
46	9%	Strongly disagree

The University is not required to notify faculty members when it receives or responds to a public-records request for their email or other documents. Do you agree or disagree that the University notify the faculty member of such requests?

272	54%	Strongly agree
119	24%	Agree
40	8%	Neutral
32	6%	Disagree
41	8%	Strongly disagree

In the wake of the Koch Agreement, the 2008 Memorandum of Understanding between FSU Trustees and the Koch Charitable Foundation, do you agree or disagree that external organizations should be barred from exerting a decisive influence on the academic operation of the University?

298	59%	Strongly agree
118	23%	Agree
56	11%	Neutral
13	3%	Disagree
18	4%	Strongly disagree

The UFF Bargaining team is seeking expanded rights in regard to classroom safety. Are you aware of the protections the University offers in the event of violence or threats during class?

60	12%	Yes
355	71%	No
87	17%	Not sure

Do you agree or disagree that the University offers faculty members enough protection in this regard?

14	3%	Strongly agree
59	12%	Agree
299	62%	Neutral
72	15%	Disagree
42	9%	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?

51	10%	Strongly agree
158	32%	Agree
122	25%	Neutral
94	19%	Disagree
62	13%	Strongly disagree

The FSU administration has suggested that promotion and tenure binders contain a minimum of 5 or 6 outside letters instead of 3. Do you agree or disagree with this suggestion?

48	10%	Strongly agree
96	19%	Agree
107	22%	Neutral
143	29%	Disagree
99	20%	Strongly disagree

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?

42	8%	Strongly agree
104	21%	Agree
123	25%	Neutral
133	27%	Disagree
93	19%	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?

23	5%	Strongly agree
107	22%	Agree
172	35%	Neutral
116	23%	Disagree
77	16%	Strongly disagree

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

72 14%

- Sweeping policies negate discipline-specific culture and expectations (e.g., international reputation, number of letters). Let's not over-regulate.
- Do we have a chip on our shoulder? Why do we have the phrase, "high expectations" in evaluations and not just "FSU's expectations?" The words won't make the standards high; only making the standards high will.
- Addressing the ORP cuts must be one of the highest priorities.
- People who were hired as assistant professors in the early 2000s have received no raises and this past year was essentially the first year for merit bonus (one other year we were ineligible because we were still tenure-track). Some salary increases for this group needs to be bargained for.
- The move to more reasonable 2nd and 4th year evaluations is fine. in terms of the emphasis on international reputation, all I can say is that the university should be prepared to compensate people appropriately. The track record over the past decade is not encouraging, and leads one to believe that this is a way of placing more hurdles in the way of faculty. The definition of international recognition is also highly variable, and even inappropriate in some contexts, across disciplines.
- Non-reappointment (non-renewal) discretion is not often abused, but there still needs to be protection against those instances. Right now, there is virtually no protection against such abuses. We need a "just cause" standard or something similar.
- Getting rid of the UFF should be a priority. It is a blight on FSU faculty.
- The public-records question is oddly worded; add a "should" between "University and "notify."

In my (limited) experience, tenure-letter writers from foreign institutions do a pro forma job and are unhelpful, but others' mileage may vary.

- When FSU gives us enough travel money to create and sustain our international reputations, THEN they are in the right to emphasize it. Until this, that is an unfunded employer mandate that is grossly unfair and punitive to faculty.
- I was confused by this item: The University is not required to notify faculty members when it receives or responds to a public-records request for their email or other documents. Do you agree or disagree that the University notify the faculty member of such requests?

I strongly think that the University should be required to notify faculty members anytime when their e-mail is being examined or shared.

- Retirement contributions for ORP have been reduced. We are now stuck in 3rd class and can't move. This is a SELECTIVE reductikn in pay and retirement benefits not suffered as much b uh admins (1st class) and state retirement participants (2nd class). The union needs to fivht this just like they did the layoffs and the 3% cuts to retirement in 2011.

- The faculty senate committee and the president both report that the Koch Foundation did not exert a decisive or even an undue influence on academic operations.
- I am puzzled by all these proposals raising demands on new faculty when there's no money to even pay faculty the cost of living increases that faculty at other universities routinely receive. In fact, our benefits are being cut. What is the basis for making increasing demands on new faculty when FSU is not paying salaries commensurate with those at other universities? Do we really need to add to reasons driving new faculty to leave FSU?
- C'mon - the Koch question is clearly leading. Why not just say, "Do you agree or disagree that the Koch foundation should run this University?" Results from that question are garbage.
- no
- re: expanding Satisfactory ratings: remove the verbiage "FSU's High Expectations"; it sounds so puffed up and self righteous. I would agree to expanding the Satisfactory rating scale IF 1) it was used for merit consideration and 2) it replaced the plethora of ways that merit is decided unit by unit. Since annual evals should include CV and AOR, it would eliminate another round of getting stuff together for merit; a duplicative exercise re: 2nd & 4th year reviews: is this in ADDITION to 3rd and 5th or IN PLACE of? if in lieu of I'm in agreement, assess early for corrective actions. If in addition then STRONGLY DISAGREE, 3rd and 5th year are good. Some feedback and indicators should be given during annual evals, or else one could perceive they are being "pencil-whipped"

Move up in priority: Approve the Appendix J that was reworked over 2 years ago and presented to the bargaining team and don't tie it to NTTF revisions and promotions. Approve J now and amend or eliminate as NTTF gets closer to approval.

- More special titles for lectures??? FSU is losing several high quality faculty to institutions that are willing to pay our best faculty more than FSU will pay them and the union wants to waste time on more new titles for lectures? Maybe that makes sense once all of the faculty with PhDs have left.
- One's international reputation represents "degree creep" for academics. Many areas of scholarly research are international these days, but probably not all.

If every university starts to require 5 or 6 outside letters, we raise the workload for external writers and internal reviewers, and I'm not seeing much of an incentive to do this activity today (in my case). Workload is high enough without a "tragedy of the commons" increase by well-meaning administrators.

- Ingrain respect for non-tenure faculty--through allowing them to participate fully in service to FSU
- Parking and faculty/staff health/workout center
- Strongly support domestic partner benefits as equitable right.
- Why is the administration trying to make merit evaluation and tenure and promotion more rigid, intrusive and onerous at a time when it is not rewarding its faculty? They need to be told that this is totally inappropriate timing. they should wait until they are actually rewarding faculty adequately--then, let's talk!
- ASSURE EQUITY IN UNIVERSITY CONTRIBUTIONS PROVIDED TO FACULTY RETIREMENT, BETWEEN ORP and TRS MEMBERS.
- Some state colleges provide paid leave for spring break for all employees. Granting this would be a huge morale booster.
- Tenure procedures: Outside letters are already a major workload for external reviewers. Seeking more letters than the required amount could stretch an already limited pool depending on the expertise of the faculty member. Also, some fields are primarily oriented toward a domestic focus and some areas of expertise within a field are decidedly domestic in their focus and contribution. Therefore, an international reputation would be less accessible and less relevant in these cases.
- You cannot push for professors to have "International Reputations" for P&T until you adequately provide for their research time. Many university professors are doing more admin since faculty lines have been taken away.

- I'm glad that parking is NOT on the poll this year.
- Before working on new procedures, I think it would be better to assure that quantitative procedures are in place and are being followed for Tenure, Promotion, and Annual Evaluations. Administrators should be required to document their procedures and show that they comply with University requirements.
- Support for travel to national and international meetings when a paper is being presented.
- FSU has unusual and unfavorable sabbatical practices that need to be reformed. I would like to see these addressed so that regular sabbaticals become realistic for most faculty.
- While more tenure letters may help with decisions, many fields are completely taxed in terms of the sheer number of letters professors are asked to write every year. It is unfair to the fields to require additional letters and thus more work for those in the field (and a higher chance of people saying "no" due to be overloaded). Additionally, international reputation should be for promotion to full professor only. It is inappropriate to expect an assistant professor to obtain international reputation in 5 years.
- It is somewhat hard to sale higher expectations when we are getting pay cuts (i.e. cuts in ORP) not any real chance of increases. If admin expects more, then they need to provide more seed resources and make them easier to get. It is crazy to force faculty to essentially jump through numerous hoops or beg for basic resources that are required to go after outside funding, conduct research, or present such research at national/international conferences. Unfortunately, being in Florida carries with it every present unfunded mandates at every level of the institution.
- All these hoops to jump through and extra evaluations might be okay if substantial merit raises (in addition to necessary cost-of-living raises) were actually in the picture. But as it is, it seems like they're just having us beg for crumbs. It's humiliating.
- I thought annual recertification of faculty outside activity and conflict of interest was already in place.
- A research release sometime during the third year for Asst. Professors would be incredibly helpful, and is standard practice at many Research-I institutions. I am also *very* surprised and disappointed to learn that sabbaticals are delayed a year post-tenure (they take place in the second year after the tenure process), and that many of the applicants did not receive them last year. I think that sabbatical funds must be available for all applicants with worthy projects; this is a dealbreaker.
- Multi-year contracts would help in the recruitment of new faculty. The single year contract creates unnecessary tension regarding faculty moving across the country/world etc.
- As someone moving from assistant to associate, I feel that my Chair's evaluation of my performance every year and the annual review I had to fill out every year, and the classroom observations that were conducted on a regular basis was enough oversight in addition to my third year review. More paperwork leads to less time for research and writing. In addition, in a world of diminishing funds how on earth would I be able to regularly go to international conferences - which there are very few and far between for my field of study - in order to establish an international reputation? Lastly, it was hard enough to get 3 people to write letters on time to get in the file. (I got 4 and two of them came in rather late) How are you going to do that for 5 or 6?
- Avoid any procedure which increases administrative/formal requirements.
- I agree that a strong national and international reputation should be important criterion for promotion to Professor, but not at promotion to Associate Professor or for tenure.
- Where is teaching in this equation?

President Barron has said that he wants FSU to become more "student-centered"--but if faculty rewards are solely based on research, students become an afterthought.

- FSU administrators call for more requirements regarding the tenure and promotion process does not seem to take into account that all faculty members are being asked to do less with more. If more letters, more reviews, and an international reputations are of importance than adjustments for workload effort and university resources need to be

discussed.

- certain percentage increase is needed to keep up with inflation
- We need a more even and fair assessment of faculty activities. The AOR and the way the percentages are used to judge performance are strange. In the first place not everybody puts in 100% effort. Working 60 hours a week is more than 100%. Many of us do that, but it is not reflected in the AOR.
- The design of this survey is seriously flawed. It does not have 'I don't know' or 'Not applicable' answers, and therefore is likely to produce incorrect results.
- For non-tenure-earning faculty: promotional ladder with raises and meaningful titles
- 1. It would be unbelievable to have daycare. I might get more work done and get some merit pay.

2. Why don't we have the right to a new computer every three or four years and a laptop? This is common at many small universities, where a new computer/laptop is part of the bargaining contract. In my department you only get a "new" computer when your old one fails and the computer person gives you a refurbished used one from surplus. If you want a new machine you have to beg for one but you won't get one.

3. My office is horrible. I have all old furniture from surplus and not enough bookshelves. My chair is killing my back and water leaks from the ceiling when it rains. No wonder I hate being there.

- 2nd and 4th year reviews are an onerous addition of work on many people. International reputation and 5-6 letters work well in some disciplines but are DISASTROUSLY IMPOSSIBLE in others (small fields and/or those that are not 'the same' in every country or culture).
- I don't know what a pre-tenure research release means.
- what is prompting all this. Is something not working well?
- After so many years of no raises and now shrinking benefits, salary/benefits should be the main priorities. After a while, discouragement and desire to work where effort is appreciated (and demonstrated with some salary increment) set in.
- There appears to be inequitable distribution of workload between tenure-track faculty members in this department. Percentages of assignments may be equal; however, the actual workload is inequitable.
- Again, given the past few years I am emphasizing security (e.g., for NTTF). What's the point of the elaborate evaluation system if there are no merit raises or these are at administrative discretion? We act as though we are Harvard with the tenure and promotion process, which is in fact far more elaborated than most other places I have heard of. All the reviews strike me as "let's make it easier to get rid of assistant professors." Let's just make sure they get plenty of feedback from chairs rather than waste everyone's time with more paperwork.
- JOB ONE: Incremental cost of living increases. It is most important that we spend as much money as possible on this.
MERIT: Administrative discretion, tied to internationalization, grant/contract \$\$, research/creative work, teaching, service.
ANNUAL EVALUATIONS: Ditch the current system, it's meaningless. Instead tie these to grant/contracts (dollar values, ratio of attempts/awards, attempts, etc), research/creative work, internationalization efforts (i.e. participation in a cooperative agreement), teaching, service.
- On the number of outside letters for tenure--my field has only about 1100 active scholars in its main professional society, and less than 500 of them are tenured full professors who would be appropriate to write letters. To increase to 5 letters would mean that 1% of those available would have to write letters for each promotion! This causes special problems with new or trending subspecialties, where there are few older scholars knowledgeable enough to write a detailed review of someone else's work. Since we have one of the largest programs in the country (many more faculty than most in each area) this increase in letters would cause problems for many faculty in my unit. Regarding "international reputation" for my field the US scholarship is by far the strongest and most

established. The international conferences are very easy to get papers on--it is the US ones that may only accept 25%; same for the journals, where the US ones may accept as little as 15% and the international ones are looking for essays. All it takes to present internationally is money to travel (which most of us don't have)--and it does not signify anything that special professionally (though it is a mark of those who make enough money that they can afford to go and are senior enough to take more time off from classes than most of us can). These changes the administration is proposing would have unintended consequences for some areas/departments in the university.

- The problem is that "other" issues can divert attention from the most important issue for most faculty: salaries.

If salaries were negotiated first, and other issues later, then okay. By waiting for the end of negotiations before discussing salary has the effect of "negotiating against ourselves."

- none
- The following question is not worded clearly. The University is not required to notify faculty members when it receives or responds to a public-records request for their email or other documents. Do you agree or disagree that the University notify the faculty member of such requests?

I believe the University should be required to notify faculty that their information has been requested. Furthermore, faculty should be afforded the opportunity to opt out of such requests.

- Domestic partner benefits are crucial for FSU to attract a diverse pool of faculty
- I think that UFF should cease the current NTT negotiations.

Not only are they clearly a waste of time having produced little in 6 years of negotiations, the basis of the negotiations are solely the product of the Faculty Senate, which has no representation from the NTT faculty.

The bargaining unit now has about 40% NTT faculty in it. UFF should allow the entire NTT faculty a fair chance to have their own say in these NTT negotiations rather than blindly following the six-year-old recommendations of the Faculty Senate, which has no NTT members.

- While my children are all adults now, I recall how desperate we were for child care, so I think the union should value child care
- The union has consistently concluded agreements on tenure-track faculty concerns while having pushed off non-tenure track issues for two years now. Why do you even bother to list these as potential priorities when it is clear you will overtly ignore non-tenure track faculty issues in favor of tenure-track faculty? It is clear you do not consider non-tenure track faculty part of your constituency despite having some as members.
- Trust is still an issue
- Pre-tenure release - It seems to me that tenure should be giving on the basis of faculty performance that is expected to continue into the future. To the extent that a pre-tenure release creates conditions that are artificial (i.e., unlike to be continued following the awarding of tenure, I believe it would be a mistake to use them. Assignments of Responsibility should allow faculty to balance teaching, research and service throughout their professional careers.

Adding more pre-tenure reviews - Our university has gone over a cliff in asking faculty and staff to engage in non-productive activity to document their productivity. More pre-tenure reviews would, in this respondent's opinion, waste far more professional time that could be justified by it's potential benefits. Chairs are already charged with mentoring their tenure-seeking faculty.

Outside letters - New (and newly academic) fields are often challenged to find enough qualified reviewers. The current policy allows this challenge to be explain and it's validity to be judged by the reviewers.

- Admin needs to be able to raise pay with out person seeking counter offers
- Mentoring faculty through the promotion and tenure process seems to be inconsistent

across university units. My unit could use more frequent and consistent mentoring; in the case of chairs being unfamiliar with the specifics of particular sub-fields within their units and what constitutes recognized achievement in them, efforts should be made to arrange for appropriate guidance.

- There needs to be a bonus or salary increase for newly hired faculty who were required to contribute 3% to retirement, but did not receive an increase (like other faculty did) to compensate for the contribution. Also, it is unclear if the lawsuit, if successful, will apply to these faculty. My contract was signed in November 2010, and I am not sure if the breach of contract ruling would apply to me. Clarity on these matters would be helpful.
- no
- The Faculty Senate findings on the Koch agreement were shameful. By choosing to emphasize the administration's narrow (and mostly false) version of the procedural details, we failed to stand up for core principles and for FSU's academic independence.
- I favor the following change for the "satisfactory" category: "The FSU administration has suggested that the "satisfactory" category be changed to: "meets FSU's High Expectations." I do not believe it should be broken into 3 different categories.
- Tenure and promotion should consider strongly the contributions that tenure-track faculty make in relation to the establishment & ongoing collaborative efforts to create exceptional teaching, training, & mentoring of graduate students regarding: (1) consistent instructional classroom content & curricula across graduate student-taught classes; psychometrically sound classroom instruction, exams, & projects; and (2) skills training & development of graduate students' scholarly development as exceptional future professors who are mentored comprehensively by faculty members with respect to extensive, exceptional research experiences & demonstrated exceptional proficiencies concerning the professional aspects that include of analysis of extant literature as well the abilities to demonstrate exceptional skills in research, analysis, critical thinking, & scholarly writing in their own Masters & Ph.D documents as well as acceptance publications during pre-Ph.D. publications that contribute new knowledge to their chosen domains of focus.
- I thought it is currently on a yearly reporting schedule.
- Please protect our health insurance benefits and make sure they are emphasized.

General Survey Questions:

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

10	2%	Strongly agree
132	26%	Agree
98	20%	Neutral
160	32%	Disagree
99	20%	Strongly disagree

Faculty morale is high at FSU.

3	1%	Strongly agree
48	10%	Agree
108	22%	Neutral
191	38%	Disagree
148	30%	Strongly disagree

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

39	8%	Strongly agree
136	27%	Agree
123	25%	Neutral
116	23%	Disagree
82	17%	Strongly disagree

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

85	17%	Strongly agree
191	38%	Agree
92	19%	Neutral
68	14%	Disagree
61	12%	Strongly disagree

FSU administrators have inappropriately high salaries compared with FSU faculty.

181	37%	Strongly agree
153	31%	Agree
118	24%	Neutral
33	7%	Disagree
9	2%	Strongly disagree

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

89	18%	Strongly agree
206	41%	Agree
49	10%	Neutral
93	19%	Disagree
62	12%	Strongly disagree

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

122	25%	Strongly agree
217	44%	Agree
88	18%	Neutral
33	7%	Disagree
30	6%	Strongly disagree

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

104	21%	Strongly agree
199	40%	Agree
100	20%	Neutral
54	11%	Disagree
39	8%	Strongly disagree

Merit assessment procedures in my department/unit are satisfactory.

85	17%	Strongly agree
158	32%	Agree
102	21%	Neutral
85	17%	Disagree
62	13%	Strongly disagree

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

89	18%	Strongly agree
213	43%	Agree
129	26%	Neutral
44	9%	Disagree
15	3%	Strongly disagree

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

25	5%	Strongly agree
167	34%	Agree
153	31%	Neutral
92	19%	Disagree
49	10%	Strongly disagree

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

28	6%	Strongly agree
149	31%	Agree
102	21%	Neutral
145	30%	Disagree
64	13%	Strongly disagree

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

62	13%	Strongly agree
193	39%	Agree
99	20%	Neutral
110	22%	Disagree
32	6%	Strongly disagree

I can give sufficient time to my students.

35	7%	Strongly agree
229	47%	Agree
103	21%	Neutral
95	20%	Disagree
23	5%	Strongly disagree

Faculty loyalty to this university is rewarded.

6	1%	Strongly agree
51	10%	Agree
129	26%	Neutral
155	32%	Disagree
148	30%	Strongly disagree

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

66	13%	Strongly agree
128	26%	Agree
161	33%	Neutral
76	16%	Disagree
58	12%	Strongly disagree

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

94	19%	Strongly agree
140	28%	Agree
129	26%	Neutral
96	19%	Disagree
34	7%	Strongly disagree

I feel loyal to this university.

68	14%	Strongly agree
193	39%	Agree
113	23%	Neutral
63	13%	Disagree
58	12%	Strongly disagree

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

77	16%	Strongly agree
123	25%	Agree
125	25%	Neutral
125	25%	Disagree
42	9%	Strongly disagree

Teaching assignments in my department/unit are done equitably.

93	19%	Strongly agree
187	39%	Agree
106	22%	Neutral
64	13%	Disagree
35	7%	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?

239	50%	Furloughs (mandatory unpaid leave)
129	27%	Layoffs
51	11%	Pay rate reductions
58	12%	Other

Please comment on your response to the previous question.

124 24%

- There is dead weight that could be eliminated.
- Layoffs or furloughs but with real reductions in the amount of work; e.g., cancel classes, don't just take furlough on non-teaching day.
- Pay rate reductions that are clearly described as temporary.
- Too much waste on campus. Football lights on constantly, grounds crews sitting around not working, trucks running for extended periods with nobody near them, too much focus on sports budget and admin salaries, and on and on
- They have already cut enough; there can be no more cutting.
- There are many areas where I see excess staff who are not performing or performing minimally. If you expect professors to take furloughs or pay rate reductions, then administration needs to decrease there expectations for us in terms of research and service and teaching. I had a 20% increase in class size this year with no grading assistance. The extra time I needed for grading was huge, which of course affected my research. Furloughs and pay rate reductions are not satisfactory options.
- close libraries on weekends
4 day work weeks/classes
cancel summer classes
- Layoffs of poor performing faculty, of which there are many. Furloughs are ridiculous, as all of us would still be expected to do everything we do now but without compensation. Many of us already work a lot of unpaid hours.
- Start by lowering administrators' salaries
- There are too many departments and too many programs at FSU. The university would benefit from streamlining its offerings. In fact such a procedure was recommended 6-8 years ago, well before the current recession. The university is still trying to do too much with too little.
- Furloughs, including having to cancel some classes for teaching faculty, provide the most equitable way of "sharing the pain" and letting others, including students and their families and legislators, know the real consequences of budget cuts. The mantra of "do more with less" is not a viable policy for a quality higher education system.
- those who have grants could still "patch" their salaries up in case of furloughs, which would not be possible in case of a pay rate reduction
- This is a tough one - the choices seem to be "all give some" or "some give all (more)" - I might vote for layoffs if I knew it wouldn't be me! Reductions will likely lead to more departures.
- Furloughs must be contract furloughs: that is, if 25% of my contract is teaching, and we are laid off for four days, then eight hours of that layoff (one day's worth) must come out of my teaching time. This will be the only way to make sure that furloughs are visible to the taxpayers/public and to make sure they do not hit unfairly at faculty research (which the University should not want to happen, either).
- Furloughs of administrators.
Reduced classes--if the students (and their parents) don't feel the pain, nothing will change.
- Don't give an inch! Let the administration and athletics go first.
- Furloughs for admin & faculty first, not low paid staff making less than some threshold, say \$12/hr. Furloughs should, however include OPS and student employees.
- spreads out across the board to be fair

- If budgets require reductions, eliminate the least worthwhile programs and departments rather than bleed every department.
- layoffs can be implemented to address poor performing units or individuals. Just documented cause should be given for a RIF, but it seems more acceptable than across the board cuts that rarely get returned
- Furloughs are lousy, but generally better than the alternatives.
- I think it is better to keep the most necessary people rather than lose the best by cutting everyone's salary by whichever method (furlough or rate reduction).
- Furloughs have the least impact on my family. Furloughs can be accomplished equally among all faculty.
- Death by 1000 cuts is not my preferred action. If we do not have the funding to maintain a reasonably paid staff and faculty complement, then we need to shrink in size and mission as a university.
- Layoff some of those who e.g., came back from DROP at extraordinarily high salaries and are really not adding to the work of FSU. A former boss is making \$100,000 for literally doing nothing? I am appalled at this type of lack of oversight at such a critical time
- Rolling furloughs for administration. As faculty of all ranks will be expected to teach and maintain research productivity despite furloughs, and administration represents the highest pay bracket, administrators should be subject to furloughs.
- Part time during semesters rather than informed up aid leave or pay reductions.
- I would rather it be quick and painful, then a pain that last a long time such as a layoff or pay reduction
- Strongly support furloughs over other personnel cost cutting measures.
- The least of many evils.
- Place a hiring freeze on new administrative positions.
- Temporary rather than permanent approach to spreading the hit across the university faculty and staff.
- Develop ways in which an increase in student fees translates into compensation for faculty.
- cut the number of administrators
- If my pay is cut any further, I'm hitting the road. I will only pass up the opportunity to make substantially more elsewhere so many times. Of course, a big part of the problem in my department is that our department is not trying hard enough to raise external money.
- Furloughs or pay rate reductions before layoffs
- I do not think I can survive with anything less than what I make now. We have not had meaningful raises for a very long time, and our purchasing power has substantially decreased over the last 5-6 years. I would have ordinarily supported pay rate reductions and would not want to lose any faculty member. The fact that I have to choose layoffs as a solution is a testament to the sad financial situation we are all facing.
- I would prefer furloughs because layoffs would complicate the possibility of rehiring at our institution and pay rate reductions would likely be permanent rather than temporary.
- Our department is consistently over-staffed. I would much prefer layoffs of staff to faculty furloughs.
- I do not believe furloughs for faculty would be fairly implemented. Furloughs would be equivalent to a pay reduction with no "leave", because I highly doubt that productivity expectations would decrease accordingly.
- Layoff non-tenured and untenured faculty, streamline administrative positions.
- Cut administrators fees first till they are more inline with what percentage the rest of us are at compared to any peer group you choose to select.
- We've been cut so much what else is left? Everyone who is good is trying to leave already.
- I would rather get rid of whole units that don't perform well than hurt everyone across the board. It's a horrible choice to make, but the University will suffer more if the great departments are made mediocre.
- None of these solutions are acceptable if they are applied selectively by administrating

deans or the provost, as was attempted in 2010. In the absence of any single clear-cut, uniform objective criterion for imposing these solutions, an across-the-board solution should be the default approach.

- None of the above. There would be little to no quality investment in the students. It would be time to move on to another institution or field.
- I am aware (first hand) and hear (second hand) that there are "dead wood" at our university, like in every organization. These faculty should be first for layoffs before hard working and committed faculty are asked to take cuts (i.e. mandatory furloughs)
- None of these. There are fewer faculty every semester.
- Cut administrators' high salaries. Increase tuition. Allow temporary deductions in salary for temporary reduction in responsibilities and start first by asking for volunteers.
- What about asking athletics to help out a bit for a year or two while FSU recovers from additional budget cuts. I know they're short now too, but I have to say that I have little sympathy when the "shortage" is to a multi-million dollar salary.
- We have to make decisions about which departments and programs are strong enough to continue. Penalizing all equally will result in equal mediocrity.
- In situations like this priorities need to be made, kept, and supported. Everything can't be a priority.
- I think the costs have to be born by those who make the most. My entire family makes less than some faculty and administrators make with a single salary.
- Could also require that research grants pay out-of-state tuition for graduate students.

If FSU has to distribute budget cuts to individual departments, then it should be based on quantitative performance metrics used for the entire university.

FSU should collect employment data for graduating students. The percentage of students getting jobs related to their field of study should be used when determining whether or not degree programs should be cut.

- Equal percent for all, including administrators.
- All of these options are bad. Furloughs at least maintain a baseline salary for future times not quite so lean. But they're silly--no one "stops working" on furlough days, and if you do, you'll be penalized comparatively for promotion. If there are furloughs, they need to be tied to (say) lower service expectations, or somesuch.
- Streamline and reduce administration
- altered work week hours, e.g., 10 hrs / 4 days for staff (on rotating basis); layoffs for faculty; pay rate reductions for administrators.
- perhaps we simply fuse with TCC and stop being a research university
- For those of us with external grants and other non-state funding sources, allow us the decision to make up salary shortfalls using these other funds. This should be coupled with an appropriate adjustment to our AOR's for conducting external research as our work effort.
- Ongoing budget cuts limit administrative initiatives. I have the highest regard for President Barron and for my departmental chair: both excellent. Sometimes the administration makes "bad choices" because there are no good options available. Until FSU develops a better financial base, resources will always be inadequate. Money-generating initiatives by faculty in support of FSU should be encouraged and supported.
- I'd rather have time off on my own without expectation to work than less pay that would not mean a reduction in work equitable to my pay loss. Layoffs should be a last resort.
- all are bad choices
- reducing the number of programs/majors to maintain the quality of the programs we do offer
- I think departments should be given the opportunity to make cost savings arrangements before any of the previously mentioned.
- Pay rate reductions would also be OK if there is some guarantee they would go back to their original level when the crisis is over.
- There are a number of faculty not doing a good job. It is very hard for the administration

to dismiss them.

- President Eric Barron looks like/ or is a faculty-president. Hope that he will work hard for faculty.
Hope FSU will spend more on the campus/environment esp. the areas around Strozier Library.
- It should be sought in finance and administration and not in faculty
- The University should make strategic decisions about which programs to cut and which programs should be protected or even enhanced. Across-the-board cuts should not be made--the strongest programs and those with strategic significance for the University's future should be protected.
- Removal of programs. You do not want to bleed the whole university.
- Not sure between pay rate reductions and furloughs. Would prefer which of the two are better (for the faculty person affected) for his/her income taxes and retirement benefits.
- There have already been too many cuts to salary and faculty lines. More work for less pay and more stress is not going to retain faculty
- Administration cuts first
- Would need to know the length of the furlough.
- An ad hoc committee of faculty and administrators should decide how to adjust spending across the university.

Administrators are too insulated from the faculty to make these decisions.

- Administrative cuts and cutting the salaries of the highest paid faculty.
- I'm just not sure anymore - I'm so sick of hearing about cuts.
- Furloughs seem the most temporary. The others are too permanent.
- I don't think that any of the above is acceptable.
- Cut the blossoming population of administrators.
- Attrition
- Don't know
- Better to lose a faculty member than for everyone to lose salary rate or money through furloughs.
- With furloughs at least you could spend your leave researching.
- I'm not sure.
- Cut excessive spending on FSU promotional products, improve computer systems for more effective work force, cut double dipping and administrator pay.
- Cut the administrator's salary by 25 to 30 % before cutting Faculty salaries or imposing furloughs.
- Raising the student/faculty ratio more is not acceptable. Furloughs at least admit that a further salary reduction for the same amount of work is unacceptable
- top earners are cut first.
- If you do furloughs or pay rate reductions, everyone is upset and morale is negatively impacted. If you do layoffs, that person is upset but they are gone and can't damage morale of those left.
- I'm not sure maybe some combination of all of the above
- If cuts are unavoidable, then all should share in bearing the burden. That means either furloughs or pay cuts, not layoffs.
- as the face of Florida government, FSU represents a brutalized regime and its formulations and dictates follow in line with the governor and his republican thugs
- Do not reduce my actual salary, since that is permanent. At least furloughs are temporary. As it is my salary is insanely below market and offensively below my credentials, performance, and skill.
- Pay should not be reduced. It's too low already. Layoffs allow the university to make strategic decisions about where to focus our resources by eliminating less-needed areas
- get rid of so many admin. and admin. staff. EVERYWHERE No need for Dean of Fac. or Grad. Dean and their staff, or for so many trying to get patents. Way to many staff for the need.
- An equity approach that corrects for compression/inversion.

- I love everything about my job at FSU except for my salary, which is demoralizing to the point that it casts a pall over everything else. The imperative to get a counter-offer means I am constantly distracted and must divide my attention between what I am doing here, and my potential at another university.
- I prefer that salary rates not be affected for the long-run (and pension purposes) and prefer to avoid layoffs.
- Benefits and salaries have been already reduced. Let go of faculty or staff identified as being nonproductive rather than further penalize the entire group.
- Furloughs = free labor. We all have responsibilities we need to attend to whether we're paid for these activities or not.
- Why is there never discussion of cuts to administrative compensation? which is high in relation to other universities, whereas faculty compensation is very low.
If you do not raise faculty salaries, FSU will basically become a community college.
- There are faculty and administrators that make too much money and/or "double dip" by receiving retirement and an extremely large income from FSU. Moreso faculty with such high salaries don't contribute as much to students and the university. It would be nice to have oversight on that so that the faculty that provide the best performance are fairly compensated. Many faculty that work the hardest and make the biggest difference with students are underpaid and over-worked and unhappy. When faculty who make twice as much in salary work half as much, it is insulting.
- Whatever austerity measure must be taken should be explicitly temporary.
- although this is painful, hurting everyone and increasing the likelihood of faculty departures does not seem like a smartmove to make
- Eliminate one assistant coach in football. Save 10 faculty members.
- Hang together. No layoffs. Solidarity
- At least with furloughs I would have time with my family while getting a lower salary.
- Consolidation and layoffs in upper administration positions.
- layoffs of non-tenure track or untenured faculty or staff would make sense...
- freeze hiring and no salary increases.
- Focus on strengths, cut elsewhere.
- But only, of course, if the work load is actually reduced
- 1. layoffs of low-performing faculty only (if there are any -- my sense is that everyone is working pretty hard)
- 2. pay rate reductions would be my second strategy and I would start at the top (administrators, etc.) and work my way down
- After corrections to faculty pay inequities within each academic program, pay rate reductions should be the same percentage per person across the University.
- Furloughs are a last resort, but the most equitable option.
- Any organization, including FSU, that grows during times of plenty must then shrink during lean times. When we must choose, we should choose quality over quantity.
- There is still much waste that occurs - that should be addressed first. Example: Our previous Dean completely remodeled the top floor of our building - it was completely unnecessary and unproductive.
- It is the most efficient use of limited budget resources to lay off under-performing faculty. However, UFF impedes this and this is not conducive to encouraging faculty to increase their performance as far as research, teaching and service.
- Layoffs are the least of all these evils.
We must pay the faculty that we retain properly in order to be a top university.

Then sack Rick Scott and some of the legislators.

- weed out the least successful.
- ...for some of the tenured faculty.
- Avoids terminations.

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

160	32%	Very positive
181	36%	Somewhat positive
73	15%	Neutral
44	9%	Somewhat negative
29	6%	Very negative
9	2%	Not sure

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

436	88%	Yes
49	10%	No
8	2%	Not sure

Administrator Evaluations:

President Eric Barron's job performance has been

183	37%	Outstanding
239	48%	Good
40	8%	Fair
6	1%	Poor
5	1%	Unacceptable
21	4%	Not sure

Provost Garnett Stokes' job performance has been

55	11%	Outstanding
166	34%	Good
55	11%	Fair
13	3%	Poor
3	1%	Unacceptable
200	41%	Not sure

Interim Dean of Faculties Jennifer Buchanan's job performance has been

63	13%	Outstanding
139	28%	Good
43	9%	Fair
13	3%	Poor
8	2%	Unacceptable
223	46%	Not sure

My dean's/director's performance has been

91	19%	Outstanding
193	40%	Good
73	15%	Fair
46	9%	Poor
45	9%	Unacceptable
40	8%	Not sure

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

144	30%	Outstanding
178	37%	Good
67	14%	Fair
27	6%	Poor
43	9%	Unacceptable
19	4%	Not sure

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

136	28%	Strongly agree
76	16%	Agree
122	25%	Neutral
80	16%	Disagree
75	15%	Strongly disagree

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

76	16%	Strongly agree
61	13%	Agree
115	24%	Neutral
116	24%	Disagree
113	23%	Strongly disagree

Professional Work Climate:

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

54	11%	Strongly agree
214	44%	Agree
92	19%	Neutral
80	16%	Disagree
51	10%	Strongly disagree

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

87	18%	Strongly agree
215	44%	Agree
71	15%	Neutral
59	12%	Disagree
56	11%	Strongly disagree

Faculty members are rewarded fairly for the amount of effort they put in.

13	3%	Strongly agree
102	21%	Agree
95	20%	Neutral
162	33%	Disagree
114	23%	Strongly disagree

Procedures used to evaluate faculty performance are fair.

48	10%	Strongly agree
196	41%	Agree
118	24%	Neutral
72	15%	Disagree
49	10%	Strongly disagree

Faculty members are rewarded fairly considering their accomplishments.

18	4%	Strongly agree
116	24%	Agree
120	25%	Neutral
139	28%	Disagree
96	20%	Strongly disagree

Procedures used for promotion, merit distributions, and other matters are fair.

37	8%	Strongly agree
201	41%	Agree
116	24%	Neutral
82	17%	Disagree
51	10%	Strongly disagree

Which of the following best describes the impact on FSU of legislative budget cuts during the 2011-12 academic year?

14	3%	No real impact
44	9%	A small but important negative impact
155	32%	A moderate negative impact
278	57%	A large negative impact

Which of the following best describes the impact of the Legislature cutting retirement benefits?

10	2%	No real impact
30	6%	A small but important negative impact
106	21%	A moderate negative impact
348	70%	A large negative impact

In 2011, in addition to merit bonuses distributed according to department/unit criteria, Deans were allowed to distribute a small amount (\$150 per FTE) of bonus funds to faculty they considered meritorious. Did you receive a "Dean's Merit" distribution?

133	27%	Yes
237	48%	No
126	25%	Don't know

For future raises and bonuses, should Deans again have a designated pot of money to distribute as they see fit or should all such money be distributed according to department/unit criteria?

161	33%	Yes, deans should have a separate pot of money to distribute.
212	43%	No, department/unit criteria should be the only mechanism for merit distributions.
117	24%	Not sure

Did you actively seek alternative (non-FSU) employment during the 2011-12 academic year?

130	27%	Yes
344	70%	No
14	3%	Not sure

Do you plan to actively seek alternative (non-FSU) employment during the 2012-13 academic year?

157	32%	Yes
232	47%	No
104	21%	Not sure

What is your position classification?

55	12%	Assistant Professor
126	28%	Associate Professor
150	33%	Professor
3	1%	Eminent Scholar
0	0%	Lecturer
2	0%	Instructor
22	5%	Assistant In ____
23	5%	Associate In ____
21	5%	Research Associate
0	0%	Instructor Librarian
6	1%	Assistant University Librarian
8	2%	Associate University Librarian
5	1%	University Librarian
7	2%	Assistant Scholar/Scientist/Engineer
5	1%	Associate Scholar/Scientist/Engineer
6	1%	Scholar/Scientist/Engineer
0	0%	Specialist, Computer Research
1	0%	University School Instructor
1	0%	University School Assistant Professor
1	0%	University School Associate Professor
0	0%	University School Professor
9	2%	Other

My assigned duties involve:

67	14%	Mostly research
93	19%	Mostly teaching
42	9%	Mostly service
211	43%	About an even balance of teaching and research, with some service
73	15%	A diverse combination with no area dominant
5	1%	Not sure

Are you in a tenured or tenure-earning position?

356	73%	Yes
131	27%	No
4	1%	Not sure

Which of the following best describes your normal annual appointment?

373	76%	9-month contract
103	21%	12-month contract
15	3%	Other
1	0%	Not sure

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

3	1%	Accounting
1	0%	Advanced Power Systems (Ctr for)
0	0%	Aerospace Studies (Air Force ROTC)
3	1%	Anthropology
3	1%	Art
3	1%	Art Education
4	1%	Art History
6	1%	Askew School of Public Administration
18	4%	Biological Science
2	0%	Chemical and Biomedical Engineering
14	3%	Chemistry and Biochemistry
2	0%	Civil and Environmental Engineering
3	1%	Classics
17	4%	Communication
5	1%	Communication Science & Disorders
6	1%	Computer Science
8	2%	Criminology and Criminal Justice (all areas)
7	2%	Dance
0	0%	Dedman School of Hospitality
21	5%	Earth, Ocean, and Atmospheric Science
6	1%	Economics
3	1%	Educational Leadership and Policy Studies
8	2%	Educational Psychology and Learning Systems
3	1%	Electrical and Computer Engineering
23	5%	English
4	1%	Family and Child Sciences
1	0%	Finance
5	1%	FSUS (all areas)
1	0%	Geography
11	3%	History
1	0%	Industrial Engineering
1	0%	Information Technology
3	1%	Interior Design
4	1%	Learning Systems Institute
13	3%	Library & Information Studies
14	3%	Magnet Lab (NHMFL)
8	2%	Management
5	1%	Marketing
11	3%	Mathematics
0	0%	Military Science (Army ROTC)
4	1%	Mechanical Engineering
11	3%	Modern Languages and Linguistics
1	0%	Motion Picture Arts (Film)
19	4%	Music (all areas)

8	2%	Nursing (all areas)
3	1%	Nutrition, Food, and Exercise Sciences
2	0%	Office of Distance Learning
2	0%	Ocean & Atmospheric Prediction (Ctr)
2	0%	Panama City (all areas)
3	1%	Philosophy
13	3%	Physics
3	1%	Political Science
0	0%	Prevention and Early Intervention (Ctr for)
12	3%	Psychology
4	1%	Religion
2	0%	Retail Merchandising and Product Development
1	0%	Risk Management, Insurance, Real Estate, & Legal Studies
3	1%	Scientific Computing
17	4%	Social Work
8	2%	Sociology
0	0%	Sport Management
3	1%	Statistics
12	3%	Teacher Education
4	1%	Theatre
18	4%	University Libraries
5	1%	Urban and Regional Planning
17	4%	Other

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

88 17%

- Merit criteria are OK in our unit but distributions should take into account current salary. Meritorious activity in a well-paid faculty is expected. Meritorious service in a severely underpaid faculty should be rewarded. Current across the board strategies either for base or for merit do not eliminate compression/inversion. Take current salary into account for ALL decisions. Compression and inversion have been a problem at FSU for over 20 years and it is still a major problem. The focus of UFF on across-the-board strategies is a contributing factor to this.
- The President is really trying, but the Legislature in this state is an absolute disaster for education. We are getting cut, and we were never well treated even in good times. I fear for the state's university system's future.
- I believe that the UFF takes up issues of little importance to faculty who do their jobs and do them well.
- Merit bonuses for chairs were too high compared to their peer-evaluations
- Inadequate funding is our obvious "Number 1" problem, but shared governance and transparency are also essential for the advancement of FSU as an institution. President Barron and the Trustees need to keep this in mind and work for improvement.
- There is too much favoritism here. If you just do a good job and are not one of the favored, you don't get anywhere. There is no regard for policies or deadlines, no accountability of what people do. No respect for expertise and experience- the administration would rather listen to librarians new to the field than people with job knowledge.
- FSU is a dreadful institution, where unethical and unprofessional behavior is openly engaged in and never condemned. I sincerely hope not to be working here much longer and have not one good word to say about our 'management' teams at institutional, college and departmental levels. I am embarrassed to let people know I work here.

- With very few exceptions, the UFF's priorities in recent years have been a blight on FSU faculty. FSU faculty would be much better off without the UFF.
- I believe those in our College are doing everything they can with limited resources.
- I wanted to come here and stay until retirement but conditions in the [snip] Department are completely impossible. We will have new leadership (this will help some--the old chair was simply awful) but the best colleagues are leaving, have left, or are trying to leave. I would have stayed but no longer feel I can. This is not really about the money (but that is a problem too). FSU has become a frightening place to work---will we even have our "tenured" jobs, the contracts and retirement we were promised, or the assignments we are supposed to have? One doubts from day to day what the actual working conditions will be, but the one thing we can count on is that the bloated admin will continue to feed on us. Yes, these are tough budgetary times, but we could probably get through that if conditions within the department were better. FSU talks a lot about wanting to be a top research university but they refuse to give us the funding required to even play in the bigger leagues. I can't even get to the conferences I need to get to to present my research---every year I am invited or have papers accepted but have less travel money than even one conference costs. Our grad student stipends are an embarrassment and make recruiting impossible. Our new faculty hires are frankly weak but the strongest ones turn us down for more secure places. The worst thing of all is the endemic service culture that forces faculty to waste hours and hours in stupid committee meetings where nothing results but increased rancor and divisiveness. I have had it. Some of my colleagues have completely checked out ("the walking dead") and do nothing except teaching and research---one more year like last year and I'm there too. Every colleague I respect is on the market (and now I will be, too). We are highly overstressed, underpaid, unfairly treated, serviced-out. Factions in the department are like a horrible circus--you'd laugh if it weren't so damaging. Bad leadership in [snip]; wish Joe Travis were still Dean because I think he would not have let things get to this state. We need to refocus on RESEARCH and TEACHING, in that order.
- Our technology is outdated and broken, i.e. - blackboard. Instead of building more space to air condition, I would like to see the university focus on professional development/integrating technology into the classroom. All the cool space in the world will not save us if we do not have the skills to teach 21st century students.
- Acting Dean Huckaba has done an admirable job. The nation search has helped mkrale, but we still have a long way to go. Barron +++; provost ? VPR??? Dean ??? Chair ???

But at least good earches are going on.

The decision to forbid new repacement hires for a 1 year waiting period is crippling to those of us who want our depts to succeed!

Morale is improving greatly...but I would only rank it 5/10 (think pain scale); still an F but better than the 0 I would have used 3 years ago.

Can our Legislature possibly screw things up any worse for publicly funded higher education in 2013?

- One way to make up for cuts to faculty benefits and lack of raises would be to make parking free. Currently we pay for parking, and can't find parking anyway. Make it free for faculty to park in campus lots, and allow faculty to park in any lot where they can find a space.
- Though the process is well intended, our in unit evaluation has a strong bias towards rewarding merit based upon time served or past accomplishments, favors members of the majority disciplines, and ignores combined productivity in all 3 areas of research, teaching and service. Thanks for your efforts!
- I see little use in collective bargaining when the state simply cuts the negotiated benefits anyway.
- We need a new legislature and governor.
- Our interim dean Dr. Speake is outstanding but we do need a permanent dean.

- I think the Governor's veto of differential university status was crushing to our university. We don't have the location or alumni demographics to be able to be as successful at fundraising as UF is. If we are going to succeed and be a highly ranked university, we have to charge tuition that is commensurate with the cost of providing education in disciplines where market-driven costs are substantially higher. It is sad to me because our president has significantly outperformed other university presidents in terms of contingency planning, yet we seem to be penalized for that through larger cuts.
- I am very concerned about the NTT reclassification project. After reading the documents, it seems to not understand there are NTT faculty who are program administrators whose duties far exceed "service." For example, I oversee a team of *[snip]* TAs/tutors that work in *[various]* locations, teach 2 classes a year, am expected to continue publishing even though I don't get "credit" for it. The proposed change to my job title, Instructional whatever, is insulting. I also have a Ph.D. I wish the NTT reclassification allowed for different levels of qualification and an expanded understanding of the many roles NTT faculty take one that go beyond a simple teaching, research, or service formula.
- The continued disdain and disregard for non-tenured (and qualified faculty) with PhDs to participate in service to FSU and to direct research, is disheartening. Rome is burning and I have a firehose--which is not being used.
- We are collectively running scared and have already yielded the high ground. We need to reaffirm the value of an education as a contributing member of our society, not simply as a potential employee.
- My department chair plays favorites, ensuring that some get easy assignments while others, whom he would like to leave, are heavily burdened. My chair supports mediocre faculty members *[snip]*. This has ruined the reputation of our department in the field.
- I think if you ask people to identify their college, their department, and their rank, you might as well ask for names. You're less likely to get honest, forthright answers if you ask for identifying information like that. Human beings are going to be reluctant to criticize people that have the power to influence their compensation if they think there is a possibility the people with that power will find out about their criticism. And no amount of assurance about keeping the answers confidential can ever be fully convincing. It's just the way it is.
- Hostile work environment for some employees--very negative atmosphere- not speaking, rolling eyes at meetings. Bad stuff, and there is no redress for the targeted employee.
- The largest impact on negative morale has been the funding of the university from the Legislature. I also believe that the lack of cost of living and no progress on non-tenured and partner benefits has been very negative.
- I have rarely been impressed with deans here. They appear to be incompetent as leaders and managers. There should be term-limits for deans with negative overall approval.
- There should be some mechanism to determine whether FSU policies and procedures are being followed -- other than just asking the administrators.
- NTT faculty teaching loads are becoming larger and larger, to the point of becoming completely unacceptable.
- Faculty members are forced to exert a lot of effort on a regular basis to prove their worthiness, yet the rewards are low. If we can't increase the rewards, we should at least try to make the process less time-consuming.
- I am in ORP and am very concerned about the reduction in funding.
- We must begin to rebuild and replace lost faculty in manners reflecting the units accomplishments and student demand.
- We need leadership at the School-level. We desperately need a new Director. The one that we have is incredibly incompetent and vindictive. It is hard to lead when you are only motivated to protect yourself. Things would run better if we had no director at all.
- It seems that UFF is the only organization that is even trying to identify areas of inequity or unfairness at FSU. This should be a primary and active focus of deans, but they ignore inequity unless an issue is forced upon them. This indifference contributes to a "them vs us" attitude between faculty and administration, and fosters a confrontational management/labor type of relationship rather than a cooperative environment. Much of this is former Provost Abele's legacy, but the attitude continued after his departure,

despite Barron's efforts.

- Simply the level of 'burn out' that seems to be raging across the campus.
- We have never evaluated our department chair. We only very recently (thank you, Provost) evaluated our Dean for the first time in our college. This is a stark example of the top-down, hierarchical leadership model that exists at FSU
- I surely hope the political pendulum in Florida will start to swing back toward sanity soon.
- Non-tenure track faculty need multi-year contracts. There needs to be more promotion possibilities for non-tenure track faculty. There is too much inequity in salary between experienced non tenure faculty and inexperienced tenure track faculty.
- In this time of budget cuts and reductions, it would be very helpful to know where to find information on how to negotiate with administrators when taking on additional duties and responsibilities. I find myself exhausted because of all of the additional work I took on this year, and have not really been compensated for it at all.
- Please create, or contract with, a group to create and maintain your promotional materials. The cartoons on your advertisements create a terrible philosophical impression of the quality work that you do.
- Negative energy. Complaining. If you don't like it here, feel free to move on. Some of us enjoy our work and appreciate the opportunity to contribute to the mission of FSU.
- The human subjects committee/procedure is a serious barrier to conducting research at FSU.
- Graduate student stipends / compensation is low compared to competing institutions. We are losing top students to other schools, which negatively impacts on teaching and research aspects of my job. I know graduate students don't fall under UFF's mission, but it is vital that UFF work together with the grad student union to maintain and improve their compensation.
- The faculty at the College of Engineering are generally isolated from the activities of main campus. We are second class citizens to the university administration. Main campus administration and even the faculty are more familiar with goings and comings of the MagLab than of the College of Engineering.
- Many efficiencies (and thus, cost-saving) measures could be pursued productively. Teaching and learning are currently near the bottom of the barrel at FSU, which is unwise and unfortunate.
Barron is doing the best he can in a highly adversarial situation.
We must replace Rick Scott asap!
- I am resigning from FSU and moving elsewhere. There is nothing worth staying for at FSU.
- the ambiguity & second-class status of the NTT faculty is dehumanizing
- please see my above comments about retirement benefits
- Salary compression and inversion. As a Full Prof, I see my salary constantly eroded. Procedures for merit awards are fair, but amounts are pitiful.
- I am Emeritus Professor with active research program. You may not want to include my responses; i.e., not sure if my voicing my opinions here is appropriate.
- Lack of concern for some positions, base salary increases; added significant number of non-teaching positions.
- the leadership in our department and college is punitive and negative. They are hostile and create an environment where everything is micromanaged. They don't think about the students in planning classes, or the seniority of faculty, they have faculty that don't question them--and they are shown favorable teaching schedules, TA help and other rewards. It is appalling that this behaviour is allowed to continue year after year.
- Yes. I am concerned that the University is replacing classical, core academic values with commercial ones. "Big ideas" are good but so are some old ones that are sorely neglected at FSU.
- On our Chair - we recently removed a bad Chair, have a "good" (as scored) interim Chair, and have already had a vote to start soon with a new chair and new hope.
- Just very concerned about morale and the future of my department at this time.
- Not enough focus is being placed on enhancing research and scholarship in our college.

There is not enough support provided by administration to those in the tenure track positions. This area needs to be enhanced and should be a major focus of our college. Those with PhDs or currently working on PhDs are concerned about the ability to achieve tenure under the current structure of the college and with the intense workloads that accompany working in the college of nursing. We are consistently losing individuals with PhDs to other universities because of the lack of administrative support for research and high workload distributions.

- In my experience there appeared to be a gigantic slip between the results of merit evaluation and those "bonuses".
- 1. We work in a culture of "no."
- 2. Integrity is not important here -- I have found that a majority of faculty are unable to own up to their mistakes or take responsibility for their actions. Problems are ALWAYS the fault of another. Without any integrity the goals we set out to accomplish are banal and unlikely to make a big difference.
- 3. Management?
- Not optimistic about state support of FSU to be a premier state Univ.
- I was disappointed with the way the dean allocated the limited merit raises last year--he totally ignored contributions of some faculty who were very deserving of the bonuses and gave them to others less deserving. This is uncharacteristic for this dean--who normally is very fair and above-board in his dealings.
I am very pleased with the leadership of President Barron, of Provost Stokes, and of Jennifer Buchanan filling in as Dean of Faculties--all have made strong positive contributions to the university in the last year. I hope we hire a VP for Research who matches them in excellence.
- I really would like it if we considered giving faculty options with regard to their pay being either 9month, 10month, or 12month like other educators in this state.
- Just want fair pay for work...
- 12 month pay should be an option.
- How did UFF not see coming/not care about the cut to ORP?
- My primary concern is the disparity of treatment toward women and minorities in the department. The English department has a proven history of unequal expectations and treatment resulting in near zero retention of minorities and women!
- I think that UFF-FSU does an outstanding job.
- The Humanities Program needs to be brought back to life. It is a crying shame what the College of Art and Sciences has done to the Humanities. Many, many graduate students were hurt by this...one of them [*snip*] made the national news (Chronicle of Higher Education and ABC TV, and NPR indirectly).
- State and University treatment of faculty and salaries is opprobrious, if not outright profane. The degradation of salary year after year and amount of iniquity allowed within job rankings is simply criminal
- central administration does not seem to care that the dean of the college of human sciences and several of it's chairs (e.g. Nutrition) do not have a clue as to how to operate an administrative unit fairly and with integrity. it;s a shame and an embarrassment.
- Yes, the poor performance of the union. I was subjected to union staff and faculty telling me how critical it was to join the union to protect our interests. That only with them could faculty protect ourselves against unfair changes in policy. And then the legislature passed a second decrease in retirement benefits this past session and the union only became aware of it after the fact. The union's incompetence was highlighted by this. How can they possibly fight for faculty rights when they aren't even staying informed about what bills are moving through the legislature?
- I love my job and I love my department...but unless the budget situation improves in the near future I'm looking to get out of Florida.
- Salary inversion is depressing, and offensive but is part of the FSU system. President and Deans demonstrate no effort to address this morale issue.
- Attacks on faculty retirement and public broadcasting by the governor and legislators creates a hostile environment for learning at the expense of commercialization. It the UFF and the FSU Administration, perhaps in collaboration with other similar-status universities

within our state (and perhaps region) can do anything to correct that short-sighted perception, it could do wonders to make the work most of us do at the university more rewarding.

- A fairer balance is needed between teaching load and high-impact research activity.
- Hard to complete parts of the survey as have two perspectives: one for college on main campus and one at FSU/PC. So, some answers relate to one on other answers to other location
- Assigned duties are a combination of administration and research which is not an option above.
- I think President Barron is doing an excellent job, and has worked wonders in increasing faculty morale.
- this retirement benefit cut really stinks...it makes me less likely to want to remain her at FSU indefinitely!
- For the want of a more appropriate box: Please let there be a mechanism to stop the deluge of unsolicited NEA related junk mail. If there was some way to opt out of the NEA I would take it (the cost is not an issue).
- The perceived lack of planning for growth of physical facilities to address an expanding student demand for courses supporting careers in STEM. This is already a significant problem for our Department.
- In general, there is a lot of favoritism on the part of administrators. This impacts who sits on committees, who receives merit bonuses, who receives travel and professional development funding, and who is recognized for achievements. The Dean's merit pot of money seems to have been distributed to "favorites" of certain ADs (or ADs who are willing to advocate on behalf of their employees). It seems, at times, that the Dean sometimes relies too much on what ADs suggest to her.
- My academic program unit requires an enormous amount of ongoing faculty-led training & development concerning graduate students & the courses that they teach. Also, I have had to meet extensively with graduate students with respect to teaching them scholarly skills (research skills, teaching, advising, & writing). I work collaboratively with other faculty members, even when some of them are highly resistant. A huge amount of my time at FSU has been tied up in the development of coordination, coherence, & psychometrically-sound course materials, exams, etc. by graduate students. When I first arrived at FSU, no formal mechanisms (i.e., meetings, resolution of inconsistencies) existed for coordination & consistent decision-making with respect to course-related issues for the 2 courses that were taught by 8-10 graduate student teachers each semester. I identified & have developed structured procedures, meetings, etc. Also, I have developed 2 online courses for our unit. In addition, to my conscientiousness regarding the advise of graduate students, as needed, my research time has been reduced substantially. Unfortunately, I am coming up for tenure, & it appears that my contributions to the success of FSU as an exceptional academic institution will be largely dismissed. So, I should not have addressed serious academic teaching & training issues for our graduate students, but, rather, I should have insisted with every one of our graduate students' publications that I be listed as first author whenever it could have been ethically argued that I should have first authorship. The fact is that I did not push my ego to the top every time graduate students & I produced a published paper & conference paper, even though the student papers were developed in large measure as the result of extending my line of research into a variety of related domains that students wanted to study. In short, my time here has been wasted on trying to do the right thing for both our academic program & for the graduate students with whom I have worked, rather than trampling over my students & other faculty to build my curriculum vita. I was simply naive to think that building the program, collaborating with everyone, & working for the success & learning for all was the right thing to do.
- I get discouraged that the majority of FSU-PC faculty members do not appreciate the effort UFF members put into the non-tenured status issues.
- I believe faculty sabbaticals (one semester, full pay) should be essentially guaranteed after 8 years of service. It's perfectly reasonable to have to submit a proposal prior to the sabbatical and perfectly reasonable to have to submit a progress report afterwards, but

the idea of having to compete with one's colleagues, all of whom are working hard for FSU, is absurd and an insult. A one-semester sabbatical should be guaranteed after 8 years of service just as a FYAP is essentially guaranteed after the first year. This would be one way to improve faculty morale and faculty retention and to enhance faculty recruitment.

- I enjoy my job although I do not think my potential is fully realized.
- My disappointment with the morale and leadership in my unit and college have become so critical that I have accepted a recruiting offer from another university and will not return to FSU. Lack of transparency and lack of leadership at both levels have been principal factors in my decision.
- As a non-tenured faculty member, I find it frustrating that the tenured faculty do not appreciate us as they should! Our Dean is very supportive of us and recognizes AND appreciates what we do.
- Administrative leadership and visioning in our existing financial crisis is nonexistent. We operate at the whim of the governor and legislature. The BOG is not an advocate for FSU or higher education. FSU is an ongoing train wreck.
- UFF needs to add some Republican lobbyists to their lobbying team.

Thank you for completing the basic FSU Faculty Poll for May 2012. 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.