LINCOLN UNIVERSITY FACULTY COUNCIL 2018-2019

Faculty Survey Summary Report Fall 2018



This summary narrative is based on the Faculty Council Survey, September 2018, prepared by Tiffany Lee, Director of the Office of Institutional Effectiveness, Research, and Planning, relating to the responses as received from 71 respondents. This survey shows that 102 faculty members received the initial questionnaire.

The rationale for this survey was initiated as, based on faculty concerns, during the Fall 2017 and Spring 2018 semesters. There exists a general ambiguity about the Faculty Council (FC) charge, which has led to a general distrust of the council.

This narrative is designed to address the majority responses from faculty participating in the survey.

How important is it to you that shared governance exists at Lincoln University?

42.86% of faculty respondents believe that FC was established to enhance faculty involvement in shared governance and believe that the council has effectively performed their roles, thus far.

The faculty council (FC) was partly established to enhance faculty involvement in shared governance at LU. How effective was the FC conducted its role in that regard so far? 77.46% of faculty respondents think shared governance is very important.

How well informed are you about the activities and roles of the FC?

58.57% of faculty think that they are somewhat, informed about the actions of the FC

How well informed are you about the activities and roles of the FC in contrast to those of the standing committees?

48.57% respondents say that they are somewhat informed about standing committees. This response bears further discussion based on the "liaison" between the chair of the committee and the FC. Our charge should be the acknowledgement of the chair and how we support chair concerns.

Do you agree that part of the role of the FC is to act as a liaison between the faculty and the office of the President?

46.48% agree that FC was established to be a liaison between faculty and the office of the President.

Distinctions of individual faculty responses

The faculty feel that the following issues should be championed this school year. FC should work with the Provost Office and Tenure Committee to develop a new yearly evaluation tool as the current tool does not take into account for classroom observation and other



professional behaviors of the faculty. FC should be responsible for undergirding each standing committee making sure, in consult, with each chair that each committee is fulfilling this charge.

FC must proffer a plan to the administration that mandates all students to purchase textbooks. Textbooks should be included in the tuition based on student's course of study.

Consider electing FC for two years.

FC must investigate issues surrounding student housing.

FC should assist in fostering strategic alliances with organizational enterprises (public-private partnerships) in partnership with Developmental Office and Career Services for programmatic funding, job opportunities, cooperative education experiences and internship opportunities.

Faculty should be issued an end of year evaluation on performance during the school year.

FC is charged with preparing a synopsis of all committee reports submitted and documented at faculty meetings.

FC minutes must be distributed at faculty meetings for accountability.

The Executive Council should serve for two years.

There are concerns about Education Policy Committees and the fact that FC should be able to (fight) with the administration in the interest of the faculty and students. A feeling exists that the practice of hiring too many BPS exists at the peril of less faculty resource lines.

Respectfully submitted,

Charles Pettaway