Headliners
Faculty Assembly and Senate Chairman Dr. Byron E. Price Resigns

On Thursday, May 3, 2012, at the Faculty Senate's ultimate 2011-2012 meeting of the body, Chairman Dr. Byron E. Price announced his resignation from the Chairmanship and from his Associate Professorship of the Business School at Medgar Evers College, City University of New York. Chairman Price leaves behind a legacy of activism and dynamic leadership to be emulated by all Texas Southern University Senators and faculty at large.

As directed by the 2002 Faculty Manual, Vice-Chairman Dr. Rasoul Saneifard will step forward immediately to fill the post of Chair, so that the Faculty Senate and Assembly may transition smoothly to a new administration and continue to pursue the established agenda. Elections will be held to fill the post of Vice-Chair at the first 2012-2013 meeting of the Faculty Assembly.

Chairman Price reminds the Faculty Assembly of its commitment to the completion of these outstanding priority goals:

- To complete and ratify the new Faculty Manual;
- To develop an evaluative assessment of Texas Southern University’s Board of Regents;
- To establish effective and constant communication between the Fac-

(Continued on page 4)
Dear Colleagues,

As I transition from my current position as Faculty Senate Chair to my new professional endeavor out-of-state, I wanted to pause to say thank you for allowing me to serve as your Chair. It was a privilege to work with the brilliant faculty members whom you elected as Senators from your respective schools. I also want to thank each of you who would stop me across campus to say, “Thank you for representing our interests,” and those who passed on sage advice to me about how best to engage the leadership. Your words were very uplifting and always timely. As I stated when I campaigned last year, it was important for us to embrace the African Proverb: “When Spider Webs Unite, They Can Tie Up A Lion.” If we reflect on this African Proverb, I think the things we accomplished this past academic year can be attributed to our unity and our willingness to subjugate our individual interests to achieve the collective interest.

One concern that has
From the Faculty Senate: Committee Reports

Faculty Manifesto Ad Hoc Committee Report

By Senator Lila Ghemri, Ph.D., Committee Chair

The Faculty Manifesto Ad-hoc Committee was set up during the December Faculty Senate Meeting. Chairman Price asked Senator Lila Ghemri to chair the committee, and Senators Ford, Opolot and Sherif volunteered to be members. The idea was to create a forum in which faculty could express their concerns, frustrations and wishes. Senator Song created a Google document whose link was widely publicized among faculty, soliciting their input.

https://docs.google.com/document/d/1YtKVBIH47geqgZdplDKjtke9dUeFsdT5INurYCjYU/edit

The committee prepared a preliminary report that was presented to the Faculty Assembly by its Chair, Senator Ghemri, during the Spring 2012 Faculty Opening meeting. Chairman Price encouraged faculty involvement and participation. The committee met three times during the semester to discuss findings and organize the document. A draft was sent to Chairman Price on April 4th, which he shared with all Senators.

Ad Hoc Faculty Performance and Teaching Evaluations Committee Report

by Alexis Brooks de Vita, Ph.D., Committee Chair

The Ad Hoc Faculty Performance and Teaching Evaluation Instruments Committee has completed and ratified its third and final version of the revised teaching evaluation instrument, to be disseminated electronically university-wide, beginning in the Fall semester of 2012. This final draft of the recommended teaching evaluation instrument represents a package of presentation that is the result of months of careful deliberation. One aspect of that deliberation is the Committee’s recommendation that the new instrument be disseminated electronically, university-wide, so that students may evaluate each class, every semester, beginning in the fall semester of 2012.

PROPOSED TEACHING EVALUATION INSTRUMENT – THIRD DRAFT 04/09/2012

Rating System: 5 – Strongly Agree, 4 – Agree, 3 – Neutral, 2 – Disagree, 1 – Strongly Disagree

(Continued on page 6)

(On the Table, continued from page 1)

Responders were to mark Poor, Fair, Good, Very Good, Excellent, or No Sufficient Information Provided, in answer to each question or prompt.

![Graph](https://via.placeholder.com/150)

*Graph courtesy of SurveyMonkey

Administration’s Relationship with Employees: Poor

The President’s greatest percentage of votes (30.2%) marked his Availability to TSU employees as Poor; Fair received a 20.1% vote, and no other rating came within 10% of votes from the 199 responders; Good received 18.6%, Excellent 11.6% and Very Good 7.5% of votes. In Understanding faculty concerns, 33.8% of 198 responders rated his performance as Poor; no other rating came within almost half this percentage of votes (the closest being Good at 17.7% and Fair at 17.2%); Very Good received 10.6% and Excellent 9.1%. Effective training, mentoring and expectations received a 31.3% Poor rating, with Fair receiving the next numerous (19.2%) percentage of 198 votes in this category, followed by Good at 16.2%, Very Good at 11.1% and Excellent at 8.1%. Realistic expectations was rated Poor at 32.3% of 198 votes, with Fair receiving 23.7% of the 198 votes in this category; Very Good received 11.1% and Excellent 7.6%.

(Continued on page 9)
ulty Assembly and its Senate with the establishment of regular College and School Town Hall meetings.

In keeping with his legacy of unprecedented activism, Chairman Price exhorts the Faculty Assembly through its Senate to persevere, and to hold itself accountable for effecting change in the government of this University.

We remain grateful for this opportunity to have worked with Chairman Price and to have progressed this far, and we join together to wish Chairman Price continued success as Dean of the Business School at Medgar Evers College of the City University of New York.

- Alexis Brooks de Vita, Editor

(Headliners, Continued from page 1)

majority vote, at TSU. Perhaps those in positions of sufficient authority to voice these issues without repercussions are unaware of them; maybe those who are aware of them are afraid of offending colleagues and alienating a potentially vital supportive team. However, if we as a university community cannot discuss the unvoiced decisions that are compromising our ability to thrive in the twenty-first century, we risk earning a few more condemnatory external reviews such as the one received this year by TSU’s English Department. A few more such reviews will soon cause TSU to fold.

I, too, have no wish to alienate and cannot know who might feel offended by the concerns raised in this end-of-the-year editorial. However, I share the responsibility of the TSU community to address its taboo subjects, in the hope that a thriving university environment may soon result.

Post-tenure review is coming; how will it be instituted? TSU boasts many grandfathered faculty members whose credentials and research accomplishments would make them highly prized faculty members at any university or college of their choice. They are to be commended for pursuing the excellence that all of us hope to make synonymous with the name of TSU. However, among the issues one hesitates to raise at TSU is this: what will be done to address those grandfathered faculty members who have never been expected to meet the tenure standards demanded of faculty members who apply for tenure?

Uniformity within departments and schools regarding tenure and merit raise standards would be beneficial to TSU’s efforts to attract the competitive students it needs to survive. With the advent of TSU’s new post-tenure review process, may we hope that what seems to be, in some departments and colleges, an apparent double standard skewing performance expectations between grandfathered and tenure-earned faculty will be eradicated?

It seems to be increasingly widely agreed at TSU that this university is committed to attracting highly prepared students. Such students come to the university already motivated and disciplined to succeed (which translates as “graduate in three to six years”). These students have already been taught that they must submit themselves to the rigors of—if not enjoy—the abstract intelligence-enhancing as well as concrete financial advantages of a university degree.

This year-end editorial asks a question that I think needs to be asked more often than I hear being done, in some departments at TSU. Are we as faculty—and is TSU’s administrative leadership, as the distributor of funds and enforcer of regulations—prepared to do what is necessary to offer what a more competitive student body expects and has the right to demand of its university experience?

Faculty (inter)nationally known for its research and creative productivity.

Faculty skilled in innovative methods of effective teaching.

Scholarly and financial support of independently-motivated student research.

The university’s ability, commitment and willingness to mentor student research.

Sufficient international recognition of TSU’s faculty expertise to lend weight to faculty recommendations of TSU students applying to graduate and professional schools and to the professional workforce.

When a community college or high school counselor pulls up offer letters from colleges

(Continued on page 5)
(Cont’d from page 4)

and universities courting their most promising students, will TSU’s letter be one of the first to have arrived? Will TSU’s administration have arranged to ensure that students throughout the United States earning the ACT/SAT scores and grade point averages that TSU seeks will automatically receive invitations to apply to TSU? This is a standard student population-building practice; has TSU’s administration adopted it? Let us all hope that the answer to this question has become yes.

When counselors search TSU’s department or college websites to research the backgrounds of faculty teaching in their competitive students’ interest areas, will they find creative or research-producing faculty with terminal degrees? Students who might choose from among several colleges or universities need to see that they will benefit from an objectively discernible academic and reputational advantage, if they choose to commit to TSU.

What are the credentials and productions or publications of faculty teaching upper division and graduate courses, in each department at TSU? Preferential relationships and personal friendships between individual faculty members, their department chairs, and even their deans may place professors without terminal degrees or established productive or research reputations in teaching positions that dissuade counselors and parents from sending promising students to TSU.

TSU’s faculty and administrators must habitually skim the Internet for other universities’ department and college faculty pages. We must discipline ourselves to continually take an objective look at the terminal degrees, publications and creative productions of TSU’s competition. In today’s job market, people who have earned terminal degrees from public and private Ivy League universities are being hired at a pittance or going begging for tenure-track positions. Has TSU taken advantage of this hiring opportunity to staff its departments with productive, cutting-edge terminal-degree graduates? Where would you send your brightest students or your own college-age child, given the departmental and college websites that you see featuring their faculty members’ accomplishments?

How do the student-attracting faculty members at TSU’s departmental and college websites, as a body, measure up against their competition?

What are the teaching skills of TSU’s faculty? Perhaps those who may not have terminal degrees or internationally renowned creative or research reputations in their fields nevertheless excite, challenge, and impart insights that their students could not have gleaned without them. Beginning in the Fall semester of 2012, electronic—and therefore tamper-resistant and objective—teaching evaluations will provide proof of this added value of some of TSU’s longstanding as well as new faculty. Such challenging, communicative and effective professors are invaluable for their ability to inspire and retain through graduation those highly motivated students that TSU seeks and needs.

Is TSU’s administration ready to commit the financial resources necessary to further faculty research that helps attract highly desirable students? (Cont’d on page 8)
PROPOSED TEACHING EVALUATION INSTRUMENT – THIRD and FINAL DRAFT 04/09/2012

Rating System:  5 – Strongly Agree, 4 – Agree, 3 – Neutral, 2 – Disagree, 1 – Strongly Disagree

OPT-OUT QUESTION: In my opinion, this professor’s overall teaching is effective.

SECTION ONE: PROFESSOR’S PREPAREDNESS
1) Seems well-informed about the subject matter of the class.
2) Seems well-organized and well-prepared for the class.
3) Seems enthusiastic about the subject matter and the class, overall.
4) Uses creative teaching approaches that may include collaborative learning, guest speakers, student presentations, or field trips.
5) Announces and keeps scheduled office hours.

SECTION TWO: STUDENT RELATIONS
1) Communicates frequently, effectively and well.
2) Values students and treats them professionally.
3) Encourages, supports and invites students to learn.
4) Provides feedback on tests, essays, homework, and class concerns in a timely manner.
5) Tests and assignments represent learning objectives and material presented to the class.

SECTION THREE: EFFECTIVENESS OF COMMUNICATION
1) Presents subject matter clearly and distinctly.
2) Provided a syllabus at the beginning of the semester and clearly announced changes.
3) Class instruction was directly related to learning objectives.
4) Encourages student participation (Continued on page 7)

Because of the high percentage rate of African American female college/university enrollment in Texas, the African American population overall exceeds the 5.7% college/university enrollment goal in this state.

However, the African American graduation rate does not meet the 57% graduation rate goal.

African American women graduate at 41.7% in Texas.

African American men graduate at 29.2% in Texas.

Commissioner Parades seems to suggest at this point that the severe problem of low African American male college/university enrollment is somehow aggravated by the high rate of African American female enrollment. If this is what Commissioner Parades intended to suggest, then his Daniel Patrick Moynihan-type reading of the threat to African American male enrollment in and graduation from colleges and universities in Texas is troubling. However, Commissioner Parades was not asked for clarification of this point; therefore, I cannot verify that he intended to present African American female enrollment in Texas institutions of higher learning as a threat to the rate of African American male enrollment in these institutions. He did state that African American men “look around and see no one who looks like them” as a problem with enrollment.

Commissioner Parades listed suggestions for “Reinventing Higher Education,” including:

Create a “lean culture”: Commissioner Parades explained that most colleges/universities can decrease costs 15-30% according to the “Winning by Degrees” study of McKinsey, by cutting down student aid, increasing faculty workload, and instituting outcome-based funding (from the state, I assume). Commissioner Parades proposed not only an increase in faculty teaching loads, but mentioned that faculty are teaching “whatever they want to teach” and that conforming courses statewide will increase student graduation rates. Commissioner Parades also suggested that the minimum full-time student course load should be increased to 30 credit hours per year, necessitating summer coursework. Increasing minimum fulltime student course loads would be tied to decreasing student financial aid.

Continuous improvement: Commissioner Parades suggested we “look at” admissions standards; he encouraged increasing those standards to increase the percentage enrollment of students already familiar with how to achieve academic success and praised President Rudley’s initiation of higher admissions standards.
Commissioner Parades mentioned the state-wide 2 + 2 system; I am unfamiliar with the term in this context and cannot comment further.

Restructure financial aid for students: Commissioner Parades reiterated his suggestion that student financial aid be decreased.

Reinvent developmental education: Commissioner Parades suggested that undergraduate education must be emphasized before attention is turned to graduate programs; Commissioner Parades also pointed out that TSU must begin to work with area K-12 schools, to help teach sciences and mathematics before students arrive at college, to rebuild TSU’s lost Physics major.

Strengthen 2-year colleges: Commissioner Parades pointed out that two-year college graduates have already learned necessary college/university success skills and should be encouraged to enroll at TSU, a suggestion that has been made repeatedly on TSU’s University-level committees, during the past few years.

Implement outcome-based funding: Commissioner Parades repeated this suggestion.

Review admissions standards: Commissioner Parades repeated his suggestion that students with high National Test scores and grades will proceed quickly toward graduation.

Redefine excellence: Commissioner Parades suggested that higher education must be aligned with the acquisition of jobs. Commissioner Parades stated that colleges and universities must teach students to “think critically, have values, and work in groups,” as these are skills employers seek in new hires.

(Commissioner Parades did not suggest in which courses critical thinking, “values,” and teamwork should be taught; hopefully, in all appropriate courses, it must be assumed. However, TSU does not offer degrees in Philosophy, Theology, Logic, or Peace Studies. Would these majors be recognized as employment-preparatory, if such majors were proposed to the Board of Regents?) Commissioner Parades pointed out that, in his opinion as a former member of the Board of Regents of the University of California, Los Angeles for thirty years, there is “not much bloat” in Texas university administration. - Dr. Alexis Brooks de Vita, Editor, 4/30/2012

Specifically, he suggests TSU become “lean.”

(From the Faculty Senate, continued from page 6)

questions and discussion, as class size allows.

5) Grading practices were clear, consistently followed and fair.

SECTION FOUR: CLASS MANAGEMENT

1) Emphasizes important points in class lecture, reports or discussions.

2) Taught materials as outlined on the syllabus and helped students meet the learning objectives of the course.

3) Meets each class as scheduled and on time and makes provisions for any classes not held.

4) Uses available technology to support instruction.

5) Asks examination and discussion questions that are challenging and related to the subject matter.

Suggestions that might improve the class:

Additional Comments:
competitive students? Highly motivated and prepared-for-success students are not going to choose to come to TSU unless their counselors and parents can see that TSU's faculty can expose those leaders of tomorrow to whatever it is they want and need to learn.

What publications or productions prove that TSU's faculty has a nationally or internationally recognized reputation in sought-after academic fields? If too few, why? Is the problem a lack of sabbatical time devoted to the arduous tasks of self-directed research, writing, creative productivity, and/or publishing? Or does the fault lie in a lack of administrative generosity and discipline, to simultaneously support the creative and research efforts of faculty while enforcing the requirement of scholarly publications or creative productivity, for continued tenure? Please forgive my candor. However, I have not heard "publish or perish" regarding the faculty at TSU unless it is being used as a reason to dismiss overworked young tenure-track faculty—not grandfathered faculty. Conversely, I am sorry to have to admit that a semester has not passed when I can say I was not exposed to virulent complaints questioning the motivations, preparedness, or even the capacity of TSU's student body. Highly motivated, high-scoring students expect and must be taught by research-producing or creative faculty. What travel to present research at conferences distinguishes TSU's faculty as being poised to present the newest developments in scholarly fields? If none, why not?

What hinders TSU's faculty from travel-based productivity: a lack of readily accessible university funds, set aside specifically to support travel to present research and creative productions, there to make academic connections and meet editors of scholarly journals and publishing houses? Travel to present research and creativity is the basis of those invaluable one-on-one sessions that lead to scholarly publications and invitations to present or exhibit creative productions. Does TSU's administration not only make this commitment but stick to it, leaving such monies reserved so that research-presenting and productive professors may rely upon access to them?

If TSU's faculty is not sufficiently financially supported to travel to present research, how can research or creative productivity be expected of TSU's faculty?

If significant time must be taken away from teaching and service to committees at every level of the university, simply to apply for faculty development funds—complicated forms that require multiple signatures from busy or under-published administrators—then how readily can faculty benefit from TSU's faculty development funds to help them establish or build (inter)national scholarly and artistic reputations? Is the application process for such funding straightforward, efficient, needing few or no extraneous signatures from chairs or deans who may have little or no understanding of what the conference or presentation is about?

Are faculty salaries equitable enough to guarantee faculty not only enough money to repay the loans necessary to earn terminal degrees, but simultaneously to travel to present research and build a

(Cont'd on page 9)
The Provost’s greatest percentage of votes in this category judged his Availability to TSU Employees as Poor at 23.2%, closely followed by Fair at 20.7% and Good at 20.2%; Excellent was close at 15.7%, and Very Good followed at 11.1% of 198 votes. In Understanding faculty concerns, the Provost was voted Poor at 27.3% and Fair at a close 23.2% of 198 votes, followed by Good at 15.7%, Very Good at 13.1%, and Excellent at 11.1%. In Effective training, mentoring and expectations, the Provost was voted Poor at 27.3%, followed by Fair at 22.2% and Good at 16.2%; Excellent and No Sufficient Information received 11.6% of 198 votes, and Very Good received 11.1%. For Realistic Expectations, the Provost was voted Poor at 31.0%, Fair at 23.4%, Good at 17.8%, and Very Good at 14.7%; Excellent and No Sufficient Information were both negligible at 6.6% of 197 votes.

The Associate Provost’s Availability to TSU employees was voted Poor at 21.2%, closely followed by Good at 19.2% and Fair at 18.2%; Excellent received 13.6% of 198 votes and Very Good 10.6%. Her Understanding faculty concerns vote was Poor at 26.8%, closely followed by Fair at 19.3%; Good received 14.7% of 197 votes, Very Good 11.7%, and Excellent 11.2% of 197 votes. In Effective training, mentoring and expectations, she received 28.4% of votes in the Poor rating, 21.8% as Fair, 15.2% as Good, 9.6% as Very Good, and 8.6% as Excellent. In Realistic expectations, she was voted Poor at 29.2%, Fair at 22.1%, and Good at 19.0%; Very Good received 11.8% and Excellent 4.1% of 195 votes.

The Provost’s rating in Responds to employees’ mistakes is 28.5% Poor, closely followed by Fair at 22.0% and Good at 12.5%; Excellent at 12.5% Good, 7.0% Excellent, and 4.5% Very Good; nearly one fourth (23.6%) chose No sufficient information. His Feedback about work rating was 38.6% Poor, over twice as great a percentage of the 197 votes as the next highest rating, which was 16.8% Fair, then 11.7% Good, 7.6% excellent, and 7.1% Very Good. Regarding Helpful feedback, the President received 37.0% of 192 votes as Poor, followed distantly by 15.1% Fair, 12.5% Good, 8.9% Very Good, and 8.3% Excellent. In Listens to employees’ opinions, the President received what was perhaps his most disturbing vote: nearly half his 190 votes were rated Poor (44.7%); distantly, at nearly one third that percentage, he received 16.3% of votes as Good, then 14.7% as Fair, 6.8% as Excellent, and 5.3% Very Good.

The Provost’s rating in Responds to employees’ mistakes is 28.5% Poor, closely followed by Fair at 22.0% Fair, then 12.5% Good, 8.0% Very Good, and 7.0% of 200 votes as Excellent; 22.0% of responders in this category chose No Sufficient Information. His Feedback about work rating is 32.7% Poor, 20.9% Fair, 13.8% Good, 11.7% excellent, and 5.1% Very Good out of 196 votes. In Helpful feedback, the Provost received 30.9% of 191 votes as Poor, 19.9% as Fair, 12.6% as Good, 11.5% as Very Good, and 8.4% as Excellent out of 191 votes. In Listens to employees’ opinions, the Pro-
What will the student described above be enabled to do at TSU with the first promising fruits of her own intense interest? Will s/he be challenged by the rigors of cutting-edge coursework? Will her/his first fruits of independent research or creativity be honed and pushed into the academic spotlight by the demands of faculty who have not spared themselves the hard work of productivity and who, therefore, do not spare their brightest students?

Will the TSU student’s first experimental productions be polished to professionalism with the support of professors who know firsthand what it takes to achieve a showing, a juried article, a published book?

Will the TSU student be funded by her or his department, college or school to travel to present her or his research at an appropriately national or international venue? This is how students assure themselves of the resumes and reputations that gain entry, scholarships and internships to graduate schools and professional venues.

Or will the gifted TSU student spend months going hat in hand from office to department to administrator, begging for plane fare, a hotel room reservation, or a sponsoring faculty member that may never be forthcoming, at TSU?

TSU’s administration and faculty seem to be coming into accord on the goal of attracting highly motivated, high-scoring, and high grade point-averaging students, to raise TSU’s graduation rates. If faculty and administration at TSU are indeed sincere about attracting a greater percentage of these prepared, competitive, self-motivated students and retaining them at TSU through the completion of their degrees, then:

1) the credentials, conference opportunities, and research support that such students AND THEIR FACULTY need and deserve must become the highest priority among TSU’s administrative decision-makers.

2) It should be obvious that the allocation of funds necessary to carry out research and creative productions, and the funds necessary to travel to present such work and meet the publishers who might broadcast it, must become a matter of the first order for TSU’s present administration.

3) The reputation-damaging practice of dismissing newer faculty who bring terminal degrees, their first juried publications, and perhaps their popularity with students to an older faculty population at TSU, while granting raises to grandfathered faculty members even when they may not offer as many student-attracting assets, is an administrative double standard that we as faculty may have to begin to redress, if we mean for TSU to survive.

-The Editor

The Associate Provost’s rating in Responds to employees’ mistakes is 25.4% Poor, 18.8% Fair, 137% Good, 6.6% Excellent, and 5.6% Very Good, with over one fourth of 197 responders (28.8%) choosing No sufficient information. Her Feedback about work rating is 29.3% Poor, followed by 17.2% Fair, 14.1% Good, 10.1% Excellent, and 5.6% Very Good, with 23.7% of 198 responders choosing No sufficient information. Her rating is 29.7% Poor in Helpful feedback, with 18.8% voting Fair, 14.6% voting Good, 8.3% voting Very Good, 7.8% voting Excellent, but 20.8% of 192 responders voting No sufficient information. In Listens to employees’ opinions, one third of 190 votes (33.2%) rates the Associate Provost as Poor, 16.3% as Fair, 14.7% Good, 8.9% Very Good, 7.9% excellent, and 18.9% No sufficient information.

Administration’s Management and Assessment of Advisement: Poor, Fair, Good, and Insufficient Information Provided

The President scores 29.9% Poor on Recruitment, retention and graduation, with 21.9% of 187 votes rating his performance as Good, 20.9% Fair, 10.7% Very Good, and 10.2% Excellent; only 6.4% chose No sufficient information. For the first time in this set of ratings, assessing Faculty recognition, a majority of votes selects Fair for the President, with support from 21.7% of 184 responders; 21.2% fall back on Poor, 20.7% Good, 15.8% Very Good, 13.6% Excellent, and only 7.1% claim No sufficient information. Again, in Faculty development, a slim majority of the 182 responders casts 25.3% of their votes for Fair; 23.1% choose Poor, 19.8% Good, and nearly ten percent fewer at 9.9% choose Excellent and 9.3% Very Good, while 12.6% claim No sufficient information.

Fostering relationships among faculty, students, staff, university supporters, over one third of 188 responders (36.2%) again choose Poor, while 20.7% opt for Fair, 16.5% Good, 11.7% Excellent, 8.0% Very Good, and only 6.9% claim No sufficient information. In Leadership/assessment in community, 22.3% of 188 responders rate the President’s performance as Poor, 20.2% as Fair, 14.9% leap to Excellent, and 14.4% choose Good and Very Good, with 13.8% claiming No sufficient information.

(Continued on page 11)
The Provost’s Recruitment, retention and graduation rating is also Poor by 25.7% of 191 votes, closely followed by 25.1% Fair, 22.5% Good, 11.5% Very Good, and 7.9% Excellent, with only 7.3% claiming No sufficient information. However, the majority vote leaps to Good for the first time in this survey when the Provost is assessed for Faculty recognition with the support of 24.2% of 186 responders, followed by 22.0% Fair, 16.7% Poor, 16.1% Very Good, and 14.0% Excellent, with only 7.0% claiming No sufficient information. The majority vote for the Provost in Faculty development is Fair with the support of 25.9% of 185 responders, followed by 21.1% Good, only plummeting to 20.0% Poor as the third most frequent choice, followed by 11.9% Excellent and 10.3% Very Good, only slightly less than the 10.8% who claimed No sufficient information. In Fostering relationships, his rating drops to Poor at 32.8% of 186 votes, followed by 20.4% Fair, 17.7% Good, 12.4% Excellent, and 8.1% Very Good, only slightly exceeded by the 8.6% who claim No sufficient information. In the category of Leadership/assessment in community, the Provost is rated 23.2% Fair and Poor, equally, followed by 20.5% of 190 respondents voting No sufficient information, 13.2% Good, and 10.0% equally voting Very Good and Excellent.

The Associate Provost rates Poor in Recruitment, retention and graduation by 27.5% of 189 votes, followed by Fair at 20.6%, Good at 18.0%, Very Good at 10.6%, and Excellent at 5.8%, but 17.5% claim No sufficient information. Her Faculty recognition rating is Fair at 23.8% of 185 votes, followed by 21.1% Good, 17.8% Very Good, and not until fourth place Poor by 13.5%, with 11.4% voting Excellent, and only 12.4% claiming No sufficient information. Her Faculty development vote is in the majority a troubling 23.9% of 184 voters claiming No sufficient information, followed by 22.8% voting Fair, 20.7% voting Good, 16.3% voting Poor, 8.7% voting excellent, and 7.6% voting Very Good. In Fostering relationships, her rating drops to Poor again by 26.6% of 184 votes, closely followed by 24.5% Fair, 15.2% Good, 8.7% Excellent, and 7.1% Very Good, though 17.9% claim No sufficient information. Again with Leadership/assessment in community, the majority vote is 27.6% of 185 for No sufficient information, followed by 23.8% Poor, 19.5% Fair, 13.0% Good, 9.2% Very Good, and 7.0% Excellent.

Overall Effectiveness: Fair

The President: 25.9% rated his performance as Fair
The Provost: 27.8% rated his performance as Fair
The Associate Provost: 28.3% rated her performance as Fair

Enthusiasm for Continuance/Reappointment of Administrators: Poor

The President: 31.5% of responders rated their enthusiasm as Poor
The Provost: 29.4% of responders rated their enthusiasm as Poor
The Associate Provost: 30.3% of responders rated their enthusiasm as Poor

Strengths of the Administrators

The President: “visionary,” “fiscal management,” “campus beautification,” relations with community and students, “goal-oriented/decisive/diligent”

The Provost: “effective and knowledgeable leadership/follows the President’s leadership,” “work ethic/works hard,” “faculty relations,” “concerned about academics/understands academics/academic excellence/new academic programs,”
“amiable/visible/approachable,” “commitment to research,” “persistence”

**The Associate Provost:** “multitasking/organized,” “communication,” “collaborative,” “collegial/people-oriented/personable,” “smart/intelligent,” “listens,” “responsive/responsible,” “professional,” “concerned about/available to faculty,” “manages chairs and deans,” “committed to research”

### Weaknesses of the Administrators

**The President:** “micro-management,” “lack of concern for faculty development/faculty mentoring/problems faculty faces,” “not receptive to criticism/too defensive,” lack of visibility, “unapproachable,” “does not value faculty input,” “listens only to inner circle,” “does not understand academics/academia/research,” “tendency to bully,” fiscal mismanagement, selects/listens to wrong leaders in enrollment/student services”

**The Provost:** “should deal with academic leadership who do a lot of talking but aren’t performing,” “communication/listening,” “does not respect shared governance/provide shared vision,” “supports wrongdoing of lower administrators,” “does not implement recruitment/retention/graduation of students,” “reactionary,” has faculty “doing things irrelevant to teaching/research,” “indecisive,” “arrogant,” “relies too much on deans,” controlled by the President, “does not value African American men/women”

**The Associate Provost:** “harried,” “busy doing everyone else’s job,” “consumed with cleaning up after president and provost,” “reputedly hard on her staff/graduate students,” “communication/not listening/not visible,” implements policies she does not agree with,” “does not use her power/not enough power”; the Associate Provost and her work were often not identifiable to responders, a problem needing to be addressed

### Recommendations to Improve Administrators’ Performances

**The President:** “listen without defensiveness/be impartial,” “keep in mind the campus is for the students,” “work with faculty/alumni/community,” “focus on helping students/graduation rates,” “work with administrators/hold administrators accountable,” “less micromanagement,” “implement a recruitment/retention/graduation plan,” “stop hiring administrators/put the right people in the right positions,” “stop micromanaging the provost,” “talk with staff/interact on a regular basis with faculty/not just cabinet,” “cost of living adjustment/implement salary equity”

**The Provost:** “hire/listen to professionals/people who know what they are doing,” “support faculty-based planning and shared governance/work with faculty,” “provide academic leadership/be consistent,” “more support/effective administrative infrastructure to improve teaching/learning/research,” “listen to faculty to improve student performance/graduation rates,” “increase support for research/more opportunities for professional development,” “promote post-tenure review”

**The Associate Provost:** “be approachable for staff and faculty,” “assure that resources for faculty development exist,” “listen to/consult faculty,” “teach a course each semester,” “work to improve faculty and staff morale”

---

*Graph courtesy of Surveymonkey*

### Additional Comments/Suggestions

“Treat students with respect,” “unqualified people at TSU/dragging TSU down,” “utilize faculty knowledge/skills before external consultants,” “this institution needs strong, honest, intelligent leadership,” “care about student well-being and success,” “treat faculty, staff and students with highest respect and regard,” “should not keep faculty and staff salaries low to pay administrators,” “encourage by example employees and students to work as a team,” “release information to faculty and staff instead of forwarding it through deans and chairs,” address “racism/salaries of female faculty/absenteeism,”

(Continued on page 13)
need “tighter control of funds used for administrative purposes,” “investigate five million dollar commitment to NASA URC,” “develop listening sessions,” “remove climate of fear about addressing inequalities/ineffectiveness,” “focus on retention/graduation/student accountability,” “promote better relationships”

Summary Reading of Spring 2012 Administrators’ Survey

Submitted by Editor Alexis Brooks de Vita, Ph. D.

Illustrations courtesy of Ms. Kirsteryn Gunter, Executive Admin. Ass’t., Faculty Senate

And TSU’s Award-Winning Photographer, Mr. Hudnall

(Continued from page 2)

One concern that has been conveyed to me is that the Senate will not function, since I am leaving. I want to dispel this opinion. Dr. Rasoul Sancifard will be a great Faculty Chair, and the accomplishments ascribed to me are not mine; they belong to us. If I had been ineffective as the Chair this past academic year, the failure would not have been mine alone, but the Senators who comprise the Senate would have failed, and you as a body would have failed. The power is in the Assembly; the Senate represents your interests, and the Chair is your spokesperson, only. You have the power to remove us all if we do not perform our duly elected responsibilities.

Furthermore, to ensure the Senate will stay focused on serving your interest, we have laid out the 2012-2013 agenda and will be reaching out to you for additional agenda items. My charge to the Assembly is to review the agenda items and hold the Senate accountable if things are not getting done.

Finally, remember, as Frederick Douglass stated: “Power Concedes Nothing without Demand.” One thing we should be careful of as we seek the kind of positive change we envision is to remember to keep issues internal, and recognize that the media is not a friend of TSU. Some closing observations: I think it is going to be difficult to get President Rudley to embrace transparency. I have noticed for a little over a month-and-a-half, Ms. Newman, the president’s Chief of Staff, rarely acknowledges my emails. The past month-and-a-half is uncharacteristic of her behavior, given the last eight-and-a-half months: she was always cordial and personable and responded in a timely manner to my emails. Coinciding with her disengagement from email with me has been the cancelling of the President’s Council meetings—an inordinate number have been cancelled.

Furthermore, the President meets with his Cabinet members individually now instead of in the open forum the President’s Council provides to his Cabinet members. This new practice suggests that the administration is becoming less transparent.

I wish you all the best. Remember the words of Anatole France: “To accomplish great things, we must not only act, but also dream; not only plan, but also believe.”

Peace in every step,

Byron E. Price, Ph.D.,
Chair of Faculty Assembly/Senate
The voice of the TSU Faculty Senate.