

Monday, April 6, 2020

Dr. Randy Pembrook
Rendleman Hall 3316
Southern Illinois University Edwardsville
Edwardsville, IL 62026

Dear Chancellor Pembrook,

As described in the Faculty Senate Bylaws, the Rules and Procedures Council has completed its summary report of your performance from Year 1 through Year 4.

Based on the Rules and Procedures Council's operating papers, we invite you to respond within ten working days either in writing or through discussion with the Chair of the Council. Once we receive your response, the report will be finalized and resubmitted to you. Upon final approval, the report will be shared with the faculty senate, the Chairperson of the University Planning and Budget Council (UPBC), as well as the Chair of the CHAPA Committee, and President Mahony.

The final report consists of the following:

1. Cover letter from the Rules and Procedures Council
2. Qualitative themes from each annual evaluation report
3. Quantitative indicators for Year 1 through Year 4
4. Summary of findings
5. Chancellor's response

Sincerely,

Wai Hsien Cheah	Chair, Applied Communication Studies	wcheah@siue.edu
Marcus Agustin	Mathematics & Statistics	magusti@siue.edu
James Hanlon	Geography	jhanlon@siue.edu
Andrzej Lozowski	Electrical & Computer Engineering	alozows@siue.edu
Vincent Rapini	Dental Medicine	vrapini@siue.edu
Jared Sheley	Pharmacy	jashely@siue.edu
Ezra Temko	Sociology	etemko@siue.edu

Qualitative Themes

The qualitative themes below were derived from the comments provided by faculty, which were based on the following two open-ended questions:

- 1) What do you see as the most pressing concern facing SIUE?
- 2) What do you see as the most pressing concern facing the Chancellor?

The faculty were also able to provide additional comments in a section labeled as “Other Comments” on the annual evaluation instrument as well.

Year 1

- Concerns about the budget, health insurance, program prioritization, and communication.

Year 2

- Concerns about budget, faculty retention and salary equity, relationship between SIUE and SIUC, between administration and faculty, and between union and administration, minority inclusiveness and equity in campus.
- The need to address direct communication to faculty and relationship with union.

Year 3

- Concerns about faculty salary, faculty morale, and faculty retention.
- Concern regarding the Chancellor’s negotiation with Faculty Union.
- Concern about equitable allocation of fiscal resources from the SIU System.
- Concern about the need to balance academic growth with academic rigor.

Year 4

- Concern about the budget allocation from the SIU system.
- Need to improve faculty morale and increase faculty salary.
- Need to mend the tarnished faculty-administration relationship.
- The Chancellor needs a stronger administrative team.

Quantitative Indicators

Table 1: General Performance

	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	
Response Rate	13%	15%	22%	27%	
Question					Mean
Academic leadership (allocating resources for faculty in a manner promoting excellence in teaching, research, and service).	4.05	3.50	3.65	3.48	3.67
Service leadership (fostering an institutional climate conducive to achievement of University goals and mission).	4.30	3.63	3.93	3.79	3.91
Communication (interacting on regular and open basis with the University community on all issues of interest).	4.08	3.73	3.99	3.88	3.92
Decision making (identifying, understanding, and addressing issues of significance to the University).	4.02	3.54	3.79	3.66	3.75
Keeps abreast of changes in education and the need for new programs in the University.	4.30	3.68	3.97	3.78	3.93
Effectively communicates prioritized goals for the University.	4.09	3.55	3.95	3.90	3.87
Demonstrates a commitment to collegial governance.	4.25	3.53	3.96	3.80	3.89
Inspires confidence in approach to decision-making.	4.12	3.42	3.85	3.65	3.76
Fosters positive morale by establishing a working climate conducive to the achievement of faculty goals.	4.09	3.35	3.70	3.45	3.65
Optimally manages fiscal resources.	4.32	3.40	3.73	3.42	3.72

Table 2: Specific Performance

Question	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Mean
Effectively promotes minority participation in the University community.	4.09	3.70	3.93	3.78	3.88
Provides substantive community service and leadership.	4.38	3.80	4.15	4.06	4.10
Shows an understanding of the mission and academic goals of departments.	4.12	3.53	3.80	3.49	3.74
Willing to make and follow through on commitments in order to provide sufficient support to departments.	4.25	3.37	3.77	3.41	3.70
The strategic planning in serving the development and mission of the University.	4.21	3.44	4.01	3.75	3.85
The vision, integrity, and the leadership skills in engaging the campus community in maintaining the highest standards of quality and academic excellence.	4.29	3.61	3.97	3.74	3.90
Judgment in selecting effective administrators in advancing the goals of the University.	4.03	3.36	3.78	3.25	3.61
Actions in fostering open dialogue and consensus building with students, faculty, and staff on campus.	4.24	3.70	4.03	3.83	3.95
Actions in fostering open dialogue and consensus building with external constituencies such as alumni, state and federal officials and agencies, the media, and community leaders.	4.34	3.63	4.20	3.84	4.00
Actions in strengthening relationships and partnership between the University and state, national and international organizations, both public and private.	4.37	3.52	4.11	3.84	3.96

Table 3: Additional Job Specific Performance Issues

Question	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Mean
Ability in successfully raising funds from both public and private sources.	3.90	2.91	3.67	3.33	3.45
Competence in contemporary administrative and organizational concepts and practices.	4.34	3.56	3.79	3.67	3.84
Competence in educational planning and evaluation procedures.	4.22	3.43	3.87	3.67	3.80
Competence in promoting the utilization of new technologies to deliver educational services.	4.13	3.42	3.77	3.68	3.75

Summary of Findings

The summarized report below is based on survey responses (on 24 closed-ended items/measures) and open-ended comments provided by the faculty. This report addresses data from four main areas including academic leadership, service leadership, communication, and decision making. The ranking system for the closed-ended items/measures was based on a 1.0-5.0 scale with “1” being poor, “2” being fair, “3” being neutral, “4” being good, and “5” being excellent.

Based on the quantitative indicators in Year 1 (see Tables 1-3), the Chancellor was rated positively by the faculty. With the exception of one item/measure (e.g., “*Ability in successfully raising funds from both public and private sources.*”), the rest of the items/measures all had an average score of 4.0 or higher. The range of average scores for Year 1 was 3.90-4.38. However, in Year 2, the Chancellor did not fare as well with his performance. All 24 closed-ended items/measures had a reduction in the average score. The item with the largest drop (0.99 point) in average score (from 3.90 in Year 1 to 2.91 in Year 2) was for the item, “*Ability in successfully raising funds from both public and private sources.*” The range of average scores for Year 2 was 2.91-3.80.

Although the Chancellor did run into some challenges with his performance in Year 2, he managed to rebound by Year 3. He had an increase in average scores for all the quantitative indicators. The range of average scores for Year 3 was 3.65-4.20. As for Year 4, the “reduction-in-scores” pattern seen in Year 2 was again observed. Fortunately, the “reduction-in-scores” for all quantitative indicators in Year 4 were less severe compared to Year 2 overall. The item with the largest drop (0.53 point) in average score (from 3.78 in Year 3 to 3.25 in Year 4) was for the item, “*Judgment in selecting effective administrators in advancing the goals of the University.*” The range of average scores for Year 4 was 3.25-4.06.

The qualitative comments for Years 1 and 2 indicated that the Chancellor struggled with his communicative attempts with faculty, staff, and students. Fortunately, the Chancellor took action by conducting multiple Q & A sessions to understand the perspectives and needs of the various constituencies on campus, and subsequently, the communication problems identified in Years 1 and 2 no longer appeared to be an issue of concern in both Years 3 and 4. The Chancellor's greatest strengths include his community service and leadership, as well as his ability to communicate with others. These attributes of the Chancellor were clearly reflected in the four highest quantitative indicators (highlighted in yellow in Table 2).

Although the faculty had commended the Chancellor for his dedication and commitment in pursuing the betterment of the University in times of difficulty in all four reviews, the faculty believed that there are still some challenges and obstacles that must be overcome by the Chancellor. Low faculty morale, the need to balance academic growth and academic rigor guided by the most appropriate and effective administrative team, as well as the budget allocation issue within the SIU system continue to be of concern among the faculty. These concerns of the faculty were reflected in the four lowest quantitative indicators (highlighted in red in Tables 1-3).

Chancellor's Response

Thank you for forwarding the aggregated, four-year Faculty Senate survey results. I appreciate all the work that has gone into creating the document and the summary. I have the following thoughts as it pertains to the information:

1. I was pleased at the areas that came through strongly. I have tried to place a major emphasis on community connections and with communicating with faculty, staff, and students through e-mails, lunches, campus Q&As and specific interactions with executive leadership groups, constituency heads, etc. I hope that faculty feel they have avenues to discuss current issues. Please feel free to continue to encourage faculty to invite me anywhere and anytime they think it would be beneficial.
2. Resources are a challenge. A lack of resources creates issues relating to morale, raises, ongoing operations, equity and more. The current COVID 19 environment will probably introduce additional variables into a highly complex situation. I think it would be a good idea to meet with Faculty Senate leadership (and maybe the body as a whole) after the Stay at Home order ends to discuss what is on the horizon. It is unclear at this time how refunds will correlate with emergency funding at the State and Federal levels. Hopefully, in a few weeks we will have a clearer picture so that we can plan together for the future. This might even become a model for an annual update to Senate about specific budget matters.
3. Regarding the comments about my SIUE administrative team, again, I would like to meet with the Faculty Senate leadership to develop a better idea of the specific concerns that exist so that they can be addressed. Maybe that could be a separate meeting in May.
4. Finally, in looking at the individual measures over four years, it is remarkable how they vary consistently across the time period: The scores were largely over a mean of 4 in year one, down in year two, a recovery in year three, and down somewhat in year 4. I wondered how the issues existing in the world served as causal factors or correlational elements over this period of time. It has certainly been an interesting four years with major issues such as the lack of a state budget, the negotiation of the first faculty association contract, the allocation discussion within the System and now COVID 19. I think it certainly can be said that we live in "interesting times".