

It should be noted that President Goldfarb scored higher than 3.5 on 75% of the assessment questions and 3.75 or higher on 30 of 52 questions—57.6%.

The two questions where President Goldfarb scored below 3 were: 14 (allocating resources to accomplish faculty research missions—2.84) and 20 (making excellent administrative appointments—2.91). Two other areas of concern were infrastructure (question 24 with a score of 3.05) and promoting policies that foster the academic unit or department (question 3 with a score of 3.06). One other low scoring area concerned working effectively with deans (question 11.ii with a score of 3.05).

These results are not surprising given the make up of the faculty comments. The comments were wide ranging with both laudatory and critical comments, but there were concerns about WIU’s infrastructure as well as comments about the President’s administrative appointments and relationships with deans. A detailed summary of the comments follows below Table A.

Some faculty commented that they did not believe the comments would be read, taken seriously or effective; some faculty wrote comments that were *ad hominem* attacks against the President. These unprofessional comments are neither useful nor relevant to the goals of the survey. Critical comments on the survey are welcomed, but they need to be relevant to the issue at hand and written in a professional tone and manner.

Overall, the quantitative data demonstrates what faculty members think is important, what President Goldfarb’s areas of strength and weakness are, and how the President’s leadership has affected them over the last year. In this sense, the survey has fulfilled its function.

Table A: President Summary Report Data

For each of the following series of questions you will be asked to rate how effective President Goldfarb is in performing various aspects of his responsibilities. The scale ranges from 1 (not effective) to 5 (highly effective). If you feel that you do not have enough information to form an opinion please select “No Opinion” or “No Answer.”

NB: When comparing unadjusted means across years, keep in mind that the 2007/2008 survey was reported on a 5 point scale and the previous two years were reported on a 7 point scale. No opinion and no answer numbers were not used in calculating the mean or standard deviation.

Q #	Question Text	Mean (Average) Score	Standard Deviation	N (Total # of Respondents for this question (no opinion/no answer*))
1.	The President actively promotes an environment for excellence in:			
	i. Scholarship	3.64	1.30	236, 13/3
	ii. Teaching	3.78	1.23	236, 12/4
	iii. Student learning	3.79	1.21	226, 22/2
2.	The President actively promotes policies that support the mission of the university relative to:			
	i. Short term strategic planning	3.88	1.24	225, 22/4
	ii. Long term strategic planning	3.87	1.30	223, 20/5

Overall job efficiency:

The predominant issues under the domain of overall job proficiency identified concerns about the campus infrastructure and fiscal needs of the University. Numerous comments described a negative impact on teaching due to poor building conditions and a lack of physical resources. These statements were often mixed with recognition that the resource needs of institutions of higher education are not being met by the state of Illinois. Declining academic standards for undergraduate education was the primary concern voiced under the student category. Concerns were noted for the development of too many programs for a University of WIU's size and mission.

Personal skills related to the role of President:

The three subcategories under personal skills of the President were leadership, relationships with faculty, and administrative appointments. President Goldfarb's leadership was evaluated positively by a large number of comments, indicating a caring, hard-working, and dedicated leader. Several comments voiced concern about less accessibility of the President over the past couple of years. Faculty also expressed concerns about the new emphasis on research productivity with few resources to accomplish same, as well as an increasing lowering of opportunities for faculty governance coupled with low faculty morale. The overwhelming concern stated in regard to administrative appointments was for the continual increase in administrative positions at a time of difficult economic conditions. Other responses related to concerns about layers of bureaucracy insulating the President from faculty and their issues. Also, one-third of the comments regarded administrative appointments which centered on Provost Office positions, with the vast majority of those being