**UO Senate Faculty Survey Results for the HECC on the UO Board of Trustees**

10/26/2015

This report shows the results of a survey done by the UO Senate, in response to a request from the HECC for information on specific questions regarding the UO faculty’s opinion of and experiences with the UO Board of Trustees.

The survey was designed for and initially sent to recent members of the elected UO Senate and Faculty Advisory Council. These recipients were later asked to send it to their faculty constituents, and it was also distributed by the United Academics faculty union to all faculty in the faculty bargaining unit, excepting a few who had asked to opt out of union emails. The faculty bargaining unit excludes all law professors and some “Principal Investigators”, who are considered supervisors because their grants involve hiring authority. Many though probably not all members of these groups received the survey from their Senators.

Data collection began on 10/22/2015 and the survey closed on 10/25/2015. The survey used an anonymous URL link, meaning that anyone with the link could respond, although the software checks for multiple responses and there was no evidence of this. We received 184 responses, out of about 1800 total UO faculty (including part-time faculty). There were 70 responses to an open-ended written question. There were a few student, staff, and Officer of Administration responses as well. 14% of respondents said that their primary current job responsibility was administrative, rather than teaching and/or research. Respondents averaged about 10 minutes completing the survey,

Given the low response rate and the incomplete sampling, the results should not be considered representative of the faculty, though as can be seen the responses cover a very wide range of views.

The survey began with this preface:

Welcome. This is a brief survey for UO faculty, about their opinions and experiences with the UO Board of Trustees. If you would like to respond you must do so by Friday, October 23.

The Oregon Higher Education Coordinating Commission (HECC) has asked the UO Senate to collect information for its evaluation of UO and the UO Board, in accordance with ORS [352.061(2)(c)](http://www.oregonlaws.org/ors/352.061) and ORS [352.025](http://www.oregonlaws.org/ors/352.025).  
  
Information on the UO Board of Trustees is available on their official website at [trustees.uoregon.edu](http://trustees.uoregon.edu/). Some news stories can be found via google [here](https://www.google.com/search?q=google&oq=google+&aqs=chrome..69i57j69i60l5.10231j0j4&sourceid=chrome&es_sm=119&ie=UTF-8#safe=off&tbm=nws&q=%22University+of+Oregon%22+%22Board+of+Trustees%22).  
  
The UO Senate will forward all responses to the HECC. This will include all responses to the one open-ended response question on the survey. Your responses will be anonymous unless you add your name to the survey at the end.

The HECC has specifically asked for faculty input, but given that our Senate includes other constituencies we are sending this to non-faculty members of the Senate and FAC.

Tabulations of the responses are below, followed by the complete text of all responses to the written question.

This report and the raw response file have been sent to the HECC and to the UO Board Secretary.

Sincerely,

Bill Harbaugh

UO Economics Professor, and UO Senate VP and President Elect

harbaugh@uoregon.edu

UO HECC BOT Report

Last Modified: 10/26/2015

Unless indicated by %, raw response numbers are shown.

1. I am a

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| # | Answer | |  |  | | --- | --- | |  |  | | Response | % |
| 1 | Tenured professor | |  |  | | --- | --- | |  |  | | 80 | 43.5% |
| 2 | Untenured tenure track professor | |  |  | | --- | --- | |  |  | | 12 | 6.5% |
| 3 | NTTF instructor | |  |  | | --- | --- | |  |  | | 50 | 27.2% |
| 4 | Research faculty (Officer of Research) | |  |  | | --- | --- | |  |  | | 11 | 6.0% |
| 5 | Library faculty | |  |  | | --- | --- | |  |  | | 4 | 2.2% |
| 6 | Other faculty | |  |  | | --- | --- | |  |  | | 7 | 3.8% |
| 7 | Emeritus professor | |  |  | | --- | --- | |  |  | | 6 | 3.3% |
| 9 | Officer of Administration | |  |  | | --- | --- | |  |  | | 11 | 6.0% |
| 10 | Staff | |  |  | | --- | --- | |  |  | | 2 | 1.1% |
| 11 | Student | |  |  | | --- | --- | |  |  | | 0 | 0.0% |
| 12 | Other non-faculty | |  |  | | --- | --- | |  |  | | 1 | 0.5% |
|  | Total |  | 184 | 100.0% |

2. The major part of my current appointment is

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| # | Answer | |  |  | | --- | --- | |  |  | | Response | % |
| 1 | administrative (e.g. dean, associate/assistant dean, dept chair) | |  |  | | --- | --- | |  |  | | 26 | 14.2% |
| 2 | teaching | |  |  | | --- | --- | |  |  | | 41 | 22.4% |
| 3 | teaching and research | |  |  | | --- | --- | |  |  | | 99 | 54.1% |
| 4 | research | |  |  | | --- | --- | |  |  | | 17 | 9.3% |
|  | Total |  | 183 | 100.0% |

3. I have worked at UO for

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| # | Answer | |  |  | | --- | --- | |  |  | | Response | % |
| 1 | Less than 5 years | |  |  | | --- | --- | |  |  | | 40 | 21.7% |
| 2 | 5 to 9 years | |  |  | | --- | --- | |  |  | | 32 | 17.4% |
| 3 | 10 to 19 years | |  |  | | --- | --- | |  |  | | 59 | 32.1% |
| 4 | 20 or more years | |  |  | | --- | --- | |  |  | | 53 | 28.8% |
|  | Total |  | 184 | 100.0% |

4. In an average year I spend the following percentage of my work time on shared governance service, such as departmental, Senate, and university committees:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| # | Answer | |  |  | | --- | --- | |  |  | | Response | % |
| 1 | less than 10% | |  |  | | --- | --- | |  |  | | 73 | 39.7% |
| 2 | between 10% and 20% | |  |  | | --- | --- | |  |  | | 66 | 35.9% |
| 3 | More than 20% | |  |  | | --- | --- | |  |  | | 45 | 24.5% |
|  | Total |  | 184 | 100.0% |

5. I teach/work primarily in

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| # | Answer | |  |  | | --- | --- | |  |  | | Response | % |
| 1 | AAA | |  |  | | --- | --- | |  |  | | 24 | 13.0% |
| 2 | CAS Humanities | |  |  | | --- | --- | |  |  | | 35 | 19.0% |
| 3 | CAS Natural Science | |  |  | | --- | --- | |  |  | | 16 | 8.7% |
| 4 | CAS Social Science | |  |  | | --- | --- | |  |  | | 37 | 20.1% |
| 5 | School of Music and Dance | |  |  | | --- | --- | |  |  | | 5 | 2.7% |
| 6 | Law School | |  |  | | --- | --- | |  |  | | 3 | 1.6% |
| 7 | School of Journalism and Communication | |  |  | | --- | --- | |  |  | | 3 | 1.6% |
| 8 | College of Business | |  |  | | --- | --- | |  |  | | 2 | 1.1% |
| 9 | College of Education | |  |  | | --- | --- | |  |  | | 38 | 20.7% |
| 10 | Libraries | |  |  | | --- | --- | |  |  | | 4 | 2.2% |
| 11 | Other (Includes Honors College) | |  |  | | --- | --- | |  |  | | 17 | 9.2% |
|  | Total |  | 184 | 100.0% |

6. My knowledge:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| # | Question | A | B | C | D | F | Total Responses |
| 1 | On the subjects of UO governance, Oregon higher education policy, and the UO Board of Trustees, I would grade my overall knowledge as | 28 | 85 | 46 | 13 | 12 | 184 |

7.  On the following issues I would grade the performance of the UO Board of Trustees as follows:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| # | Question | A | B | C | D | F | Not enough info to grade | **Average with A=4, F=0** |
| 1 | Provide transparency and public accountability for the university. | 16 | 35 | 40 | 32 | 17 | 43 | **2.0** |
| 2 | Provide financial support for the university. | 27 | 35 | 27 | 24 | 11 | 59 | **2.3** |
| 3 | Support the faculty's teaching and research goals. | 21 | 27 | 41 | 31 | 16 | 47 | **2.0** |
| 5 | Promote greater access and affordability for Oregon residents and not disadvantage Oregon students relative to out-of-state students. | 22 | 28 | 32 | 19 | 11 | 71 | **2.0** |
| 4 | Support the university's shared governance system. | 23 | 23 | 40 | 30 | 22 | 44 | **2.3** |
| 6 | Promote the academic success of students in support of the mission of all education beyond high school as described in ORS 351.009 (the 40-40-20 goal). | 23 | 30 | 34 | 19 | 11 | 65 | **2.3** |

8. In the box below please add any comments that you think would help the Oregon Higher Education Coordinating Commission conduct its evaluation of the University of Oregon Board of Trustees. (<10K characters)

|  |
| --- |
| Text Response |
| the UO Board needs to have a visible strategy for how it pursues its goals and conducts business. it is a well meaning, talented group, but it seems to lurch from one issue to another with little advance preparation or deliberation and lacking a visible sense of where it is going, how it plans to get there, etc. students, faculty, staff, and the public have little sense of either the boards priorities or means. |
| I realize my assessments are low; that's because thus far the board just hasn't done much, period--presumably because they are still new and procedures are still being established. But so far, while I don't have active complaints, neither do I see much that impresses or any real accomplishments in the categories above. |
| The Board of Trustees is more interested in paying huge raises to the heads of the athletic department then controling tuition OR supporting students. ACTIONS SPEAK LOUDER THEN WORDS. The BOT's actions regarding money show they do not care for education. |
| 1. The salaries of staff personnel are disgraceful. Many of the staff are women supporting their families with inadequate income. Set up a committee to study this. / 2. Set up a comm to study the AD and who controls who? Do the Pres and Tees have detailed info about AD and input to AD? There is no transparency here. / 3. Focus on the great majority of excellent faculty already here and bring their salaries up to competitive levels with AAU. Set some goals and dates. / 4. More transparency is needed regarding Foundation. What controls and supervision do Pres and Tees have over Foundation. Appears that their leadership is often calling the shots rather than U admin and faculty. They apparently find it easier to raise money for athletics than academics. / 6. Every donation to AD shd require that 15% be turned over to academics. / 7. Parking for JSMA is wholly inadequate. It's a treasure on campus. How many Tees regularly visit there? For public access there must be adequate parking. / 8. UO is losing its green spaces. It is not the beautiful campus it was 20 years ago. In another 20 years it will look like NYU unless you set better green space policies. / 9. How much does the UO have to pay for the maintenance of elaborate donated buildings that have limited student and faculty access? / 10.Tees and UO have a duty to be involved in planning of designs of new donated bldgs rather than turning them over to donor under agreements that the public doesn't see. Surely these shd be partnerships rather than donor controlled. / 11. Include non Tee faculty on some of your impt subcommittees to get more faculty input so that you are not dominated by administrators. / 12. Do a study of the rise in administrators across the campus and their salaries. We have seen inordinate growth in admors w/o an evaluation of the benefits achieved for the costs. Most faculty have this opinion. / 13. Show more respect for student Tees by protecting them from being overrun by other Tees. The chair of meetings should protect them from being intimidated into silence. / 14. I checked the Tee website and don't see any reports, studies, evaluations, details of committee work etc. What happened to the transparency goal? / 15. This box is too tiny to review and polish comments. It's size suggests that respondents shdn't bother. / 16. Will comments be made available to Tees? / |
| I appreciate having a board that is focused on UO and aware of what is going on here. From what I can tell, the board has been responsive when issues have arisen. I also appreciate the effort to reach out to facullty, staff, and students through the drop-ins the board has organized. |
| The board of trustees is doing an excellent job in guiding the university, especially during the course of the 2014/15 academic year when Scott Coltrane was the interim president. It is clear that each and every trustee has the interests of the University and Students at heart, and are endeavoring to guide the university through this time of change. Its tasks will be much more straightforward with the arrival of President Schill, as we can now move strategically in a number of directions, something that was not possible during the tenure of an interim president. |
| Please consider looking into the practice of the Board in appointing a faculty representative member to that board without faculy input. |
| I think Bill Harbaugh, current Senate VP, is the real detriment to shared governance. I refuse to participate as long as his toxic leadership is in place. He is on a egotistical mission to "expose" the board which includes spying on vehicles at Johnson Hall and other bizarre behavior. Grading the Board of Trustees while they work in this environment is difficult task indeed but I think in their first year they have tried to communicate with the campus community and deserve our support. I will choose to be anonymous because of Harbaugh's penchant for vicious attacks on those who disagree with him. |
| Service requirements are changing for NTTF faculty; however, to this point, the requirement has varied from School to School. In the SOMD, it was either not spelled out as an expectation in workload and merit reviews or actually prohibited in some circumstances, both in terms of internal and external committees. This has allowed some NTTF, such as myself, to remain largely ignorant of campus-wide issues, including the board of trustees. Although we are treated with great equity and respect within our School, it is only now that NTTF will receive time within their workloads for service and have the opportunity and responsibility to fully participate in processes of governance. (Although I value this participation highly and have previously participated in cross-campus committees, if the time is not formally granted and remunerated, it's simply difficult to prioritize the commitment.) With NTTF representing a significant portion of UO faculty overall, I assume this will impact your survey results, as I'm sure you are aware. |
| I would encourage HECC and the governor to consider creating a seat on the UO Board of Trustees for an Officer of Administration. This is an entire employment group of 1,400+ UO employees unrepresented on the Board. The representative makeup currently includes other employment groups—faculty, classified employees, and students. The OAs are not represented by the unionized staff trustee. OA representation would be a helpful contribution to the work of the UO Board, providing crucial information of OA-specific concerns and topics of expertise where there is currently little. / / Thank you for requesting our input. |
| Earlier and more frequent communication from the Board would help. In particular, communication that would go directly to UO faculty and not depend on the Senate for transmitting the information. The faculty listening sessions are a good idea and should continue. Most faculty have little knowledge about the board except what they read in the paper or on line. |
| I shouldn't need to research what the board does to be able to answer whether they're doing a good job. There should be more communications about what they do that come to me naturally through small chunks. |
| Please acknowledge that there are many types of NTTF. I am a Full Time Instructor and thus have a very different outlook and experience than and instructor teaching one or two courses a year. Please do not lump us into the same category. My suggestion is that there are separate "boxes" for Full Time NTTF and part time NTTF. |
| The Board has done a terrible job. They are running the university like a corporation with no transperancy, shared governance, or any interest in academics. No wonder why the UO is slipping to an all-time low in rankings with his board in place. |
| First, I am surprised that your survey does not include the Clark Honors College among the list of schools and colleges. Second, let me note that the average academic grade is a C, and the board's performance strikes me as average. Where I would give the board an A is its appointing the new president of the university. I have great confidence in President Schill's leadership, along with the executive team he is assembling -- and the deadwood he is removing -- to work effectively with the board for a bright future. The more the board can understand what faculty do and honor the university's academic mission, the better the university's progress in retaining its AAU membership and telling the \*real\* story about the UO. The board needs to understand and honor the warp and weft of the university education -- not in sound bites, but in roll-up-the-sleeves work. It will take the board members a lot of dedication and hard work -- primarily conversations with faculty on-the-ground as well as campus leaders in governance and administration -- to right the ship that is the University of Oregon. Collaboration, critique, dynamism -- these are the hallmarks of successful education. . |
| I do not have much knowledge of this information, as I am a brand new faculty member. |
| I'm sorry that I'm not very aware of the day to day responsibilities of the trustees, but I'm sure they are doing the best they can just like I am. |
| I would like to see greater transparency and reform of the public records office at UO. I am concerned about the way in which the University lawyers seem to do things that hurt and damage the University (student rape allegation reprisal, UO Police Department scandal), and was very disappointed with how the University handled the GTFF strike last year, illegally threatening foreign students that their visas would be compromised, which is a very serious and unconscionable action, and threatening undergraduates that their tuition would rise. I would like to see the board actively question the University leadership on these matters. I think there needs to be more faculty representation on the board, and a new student leader or leaders. Open comment/testimony periods during meetings have been helpful and should be frequent. I was present at two of them and the Board was generally responsive to the comments. There need to be direct ways like those to get to the board without going through layers of administration. |
| I do understand that the board has been functioning for a short time, but it would have been useful to talk to faculty more often early on. That the UO Administration is held in low repute is a consequence of its own behavior and poor management. I do hope that the board engages with faculty more constructively than it has been doing in the past and [unfortunately] Susan Gary is very removed from the broader base. NOTE: I am NOT a member of the union, and regret the unionization. That it happened at all says more about the the low level of confidence in the senior administrators. I wish it were otherwise. |
| The board has not been functioning that long, so a thorough evaluation will likely be more appropriate after the board has more time to assess the UO's needs, especially the needs of students and faculty who are the reason the university exists. / / I think we all need to find ways to recenter or renew attention and equitable funding on the central mission of teaching and learning, rather than on growing the central administration cohorts, athletics, or a few targeted projects. IMO, we all need to invest money and time and concern in general education, specialized and unusual courses, research and majors/minors, and support students' intellectual growth in problem solving, good judgment, reasoning, communication (including thoughtful listening/reading), empathy, curiosity and so on. Students often view education as a commodity rather than as an experience. As we pull away from one another more and more (in face to face exchange), the tears in the social and familial fabric becomes more pronounced. Part of what higher education offers is a chance to listen well, read deeply and not just for surface information, increase a capacity for nuance and rigor, and successful encounters with new ideas and new people. These are crucial for a more successful democratic society and an increasingly global world. Connections and attachments matter for our future. |
| I observe the new Board attempting to improve and correct the record of past Boards, in consulting and listening to faculty about how better to meet the Board's stated directives. / I strongly recommend that the Board work to place some kind of stipulation on large donations to UO, such that a percentage automatically goes directly to the UO's academic mission. Examples are faculty salaries, support for scholarship, tuition reduction and financial support for students, and improvement of classrooms (based on consultation with faculty needs!). / It's my understanding this type of 'surcharge' is routine practice at some institutions - not an original idea. |
| I think the University of Oregon is out of touch with its adjunct faculty and their needs. I am also concerned that the cost of education at the UO is rising to pay for campus amenities, rather than educational costs. |
| Four areas I consider to be key for the University of Oregon are: / / \* Infrastructure improvements, particularly in the area of networks. / / \* Centralization - Our campus, governance and departments are far too disperse. We need more centralized pooling of resources. / / \* Improved salaries leading to, I would hope, additional Professor hires for the UO. Clearly we are \_critically\_ lacking in the number of teaching faculty at the UO. / / \* Awareness of what makes the UO great and what we are missing out on. Countless times I see missed opportunities and an institutional lack of awareness of what we have on our own campus. The UO does not adequately support faculty and staff writing research proposals. This is basic and fundamental. To maintain our AAU status we need more grants - yet, there is almost ZERO support for someone who is trying to do this. An office that keeps track of funding opportunities, that actively let's faculty and staff know of these opportunities in a much more targeted fashion and offers support to write proposals is sorely needed. In addition, if we wish to move up in the chain of Universities our lack of clue when it comes to technology use and resources is painful. We have missed so many opportunities that just needed minimal funding and some vision because no one is paying attention to these issues. |
| Poor Quality |
| As an NTTF I have no idea how I would get nformation about what the Board of Trustees is doing and deciding. I don't believe there is anymechanism in place to inform me of their activities or topics of discussion. |
| Trustees need to advocate more for core academics-- for faculty and student support, not athletics and climbing walls. |
| Safety is a real issue here. The school has done a terrible job of taking seriously their responsibilites to ensure the safety of faculty and students. Little has been done to meaningfully address sexual assault on campus. And only lip-service is paid to the possibility of mass gun violence on campus. Faculty and student concerns about gun violence on campus are not taken seriously and are not addressed. Other campuses around the state and throughout the nation have taken positive and specific steps to attempt to keep faculty and students safe. This includes lockdown drills, installing locks on doors and providing transparent procedures for faculty and students to follow as they are waiting for police to arrive. This campus has no locks--many rooms have doors with no locks that open into the halls. This makes it impossible to follow the "hide" portion of the Run, Hide, Fight advice that is repeatedly suggested by the administration. I have yet to participate in a drill and we have been told through meetings with administrators that the best they can suggest is that we "hunker down" until help arrives. Without doors that lock and open to the inside it is impossible to keep ourselves and our students safe. Oregon has seen an increased rate in gun violence at schools. This is an issue that cannot be ignored. |
| You didn't ask about supporting faculty who are supporting students. |
| Recent administrations (since LaRiviere) have been wretched for UO faculty and graduate research other than the perennial favorites in the physical/bio sciences, Psychology and the School of Ed; wretchedly clueless and dilatory in addressing rape culture; and merely supine in relating to a Board of Trustees created to raise money and polish a brand in exchange for receiving a blessing to pursue oligarchic powers over the faculty. / / I'm not sure HECC can do anything but shine a very hot bright light on individual Board members (and by extension, the senior faculty administrators, and the UO lawyers and high level non-faculty administrators--assistant VPs and the like) who worst- typify the symptoms of bad governance listed above. / / While the civil approach might be to create a parallel list of positives and negatives (best practices, worst practices) not associated with any person, and hope that things might improve as a result, I doubt that any of the worst offenders would feel as though they bore a share of blame or individual blame, let alone being definitely identified with bad governance, unless names are named. / |
| I see that the UO's claim to fame now is that it is the frontrunner among universities in expenditures on athletics. At the same time, I have no laboratory facilities. |
| I do not think that the BoT really understands what tenured faculty in particular do at a university or the very important ways in which a university as an organization differs from the corporate sector (or why it's vital in a democratic society for universities to differ from the corporate sector). Might be a good idea for BoT members to shadow faculty members at different levels to get a better appreciation. |
| I've met most of the members on the Board. They are cordial and intelligent people with lots of corporate business experience, but I do not see them understanding the role of funding for liberal arts and humanities and the public good it provides. I also see them being out of touch with the needs of faculty and students, not understanding the damage caused by low faculty wages and high student debt. I wound like to see them shift way from the corporate model of education and spend more time working with shared governance groups such as faculty Senate, ASUO, United Academics, SEIU, and other groups representing stakeholders in the UO. |
| 1) I read UO matters - this seems to resonate, so my answers may be affected by that. / / 2)I'm seriously thinking about leaving because of salary issues. (I've had a couple interviews.) I could be making probably twice as much outside academia, and when I have to start deciding whether to fix the water heater or fix the car, this becomes more than an idle thought. |
| I have heard at several administrative meetings that the board is looking at UO through a business lens. This is concerning, as business practice and academic process are often at odds. I am concerned that financial decisions to reduce support and programs will erode our ability to achieve the UO mission. |
| In meetings with Chuck Lillis I have been deeply disturbed by his derision toward and dismissal of the UO senate as a governing body in the University. |
| I have appreciated the accessibility of BOT member Susan Gary who has meet with a group of concern faculty about decisions. She did a wonderful job illustrating how the BOT works and what infratructure was in place around them. It helps our group understand where the decisions had first been made and were to go back to in order to find answers. |
| I was appalled when the Board tried to sneak a dismantling of shared governance past us last year. I am dismayed that the student rep, Helena Schlegel, quit over tuition issues, and I am fed up with the paltry faculty representation. Need more? |
| The board is really too new to really evaluate effectively. But I think it is shocking and scandalous that NOT ONE MEMBER of the board has a PhD (and I think only two higher degrees between them, one in Business and one in Law). Surely a university board of trustees should have SOME members with some experience teaching the kinds of subjects that most students will actually take, and ideally there should be a representative for each of the three primary divisions of academic knowledge -- that is, someone from the humanities, someone from the social sciences, and someone from the natural sciences. Such board members -- in the form of retired professors -- should not be hard to find -- but apparently no one looked for them. Their presence is really essential, however, since thy can advise the other board members who may bring other skills to the table -- but who know nothing about the job of teaching and research, which is, after all, the main function of a university. It can't be stressed enough -- a law degree and and a business degree are NOT sufficient when the goal of a research university is to inculcate values beyond the legalistic and economic, and to advance the total sum of human knowledge across multiple disciplines. / / Let's get some real academics with experience in the arts, social sciences, and natural sciences on this so-called educational board, please. |
| Why is there no faculty input into the selection of Trustees? It's been entirely by appointment up until now. Regarding the "cost of attendance" question above, it may not be in the BoT's power to change it single-handedly, but the upward spiral of student costs is still very worrying. In some ways, it's still too early to figure out what specific effect the BoT has on long term UO developments. |
| Sorry for all of the "not enough info to grade", but I feel like the BoT has not been in place long enough for me to have an opinion I can feel very confident about regarding their performance. My general sense so far is that they're doing well, except for one misstep early on regarding shared governance and policy making. |
| I don't think the Board has an adequate sense of the work that faculty members do. Talk is cheap, but we need resources - and salary is part of that but only part - do elevate the quality of the institution. The Board also needs to signal deep and long-term commitment to the Liberal Arts, rather than chasing after the "knowledge economy" and a fetishization of STEM fields. The unbalance which has created a glamorous athletic program (which is fine up to a point, but we are far past that point) while having a lagging academic side needs to be addressed before we become an embaraessment / |
| I was disappointed to learn of the UG student board member resigning and her criticisms of the board. I felt that the board did not address her concerns sufficiently. |
| The survey questions seem strangely leading. Odd for an institution of learning to put together a survey like this. Seems like it is trying to discredit the board. The short timeline is also very odd. / / Board has been given a tough mission and is taking the correct steps through it. University needs to make some hard decisions. / / University senate has been a rediculous institution which claims to represent the faculty, but from what I can gather is mostly made up of entrenched individuals who work hard to push forth their own agendas and dont speak for the faculty. |
| How close does the UO come in its hiring goals for recruiting, hiring and retaining faculty of color anywhere near the 80% Rule required for Affirmative Action compliance. |
| I am extremely disappointed with the Senate, and what it choses to focus on. This is much more a contributor to the discontent and problems we have on campus at this time. The Senators use their position to further their own agenda, rather than focus on topics and issues that can improve the University as a whole. To many view the Faculty-Admin in a "us versus them" manner. |
| The Board's corporate model, including rebranding, with an unapologetic rush to meet superficial standards of success is disappointing, dispiriting to faculty, and in the long run unlikely to support serious, substantial, and sustainable academic excellence. Academic excellence should be the first priority of a research institution. |
| I think transparency has been the biggest issue. We're all in it together--the board, the administration and the faculty, but the faculty often seems to be out of the loop. This has led to criticism, Senate action, backpedaling on the part of the board and administration and some ill will--all of it unnecessary, in my opinion. |
| Listen to a wider array of students, faculty, and staff. The fiasco with the board resolution to create a new policy on policies while bypassing the UO Constitution and senate tells me there was little regard for the shared governance system. / / On the plus side, the board is to be commended for hiring President Schill. |
| I'm not sure about the above questions but I can outline my concerns. As indicated above I am a "career" NTTF who has been teaching at the UO for more than 20 years. Over the last ten years I have typically had between 450 and 650 in total enrollment per year with a range of class size, usually one large, one smaller per term. Because of the nature of the university, I get a wide range of students: some majors, others not, some truly outstanding students, others less so and for a variety of reasons. Some students don't wnat to come to class but would do fine if they did; others come to class and aren't sure what to do once they get. They weak academic skills, a problem that I associate with students coming from weak school districts in state. I have always thought of my job as trying to create a positive learning environment for the full range of my students. I am proud that my classes have and continue to attract some of the university's best students (I have had several Oregon Six over the last few years as well as several winners of the Undergraduate Research Award etc.). But I often like to say that anyone worth their salt can teach good students; the real challenge is the middling students: those who want to do well but struggle. / I feel that the board is sending either (in the best case scenario) mixed messages or a wholly negative message regarding the university's educational mission. It has made very clear that it intends to prioritize the university's research mission. My concern - and I think I see it in various policies and actions at the administrative level - is that the board is willing to prioritize research at the express cost of education and, in particular, that it is willing to write off what might be termed the "middling" educational mission of the university: that part of the university charged with educating our less-then-best students. My general sense is that board has little idea of what delivering a quality education requires. Unfortunately, I also have the sense that it doesn't particular care or doesn't care enough to look into it. My sense is that it thinks it sees "inefficiencies" that could be eliminated so as to free up resources for research. Either knowingly or unknowingly, it appears to be moving down a path that will end up sacrificing the broader educational mission of the university for "excellence" in research, which largely seems to be defined as what keeps the university's AAU status. If it is doing so knowingly, you can just change all those "grades" to "F" - I have zero confidence in a board that doesn't see the education - and not just the education of its student elite - as one of the central missions of a public university. If it is not intending that path, it probably needs to communicate its intentions more clearly to the university administration. But last year I heard a top administrator say that the solution to all our "education" problems is to recruit better students - I find such a notion both quixotic and irrresponsible. Sure, we'd all like better students. But we also have a responsibility to the students we have and will most likely continue to have in the foreseeable future. |
| The BOT has been very disappointing. They do not seem to have a full sense of the value of a liberal arts education and the value of shared governance in a publc university. They all but tried to dismantle it - not a great use of university resources, efforts that only revealed their skewed priorities. They do not seem to take seriously the roles and perspectives of students, staff, and faculty. We need more accountabilty for the Board so that they are held responsible to students, faculty and staff, and the larger public. I am very concerned that their priorities are not in line with those of a good public univ, and they are not centered on the research and teaching mission as they should and need to be. I am particularly concerned about the lack of financial accountability, the budget model and the overemphasis on athletics, donors, and fundraising, as well as cluster hires of excellence in very select areas - areas not necessarily selected based on good academic reasoning or inservice to a liberal arts education - to the neglect of other important areas. Fine to support certain areas with greater emphasis, but this can't happen while we starve other units and areas (like CAS, particularly humanities). |
| The Board of Trustees should have more than one member of the academic profession and more than one student to represent the views of faculty + students. The number of members with various business/corporate experience is far too high: a university is not a corporation, and what works in other settings may not always work successfully here. Faculty, students and staff, the categories that have most at stake in the university, should receive a larger share of representation. |
| Even before UO left OUS the mission of the university had changed. We no longer are a state public institution. We are a public-private university that seeks to keep afloat by attracting a high number of out of state students. / Academic excellence has not been a top priority. The student population has exploded but the faculty population has not kept up. The sense of collegiality that I enjoyed when I came to the university in 1976 has all but disappeared. All of the former OUS campuses are struggling to survive without consideration of duplication of programs and what will best serve the citizens of the sate. The UO Board of Trustees may have corporate experience but they don't have higher ed experience. The Board President runs the Board like he is a corporate president. This doesn't work at an AAU institution. The students aren't well represented as the writings of the last student board rep illustrate. The faculty aren't really represented. The current faculty member of the board was not chosen by the faculty and does not represent broad faculty interests. I hope things improve but I'm not very optimistic. I am glad I am an emerita professor with some distance from the UO. |
| This is a new system. But the Trustees need to listen to the faculty to learn what is really going on. Too often they think they know what is best, but without full consultation, decisions can be wrong-headed. They often seem too business oriented, without enough knowledge or appreciation of academics. Universities are not businesses. They provide a public, civic mission, not simply a product. |
| It is perhaps a bit early to judge them, but they seem to be doing a relatively good job. |
| The board of trustees just started to work at our University in the past couple of years or so. It takes time to build the synergy between faculty and board that is necessary to have the most effective and positive impact on the whole University. The intentions seem more than positive for the moment. |
| (1) Often, important documents are missing before a BOT meeting, or given to the BOT to consider right at the meeting with no time for the public to se them. (2) the BOT is only interested in the sports franchise aspect of the UO. The Athletic Department head and football coach got an obscene raise, while tuition has also increased. That realy sends one message. The BOT is willing to spend money on foolish branding, more PR consultents, but not willing to pay world class faculty more; and not willing to allocate more money for scholarships. (3) It is a shame there is no more faculty representation at the BOT; S Gary finally remembered to meet with faculty only very recently. / The board is not interested in faculty input whatsoever, and are only interested in coorporate-like business. and sports. |
| The Board seems impermeable and impervious to faculty, honestly. There seems to be a pre-conceived notion about what a university is or should be, that doesn't correspond much to what we really do, what our values and goals are, and what we can accomplish. Having one faculty member on the board is dispiriting. Having the ASUO president step down on the grounds that she was not listened to is, honestly, an appalling sign of the board's indifference to the grass roots. The Board Chairman's scolding of the UO Senate in fall 2014 was meant to embarrass the senate but it was an embarrassment to the board. I have felt increasingly pessimistic about the university's future with the new governing board. |
| The Board has done an admirable job of learning about the complex institution and contributing to effective solutions for our shared challenges. Board members have been generous with their resources. The Board clearly wants Oregon to achieve its capacity for excellence. The Board is still new and developing a common administrative culture, in particular in its relationship with the Institution - with all its constituencies and varying levels of functional effectiveness. This process takes time. Moreover, the board has had to respond to a dysfunctional Faculty Senate, a UO faculty member who meets the working definition of a Cyber-bully, and an unfriendly Press who prefers hyperbole and perceived controversy to communicating the complexity of truth, problems, and attempted solutions. The Board has fared well in meeting the challenges to which it is charged. |
| We are very fortunate to have an excellent Board of Trustees who are committed to the functioning and health of this University, and who are helping the University carry out its mission in the state of Oregon. They consistently operate in the best interest of the University, and navigate a ridiculous number of obstacles to do so. |
| The UO BoT should hold scheduled meetings with each major College to learn more about each unit. AND, for faculty to learn more about the BoT. |
| The first year of any new Board can be challenging, and made even moreso when changes in key leadership and governance occur simultaneous to the launching of a new Board. The UO Board of Trustees has navigated their first year tremendously well. I especially appreciate the multiple opportunities offered many times a year for faculty of all levels to meet with individual Trustees. As a group, and individually, they are to be commended for their first year of service. |
| Thank you to every one of our Board Members for the important and selfless work you are doing on our behalf for the UO. |
| I have not seen the UO Bot take any action to support of the education of Oregon students. They have been more transparent with financial reports than the UO did prior to their formation. They have recently begun to meet with groups of faculty, but their initial acts in trying to write the Senate and the UO Constitution out of policy development was a major disaster. I think much trust needs to be rebuilt. Our faculty representative was not very proactive during the first year. For example she did not alert faculty that the proposed Policy on Policy wrote the Senate out of its traditional role and ignored the UO Constitution. Lately, she has begun to hold "office hours." It would be better to have the Senate elect this person and pass the candidate's name to the governor. Essentially, the verdict is still out on whether this Board of Trustees was a good idea. |
| The board is doing an excellent job and should be commended for their work on this campus. They are a group of exemplary individuals faced with a unique challenge of being the "first board." I respect their roles and appreciate their donation of time and effort to the University of Oregon. They are completely "transparent" in all their decisions and have operated with professionalism and integrity. / / The problems at the University of Oregon have nothing to do with the board. They are related to a small group of faculty members, many of whom are on the Senate, that continually disrupt the operations of the university. Through use of the internet and the local media, these faculty distort information and engage in destructive antics designed to harm the university's reputation and long term stability. I continue to be perplexed that some faculty spend their time trying to denegrate the very institution for which they work. Most of the faculty on this campus who are actual scholars and researchers are sick and tired of the dynamic created by this small group of disgruntled faculty, who have acquired power through the union and senate and continue to use this power in maladaptive, destructive ways. |
| The change to the new Board of Trustees has been like a breath of fresh air to campus. Many welcoming and orienting activities have been very successful and very appreciated. |
| The Board has engaged in a comprehensive and systematic effort to understand the University of Oregon in a short period of time. There is still work to be done; however, the Board has truly hit the ground running. The Board of Trustees is a group of thoughtful, committed, and hard-working individuals who are dedicating so much of their time and personal resources to promoting the University’s values and initiatives, such as supporting the research mission of the university and providing higher education access. I have had multiple opportunities to meet with and work with Board and have found them to be responsive to questions and needs of faculty and committed to moving the University of Oregon forward in positive directions. I appreciate the opportunity to provide feedback during this process. |
| The university seems to be increasingly run like a corporation and not an institution of higher learning. / Discouraging to hear/see University priorities. |
| I BOT seems highly committed to the success of the university. They are relatively new to this task and will make some missteps, but they are key to the long term success of the institution. |
| The independent board model has been a huge mistake. The enabling legislation, which described the Board as "governmental" but not a stage agency set the stage for privatization of this public university. The llegislature appears to have abdicated its responsibility as trustee over this ivaluable resource, to which generations have contributed time, energy and treasure. Control has been conveyed to the highest bidders. / / Upon coming into office, the board immediately attempted to end shared governance by denying to the University Senate any role in policy making. / / The current president of the Board seems much more interested in indicia of status than in the actual education of Oregon's youth. / / The present members of the Board are probably honorable, well intentioned individuals. But Board membership of, like membership on the private UO Foundation Board, which now controls the process of fundraising priorities for the University, is limited to a particular class of individuals (the wealthy) who are not always Oregonian, and who do not always reflect the preferences or interests of the Oregon public as a whole. There seems to be little interest in the Jeffersonian vision of a public university as a mechanism for training youth for the responsibilities of citizenship in a free, democratic republic. Replacing that mission is a single-minded concern with producing desirable employees and business entrepreneurs. / / Past, present and future generations of Oregon deserve better. |
| It's been really positive to see Trustees present at a majority of meetings. One concern was that with so many non-Oregonians appointed, we would regularly see empty rooms full of speakerphones. It's also been really helpful that Trustees have made themselves available for meet and greet sessions, though we have had to compete for that time. It's also been great to see Trustees at some Senate meetings. / / A portion of the Board of Trustees seems to regularly deliberate towards decisions outside of the public eye, while then holding public votes often with little or no disussion. Meeting materials are often published near the last minute or in meetings themselves, virtually precluding public participation. / / The Board leadership has attempted to chastise some of its members for voicing their opinions. One Trustee abruptly resigned this year, writing an open letter acknowledging the disrespect they've received from Board leadership. Another Trustee was chastised by Board leadership after questioning the overtly sexualized dancing of cheerleaders. Board leadership openly wants to model the academic mission of the University after the athletic program and appears to be willing to punish any dissenters. / / The Board leadership has largely chosen to ignore Senate recommendations and choose to prevent the University Senate from meaningful involvement in Trustee affairs. The University Senate had to fight very hard to be allowed to even make recommendations on the Board's new bylaws, which were then largely ignored. Months of work was thrown out without comment, and this dynamic has repeated with other matters. Board leadership has instructed our last two Presidents to pressure the Senate to narrow its scope, and remain silent in Board affairs. / / The Board has outright refused to have some members of the public speak at public meetings. Those who are allowed to speak are carefully filtered days beforehand, and may be left to wait for hours before having an opportunity for their three minutes. Those who turn in copies of their comments for the record routinely have those thrown out, replaced by minutes that don't necessarily reflect the content of what was said. All communication to Trustees is filtered through leadership, and Trustee contact information is not published. Communications given to leadership for Board consideration aren't necessarily passed to other Trustees. / / The Board gave our last President a million dollars to stop working here, and then promptly told us the University was broke. It's unclear why we would ever hire someone who we wouldn't want to teach here, which is what an academic administrator is supposed to do when they step down. It's even more confusing that a financially problematic University would use the last of its money on something so arbitrary. / / We've received some wonderful donations from Trustees, which moves us towards the purpose of a Board making UO financially independent from the State. However, there are some members of the Board in donor seats who haven't donated much money towards University academics during their tenure. If Board members are being stingy with their pocketbooks, they should be replaced with more students, faculty, or employees, who are here every day and have firsthand knowledge of University operations. We don't really have much need for Board members who are both inexperienced in academic matters and aren't donating heavily towards our academic mission. These same Trustees that lobbied heavily to exclude student, faculty, and staff representation on the Board need to start coughing up some serious money or get out of the way. / / The HECC is the only check and balance the Board has left, and the Board looks to constantly push that boundary. Board leadership has an almost fanatical obsession with asserting control over the University, and promptly stripped our interim President of most of his power after firing the last one. Board leadership openly displays contempt with what they call "the Oregon way". One of the top priorities this year has been to similarly narrow the authority of the University senate. The HECC should remind the Board that their power is not unconditional, and should be prepared to make recommendations to the governor accordingly. / |
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| Total Responses | 70 |