Faculty Input Survey Spring 2016
Faculty-Only Responses

There were 161 surveys submitted.

What is the school or college of your primary appointment?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CBS</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAS</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>59.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COBA/SITC</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEHS/SN</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>16.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>154</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. The current quality of communication from the administration to faculty is:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>11.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>24.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>33.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely poor</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>29.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>161</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Your level of trust in the administration is:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>18.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>23.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely poor</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>28.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>161</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. Your level of trust in the president is:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>16.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>29.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely poor</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>38.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>161</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Your level of trust in the provost is:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>27.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>36.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>24.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely poor</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>161</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Your level of trust in your college dean is:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>44.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>31.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>14.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely poor</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>161</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6. Your perception of the level of shared governance (faculty input and relevance) in decision making on campus is:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely poor</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>41.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>161</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. In my opinion, the level of transparency of the president to the faculty is:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>26.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely poor</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>41.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>160</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. In my opinion, the level of transparency of the provost to the faculty is:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>17.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>37.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>26.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely poor</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>159</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
9. **What is the biggest challenge to shared governance on campus today?**

- Personnel who are overworked and unable to give full attention to important matters of governance.
- Decisions are made throughout campus without faculty input or significant forethought.
- Understanding what the definition is and agreeing on who is actually a decision maker. If faculty are not, they should know.
- There appears to be a very independent agenda by the President to set up an entirely separate university in Dallas.
- Communication between administration and faculty Administration (the SLT) tends to do what they think is best regardless of faculty input.
- Faculty being involved and taking a stand. For the most part faculty are sheep and do not challenge the administration on anything.
- Administration's agenda that focuses solely on money.
- As far as I can tell neither the Board of Trustees nor President have respect for faculty, faculty governance, or even serious input. It begins at the top.
- It is difficult to say, since the president either has trouble being, or does not want to be, transparent. But it seems that the administration's modus operandi is to make decisions and then inform the faculty... which is not shared governance at all. It seems that we need a greater willingness to cooperate on the part of the president... or a greater willingness to communicate the ways that governance is, in fact, being shared... because I am not seeing them.
- The faculty is not included in decision making regarding changes that directly affects their work. I do not feel that the President, SLT, or the Board realize what the faculty actually does. It is MUCH more than teaching classes.
- There is a decision-making structure in place in which little or no input is received from faculty and little or no communication is given to faculty, particularly from the president's office. We are not a large university, so this Fortune 500 model doesn't work for us at all.
- Fear of retribution and the useless nature of anything. Nothing we say is ever considered. In most cases, we are asked after the decision has been made to make us feel as if our opinion actually made a difference. Never in my work history have I seen such a disconnect between a leader and his followers. The gulf is wide.
- I think a challenge the administration has is sharing information with a faculty body that has a track record of over-reaction. To be in higher education is to be in a field of change. The administration is primarily charged with monitoring the market and adjusting to keep ACU relevant. The faculty at this institution has a history of being change-adverse. We need to work on this! Change is inevitable and when we embrace it, it can be stimulating and fun! I think the administration has made decisions about what (and how) to communicate with the faculty because of how the administration thinks the faculty will respond (poorly). The faculty are just as much to blame to any perceived problem with shared governance as the administration. Communication is a two way street. Let's change how WE react and see what happens. These concepts are straight from family dynamics theory. If we don't like some behavior of our partner (the admin), let's change ourselves- and they will inevitably respond.
- At times there seems to be a Ready, Shoot, Aim approach to new initiatives on campus.
• It seems that decisions are being made before getting any input from deans, chairs or faculty. I understand that there are some decisions that just need to be executive decisions, but there should at least be input when there is a far reaching impact (i.e. student financial services, advising).

• Faculty apathy, faculty who are vocal and emotional but unwilling to commit time or effort to engaging in the existing system (committees, senate, etc.) and working through this system to impact university decisions and direction

• I believe the president has consistently demonstrated a "top-down" leadership style that frequently ignores the concept of shared governance, particularly by making decisions (or issuing edicts, as was the case with the change to centralized advising) in academic areas that should be, and theoretically are, "owned by the faculty." Further, it appears that the provost is unable to effectively advocate for the academic area of the university. I don't know if that is because of the amount of influence he has (or doesn't have) on the president, or if there are other issues affecting his ability to do his job.

• The president's arrogance that somehow he alone knows what is best for the academic unit. His disdain for the faculty and their voice is reprehensible.

• Seeking input after major decisions have been put in motion. There is no significant shared governance in actuality.

• Loss of faith in leadership at the top, which the administration perceives and therefore tends to work around faculty to avoid conflict. They don't want our input because it may not agree with what they've decided to do.

• The perspective of faculty is simply not valued. That is a broad challenge with many implications. Still, that is the biggest challenge.

• As a faculty member, I don't expect every decision or issue to be subject to faculty approval. My read is that confusion exists on what is "owned" by the faculty and what is "owned" by the administration, thus creating role confusion and frustration over decisions. For example, it seems both faculty and administration perceive ownership of advising. In this case, both probably share governance. Beyond this more practical issue of role definition, communication seems lacking and trust is at a low level (perhaps on both sides?).

• Distrust and dissent from a handful of vocal, dissatisfied faculty - assumptions that decisions made without faculty input (whether perceived or actual) are somehow "against" the faculty.

• Greater openness on closing programs, moving programs (cases in point, Family Studies, Ag....)

• Poor communication and decisions that ask for no input before being announced. Disrespect for the expertise of the faculty!!!

• Honestly, the biggest challenge is that FACULTY don't understand the limits to their role in shared governance. It's true that Faculty have *input* into *certain* items, but it seems many of my colleagues think they *own* the *sole* decision on *more items than they do.* That said, the administration has made recent mistakes. However, that was not the question asked for #9.

• The president and his administration do not want to work with the faculty. This is clearly seen in his repeated disregard for shared governance at ACU. They want to run this organization as a business and not as a Christian university. Decisions are made that affect the soul of this university without any input from faculty. A short incomplete list of administrative decisions void of shared governance over the past few years includes: shift from chapel to 'spiritual formation', centralized advising, change to ACU drinking policy, move to D1, spin-off of ACU Dallas as independent campus without the Christian requirements for faculty, the shift away from hiring Church of Christ faculty, the addition of
instrumental music in chapel, the change in ACU's dancing policy, changes to recruiting, firing of multiple deans, changes to health insurance, change to block tuition, forcing the new gen ed on faculty (then not funding it, then not implementing it, then blaming it for a drop in transfer students, then forcing cuts to it, ...), cutting programs, un-cutting programs, ...

- Residential graduate programs vs Dallas; the fact that agenda items for academic councils are completely structured by administrators with no place for faculty to put agenda items that are not related to the Apple chart.
- ACU is increasing being run like a generic for-profit business. Faculty are feeling more and more like rank-and-file employees who are measured based on their impact to the bottom line. Faculty do not feel like this is "our" university any more, they feel like it is Phil Schubert's university.
- Dr. Schubert. poor communication
- SLT has only one academic voice on it. Why not add the chair of the faculty senate if we want to have shared governance?
- The president deciding how things are going to be and then "starting the conversation."
- I am not clear when 'shared governance' applies? Does it apply in all decision making? That can't be efficient. Is it whenever faculty want to weigh in? The areas of authority may be laid out clearly in the faculty handbook but I am not aware of it. I wish when the idea of 'shared governance' is brought up it would be introduced by outlining exactly what it means and what areas of authority have been defined.
- A lack of realism on the part of the faculty to the needs to change the way we do higher education AND a degree of aloofness from the administration.
- Decisions that directly effect academics should be made by academics, with input and oversight of administration.
- Few/no academic voices in leadership has created an imbalanced system that poorly advocates for the mission of education (which should be the primary mission of a university).
- Too many decisions are made and then communicated. Transparency exists in the communication after the fact, not in the actual decision-making process.
- There are no adequate forums for people with dissenting opinions to verbalize their concerns or disagreements. As a result, meetings are monological and votes feel decided before the first ballot is cast. We also need opportunities to get to know the Board of Trustees.
- The President. Shared governance almost doesn't exist, on a number of fronts, and it is affecting the future of what we have called Abilene Christian University. With regard to the Administration, this is most recently seen in the top-down decision-making to adopt centralized advising, in contravention to a mainstay of life at ACU, the in-department advising practice. But it is more than the President. The Board has not talked to faculty or has had little contact on a number of issues (partly due to the adoption of the Carver Governance Model) and has not correctly perceived the dramatic decline in ACU's commitment to God and His Word, nor does it seem that the Board or President will take firm steps to maintain this institution's purpose to first be a church of Christ school (and of course to admit others who want to enroll). This is seen in a number of recent discussions and decisions regarding religious heritage for faculty, alcohol for students, "welcoming" LGBT students, the decision by the President and his wife to divorce for unscriptural grounds, the hiring of non-church of Christ personnel to senior positions despite written requirements, the use of instrumental music in Chapel almost every day this Spring semester, and even the relaxation of the dress code. Any one of these by themselves would be worthy of full discussion with faculty, but together are alarming and visible signs of a crumbling spiritual and historical commitment to what this University was created for and has sustained it for 100 years. John Stevens or other
presidents would not allow this to happen, and also understood the role of faculty in making critical decisions. In short, the identity of this Christian institution is at stake.

- There is none. Apathy. The appearance of a hidden agenda from the President and the Executive Advisory Committee. The President makes major decisions without any input from students or faculty.
- Transparency. Communication is probably supposed to trickle down through the chain, but gets modified or changed as it is passes through people. There is always the problem of my having time for meetings etc. That is mine to change.
- Senior leadership personal agendas and golden boy mentality of some within the senior leadership team
- Conflicting views of ACU as a business and ACU as a school. Most university decisions are made with ZERO faculty input.
- Decisions about curriculum and advising. There are undoubtedly problems that need to be addressed, but there should be shared discussion about how to address them.
- Faculty voices are seldom sought until after decisions are made. The administration confuses including representatives of academic administration with including faculty. The provost and others have an academic viewpoint, and their involvement is important and valuable; however, they are many years removed from the day-to-day classroom/research/service experience of faculty. We would not imagine that we know how freshmen feel by asking the VP of Campus Life. We would ask freshmen. And in fact, student opinion is sought in multiple ways/surveys /forums, etc. Similarly, if faculty opinion/satisfaction is desired, then it's important to go to faculty directly. The recent centralized advising change exemplifies this, but it's not the only example. Perhaps this is the right direction. Perhaps it will be effective. But no one who is most directly affected by the change, or who has hands-on advising experience, was part of the process. Once faculty learned of the plan and offered input, ultimately pressing the issue with a resolution when they received no acknowledgement, they were heard but their views were rejected in their entirety. No serious consideration was given to delaying the implementation or placing it in the academic division. In the process, faculty and staff who have been advising and doing it well were made to feel incompetent and irrelevant by the way the old and new processes were described repeatedly in public forums. Such callous disregard for frontline personnel is inexcusable. Advising may not be squarely within the curricular provence of faculty, but it's definitely a borderline area with direct impact on the academic experience of students and faculty. Thus, at the very least, faculty or department chairs and staff members currently advising should have been part of the discussion. Failing to ask for input implies that the administration, and most specifically the president, either do not care what faculty know and think, do not trust what faculty know and think. Or perhaps he doesn't believe they have relevant knowledge, which is insulting at best.
- The lack of a team approach at the presidential level.
- We find out things after the decisions have been made or at best the ball is already rolling in a specific direction.
- There is none. What the faculty wants and thinks doesn't matter. I feel very disrespected.
- I think there needs to be more mechanisms in place to gauge how faculty think and feel about issues. It seems that often what we have are informational meetings, with little opportunity for real input.
- I think we faculty are our own worst challenge. We have a tendency to complain about far too many things, blunting our influence on the things that really matter. I see the current kerfuffle about changes in advising process as a good example of how we have a tendency to
complain about things that are less consequential, affecting our ability to have a real influence on the things that matter most.

- The powers-that-be can make ANYTHING they want happen through extortion and manipulating the budget. Examples abound: some of the most recent travesties of justice include (1) the Core vote (by not funding the Core, even though of course Core brought in 3 courses' worth of tuition dollars PER STUDENT, and by pitting departments against Core by stating that it was THEIR responsibility to pay for Core, the administration got rid of what they wanted to do [namely Core] in the first place) and (2) not funding or acting on the foreign language requirement, even though it has been affirmed and re-affirmed from the faculty.

- Faculty voice is ignored. The University Board seems to have forgotten that there is a faculty and is failing to move the University forward. I am at the point that I just focus on my students and try to ignore the broader University. When this survey was conducted 4 years ago there was a 1/2 hearted attempt to 'connect' with the faculty that lasted for a few months. We need a president that has served as an academic and is not wrapped up in his own personal family tragedy. The president has called two faculty meetings in the last several years; both were about his personal life. Shutting down the entire campus to discuss his personal life is not appropriate administrative behavior.

- Centralized advising. Academic advising is an inherently academic activity that belongs in the academic unit of the university. In some cases, even at ACU, advising is and has been part of the academic curriculum. To move it outside of academics without any substantive discussion with advisors is a gross breech of the shared governance ideal. I am ashamed that faculty members could barely even bring themselves to utter the words "no confidence" in the recent faculty-only meeting.

- The issue of the centralized advising - Everybody I hear talking about it is upset about it.

- Decisions in terms of dollars spent (football stadium, "retention" efforts) made without solid academic understandings.

- A culture of fear has been cultivated. Many of our meetings start off with our budget woes (which are partially a projection, i.e., not a current reality), leaving people in fear of losing their jobs. We're more likely to grant power to the powerful in times of economic distress (e.g., Hitler - not that I'm making a direct comparison). Additionally our culture of niceness makes us uncomfortable with dissenting voices, so we write them off as merely disgruntled (or old school CofC, whose only real beef is with Phil's divorce). In the face of challenging times, true leadership would fully involve those they lead in making decisions about the direction of an organization.

- administration

- Faculty is not even consulted about decisions such as the changes to advising that is being implemented.

- Better communication from the president himself would improve many of the problems with the faculty he is currently having. If he would share his plans earlier and more frequently the president would be in much better shape.

- Decisions about academic matters and academic-related matters are being shoved down the faculty's throat. The Dallas campus evidently does not go through the same process on academic matters as the Abilene campus. The unilateral decision to go with centralized advising is a clear violation of shared governance.

- lack of process - at times it feels that major decisions are made without consulting with or informing major stakeholders. Even when decisions are ultimately determined to be in the best interests of the university, this lack of process leads to distrust of the administration.
• being informed of changes that affect students and faculty without having a say as to whether those changed occur or not (e.g. centralized advising)
• I don't see a challenge. Faculty often like to have input into areas for which they have a limited skill set.
• Decisions being made that impact faculty, faculty course load, etc. without department or faculty input.
• administrators' top-down management style. I hold the opinion that some of our administrators may be open to more shared governance but that the "high official leadership" is ingrained into top-down management that lower level management follow. To me top-down management is like teaching only by lecture because it takes less effort. Nothing wrong with lecturing but it is an easier way to teach because the teacher controls the classroom. The analogy can be made to top-down management - it is easier because the top tier of administrators control the university.
• It is not shared...We should have a vote or be asked before any major decision...never told. Shared = asked. told = I'm over you and don't ask. If I tell my spouse what I want them to do all the time instead of asking them, well my marriage would be heading toward a divorce. If we do not stand up, the next thing we know we will be picked off one-by-one by the non-academic upper administration. Part of this is our fault as we have not defined what we want from shared governance. In my opinion the president has way too much power and no checks or balances.
• There is little or no communication until decisions have already been made by administrators.
• Only having one career academic on the Senior Leadership Team.
• No respect by the administration for the input of faculty into decisions that have significant bearing on relationships between faculty and students is probably the biggest challenge to shared governance. Decisions seem to be made at the SLT level and passed to a select group of administrators who work to figure out an implementation plan, and then after all of the plans are set, the faculty is informed of the plans and when they will happen, and asked for comments on the plan. This is not shared governance. Why would faculty bother to question or make serious (constructive or otherwise) comments on something that will obviously happen and they have no chance to change or make better. This drives the feeling that faculty should just keep their heads down and teach and let someone else worry about the policies and functioning of the university on the larger scale. But, maybe the administration runs the university and the faculty are just cheap labor.
• I see two primary challenges related to this issue. First, Phil Schubert and several of the SLT are arrogant to the point of having contempt of the faculty. Second, the Board of Trustees, led by Barry Packer, is simply unwilling to govern senior leadership as they should. Instead, they simply enable Schubert to do whatever he wants to, to the detriment of the university. It is simply mind-boggling to think that, as badly as Schubert has managed the university, financially and otherwise, he has received compensation increases rather than being fired.
• How to define it
• Administrative transparency. I generally support an environment of trying new things in new ways. I'd better be able to support and serve the university if I had a clearer idea of where we were going. Faculty need to know the vision so that administrative decisions make sense rather than leaving us feeling like we never saw them coming.
• The administration makes decisions without academic input and then hands them down for the faculty and councils to rubber stamp. We have no input or influence up front. We have no real shared governance; only a veneer placed over top of decisions made by non-academics.
Major decisions seem to be driven by marketing and financial concerns, while academic concerns are the last consulted and last heard.

- The President and his refusal to include faculty voices (and listen rather than fire those he disagrees with), his well-known temper, and his inability to tell us the truth. We simply cannot trust anything the President tells us.
- An administration that (a) cannot operate effectively in terms of planning so decisions have to be made at the last minute without faculty input, and (b) they think they are the smartest people in the room, have the answers, we as faculty wouldn't understand the complexity of the situation anyway, so here is my/our decision - carry it out.
- It seems as though the administration does not value the idea of shared governance as much as the faculty members do.
- Being told of new plans being implemented without our input. (centralized advising being one where even after the Faculty Senate sent a recommendation to not roll it out so soon, they are doing it).
- Lack of trust of senior leadership in the faculty
- I feel as though the President knows that the faculty may not agree with his ideas. So, instead of seeking their opinions and input or seeking to build consensus as good leaders do, he prefers to ramrod his ideas through. Occasional lip-service is paid to shared governance but I have never seen any time at which the faculty opinion changed his mind on any matter. Is there any instance in which the president wanted to do something, but, after hearing the opinion of the faculty, changed his mind? As far as I can tell, what he wants to do, he will do, and (in his perspective) faculty only get in his way.
- Processes to see that the mission and vision of ACU is expanded is prolonged and has to go to many channels, thus delaying ACU's visibility and competitiveness compared to other similar institutions.
- Lack of faculty voice in strategic initiatives, especially in areas impacting academics.
- I just do not see any interest from administration in shared governance. As long as the board supports the administration faculty has no power. So, I suppose that means the boards support of the current authoritarian regime is the biggest challenge.
- The realities of economic pressures put on administrators, contrasted with the desire for top notch academic pursuits of faculty.
- Building a team (Administration, Faculty and Staff) that is on the same page. Sharing and working together to make the difficult decisions. I definitely understand that some decisions have to be made at the top (level) - but at least give us a heads up and allow us to engage in the process. Don't assume that we are incapable of working with you to address difficult situations. It would be great to have a president that understands the challenges of being a college faculty member. There is such a leadership disconnect and it is causing a high degree of distrust and lack of support. Even when we are allowed to give input it appears to fall on deaf ears - the president already has his mind made up. This is not the ACU culture of a Christian partnership and collegiality that we so desire. Please work with us and not against us! Hopefully this concern will not be ignored or simply discounted since it is coming from a faculty member.
- Faculty input is not valued or solicited by SALT The SLT
- Not feeling like what the faculty needs matters to the administration or to the board, and that we as faculty are not even consulted, much less listened to
• The reality that faculty input is almost completely devalued is of huge concern to me. We are quickly becoming a de-personalized corporation rather than a significant contributor to the landscape of meaningful education.

• Major philosophical decisions and the specific steps they necessitate are shaped without ground-floor involvement by faculty. Decisions are made, then shared with the faculty. That is not the same thing as shared governance.

• The autocratic nature of the President; his ineptitude in regard to leadership

• Admin has different goals ($, athletics) from the faculty (students/academics). It is clear that the primary concern of admin is not the students. The faculty are being asked to do more with less.

• There is so much confusion about the level of shared governance and transparency with everything going on at ACU Dallas. It seems that the Provost has no authority over Dallas, but no one's talking about it....

• The biggest challenge is getting the administration to involve faculty in major decisions that involve academic excellence.

• The president seems to be running this institution as if he is the CEO of a business. He seems to prefer to make decisions and then implement them without input beyond the Board/higher administration. I believe he fears the faculty would not agree with some/many of the changes he wants made/has already made, so instead of seeking wisdom and guidance from us, he has decided it is easier to just make decisions unilaterally and inform us of them after the fact. If this is not the case, then communication has been so poor as to give the impression of unilateral decision making. Additionally, I do not understand why more faculty are not on the SLT. It really does seem as if the president and administration do not like working with the faculty.

• I'm not sure that shared governance on this campus is valued or wanted. The impression that I have of the president and senior leadership team is that faculty are a nuisance and that shared governance is a hindrance to their plans for the university.

• Defining what should be shared and what should not

• It seems that the administration has not consistently acted in good faith in discussing key "aspects of student life which relate to the educational process" with faculty.

• Apart from curriculum, the faculty simply aren't included in the decision-making process on many items of significance and are sometimes outright ignored when we request input. The recent decision on centralized advising is illustrative. As far as I'm aware, the Senate's resolution received no response.

• Decisions by the board and the president without faculty input regarding academic matters; the decision by the board to keep Phil during the latest event causes me to vote no confidence in the board.

• Transparency and faculty involvement in decisions that affect our relationships and work with students.

• Decisions are made by administration that negatively impact the academic unit, with no opportunity for dialogue or recourse.

• It seems the budget is always in crisis, and administration feels their first priority is to make decisions to help secure the financial viability of the university. It does not appear they feel the faculty has the knowledge or perhaps the objectivity to participate strongly in these decisions.
• The president and the board are not educators. They are business people. There is a kind of arrogance in that they have a new vision of ACU that I don't think the faculty buys into. It certainly doesn't seem to have much to do with education and personal relationship.

• There seems to be a pattern of putting an administrator level faculty member on committees to develop policy change and claim that the faculty were involved. Nowhere is this more evident than in the centralized advising and the Dallas campus decisions.

• Communication Top heavy administration Phil Schubert rules the campus like a dictator. Faculty senate not representing faculty as a whole

10. What else would you like to share with the Faculty Senate?

• what is the composition of the senior leadership team--is it equally weighted between administration and faculty

• I believe what is happening at ACU Dallas is criminal. They are being allowed to operate fast and loose at the expense and against the best interest of the Abilene campus. I don't believe their is adequate oversight for the decisions being made there.

• Thank you for under taking this. I don't know what kind of response you will have, but if you don't have a great response, I hope Senate leaders would consider that the apathy is a negative response about feeling "heard" in the University.

• A resolution from the Senate and faculty indicating a lack of confidence in the President and Board is not out of order

• We may quibble over the details of various recent decisions impacting the academic life of the university. But it is very, very clear that a trend has emerged in which the topmost administration shows no regard at all for the responsibilities, knowledge, and experience of the faculty. This trend does not just hurt faculty -- it hurts students because it strips away the creativity, courage, and wisdom of the faculty and turns us all into amateur accountants and cogs in a big machine.

• There must be a vote of no confidence put forward. This vote must be completely anonymous (even to the point of paper vote yes or no). We fear retribution. This is the only way we regain our bite. Right now, we are a toothless dog chained in the corner being fed scraps of information after a decision has been made. It is time that we correct this situation. The fear of this vote (even the threat of a vote) getting out will hit the school financially. Money is what gets attention. The media will report it. The board will feel it. The president should fear it because it hits him both personally and operationally. Reports in the media alone should be enough to drive off students for the next intake. National rankings will be effected. Revenue will drop. Having been in industry for over 30 years prior to teaching I have seen a lot of messed up relationships between leaders and followers. This, my friends, is one of the worst. A complete loss of contact and consideration. It is so bad I am at a loss as to if it can even be fixed. Both the President and the Board must pay attention to the level of discontent that now exists between faculty and upper leadership. I pray that this severe problem can be resolved. However, some prayers often go unanswered....

• I'm disappointed that the senate is a primarily reactive body, I think we've lost credibility with the administration because we respond poorly to basically every change that happens at ACU.

• I feel that ACU is losing sight of OUR mission. It seems that we keep looking to other institutions and implementing things they are doing. Those may not necessarily contribute to our mission and what makes ACU unique. We would do better to keep the main thing the main thing and make sure that it fits with our goals and mission as a university.
I think that many faculty members are disappointed with some of the president's decisions and behavior. However, I doubt that there is a consistent majority (the same group of faculty) who are disappointed with any of the decisions. I think that we each dislike or disagree with some of the administration's decisions but support others. If this is true, the situation is much different than implied by the attitude and discussion seen in the recent faculty meeting. That's worth exploring further, I believe.

I believe it is time to take organized action, headed up by the faculty senate, to begin the process of taking a vote of confidence/no confidence in the president next fall.

This health insurance is so bad that I'm looking at other jobs. Either HR is horribly underfunded, or completely incompetent. Both of these are solvable problems.

Two things: First, as long as the board cedes their responsibilities to the president, they will never see a problem. Second, as long as the faculty and the faculty senate refuse to make a stand, nothing will change. So, unless we are willing to take drastic and public action, let's quit griping and complaining and just take the abuse!

We are front line and know our students. It seems as though major decisions are being made that have little to no actual faculty input.

Faculty must become more involved in making sure this is addressed. Not just the Senate, who may or may not agree. Senate's first responsibility is to represent the Faculty.

I think the president's role is larger than chief fund raiser and strategist for increasing revenue and/or assuring profitability. He/she must be a moral leader for us and, most importantly, for alums and students. I don't think we're well served by a president who wasn't able to "live into" (to use his favorite phrase) one of Jesus's few direct cautions if not prohibitions, depending on how one interprets it: divorce (Matt: 19). I would not apply this sort of litmus test to any other role in the university because this is America and we're in a culture where "divorce happens," often because of the mentality that "one can do better" or "deserves better." The divorce may not have been the president's fault at all, but I think we need to be led by someone who can model an ideal. He should go back to being CFO. And the provost, who is the president's right-hand man would do better in another position since he is much more concerned with budget issues and harvesting dollars than being our chief ACADEMIC officer, i.e., the person assigned to do things to upgrade and maintain the intellectual aspects of being a 21st century liberal arts university, not squeeze more dollars out of atrophying fruit. Sidenote: I was very frustrated how in the Strategic Plan meeting Phil characterized the innovation grants as being about new teaching methods when clearly the main criteria "stated in writing" for awarding them was that they must also generate new revenue. At ACU these days something is only worth doing if it makes money, not because it's the right thing or it's Christian. E.g. D-1 which has nothing to do with being a Christian university, only with potential TV revenue and fantasized marketing opportunities. The NCAA is a cancer on higher ed that exploits athletes' labor as well as risks their health, it represents the most shallow aspects of secular culture, and now we're all in.... The way it appears to me, if it makes money, we're interested. We're saddled with an administration seduced by mammon and also marching to a persistent hum of fear that enough will never be enough.

I struggle to recall any initiatives that faculty senate has originated, created and pursued for the benefit of faculty and campus. The vast majority of its effort seems to be devoted to opposing the administration or critiquing others' efforts. Staff senate seems to have a much better approach to this. Faculty senate will remain a generally ignored group until it finds some positive things to advocate for and to do, rather than simply seeing itself as the watchdog of the administration.

My loyalty to ACU is the lowest that it has ever been. I wouldn't want to place that outcome on the shoulders of the administration but I do sense that the upper-administration's goal is to
become a big university (centralized advising, D1, and perhaps ACU Dallas) in how we function rather than so much in size, while I resonate with student relationships, spiritual formation, and academic quality. It might be countered that these are exactly the strategic planning emphases but when you peel back those stated goals, a) there doesn't appear to be much substance within them (e.g., spiritual formation means connecting curricular and co-curricular efforts), and b) several of our major efforts (e.g., D1, ACU Dallas, centralized advising) don't seem to move in these directions. I have heard the arguments (D1 means higher quality academics, Dallas will save Abilene, advising will increase retention) but I don't find the arguments convincing. I've also heard "faculty are resistant to change." This may be true--and may be true for humans generally--but it seems to me that it is the direction of the change that causes the most resistance, not the change itself. I don't know if it's related or not, but I have been so deeply disappointed over the past several years at how many people seem to be burned by ACU. I've been to two "retirement" receptions recently where people were exiting and hurt. I've talked with several advisors who were hurt by the sudden announcement and absence of communication afterward. The firing of the ACU medical clinic staff, the departure of several faculty and staff over the past five years--it hurts me to hear stories of so many people who loved ACU but who lost trust and carry scars because of how they were treated here. I appreciate ACU and have been very blessed by being here but it pains me to hear of these stories and it affects my confidence in management decisions and loyalty to the institution. Regarding this survey, I feel strongly that it should not be seen as a vote of no-confidence. I believe Phil and Robert are working incredibly hard and doing their best. It would be unfortunate if this survey was used as saber-rattling. My opinion is that it should help us to be more effective in our shared mission and goals. If it can't do that--if it harms our relationship with the administration or the board and the administration's view of the faculty--it would be most unfortunate. I hope the Faculty Senate will navigate these waters carefully.

- ACU is a big school and growing bigger all the time. There is no "unified" voice for the faculty and no way ACU's administration can seek the input of the whole faculty for every single decision that needs to be made to keep the university moving forward. Long-time faculty who are mourning the loss of the "small school" feel ACU used to have need to wake up to the way things are today. Either you trust ACU's administration or you don't. And if you don't, why are you still teaching here?

- It is lamentable that while we have the superb Family First program led by Royce and now Heidi, our President is about to be divorced. What does this say to us, our constituents, and our students? If the President of ACU cannot keep his family/work balanced, what hope is there for the rest of "us"?

- Erosion of faculty prerogatives has been pretty steady for several years. Unfortunately the faculty has been partially responsible for this occurrence since through apathy we have abdicated our rights and responsibilities.

- Dr. Schubert should step down as president since he is getting a divorce. If he does not step down, the board should do the right thing and fire him. If neither the president or the board will do the right thing, then the faculty must stand up and insist for the good of the university that he be replaced. If our president can not uphold his marriage vows then how can he be an effective Christian leader for this Christian university? One thing I agree with Dr. Schubert about is that "I'm embarrassed" about this too.

- The president needs more academics (faculty, provost, deans, etc.) in his inner circle of advisers. Divorce is a difficult thing to go through. Many divorce experts advise that you try to avoid making major life decisions when you are going through this (for 1-2 years). I believe that Phil Schubert should be given some time to step away from making major
decisions until he has had some time to process what is going on in his personal life. This is not a suggestion that he has done anything wrong regarding his personal life, just a matter of the practical considerations when going through a major life event such as this.

- Please help give the faculty a voice! Thank you.
- Thanks for your service.
- Many of us in faculty accepted pay cuts and sacrificed careers elsewhere to teach at ACU because we believe in the mission. That sacrifice is being disrespected. The president has isolated himself from faculty. He has made decisions and asked for faculty input later. Neither he nor anyone on the board has explained how we can believe and teach one thing about divorce and yet simply accept the president's divorce without consequences.

I think Phil is in an impossible situation regarding his job and his marriage. Overall I believe it is being handled as well as it can be. In regards to his performance, I don't think he is doing a better or worse job than presidents throughout the history of ACU. I would be very worried about changing leadership at this point and I don't think there is evidence that changes need to be made. Regarding Centralized Advising, the communication of this initiative has been extremely poor. In general I don't think ACU handles large scale changes well and with a strong history of success. We fumble through it and improve things slowly over time. I am worried about the likelihood of success of centralized advising. That said, I don't think ACU is much worse than most large organizations in it's ability to communicate. Or in the way that it tries to improve it's processes. This was likely fumbled in the same ways other large scale, academic institutions would fumble it. I believe the people in charge are doing what they think is right in honest and appropriate ways. I disagree from my vantage point but I also believe I would likely agree with them if I operated in their context.

- Thank you for your support and advocacy!
- I don't believe the faculty senate has any power. It feels like the only reason this committee exists is to create the illusion that our input is being heard. I often feel like the administration and board of trustees are so far removed from the classroom that they have little understanding of who our students are, what we teach, or what our students are getting out of an ACU education. The distance feels greater every year. Yet, there doesn't seem to be any evaluation system for assessing the faculty's satisfaction with the Board's leadership.

I think that the faculty, through the Faculty Senate, is setting a poor example for our student body. We are shaping students lives to be the future of the world's marketplace, leaders if you will. How can we expect them to learn from us if we are unwilling to stand up for ourselves when it comes to our marketplace? The Senate needs to be that voice of leadership.

- We need to stretch our muscles more. We have allowed the administration to not include us in decisions.
- 1) Office of Recruitment seems to have a louder voice in academic matters than faculty. 2) Administration has effectively turned ACU faculty's mood from a sense of mission into just another job.
- The decision to go to centralized advising is the worst conceived idea of the last 100 years. It is merely a cost saving measure dressed up in fancy language of helping with student retention. But the faculty can see right through the "spin."

- Thank you for starting to make a stand for us, and for the students.
- I felt like the "no confidence" vote talk wasn't given enough consideration in the faculty only meeting
- I am concerned that the Senior Leadership team does not include many members who have a background in academics. There is a lack of understanding of the academic process.
Faculty Senate has been ineffective this year. What have been your initiatives? What assertive steps have been taken on any issue of concern to faculty? How have you represented us?

We are continuing to be asked to "do more with less." We sacrifice ourselves and our families to do this because we don't want to cause the students to suffer and because we don't want to lose our jobs. At some point we have to stand up and say NO MORE. Also, the administration makes decisions without looking at the "cost" or impact, feasibility. They have no clue what it takes to accomplish the tasks they ask of us. If I could find a job elsewhere, I would leave.

I don't know the President well. I did not know how to answer the transparency question because of this. I have seen him out in the community and did not recognize him at first. I would like for him to be more visibly engaged with faculty and students. In terms of his personal life and divorce, I believe some matters are private and I have no expectation of him speaking to that in a specific way. I believe it is best to give him "space" in that very personal area.

See above. While I agree that there are problems with shared governance at our university, I do not believe that the current move toward central advising is a wise investment of our "capital," as it were.

ACU can no longer claim (or even to aspire to) to be "a premiere university." Why? Many reasons, but three notable ones will suffice: 1. It is now highly possible for many students to go all the way through college and graduate WITHOUT having written a single long research paper. How? Because of the unevenness of what we accept as "dual credit," even if a student didn't write researched writing in those courses, the English department must accept the students as having passed 111 and/or 112. Now, because Core 210 and 310 are not mandatory/let's-face-it- they're-gone, and if a student takes, say, only business classes that don't require research papers or ... any number of courses of study, they will not have learned well what it is to understand and research peer-examined material, organize said material, and write a solid paper. (By the way, there is a solution even after the defeat of Core: all students should take an English placement test. We already do this in foreign language, and it's highly effective. Thus, we could still admit less-than-stellar writers and TEACH them how to become good writers, and students who have already mastered beginning English could begin at a higher level.) 2. We do not have even a minimal foreign language requirement, even though the faculty has affirmed and re-affirmed its need through its clearly impotent voting process. Innovative? No. Exceptional? No. Real? Real lame. 3. Our president is 100% removed from the faculty. He never even visits classrooms, and, having NEVER taught himself on an ongoing basis, has absolutely no idea what it is we do. He is a great fundraiser and money man, and he should be responsible enough to understand his strengths and do THAT instead of involving himself in the academic side only when essential and then without any real understanding. It's OK to be uninformed and disinterested in academics when you're not an academic--but NOT when you supposedly are. (Did you know in Germany, it is ILLEGAL for a person with an Ed.D and not a Ph.D to call himself "doctor"? There is a reason for that.)

Faculty Senate could do a better job of sharing results of meetings with administration. This has been a problem for several years.

"Your responses are completely confidential and anonymous. Your identity is completely hidden.... Again, no box was clicked to identify an individual. All responses are antonymous." Responding to this survey requires my.acu.edu login on a Google based system that ACU owns. I have no expectation of privacy in any system that requires
my.acu.edu login. This survey may be confidential, but is most certainly not anonymous. I hope that I don't regret responding.

- Students are the losers on this issue of the centralized advising. I can only speak about my department (DBMM), but the new system would not be effective for our students. Currently, our chair Rodney and Carlene are constantly working together to provide a very individualized care, concern, and expertise for our majors. This highly individualized care and expertise will be lost in the new system. Besides neither of them was consulted on this matter before it was announced.

- There has never been full information about the true costs to the university of Division I athletic efforts---why the secrecy?

- Work hard to dissociate Phil's divorce with any vote of no confidence, should one occur (note: I'll be extremely surprised if anything comes of this survey or the discussion - see fear and niceness above). The leadership style of both Phil and Robert are at issue, not their personal lives.

- I think the board of trustees needs to improve communications as well. ACU is a university and as such does not function like the corporate world they (members of the board) tend to come from. The corporate model is not anything like the model a university functions under.

- This president and provost seem to have little regard for academic quality. Everything is about the almighty dollar. That sort of attitude, extended over several years, leads to a poor morale on campus among students, faculty, and staff. The move to D1 athletics is a very expensive move. It is heartbreaking to see us pouring millions and millions and millions into athletics at the same time we are cutting academics. The demands for cuts to academics will never stop, will they? We have acceded to the administration's demands on many things: cutting Core, rushing through approving all these online programs, putting more regular content online, etc. We have good enrollment. We have great return on our endowment. We have the Salon, which was promised to be a moneymaker. Isn't it time we step back, take a breath, and allow all these steps to have an effect? Isn't it irresponsible to keep cutting and cutting without having time to assess the effects of these cuts, both on the academic quality of our education and on the budget? The changes in benefits are terrible. It seems like the process is so confusing and so discouraging that they are hoping we will simply stop going to the doctor. Don't begin a meeting by calling us apathetic and thus blaming us for the problems on campus. We are not apathetic: we are beaten, broken, overworked, underpaid, and scared. It's like battered wife syndrome: don't blame the victim.

- Thanks for your work!

- Department is constantly being asked to do more with fewer (not enough) faculty.

- I feel it is wrong for someone who cannot keep their marriage together to represent a Christian institution. Just like I would not want a minister counseling couples who was divorced. I feel this is more of a principle, but, the aspect that someone going through a divorce can do their job and be unaffected by the divorce is also in my opinion a fallacy. The job performance of a person getting a divorce has to be affected. A vote of no-confidence should be arranged.

- While I would like to trust the decisions of the administration, it is very difficult to do so when we are handed changes to policies without any evidence that the policy will have the intended consequences. It is even more difficult when the people who are doing the actual work and could have considerable constructive input to a policy change (including whether that change is needed) are not consulted about what works well, or what works poorly. Sometimes radical change is needed, but when that is the case, the change should come out of a robust discussion from the university, not handed down from the administration.
The Faculty generally, and the Faculty Senate specifically, needs to seriously consider if it is actually going to do anything about this issue. Passing another meaningless resolution that both the administration and the board are going to ignore will do nothing. We should conduct a no-confidence vote for the president (that is communicated to the media) at a minimum, and seriously consider other options such as a protest disbanding of the Senate, or work actions.

We should clearly define the purpose of the faculty senate.

I am deeply concerned by the staggeringly poor quality of health insurance we have here. The fact that ACU opted this year to carry an insurance plan that, for a portion of the year, was not honored by ANY LOCAL HOSPITAL is ridiculous. Even now with both hospitals recognizing our insurance, this negotiated pay model is very complex and difficult to use--it's practically impossible to financially plan for health care, and having to do so much additional research oneself to locate the best place to go for every test or consult or bloodwork adds a great deal of personal time commitment and headache for the employee. My perception is that this is the worst health insurance, both in terms of actual coverage and usability, that we have had since 2010. When I compare the quality of our health insurance and the fact that there is no paid maternity/paternity leave, subsidized child care, or insurance coverage for infertility at this university to the cost of the utterly pointless screens in the new science building, it makes me absolutely livid. Money here is spent on window dressing, on flashy, slick new things that we think will attract students, while actual members of the ACU community lack financial security and support.

I don't know why the Senate did not call for a vote of no-confidence in 2012; I think we missed our opportunity to deal proactively with a bad situation. Now, unless the board listens to someone other than the president there is nothing for the Senate to do but wait until the President resigns.

Not a good time to be at ACU. (1) For a college president, of a small, private religious school, to not only have the credibility issues he has, but in public to state that a GOAL of this institution is to have ESPN Game Day come here, is embarrassing. Athletics are great, and those students are great, but the shift in importance and balance is awful, and this President is pushing that agenda to the detriment of our academic program and our integrity. (2) Mistakes made by the administration, such as the horrible implementation of the Core, are being corrected at the departmental level with positions and staff being let go, budgets frozen/cut, and more. Why can't their lack of competence be fixed at the administrative level? (3) The non-academic areas of the campus for the last several years are balancing their budgets on the back of the academic program. All of these and so much more demonstrate a lack of thoughtful leadership.

I think a letter from the faculty outlining our frustrations and more time with faculty and the President would be appropriate.

The ACU Dallas was not handled well at all and it was not done with fidelity to the policies of ACU. Centralized advising decision was not made with adequate thought or buy in

Need to seek more ways to support grants for other departments (i.e. nursing, biology, chemistry, engineering, scholarships/grants for graduate education)

Faculty disappointment with the administration seemed deep enough to warrant a confidence vote. Regarding Central Advising: does any evidence exist that departments were notified of problems in their advising, that poor performing advisors were given the opportunity to improve or were fired and replaced, or that any other corrective measures were attempted prior to deciding to resort to central advising?
Our mission is to give life to Christ. We are a teaching university (not a research institution) and that is a good thing. I am not opposed to scholarship or athletics but I am tired of ACU chasing after every whim to be something we are not (e.g. ACU Dallas).

The move to centralized advising rivals that of the core curriculum, it will fail to meet objective of retention, raise costs, and generally add more headaches.

It is a very frustrating time at ACU to be a faculty member who feels we are moving away from our core Christian values. We are constantly trying to find new ways of doing things (to the degree that we have forgot who we are!). Please understand, I do like some of the things we are doing - For example I am fine with moving to D1, increasing the diversity in our student body and growing our degree programs. I am not fine with leaving our foundational beliefs (Biblically based) and changing to fit the culture of the world. We are becoming the TCU of the Southland Conference and that is so sad. Our students and the world are changing us more than we are changing them. I do appreciate the many in administration that understand this challenge and are working to keep us on the right track. I just don't feel this leadership is coming from the president.

Thank you for all you are doing. Keep on. Call on us maybe in new ways to serve the true calling of this university.

I believe that the President has "led" by fear, making it impossible for there to be a genuine faculty voice and making it very difficult for deans or others to lead effectively.

The administration seems to have lost its way and no longer seems true to the mission of the University to educate students for Christian service! We seem to increasingly reflect cultural values and fail to challenge our students to live counter to the culture. Research indicates a high percentage of our students are not involved in a local church, are sexually active, etc. and the administration seems to look the other way. For example, if we even have a dress code any more, then there appears to be no effort to enforce it. We look more and more like a state school and have become ordinary in many ways!

Everything with ACU Dallas is very vague and there are significant concerns about Stephen Johnson's vision.

I think more meetings like the recent one would be valuable and helpful for getting a sense of faculty feeling about issues.

I think it sent a clear message when the decision was made not to offer tenure to the faculty at ACU Dallas. The message that this sent to me is that faculty at ACU are no longer part of the long-term vision of this university. It appears to me that ACU is looking for faculty that are disposable, that they can layoff at a moments notice. I've never worked for a company that relies so heavily on layoffs. It feels as though I'm working for an oil company who when the market turns bad feels little commitment to taking care of its employees. This has created a survival of the fittest mentality among non-tenured faculty competing among each other to prevent being the next one laid off. I understand the market of higher education is changing and that universities must operate differently to pay the bills. However, I have seen firsthand, especially in residential grad, that poor financial planning by the university, not changes in the market have resulted in many of the difficulties we are having.

I think there are decisions that are not the faculty's to make. In these cases, the administration may ask our opinion or may not. I don't think they are required to ask our opinion about everything.

Even though faculty can (rightfully) articulate grievances with regard to shared governance on campus, we must also admit that faculty can be very difficult to work with. Gaining consensus on any topic with us is nearly impossible. Can we recommend a way for the administration to work with us? Some way to compromise on a way forward?
1) The president doesn't understand how to communicate with faculty. The recent presentation of the Strategic Plan is a good example. Rather than giving us the plan before the meeting, he presented a watered-down version that didn't address controversial items (such as the departmental budget cuts for FY17). Instead, he spent several minutes telling a story, and then the bulk of the content portion of the speech was purely hype, political rhetoric. Faculty see through this; it's clearly intended to distract, it is disingenuous, and it promotes distrust. 2) There is no transparency on the university budget. 3) I've seen no tangible evidence that the president supports the arts at ACU.

I think a vote of no confidence in both the board and the president is in order
I feel sad and disappointed. It seems that providing our students a high quality education with Christian mentors who are available to them is no longer the primary goal of the board and the administration.
If the president thinks his home troubles are not affecting his job performance, he is sadly mistaken. When he took office there was a 'communication survey' taken that concluded he was too quiet and hidden from the campus. He started to be more visible. Then, he and Jamie separated and he has been dramatically less visible since. Now that he is divorcing, we will see him even less as well as fewer of our traditional students.
As faculty experience an erosion of actual pay and benefits, we seem to be taking on more and more responsibilities unrelated to our actual teaching and research. We used to be a teaching college now we aim to be an administrative factory. This admin vision would seem to turn us toward a vo-tech opposite of a liberal arts, interdisciplinary standard. A critical thinking/creative problem solving standard that is actually more relevant to the work world.
An academic should be running the university.
Why is there no question asking us to rank our confidence/trust/opinion of communication with the senate? We hear nothing from them all year, until the next to last week of the semester, and then we are supposed to be getting behind a no-confidence vote because of centralized advising, of all things. This is ridiculous. Start taking seriously your responsibility to represent the faculty as a whole, and find out what they care about, and institute accountability to them.