

## Perception Survey – Written Comments – Spring 2005

Following are the comments/perception of faculty regarding administrators. Comments are presented here in their entirety (complete with any grammatical or spelling errors) with one category of exception: names and identifying references to persons other than the author or the relevant administrator have been removed in the interest of protecting third party privacy. (Any such deletions are indicated by ellipses contained within square brackets.) Any deletions were approved by a majority vote of the Senate.

### President

- ✓ The President is a good listener, articulate and with a strong vision for the University.
- ✓ The President seems like a nice person. I see her as a an academic tech...She continues a long line of Presidents here and at other institutions who were selected for reasons of liberal, (conservative) political new think reasons who fail to inspire faculty or lead educational institutions to greatness.
- ✓ Good leadership with policies appropriate to an institution of this size and description (e.g., elimination of "Performance Raises" and the coupling of tenure and promotion).
- ✓ President Trauth/university seem to be mismanaging growth – becoming more bureaucratic and losing the family-style atmosphere (the personal). We as faculty will suffer if the university becomes more bureaucratic, as will our students.
- ✓ Need to refocus on the mission of the university – teaching.  
Keep teaching as a primary objective not secondary to research. The more grants the more classes are taught by adjuncts and that may not be in the best interest of our students and their success.
- ✓ President Trauth should revise current salary/equity CUPA model. It has major flaws and is in my judgement invalid in some cases, e.g. lecturer rank.
- ✓ I wish I had more of a sense of Dr. Trauth's involvement in the processes of the university. I suppose a problem with growing is the same as a large city...we are removed and all peddling as far as we can with little time to interact with those beyond our own departments. The chairs run a lot of that interference.
- ✓ I have been impressed with President Trauth so far, especially her handling of the budget crisis 2 years ago.  
In meetings with faculty and the department, she seems honest about changes or goals, that may not be possible, but without being dismissive.
- ✓ I do not know enough about President Trauth to evaluate her.
- ✓ I am very encouraged by the philosophy of faculty driven or faculty input. This is quite contrary to what we have experienced in the College of Business. I am looking forward to a time when this will be implemented at the college and department level.  
President Trauth made a commitment to raise faculty salaries and she followed through on her word. This was a very pleasant and welcome outcome when faculty was awarded merit. For several years, submitting an annual report seemed to be a waste of effort. To learn that merit would be based on actual performance and not perceived performance by administrators was also very encouraging. For several years I have not completed an administrator survey as it seemed that these too were going ignored by administrators. It appears that President Trauth is making changes in the administration to be less of a "good old boy network" to one that is productive and working towards building bridges that had been formed from the "it's my discretion" attitude of administrators. PPS and UPPS were applied only when it would be of benefit to the administrators rather than as a rule across all situations.
- ✓ Great image.  
Seems efficient & effective.  
Seems committed to students & faculty.  
Great communication skills.

- ✓ Excellent understanding of where we have come from, where we are, and where we should be going.  
Very bright lady.  
Very capable of being our President and very serious about doing a good job.  
Well respected by outside constituency.  
Clear about what she wants and not afraid to see that it gets done.  
Very good about delegating authority.  
Very good about decision making.  
Sensitive to diversity issues - yet practical.
- ✓ The President cares nothing about the students at Texas State University. The President has little regard for the faculty here at Texas State Univ.
- ✓ She is an excellent role model!
- ✓ Dr. Trauth has an excellent vision for the university, is committed to achieving that vision through faculty governance, and has worked hard in her short tenure to promote the university effectively in the academic and civic communities. She has a responsible, democratic leadership style that is helping Texas State to fulfill its teaching, scholarship, and service obligations.
- ✓ Needs to put more emphasis on finding more scholarships and endowed chairs to continue to help the university evolve.  
Some program initiatives do not seem to rely on the advice of the most knowledgeable or visionary active faculty.  
Continues to rely on the existence of faculty-heads (i.e., chair-for-life administrators who do not lead scholarship or innovative efforts) rather than active faculty chairs to help lead the “bubble-up” feed back process.  
Needs to promote an environment where staff offices (i.e., accounting, HR, physical plant, etc.) listen more closely and further assists faculty and their teaching/research mission.
- ✓ I think more needs to be done to address other transportation issues on campus. In particular, I think the University needs to do more to encourage and nurture a bicycle friendly campus. I was shocked to learn that the student handbook states that it is a violation to ride a bicycle on campus.  
More parking garages and narrower roads are not answers as the university continues to grow.
- ✓ Presiding over process and leadership are not the same thing.

### Provost

- ✓ Reassigned an AVPAA hastily, without full knowledge of circumstances.
- ✓ The Provost is dynamic and straightforward.
- ✓ The only thing I know about the Provost is that his Ph.D. is from a university in Commerce, Texas. I have never been to Commerce, Texas.
- ✓ Good personal style; definitive when appropriate, yet approachable/flexible on most matters. Excellent leadership in decentralizing the curriculum review process.
- ✓ The Provost should implement dramatic changes in the CUPA model for faculty salary equity. Particularly for the rank of lecturer, this model is invalid.
- ✓ Responsive, when an obvious imperfect situation is encountered, he makes a quick (and appropriate) move to correct the situation. A welcome change!
- ✓ Having met him only socially, I have no perception of his role on how he has performed to enhance the experiences of faculty or students.
- ✓ I have only met the Provost once, at a meeting. He has not been here long, so I don't know how effective he has been. Ask me again after he finishes reviewing my tenure file – then I will have some experience on which to base my evaluation.
- ✓ As a tenure-track faculty member who came in under the last administration, I'd like a little less mystery about if/how the rules have changed. There are some mixed messages floating around.
- ✓ I do not know enough about Provost Moore to evaluate him.

- ✓ I know little about him.  
I don't even know what he looks like.  
I don't like that is reworked the college strategic plan after extensive faculty input & work.
- ✓ Excellent administrator.  
Very good decision maker.  
Always willing to explain rationale for decisions he has made.  
Bright guy and good at management – a unique and valuable combination.  
Equitable to all disciplines.  
Need to be a full Provost over all VP's. Without this authority, he is unable to effect some very important changes that must be made to “get the job done properly”.  
Runs a good office.  
Establishes a good presence for our institution.  
Not afraid to speak his mind in an honest and objective manner.
- ✓ Though it's early days in his tenure here, he seems candid, and competent.
- ✓ I hear little from, or about Dr. Perry. It is therefore impossible to evaluate him on any of the provided criteria.
- ✓ The provost has had a short period of time at Texas State. Faculty have had very little opportunity to see what he is planning to do.  
He seems to have a “Country club” style of management; therefore, he comes across pretty odd and leaves a taste of distrust.  
He did not leave a good impression when he came to visit the department of Management. He was not well informed but he still tried to answer questions made by faculty for which he should have said that he was not well informed or have not had the opportunity to really know all the details.  
We hope he turns out a good PROVOST – that he can bring decency to the decision making process and the direction/vision/mission of the academic affairs environment of this university.
- ✓ Needs to act more quickly to move Texas State away from the “chair for life” department head paradigm that he inherited. If Texas State U is truly to grow and evolve, active faculty teachers/researchers with vision should be encouraged to assume greater leadership roles.  
Needs to make sure that active, experienced faculty are closely engaged in strategic plan initiative evolution and follow-through.  
Many staff functions remain disconnected from effective faculty mission support. The Provost needs to address these “fief-doms”.  
Minority faculty continue to generally perceive that they have larger obstacles to overcome in tenure/promotion/merit issues, with a lack of leadership opportunities available.
- ✓ Provost showed great judgment in selecting a faculty member like Gene Bourgeois. We need more changes, replacing the “old guard” (e.g. Pat Cassidy).

## Dean

### Business

- # Well-meaning, hard working, but delegates, defers too much to less capable associate dean.
- # Dean Smart is a wonderful Dean, working tirelessly to help implement the vision for the university, setting goals and objectives to help achieve that vision and providing resources to reach the goals.  
A thorough communicator, Dean Smart is also the epitome of professionalism. Working long hours, she has chosen wonderful department chairs and is diligent about the importance of professional behavior in a variety of areas.  
Handling many duties from building a new College facility to working with external boards of directors, Dean Smart keeps things moving along and seeks the advice of well-qualified professionals.  
She also has a warm personal demeanor, making faculty feel welcome and relevant.  
She is a wonderful Dean. Remember if you are doing a good job and promoting positive change, there will be someone who does not like the change. It's human nature to be afraid of charting new territory.

- # Dr. Smart is a nice, caring and well meaning person, who seems to perform her functions doing what she believes is right. She has obviously done an outstanding job in fund raising and representing the college to the external community.
- # Dean Smart is the most professional, competent, hardworking, forward-thinking, and caring person I've had the privilege to work for. She has taken the college from a sleepy little college in San Marcos to a well-known college in Texas and the rest of the country because she has a vision and a plan. I've never know an administrator who works as hard or as many hours as she does. Dean Smart is a class-act who deserves much more money than she's paid. She makes sure that faculty have input into every decision that they need to, but leaves them alone to do their work. We are so lucky to have her as our Dean.
- # For too many years I have sat silent regarding the activities within the college of Business. I truly believe that the faculty problems within the college are totally attributed to Dean Smart's leadership or in this case lack of leadership.

Dean Smart surrounds herself with "yes" people. The people who she feels she can trust are those who only agree with her. When a faculty member asks a question regarding a decision or voices an opinion different from hers, she is quick to give the individual a verbal put down.

A student team is being told to submit inflated numbers on competition reports by their faculty advisor. I know this because a student team requested to make a presentation in my class to make their numbers after it had been announced that this team was ranked 15<sup>th</sup> in competition already. Ranking is based on performance that was completed by a particular deadline, submitted in a report, reviewed and evaluated prior to regional competition. To try to "make numbers" after the fact is not only unethical, it is fraud. I feel that we are doing students a disservice to encourage them to win at any cost. I have not gone to the Dean on this matter as we have all seen what happened when another faculty member did so several years ago. I do not wish to be treated by the Dean as she is to this previous "whistleblower." Obviously, our Dean condones such behavior. As long as student teams win, it doesn't matter how they win.

Dean Smart often refers to faculty as "children." This is disrespectful. If she isn't willing to show respect to faculty, why should anyone else?

Dean Smart makes decisions without regard to faculty input. Faculty selected for advising positions, committee positions, etc. are made without asking for faculty volunteers. Chairs, Associate Deans, and the Dean make selections. By selecting faculty without their input, an individual who may have an interest in a particular committee/activity are being overlooked. Also, this method puts a lot of pressure on the select few who are on the "acceptable" list of faculty. These few faculty members are being called on to serve more than others. One particular faculty, Mrs. Detiert, has been abused in this fashion. Chairs are not encouraged to ask their faculty for input by the Dean.

Faculty input, when solicited, is asked for on a one-on-one basis. Faculty are not called together in a group, where opinions could be heard by other faculty. On more than one occasion, Dean Smart has stated that what individual faculty tells her is not what they have been telling each other. Thus, encouraging distrust among faculty. Where is the proof, if faculty are not allowed to meet and discuss such matters? It is very convenient method to assure that only her decision is approved.

Dean Smart could improve by giving feedback back to faculty after having "input." Instead of giving feedback on a one-on-one, as convenient method, giving all faculty feedback on who she used or didn't use input would be beneficial to faculty. Another way that Dean Smart could improve is to ask for volunteers for various committee/activities from faculty. Simply stating that a faculty member will be

asked to do so-and-so in the CBAC minutes is not enough to generate inquiries. This would also allow for more faculty members to be involved in College/University/Community activities.

Our College has several advisory boards. Faculty members have not ever been informed of all of these meetings. In fact, within departments, faculty members are not told when the meetings will take place or what transpired at the meetings.

There needs to be more open and frequent communication with faculty in the College of Business by the Dean. Faculty should be informed of what committees are doing (there has been some increased activity in this area, but it is still a rarity rather than a norm), what is going on with advisory boards, what is going on with the SBDC, Latin America program, Round Rock programs, etc. There should be more press releases regarding the activities of production faculty.

Maybe President Trauth should meet with just faculty and not chairs & deans present to hear these concerns. It concerns me that Dean Smart awards teaching awards to faculty who are known to only meet 50% of the required contact class time. Why are the rest of us meeting our classes the whole time when so many are rewarded for not meeting their classes?

Dean Smart had a Lecturer coordinate the faculty equity pay in the Mgt. Dept. This is totally unacceptable. This should have been done by a Full Professor in the department just as it had been done with the merit decision. To put a Lecturer (non-tenured) in this position was not only unprofessional; it was a sign of disrespect for the full professors in the department.

# I have become very disillusioned with Dr. Smart's performance as dean. She does not foster a faculty-friendly environment, is generally not forthcoming with information which should be routinely shared with faculty, and is supportive only of select faculty. Her autocratic leadership style creates low faculty morale and inhibits the College from reaching its potential.

# The college is in a difficult situation since the Dean is doing an unsatisfactory job. The college has an overflow of faculty with poor academic and moral standards. The dean does not care about it since she encourages and perpetuated the environment by engaging in unethical practices. The list of examples that can illustrate the situation is long but I will provide few examples. For instance, awards are open to faculty and information is sent to faculty. Faculty applies for the awards; the committees spend the time and do the job assigned to them. However, it was just to keep the paper trail and the motions. The dean overwrites their recommendations and she acts on her made-up mind before hand and before the process started. Some faculty have had very good accomplishments in this college and she uses their accomplishments to her own benefits only. She does not capitalize on the talents of these faculty, or give credit to these faculty and/or generating win-win situations for everybody. That brings the morale of faculty down and the desire of NO-NO cooperation. Her intimate friendship with some faculty brings distrust in the way business is conducted in the college, especially if her intimate friends are the ones getting the awards, the opportunities, etc. Needless to say that she places or shows her personal vendettas and differences with some faculty in front of other faculty and in front of some visitors...She seems to be unprepared to be a Dean... She does not believe in diversity. She told publicly to a faculty member that has been working on a diversity research paper – Texas State is not becoming a Hispanic serving institution for a long, long while. That was shocking! As much as I agree that we should be realistic, the college will be better off if it start working on it. We are flooded with Hispanic students.

#### Education

- ☀ Hate to lose him.
- Committed to shared governance.
- Sometimes lacks follow-through.

Committed to faculty & students.

Committed to planning.

Visionary.

Kind.

Long-time commitment to making COE better.

- ☀ Dean Beck always exhibits a positive attitude and thoroughly supports all aspects in the College of Ed. He is always available and willing to speak in various settings, promoting education, highlighting our students, and commending the faculty for all their hard work.

#### Science

- I have never met the acting Dean since he replaced Dean Israel.
- The Dean is affable and tries to do the right thing.
- Dean of Science is not so well-defined right now! Our interim dean was fantastic and our new dean is too new to evaluate properly.
- As Interim Dean, Greg has done an excellent job of keeping our college moving in the right direction. He is very easy to work with. He always tried to help you get your department's needs met. We were fortunate to have him fill in for us as interim dean. Greg is a good person who works hard to keep the system in operation.
- Our interim chair had a tough task. I feel he did the best he could, but it was short of what was needed, for the college in terms of leadership and vision. Interim Dean is approachable and ethical.

#### Fine Arts and Communication

- ◆ Extremely strong leadership; advocates for departments when needed; otherwise stays out of internal department matters.
- ◆ He has lied so many times to the faculty that it is hard to believe anything he says. He hired a development director who has done absolutely NOTHING. If her pay is based on a per cent of the amount of money she has brought to the College, she should be working for free. A change has needed to be made for several years regarding the dean and the comments about his performance the last several years would validate this.

#### Liberal Arts

- € She is very supportive of faculty.
- € The Dean should request changes in the current CUPA model for faculty salary equity. Particularly for the rank of lecturer, this model is invalid.
- € She is the best Dean the College has had in my experience. She has been a superb and wise leader for Liberal Arts. She has high standards, and is very supportive of faculty. She is decisive, and gives strong support and wise guidance to faculty. She is particularly effective in selecting and working with excellent Chairs. I believe that the Psychology Department is much more in her debt than most people realize for her role in selecting Randall Osborne as Chair. In my view she has greatly improved the College of Liberal Arts in many, many ways, and I look forward to even greater things in the future.

#### Applied Arts

- £ He does not ensure that his chairs complete required paperwork in a timely and effective manner. He has several problem chairs and does not seem to be effectively supervising them or guiding their development.

### Health Professions

- Dr. Welborn should never have been placed in the position of Dean. She is an ineffective leader and manipulative administrator. Time to step down.
- She is hard-working and fair and supportive.
- The title of a recent article in the *University Star* by Dr. Jeff Gordon, “Texas State Suffers from a Culture of Mediocrity,” accurately describes the current state of affairs in the College of Health Professions under the deanship of Ruth Welborn. Every standard used to measure academic performance has been lowered since her appointment as Acting Dean in 2002. In the area of teaching, faculty are allowed to teach classes in which they are not qualified and for which they have no experience. The result is that classes get taught but the students taking the classes do not receive the quality instruction for which they paid. Scholarship in this college is a laughing matter. Faculty are supported for promotion and tenure when they do not meet minimal scholarship expectations. There is absolutely no leadership from the Dean’s office in the scholarship area since the dean has a minimal scholarship record herself. It is questionable whether she has the necessary knowledge, vision, or practical skills to lead the scholarship effort of our college since she has not performed successfully in that area.  
It is obvious that Dr. Welborn was named dean for reasons other than her demonstrated competency. As a result, a “Culture of Mediocrity” is the on-going legacy of Dr. Welborn as dean of the College of Health Professions.

### Chair

#### Accounting

- # He is an incredible chair in vision for the department, consensus building, etc. etc.
- # More appropriate compensation model should include more merit increases and less equity. Equity increases are removing all pay differences that have been primarily due to merit. Faculty with the highest salaries due to hard work and commitment find that other faculty “catch up” through equity adjustments.

#### Computer Science

- The only action taken in the past year that concerned me was the designation of a faculty member to head the faculty equity and merit raise committee. The Chairman of the committee had the committee recommend and subsequently received the largest raise I have ever seen given to a faculty member. I believe this is a conflict of interest.
- My chair is good at managing non-human resources but needs to improve human resource management.

#### Music

- ◆ He has no patience for due process or academic governance as it is specified in the faculty handbook. Decisions are made unilaterally by him alone, disenfranchising the faculty. He has no respect for the faculty, and makes no secret of it. Our School needs a lot more funds and he shows no evidence of fund-raising attempts. Our School has grown by creative thinking over the years, but anything that doesn’t fit the conventional wisdom is unilaterally eliminated by this Director. His vision for the School of Music is to keep it small and underfunded, and to make sure its faculty shuts up and says nothing while he in his great wisdom governs.

Faculty morale is at its lowest in many years. The Director is very negative in his treatment of all faculty who are not his own hand-picked yes-persons.

The Director shows no understanding or interest in the graduate program and is not even thinking of developing doctoral programs.

His administrative philosophy is wrong for our particular School of Music. We made a mistake when he hired him, and we need to start again to hire a different one without further loss of time.

- ◆ Dr. Stuessy is aloof and non-communicative. Already several important scheduling and curricular decisions have been made without regard for faculty governance. In an unsolicited conversation with a faculty member from UTSA, Dr. Stuessy's previous administrative post, it was revealed that he had the same leadership style there.

Having served under six different chairs/directors at Texas State University, I have never been as concerned as I am now about the future of this school of music.

This is the first time I have written negative comments on an evaluation form. I have a civil working relationship with Dr. Stuessy, but strongly disagree with his leadership style and vision for this school of music.

- ◆ Strong leadership in making changes that have been needed for many years.  
Has persisted in spite of objections of a small minority who are threatened by change of any kind.  
Always accessible; listens to all input and evaluates fairly.
- ◆ Dr. Stuessy is doing a great job. He is experienced, professional, friendly and has great ideas for the School of Music. He is an effective promoter of the programs and a terrific fund raiser. He is fair and impartial. He has given us a new spirit of comraderie – though there are still problems that were not of his making. Only suggestion: more lead time on promotion and tenure meeting schedules.
- ◆ Excellent work!  
Please, continue what you are doing and don't lower your standards, goals and expectations because of a few faculty who don't like high standards.
- ◆ He is the first director/chair we have had who is a musician and who has any kind of vision for the department. For YEARS, there have been substantial problems in the department that have been needed to be addressed and Dr. Stuessy is the first chair we have had who not only recognizes the need for change but he also has the backbone to implement them. Some of the old guard in the department are unhappy with him because they are being held accountable for the first time in their tenure. He is truly looking out for our students which is a welcome change.
- ◆ The chair appoints all departmental committees. There is no input from the faculty and no elections. He has a condescending and sarcastic attitude toward faculty who disagree with him.  
When we were voting for recipients (nominees) for the presidential awards, we were instructed to e-mail our choices to the chair. Ballots?  
I personally do not mind the "mild profanity" in faculty meetings, but there are some that are bothered by it. It would seem that a chair might exercise a better choice of vocabulary.  
At the end of the Fall Semester (2004), the last faculty meeting was cancelled because "There was nothing important to discuss." These were the words of the chair. A few days later, we received a memo from the chair detailing major scheduling and policy changes regarding ensembles. Was this not important enough to discuss among the full faculty?  
The "Chairs Advisory Committee", appointed by the chair, seems to be discussing and making policy for the department. An agenda and minutes have been requested on several occasions, but have not been forthcoming. Many of the faculty are feeling "left out" of major decisions. By the time policy gets to us, it appears that the decisions have already been made. It would be nice to actually discuss and vote on policy.
- ◆ Dr. Stuessy has been researching every aspect of the School of Music and created an advisory committee to "hash out" all of those issues. Even though this has meant many meetings, I feel every meeting has unearthed problems that have needed addressing for years. Finally we are trying to tighten up procedures. This of course has met with some resistance but I think will benefit the School and the students immensely.

- ◆ There are grave concerns regarding the Director of the School of Music  
 This academic year got off to a poor start [..... ] bitterly complained about the handling of the hiring of a new full-time voice teacher; fellow colleagues who served on the voice-teacher search committee [..... ] selected after a so-called national search three people for an interview; [.....] subsequently related that the candidate without the terminal degree, a person (also an acquaintance of the Director's and with only local and regional recognition in the field) was selected over more qualified applicants. The acquaintance of the Director's was hired in the end, as one of the Director's hand-picked appointees from his Director's Advisory Committee (DAC) also chaired the search committee and ultimately broke a tied vote; the Director in turn was brusquely dismissive towards those who opposed the hire of the Director's acquaintance, leaving the impression that the Director was not above employing autocratic methods;  
 Substantive issues which profoundly affect the School of Music are not formally presented for discussion before the voting faculty, let alone the Personnel Committee; in fact, such discussions take place between the Director and his hand-selected members, some of whom are not tenured, of the so-called Director's Advisory Committee (DAC); such discussions concerning substantive policy issues affecting the School of Music take place at the behest of the Director who presents an agenda to the DAC members who are not elected by the voting faculty; this action is in conflict with policy outlined in the Faculty Handbook (see the top of page 22);  
 The Director in the presence of others has belittled individual faculty members by expressing contempt for their points of view, and as a result morale is low; disdainful comments by the Director concerning faculty members have a way of spilling over to the faculty at large and to the student body as well; consequently, there is cause to investigate the ethics and motives harbored by the current Director of the School of Music; the Director's lack of esteem for some colleagues seems obvious; thus,  
 The Director is at times responsible for inculcating a negative environment within the School of Music; for example, when this university announced that it would build a new performing arts center, the news was received with enthusiasm by the School of Music faculty; the response by the music faculty was soon muted, however, by the Director's puzzling ambivalent reaction to this good news; such behavior contributes to a growing lack of confidence in the Director; some among the faculty even feel that the Director, despite his long association with the School of Music's accrediting agency, the National Association of Schools of Music (NASM), does not have the global vision, wisdom, and knowledge necessary to develop a modern School of Music at the cutting edge in the international community; and there is also the perception among music faculty that the Director was asked to step down after serving as Director or Chair of the music program at the University of Texas at San Antonio for many years: does this suggest that the current Director's management style is equally inappropriate for the School of Music at Texas State University-San Marcos as well.
- ◆ There are grave concerns regarding the Director of the School of Music:  
 This academic year got off to a poor start [.....] bitterly complained about the handling of the hiring of a new full-time voice teacher: fellow colleagues who served on the voice-teacher search committee [.....] selected three people for an interview and subsequently related that the candidate without the terminal degree and with only local or at best regional recognition in the field was selected over more qualified applicants; an acquaintance of the Director's was hired in the end when one of the Director's hand-picked appointees from his Director's Advisory Committee (DAC) chaired the committee and ultimately broke a tied vote; the Director in turn was brusquely dismissive towards those who opposed the hire of the Director's acquaintance, leaving the impression that the Director was not above employing autocratic methods;  
 Moreover, substantive issues which profoundly affect the School of Music are not formally presented for discussion among the voting faculty, let alone the Personnel Committee; in fact, such discussions do take place between the Director and his hand-selected member, some of whom are not tenured, in the so called Director's Advisory Committee (DAC); such discussions concerning substantive policy issues affecting the School of Music take place at the behest of the Director who presents an agenda to the

DAC members who are NOT elected by the voting faculty; this action is in conflict with policy outlined in the Faculty Handbook (see the top of page 22);

The Director in the presence of others has belittled individual faculty members by expressing contempt for their points of view, and as a result morale is low; disdainful comments by the Director concerning faculty members have a way of spilling over to the faculty at large and to the student body as well; consequently, there is cause to investigate the ethics and motives harbored by the current Director of the School of Music; the Director's lack of esteem for some colleagues seems obvious; yet The Director does not articulate or offer a faculty development program for those he deems deficient; and,

The Director seems to be obsessed instead with nay-saying, thus promoting a negative environment within the School of Music.

When this university announced that it would build a new performing arts center, the news was received with tremendous enthusiasm by the School of Music faculty. It is puzzling then why the Director of the School of Music received such news with ambivalence. Such behavior contributes to a growing lack of confidence in the Director; some among the faculty even feel that the Director, despite his long association with the School of Music's accrediting agency, the National Association of Schools of Music (NASM), does not have the global vision and skill necessary to develop a modern School of Music at the cutting edge in the international community; and there is also the perception among music faculty that the Director was asked to step down after serving as Director or Chair of the music program at the University of Texas at San Antonio for many years. Does this suggest that the current Director's management style is equally inappropriate for the School of Music at Texas State University-San Marcos as well?

#### Chemistry and Biochemistry

- The chair sometimes appears to be flustered and overwhelmed.

#### Management

- # The Department of Management acting chair is UTTERLY incompetent. He is condescending, divisive, judgmental, and hypocritical. He also blatantly violates federal law and the spirit of multicultural inclusion by routinely interjecting his Christian values into departmental functions, such as telling biblical jokes and offering to lead us in prayer. This has NO place in a public institution!
- # We are very fortunate to have Dr. Darling as our interim chair this year. He is an effective leader whose decisions are based on what is best for our department.
- # Dr. Darling had a difficult position to fill this year. He was asked to be Interim Chair for the department of management without the approval of management faculty. Two management faculty had volunteered to serve in this position, but neither were selected by the Dean. Either of these other two candidates would have had a working knowledge of faculty, students, classes, department/college activities, and university guidelines. Dr. Darling never made any attempt to do any of these things during his term as Interim Chair. He is more concerned with discussing his own accomplishments rather than listening to what others might have to say. The department office has continued to be a burden to faculty and students alike. The administrative assistant still does not know how to do her job after three years. She leaves the office and has student workers call her on her cell phone to come back if someone is looking for her. Instances of when she has lied to faculty/students, failed to perform her duties, and other incidents have been brought to Dr. Darling's attention and nothing has been done regarding these matters. Dr. Darling tolerates the administrative assistant lying: to faculty, to students, regarding work time, etc. Dr. Darling has done more to try to distant faculty than to bring the faculty together. In the department of management, we haven't evaluated non-tenured or lecturers in over two years. It doesn't appear that we will be doing this any time soon this year either.
- # In his year as chair, Dr. Darling has not made much effort to get to know faculty. His leadership style is based on what he thinks faculty should want, rather than finding out what they actually do want. His platform of "Caring, Compassion, and Trust" is not operationalized by democratic faculty governance.

He imposes his religious and personal ideologies on faculty, which is completely inappropriate in an academic environment.

- # This has been a reflection of the dean's poor judgment when making decisions that impact the faculty. The morale of the department has been on the floor and this person, the interim chair that is just a visiting professor wants to tell us how to run our own shop!!!! Many but many times he is out of the pot since he is going outside of policy and procedures because he does not know them and could care less to do a mess since he will be out soon. HOPEFULLY!!!!

He basically force faculty to do the faculty performance reports with a "SEAGULL MENTALITY" and decided to just use his judgment in the faculty evaluations instead of using the model in place. The existing model is numbers driven but brings more objectivity that just one person's judgment.

The Dean has been aware of the myopic management style of this person, but because the chair is her close friend then it is ok to mess up the department and its faculty.

We sincerely hope that the new chair can bring some insights, direction and goals to the department and that the situation of a wife (the chair) supervising her own husband (one of the new faculty members) will be manageable for all and will not add more corrupt behaviors.

#### Political Science

- € She is a great communicator.

#### Communication Disorders

- Lori Stiritz, current chair of SDIS Dept., has done an exceptional job as the chair of our dept. She is extremely competent and very organized. She communicates effectively with all faculty and staff, and she is available and open for discussions at any time. She is genuinely supportive and is very very effective in her role as dept. chair. Lorit Stiritz has been a wonderful and positive influence for our entire department!

#### Criminal Justice

- £ The chair simply does not believe in open communications with the faculty. He changes faculty course schedules without any explanation and the changes seems illogical. I simply do not have any faith in his judgment on many major issues including; course scheduling, personnel decisions and curriculum.
- £ Avoids faculty meetings, prefers to get consensus one office at a time.
  - Bends facts to suit himself
  - Disinterested in details of administration
  - Divides faculty
  - Withholds opportunities from some faculty
  - Makes poor decisions in appointment and retention of "Research Professor", also using under qualified GIA's and adjuncts to teach
  - Regards teaching function as relatively unimportant

#### Psychology

- € The chair should request changes in the current CUPA model for faculty salary equity. Particularly for the rank of lecturer, this model is invalid. Otherwise his compensation/merit decisions are fair.
- € He is a superb leader, administrator, colleague. I feel very fortunate to have him as Chair of the Department. He is an inspirational role model in the areas of teaching, research, and service. I have learned a lot from him, particularly in the area of teaching. He is energetic, positive, very hard-working and one of the best-organized, efficient and productive individuals I have ever known. Dr. Osborne has improved the Department more rapidly and more dramatically than I could have hoped or imagined three years ago. He has changed the morale and outlook of everyone in the Department for

the better. He supports, encourages, and rewards productive behavior. We are working together better now and there is a great spirit of enthusiasm and cooperation than there was in the past.

- € Dr. Osborne has an incredible work ethic, and works tirelessly on behalf of the department, the College of Liberal Arts, the Common Experience, the University.

#### Curriculum and Instruction

- ☀ Dr. Marianne Reese is an outstanding department chair! I'm glad that she's the instructional leader in the Department of Curriculum and Instruction.

Dr. Reese has created an environment that supports her faculty members in every way. She seeks input from professors when scheduling classes and when making key departmental decisions; she monitors the number of committees on which faculty members serve; and she uses appropriate university funds to support those who present research papers at national conferences. She's a strong advocate for us! I appreciate the way Dr. Reese inspires and encourages us to meet the vision for the department. Now, we professors are even more focused on conducting research and publishing. Dr. Reese has played a significant role in creating a collaborative culture that values, promotes and supports high-quality teaching and research.

In addition to fulfilling her assigned duties at the administrative level, Dr. Reese reaches out to the faculty and connects with them on a personal level. Her office door is always open, and she warmly welcomes students, staff and professors at any time of the day. In spite of the high stress of the job, her mood is ALWAYS friendly, considerate and kind.

Dr. Reese, thank you for the wonderful work you do!

- ☀ No planning.  
Rash decisions.  
No vision for department.  
Mostly reactive.  
Sloppy with policy (M&P/T&P) procedures & salary equity.  
Divisive.  
Not supportive of faculty, particularly jr. faculty.  
Uninvolved in major certification effort (NCATE).  
Little leadership.  
Autocratic/No shared governance.  
Resource distribution not matched to goals or any planning effort.  
Moody.  
Little commitment to departmental missions.  
Poor communication system.  
Little support for program development & maintenance.  
Needs to step down.

- ☀ Dr. Reese has demonstrated to be an effective leader in various ways. First, she positively guided our college during the renovation of the education building. As an effective listener, she understands people's needs and did her best to accommodate such a diverse group of faculty members, in finding office space and adequate classrooms. Next, she is flexible and responds with integrity and honesty to a variety of situations with an appropriate response. Students and faculty are a priority in the process. Finally, Dr. Reese is a caring and genuine individual. Through my own interaction with her and observations of her interactions with others, her demeanor reflects a warm and respectful relationship. She is always open to new ideas and respects our opinions as professionals.

- ☀ I have worked under 5 different chairpersons (Tx State and other Texas universities). Dr. Reese ranks as the very best administrator I have worked under in 20+ years in higher education. She is very supportive and encouraging. She listens to faculty members & solicits input with a focus on making Tx State not only the best but developing a program that produces the best teachers in the nation. Not only is she creative in problem-solving and developing ways to improve programs, but she is willing to go the extra mile in her own efforts and commitment to facilitate improvement. She has streamlined

processes for dealing with problems. Having worked at other institutions, she manages the largest dept. I have worked in, with less support staff, etc. and is doing the best job.

#### Family Consumer Sciences

£ Has a difficult task due to different personalities/fields of faculty. Manages to work fairly with a wide array of disciplines and even works with faculty who are not very productive. Fair.

#### Modern Languages

€ Bob Fischer is a wonderful department chair. He works very hard on behalf of the department in the university community. ON an individual level, his door readily is always open, to both faculty and students.

€ I support with great enthusiasm the chair of the Department of Modern Languages, Dr. Robert Fischer. I believe he deserves enormous credit for the exceptional (and often thankless) job he has been doing for the Department of Modern Languages during his tenure as chair. Each facet of his position commands his undivided attention at all times, whether it is students, faculty, or administration. He is thoroughly committed to the students, making himself accessible to them at all hours, greeting each one with respect, and treating each one as a rational adult. He is entirely devoted to the well being of the faculty, going to extremes to make sure that every member is treated fairly, and making such that each voice is taken seriously. He encourages our research projects to the fullest of his abilities. This is quite a balancing act for any department chair, and I believe that Dr. Fischer does it very well. As regards negotiating the requirements of administration and the needs of the department, Dr. Fischer works extremely hard to keep each faculty member's professional welfare foremost in mind, while at the same time enacting administrative agendas into department policy. I couldn't ask for a better chair and colleague than Dr. Bob Fischer.

#### Engineering and Technology

- Bob is to be commended for his past accomplishments, but after 22 plus years as chair, he has lost his enthusiasm for the position.  
The chair needs to seek meaningful senior faculty input on all major decisions regarding the department. For example, this did not happen in the case of the departmental name change, which had been approved by the Council of Academic Deans, before it was voted on by the faculty.  
The chair needs to give more attention to the Technology side of the Department, which has been neglected over the past several years.  
The chair has developed a good performance and merit distribution system, based on faculty's Personal Professional Objectives.
- Very opinionated and judgmental.  
Doesn't believe in nor does he encourage shared governance of department. Decides what's best for his kingdom then expects his servants to concur with his decisions.  
Scare and retaliation tactics keep faculty and staff in line.  
Some are fearful of filling out this survey after he made efforts to determine who had written what about him in last year's survey.  
The department needs new leadership.
- Our department chair is always concerned about improving instruction. I have always gotten the resources that I needed to teach a class. This has often been in the form of support from technical staff for labs.  
Our chair has been very helpful in working around personal issues such as dealing with illness in the family and attending seminars.  
I find our chair to be fair and reasonable. He often has unique solutions for problems because of his understanding of what resources are available and how those resources can best be used.

Our chair is one of the most competent and knowledgeable administrators that I have met.

- Dr. Robert Habingreither has little or no regard for the majors in his Department.
- I think it would be fair to say that our chairperson committed certain errors in judgment over the past 36 months that damaged faculty morale, and diminished faculty confidence in his administration. I think even he now acknowledges this reality.  
These misjudgments were, however, temporary, and because the chairperson has come to appreciate the seriousness of the problem, he is taking steps to restore faculty confidence and morale.  
Finally, I do not evaluate anyone, let alone the department chairperson, based solely upon recent events. Our chair has enjoyed a distinguished 28 year career at this institution, and quite unprecedented success. His vision, persistence, imagination, and sheer force of personality have carried this department to heights of accomplishment almost unimaginable two decades ago. I, personally, am unwilling, for the sake of recent turmoil, which is fleeting, to disregard the stunning achievement of the past 28 years. The department chairperson enjoys my continued strong support.
- Needs to implement shared governance.  
Needs to restore faculty morale  
Needs to create an atmosphere where diverse opinions may be voiced freely.

### Marketing

- # Dr. Debbie McAlister is a wonderful administrator in many ways. First of all, she understands the necessity of improving the faculty contribution to excellent research. She sends a great deal of information about important academic journals and how to improve faculty research skills. She has a stellar research record and has used her experience to encourage more and better research from the marketing department faculty.  
Secondly, she supports continued excellence of classroom teaching. Building on our strengths, Dr. McAlister makes sure that we have the necessary resources to attend events which bring prestige to the university, a key component in developing a national reputation in various areas of strength in the marketing department.  
She participates in and supports external projects which help the marketing department's excellent students groups, and she finds resources to help reach the university's broad goals.  
Finally, Dr. McAlister is very ethical and seeks to listen to faculty members' views, while considering the good of the entire department when making difficult decisions. No one can please everyone all the time, and change is difficult for personnel who have been with the university for a long time. Dr. McAlister does her best to keep the department moving forward, bringing a much needed fresh viewpoint about handling decision making. She is very smart with a wonderful employment record and the people skills to match. She takes her career very seriously and is an advocate of hard work and results.
- # Good administrative skills. Runs the department very efficiently. Very open to new and innovative approaches to teaching.  
Sets a good example for faculty. Lets faculty do their work and is "there for faculty", providing scarce resources to help them do their job.  
Weakness, if she has one, is in the area of faculty merit and equity.  
Very professional and has great organizational skills.

### Health, PE and Recreation

- ☼ While I believe Dr. Pankey has performed what he thinks is his best at his job, there are definite areas that need improvement. First, he doesn't always tell the truth. There have been several times where he has not told me the truth to my face, so I am sometimes left not knowing what to believe. It becomes a difficult predicament when I don't know whether what my boss says is true or not. I don't know if this is a management strategy he uses (very ineffective I might add), or if he has a problem. The lies are blatant. Second, he has a core group of professors that he favors which makes it difficult for the rest of us. In this department, one is either, "in" his group, or "out". The department is crazily divided into

these two parties and makes it an uncomfortable place to work. Furthermore, there have been two times of recent when he has talked badly about a faculty or staff member to another faculty or staff member in his “in” group. The information shared has absolutely NO business being shared with other faculty members either at school or during his time away from the institution. This is a slander lawsuit waiting to happen. He needs to be very careful about what information he shares with his “in” group of friends. Finally, during his faculty meetings he should treat the faculty with respect. We are not ball players, we are professors with PhD’s.

#### Physical Therapy

- Dr. Sanders has withdrawn from both her departmental responsibilities and from her faculty. She is not trusted nor respect. She has received adequate feedback from multiple faculty to either change or move on with her career elsewhere.

#### Communication Studies

- ◆ Steve is a caring and concerned chair who does a great job of promoting the department.

#### Social Work

- She is creative and hard-working.

#### Mathematics

- Dr. Wayment lost all creative ideas concerning being a chairman at least 10 years ago. The highest paid professors in the department have done the least research. Course load is determined by the good old boy technique. Some professors, with no research, have a three course load while others who are doing research have a four course load. Scheduling of classes is done by a hand picked committee with the command to choose the best teacher, regardless of course times and number of different courses. This creates a schedule with no large blocks of time to do research and some professors must teach four different classes.

#### Physics

- Chair’s actions creates the perception that certain faculty are favored. Chair does not aggressively explore “targets of opportunity” for minority faculty. Chair shows inadequate management skills in intra-departmental faculty disputes. This chair has been on the job for  $\geq 20$  years. Does this mean that no one else is capable of department leadership. If so, then we need an external chair with the research and teaching leadership for developing an appropriate department vision.

- 
- Science
  - Health
  - # Business
  - £ Applied Arts
  - € Liberal Arts
  - ☀ Education
  - ◆ Fine Arts