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1. Executive Summary

Report of the Iowa State University Faculty Senate Office of Executive Vice President and Provost Review Committee

Faculty Senate President Steve Freeman formed the Faculty Senate Office of Executive Vice President and Provost Review Committee (OEVPPRC) on 12 July 2011 and charged the members to review the office of the Executive Vice President and Provost as described in the Faculty Senate Handbook, Section 5.7.5. The members of the OEVPPRC included Micheal Owen (Agronomy), Kristen Constant (Material Science and Engineering), Suzanne Hendrich (Food Science and Human Nutrition), Sidner Larson (English), Paul Lasley (Sociology), Andrew Manu (Agronomy) and Daniel Saftig (ex officio ISU Foundation). In accordance with the Faculty Handbook Section 5.7.5, the review included a self-study submitted by the OEVPP, a faculty review of the office and its subunits and a faculty review of administrator performance. In order to accomplish the faculty reviews, the OEVPPRC developed a survey that was made available to all Iowa State University Faculty and also conducted personal interviews with ISU Senior administration including Vice Presidents, Associate Provosts, and Deans. Also, the Faculty Senate Executive Board and the Professional and Scientific Council were included in the interviews.

The survey to evaluate the OEVPP was made available to 1745 ISU faculty in mid-January 2012 and faculty could respond until the survey closed on February 3, 2012. The faculty response to the survey was very high in comparison to similar surveys and 505 ISU faculty (29%) completed the survey. The survey respondents was representative of the ISU faculty; 13% of the respondents were lecturers and instructors, 19% were Assistant Professors, 27% were Associate Professors, 34% were Professors and 6% of the respondents were University or Distinguished Professors. All ISU colleges were represented in the survey respondents. Gender representation of the faculty who responded to the survey was 35% female and 65% male. Importantly, survey respondents also provided many pages of single-spaced comments which were generally very favorable.

A summary of the survey results suggested that the OEVPP has done a good job given the extreme economic difficulties that has faced the academy during the period since the last Faculty Senate evaluation. Importantly, faculty members who reported more frequent contact with the OEVPP were more likely to provide positive responses to the questions. For example, 62% of the faculty members who responded to the survey strongly agreed or agreed that OEVPP provided good leadership in advocating for diversity within the academy. However, of faculty who reported extensive contact or some contact with the OEVPP, 87% and 90% strongly agreed or agreed that the OEVPP advocated for diversity, respectively. Given the economic stress to which the academy has been subjected over past several years, the generally positive assessment of the OEVPP suggested that most faculty respondents are pleased with the performance of the OEVPP.
Seventeen personal interviews of senior administrators and campus leaders were conducted. The interviews were attended by at least two members of the OEVPPRC and one of the committee members was the Committee Chair thus providing a consistency over the 17 half hour personal interviews that were conducted. At most interviews, three or more committee members attended. The following three questions were offered to initiate the discussion; 1) What is the nature and frequency of your interaction with the OEVPP? 2) What does the OEVPP do well and why? 3) What aspects of the OEVPP need improvement and why? The responses to these questions varied considerably but there was consensus that the OEVPP was supportive at all levels and responsive to concerns. Key points and opinions that were expressed included:

- The handling of Promotion and Tenure and third year Assistant Professor evaluations by the OEVPP has been exceptional and has unified (as much as possible) the process across the academy as a result of the emphasis placed upon this by the Executive Vice President and Provost
- The Provost and OEVPP have done an excellent job providing leadership through a long period of declining university general funds
- The OEVPP has done an excellent job generally but the office is significantly under-staffed and is in need of senior-level faculty positions in order to better handle the great numbers of responsibilities that are the commission of the OEVPP
- The OEVPP provides excellent service for issues of equity and fairness
- The OEVPP appears to make some decisions on the side of being overly cautious thus promoting a culture of risk aversion and an over-subscription to compliance and rules
- The RMM seems not to be sufficiently flexible to accommodate atypical colleges and units; the OEVPP’s implementation of the RMM remains a significant challenge
- The OEVPP supports shared governance and responds to concerns and issues well
- The OEVPP has facilitated better and more transparent communication across all colleges and units
- The organizational structure of the OEVPP and other central administration is difficult to follow – there appears to be some unneeded redundancy that should be addressed (e.g. human resource decisions)
• The OEVPP has done an excellent job of convening diverse groups across all colleges which facilitates opportunities previously not evident to all; strong collaborations among diverse groups is important to the academy and has been supported by the OEVPP.

• The OEVPP has done a very good job providing support and opportunities for faculty leadership development.

• All interviewed indicated that interaction with the OEVPP was good and communication clear and consistent.

In summary, the review of the OEVPP was quite favorable. The participation by the faculty in the survey was very high and opinions about the OEVPP good. The interviews with senior administration and campus leaders were supportive of the OEVPP. Support demonstrated by the OEVPP for Promotion and Tenure and third year evaluations was deemed excellent by consensus. Similarly, there was consensus suggesting that the OEVPP was understaffed, given the responsibilities of the office and the Executive Vice President and Provost. Overall, the OEVPP and Executive Vice President and Provost were reviewed very favorably by the faculty, senior administrators and campus leadership.

The review committee recommends that the OEVPP maintain a central role in implementing the RMM. Continued emphases on transparency and fairness in processes and decisions related to promotion and tenure and academic budgeting are crucial for this office. Enhancing campus diversity should remain a key priority for this office as well.
2. Introduction

Faculty Senate President Steve Freeman formed the Faculty Senate Office of Executive Vice President and Provost Review Committee (OEVPPRC) on 12 July 2011 and charged the members to review the office of the Executive Vice President and Provost (OEVPP) as described in the Faculty Handbook, section 5.7 (Appendix 1). The formal charge from President Freeman stated:

“The Faculty Senate OEVPP RC will conduct a review of the Office of the Executive Vice President and Provost as outlined in the ISU Faculty Handbook, Section 5.7.5. The RC will review the OEVVP and all of the office’s subunits and prepare a public report - Office of the Executive Vice President and Provost Report. The RC will also conduct an evaluation of the performance of the EVPP and prepare a confidential report - Executive Vice President and Provost Evaluation Report.”

The Review Committee was convened and met several times in order to establish the review process. It was determined that the review would include a survey that was sent to the Iowa State University Faculty, personal interviews conducted with upper administration, and support materials supplied by the Executive Vice President and Provost (EVPP) and the OEVPP.

a. Faculty Handbook description of administrative reviews

The Faculty Senate is charged to conduct a periodic review of central administrative officers to evaluate their programs and provide constructive and objective assessments of the offices. The reviews are intended to improve the function of the administrative offices to support the teaching, research and extension missions of Iowa State University. Reviews are to be composed of three components:

- A self-study by the office to be reviewed
- A faculty review of the office and its subunits
- A faculty review of the administrator’s performance

The three reports will be issued; the self-study (Appendix 2) and the faculty review of the OEVPP will be made public and included on the Faculty Senate webpage (http://www.facsen.iastate.edu/) while the third report will be confidential and submitted to the President of Iowa State University. Furthermore, a follow-up conference will be scheduled one year after the completion of the review. The format of the office self-study is detailed in section 5.7.3 of the Faculty Handbook (Appendix 1). In general, the emphasis of the self-study should be on the evaluation and analysis of all activities the directly support the Iowa State University mission statement.

b. Process and procedures for the review

The general review procedures are described in section 5.7.5 of the Iowa State University Faculty Handbook (Appendix 1). However the OEVPPRC had considerable latitude in developing the specific processes and procedures for the review as indicated in the Faculty Handbook. The processes and procedures, as proposed by the OEVPPRC, were established in conjunction with the Faculty Senate
and approved by the Faculty Senate Executive Board. The OEVPPRC would like to acknowledge the excellent support and assistance provided by Ms. Sherri L. Angstrom, Executive Secretary for the Faculty Senate in the organization and completion of the OEVPP review.

The primary purpose of the review was to provide constructive and systematic detailed faculty evaluation of OEVPP with the goal of providing the Iowa State University faculty with a better understanding of the roles, activities, and functions of the OEVPP as these relate to the faculty and university community. Furthermore, the objective faculty review of the OEVPP was developed to improve the function and capacity of the office. It is important to recognize that charge of the OEVPPRC was to evaluate the office and not the individuals within the office nor the EVPP.

Given the current organizational chart of units reporting to the EVPP and broad reaching responsibilities within the OEVPP, the OEVPPRC decided to review only those that are housed in 1550 Beardshear Hall. The other administrators and units that report to the EVPP, e.g. Office of the Vice President of Business and Finance, Office of the Vice President of Student Affairs, Office of the Vice President of Research and Economic Development and Office of the Vice President of Extension and Outreach, are described in the Faculty Handbook section 5.7.5.1 (Appendix 1) as being subject to regularly scheduled review by the Faculty Senate.

The OEVPPRC first met on November 14, 2011 to review and discuss the charge of President Freeman and determine the most effective means of assessing the performance of the OEVPP. It was determined that there was a need to directly communicate with the Iowa State University faculty and assess their perspectives about how the OEVPP has functioned. The best way to collect the opinions of the faculty was suggested to be via a survey. It was also determined that central administration should be included in the review; the committee determined that personal interviews with selected administrators, maintaining confidentiality, would be an efficient means of collecting this information. Also at this meeting, it was determined how to publicize the OEVPP review. As described in Faculty Handbook section 5.2.5.2, the notification of the pending review was made public with an announcement in the Iowa State Daily, Inside ISU, and an email to the Iowa State University Faculty (Appendices 1, 3 and 4). Also communications with College Deans to encourage Department Chairs and faculty to participate in the review process were made, as prescribed in the Faculty Handbook.

At subsequent meetings, the specific questions that would be included in the survey were vetted and the administrators that should be included in the personal interviews were determined. The final “discussions” about the format of the survey that would be submitted to the ISU Faculty were conducted by email communication. The interview schedule was also handled via email. Finally, the OEVPP review report was submitted to the OEVPPRC for comments and corrections prior to respectful submission to the Faculty Senate Executive Board for acceptance. The accepted report appears on the Faculty Senate webpage (http://www.facsen.iastate.edu/) and copies were made available to the EVPP and the President of Iowa State University.
c. Members of the Office of Executive Vice President and Provost Review Committee

The appointment of the review committee is described in section 5.7.4 of the Iowa State University Faculty Handbook (Appendix 1). The members of the OEVPPRC included six members of the Iowa State University Faculty and one member associated with Iowa State University who had frequent interaction with the OEVPP. Individuals who participated on the review committee included:

Dr. Kristen P. Constant, Professor of Materials Science and Engineering
Dr. Suzanne Hendrich, University Professor, Charlotte E. Roderuck Faculty Fellow and Professor of Food Science and Human Nutrition
Dr. Sidner Larson, Associate Professor of the Department of English and Director of the American Indian Studies Program
Dr. Paul Lasley, Professor and Chair of the Department of Anthropology and the Department of Sociology
Dr. Andrew Manu, Professor of Agronomy and George Washington Carver Chair
Daniel Saftig, President of the Iowa State University Foundation (former)
Dr. Micheal D.K. Owen, Associate Chair, Professor of Agronomy and Past President of the Iowa State University Faculty Senate (chair of the OEVPPRC)

3. Description of the Survey

The OEVPPRC developed an electronic survey instrument in order to determine how Iowa State University faculty assessed the performance and their interaction with the OEVPP (Appendix 5). The survey instrument was similar to the one used in the 1999 review of the office of the Provost (Appendix 6). The OEVPPRC would like to recognize the excellent support and assistance of Ms. Renea A. Miller in the Department of Sociology in the development, delivery and analysis of the survey instrument. The survey instrument consisted of a series of questions to establish the demographics of the respondents. There was a question that addressed the relative amount of interaction that respondents had with the OEVPP followed by a series of 15 statements that addressed specific areas, traits, activities and qualifications of the OEVPP programs and also interactions of the OEVPP with the Iowa State University faculty. This series of statements required that the respondents assess their relative agreement with the statements. The survey instrument also allowed for comments to be submitted by the respondents.

In mid-January, 2012 an electronic survey was sent to all ISU faculty soliciting their views on the Office of the Executive Vice President and Provost. The list of all faculty emails was provided by institutional research. The survey was conducted through an electronic post office in order to maintain autonomous and confidential response from Iowa State University faculty. Given that assurance that confidentiality and anonymity of faculty responses were of paramount importance, the system was designed so that no one could respond more than once to the questionnaire. The online survey was available for faculty response through 3 February 2012. It was the judgment of
the OEVPPRC that allowing three weeks for responding to the survey was sufficient time to capture the comments of the Iowa State University faculty.

4. Description of personal interviews with selected administrators

It was determined that the best way to gain a sense of how the OEVPP was interacting with central administration was to conduct personal interviews with the review committee. In the previous review of the office of the Provost conducted in 1999, administrators were asked to respond to written questions and/or to respond in personal interviews (Appendix 6). The OEVPPRC established a list of administrators that included Deans, Vice Presidents, Associate Provosts, Iowa State University Legal Counsel, and leaders in the P & S Council (Appendix 7). A key issue was to establish that any comments from the interviews would be anonymous and confidentiality would be honored.

Each interview lasted approximately 30 minutes and included three general questions posed to the interviewee (Appendix 8). Given the logistical issues of convening the complete OEVPPRC and the administrators, it was determined that at least two individuals from the review committee would attend each interview and to maintain consistency for the interviews, the Chair of the OEVPPRC attended all interviews.

The basis of each interview was to determine how the OEVPP and the administrator interacted and if there were key issues with the interactions. The review committee tried to gain a sense of the level of satisfaction expressed for the interactions between administrators and the OEVPP. Also, the interview included questions about what is well and what is less well with the OEVPP. The discussions were generally excellent, helpful and informative.

5. Results of the survey and personal interviews with selected administrators

a. Survey results

The response for the survey was quite good. There were 1745 faculty eligible to participate in the survey; 505 faculty members completed the survey which represents an impressive response rate of 29%. This rate of response is very high when compared with other similar surveys. All faculty academic ranks were represented in the participants. Instructors, Assistant Professors, University Professors and Distinguished Professors accounted for 36% of the respondents while Associate Professors and Professors represented 27% and 34%, respectively (Table 1). Only 1% of the respondents failed to indicate their academic rank. Similarly, all colleges were generally proportionately represented with the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences having 187 of the 505 total responses (37%). The College of Agriculture and Life Sciences had 95 faculty participate (19%) followed by the College of Human Sciences with 63 faculty (12%) and the College of Engineering with 55 faculty participants (11%). The College of Veterinary Medicine accounted for 7% of the responses while the Colleges of Business, Design and Library represented 6%, 6% and 2%, respectively. Less than one percent of the 505 respondents failed to indicate the college of their primary appointment.
When the respondents were asked to provide information about the number of years they had been at Iowa State University, 165 respondents (33%) indicated that they have been at Iowa State University less than 6 years (Table 1). It is assumed that this category represents the newer, untenured faculty, although new instructors could also be in this group. This suggests a high level of involvement and concern about the business of the university from new faculty; this is an important point. The rest of the respondents segregated more or less evenly through the possible faculty positions. Respondents who indicated that they had been at Iowa State University between 6 and 10 years (presumably tenured Associate professors) represented 19% of the 505 faculty respondents. Faculty who have been at Iowa State University 11 to 20 years and over 20 years represented 22% and 26% of the respondents, respectively. Only 1% of the respondents to the survey did not indicate the time in station.

When the Iowa State University faculty responded about their gender, the responses segregated 35% and 65% for female and male faculty, respectively (Table 1). Less than 1% of the respondents failed to indicate their gender. In 2011, women represented 37% of 1766 Iowa State University faculty. Thus, the current survey had a representative percentage of female faculty respondents compared to the total faculty number.

Ten percent of the respondents reported they had contact with the OEVPP at least once a month, and an additional 16 percent reported some contact which was defined as 6-8 times a year (Table 2). These two categories represent about one-fourth of the respondents. Importantly, 50% of the respondents reported annual contact with the OEVPP albeit less than five times per year. Only 24% of the survey respondents reported no contact with the OEVPP. One respondent failed to report contact with the OEVPP. A total of 76% of the faculty who responded to the survey to evaluate the OEVPP indicated that they interact with the OEVPP on an annual basis and 26% of the faculty reporting that they interact extensively or at least six to eight times annually (Table 2).

The OEVPP survey included a series of 15 statements to which respondents were requested to provide relative assessments of how the OEVPP performed in these various dimensions (Table 3). Respondents were asked to evaluate the OEVPP on a five-category Likert-scale ranging from and assessment of “strongly agree” which was scored 1 to an assessment of “strongly disagree” which was scored a 5. Respondents could also choose not to respond to specific dimensions. As a general statement, the OEVPP was very favorable assessed by the Iowa State University faculty with almost 50% strongly agreeing or agreeing with the performance of the OEVPP in a composite score of the 15 dimensions included in the survey (Table 3). Faculty who were unsure of the performance of the OEVPP in the various dimensions represented 37% of the respondents and only 11% of the faculty respondents disagreed or strongly disagreed with the statements that described the performance of the OEVPP.

Two dimensions received at least 60% agreement, either strongly agreeing or agreeing. Of the Iowa State University faculty who participated in the survey, 66% strongly agreed or agreed that
the OEVPP actively promoted an environment for excellence in scholarship. Similarly, 60% of the faculty respondents agreed that the OEVPP provided leadership in advocating for diversity.

These dimensions were followed by another set of five statements where at least 50% of the Iowa State University faculty who participated in the survey reported that they strongly agreed or agreed that the OEVPP was performing well in the specific dimension. Almost 60% of the faculty respondents (59%) strongly agreed or agreed that the OEVPP actively promoted policies that supported the mission of the university relative to the strategic plan (Table 3). Faculty support of the OEVPP performance in this dimension was followed by agreement that the OEVPP provided academic leadership in planning for the university (57%), actively promoted an environment for excellence in teaching (54%) and student learning (51%) (Table 3). Finally, one half of the Iowa State University faculty who participated in the survey strongly agreed or agreed that the OEVPP provided academic leadership in implementing new initiatives at Iowa State University (Table 3).

Four dimensions of the performance of the OEVPP received strong agreement or agreement by at least 40% of the faculty who participated in the survey. These dimensions included the support of faculty governance at all levels demonstrated by the OEVPP (49%) and ensuring that university policy, procedures and available resources are transparent (49%) (Table 3). Iowa State University faculty also strongly agreed or agreed that the OEVPP worked effectively with other administrators anticipating future needs of the faculty (45%) and that the OEVPP provided academic leadership in developing academic programs (41%) (Table 3). Faculty who disagreed or strongly disagreed with the performance of the OEVPP in these dimensions represented 21%, 14%, 10%, and 14% of the respondents, respectively.

There were four dimensions where less than 40% of the Iowa State University faculty strongly agreed or agreed with the performance of the OEVPP. Only 38% of the faculty respondents strongly agreed or agreed that the OEVPP allocated resources so that departments or academic units can accomplish their missions or provided academic leadership in program assessment (Table 3). When asked to assess the performance of the OEVPP in consulting with faculty adequately before making important decisions 36% of the faculty respondents strongly agreed or agreed while 33% strongly agreed or agreed that the OEVPP provided effective leadership in international engagement.

Interestingly, the percentage of Iowa State University faculty who participated in the survey and disagreed or strongly disagreed with the performance of the OEVPP in these dimensions was similar to the percentages in the dimensions where at least 40% of the faculty strongly agreed or agreed with the performance of the OEVPP. With regard to the dimension reflecting allocations of resources, only 13% of the faculty respondents disagreed or strongly disagreed with the performance of the OEVPP. Only 12% of the faculty respondents disagreed or strongly disagreed with the OEVPP performance in leadership in program assessment, 21% in consultation with faculty before making important decisions and 15% in providing effective international leadership (Table 3).
There was a strong positive association between reported amount of respondent contact with the OEVPP and their assessments of the 15 dimensions. Contact with the OEVPP were recoded into three categories; “extensive” (at least once a month), “some” (6-8 times per year), and “none” (combining those who reported contact with the OEVPP to be less than five times a year with those who reported no contact with the OEVPP. As one might expect, the more contact respondents reported having with the OEVPP, the more positive their assessment of the OEVPP performance. For example, while approximately two-thirds of the entire sample agreed the OEVPP actively promoted an environment for excellence in scholarship, 96% of those who reported extensive contact strongly agreed or agreed with this statement, compared to 78% of the respondents who reported some contact.

Similarly, a composite 62% of the faculty who responded to the survey strongly agreed or agreed that the OEVPP provided leadership in advocating for diversity; this composite sample included 87% of the respondents who reported extensive contact with the OEVPP and 90% with some contact. Only 52% of the faculty respondents who reported limited or no contact strongly agreed or agreed with this statement.

Importantly, other demographic variables such as academic rank, college affiliation, years on the faculty, and gender were determined not to be important explanatory variables. This is curious given the presumed great cultural differences comparing colleges and perspectives among faculty with different academic rank and time at Iowa State University.

In addition to the fixed-choice questions, faculty respondents were provided space to write comments on questions 7 through 10 (Appendix 4). Respondents used this opportunity to sing both praise and criticism of the OEVPP and the EVPP specifically. Fifty-three pages of single spaced comments were received (Appendix 9). The comments were included verbatim and ranged across the entire spectrum of issues that concern the OEVPP. Many of the respondents provided thoughtful and well-formed answers to the comments whether positive or critical; other comments were less so. It was also clear that many of the faculty who responded to the survey questions with comments did not separate the EVPP from the OEVPP and their comments were specifically about the EVPP. There were reoccurring “themes” found in the comments. Question 7 had more than 320 responses while questions 8, 9 and 10 had approximately 215, 327 and 141 comments, respectively.

It is important to recognize the context of this evaluation OEVPP. Many respondents obviously had trouble understanding that this effort was to evaluate the performance of the office and not the provost nor other persons employed in the OEVPP. This is readily apparent in the comments where numerous comments about the provost were made — some very complimentary and others critical of her leadership and management skills. Secondly, it is important to place this evaluation in context of the fiscal constraints and budget crisis that has adversely impacted Iowa State University over the past decade.
On balance, the quantitative data provide a snapshot of the performance of the OEVPP during a period of extreme financial pressure. It is not surprising that concerns about low faculty morale and complaints about EVPP leadership were voiced. Given the economic and financial stress, the general positive assessments of the OEVPP suggested that most of the faculty respondents are pleased with the general issues facing the OEVPP and the performance of specific duties, yet the comments also contain complaints about specific instances where responding faculty felt that more decisive or direct action was warranted.

More responses to question 7 were received and the general theme of the responses suggested that the level of satisfaction the responding faculty had experienced with the OEVPP was good (Appendix 9). It was clear that a majority of the responses were specifically directed to interactions with the EVPP and included comments about promotion and tenure, faculty governance, specific programs (e.g. STEM), institutes (e.g. Plant Sciences Institute), and committee activities.

Question 8 provided respondents to provide comments on what the OEVPP does well (Appendix 9). Again, most of the comments specifically referenced the EVPP and not the OEVPP. Reoccurring themes included positive experiences with promotion and tenure and support for diversity at Iowa State University. The communication in the OEVPP to faculty was also generally reported to be good and the encouragement of new and collaborative research efforts was appreciated. An important comment suggested that the OEVPP had “provided leadership to ensure that core ISU strengths have not been sacrificed as state funds have dried up”. A general theme of the responses to question 8 was that the leadership and management of university affairs provided by the OEVPP and the EVPP were good.

Question 9 had more comments than any of the others and similar to the other questions, there was diversity of the responses and in many cases, the respondents commented specifically on the EVPP rather than the OEVPP (Appendix 9). The most consistent suggestion as to how the OEVPP needs to improve focused on how the office communicates to the faculty. It was suggested that there is a need for transparency to better communicate how decisions are made. Coupled to this suggestion was the need for more timely communications and greater visibility for the OEVPP. The budget model was also mentioned frequently as something that needs to be improved or removed. Better strategic planning was mentioned as well as the need for greater diversity within the university as areas for improvement for the OEVPP.

Iowa State University faculty who participated in the review survey were asked to make additional comments that might help the OEVPPRC evaluate the OEVPP performance. There were more than 140 comments offered in response to question 10 (Appendix 9). As in the previous three questions, respondents often commented specifically about the EVPP and not the OEVPP. In fact most of the comments were about the EVPP and most were complimentary about the EVPP performance. There were, however, comments that were negative about the OEVPP as well as the EVPP; most of these comments were lacking in substantive suggestions and of little value in assisting the OEVPPRC in their evaluation. However, there were a number
of comments that included suggestions that were similar to comments made in the previous questions.

Specifically, it was suggested that the OEVPP make faculty quality of life a greater point of emphasis in the future. Concerns were raised again about the budget and the budget process and respondents to question 10 suggested that the OEVPP make these areas a future priority. It was suggested that the OEVPP be timelier with responses to inquiries and decisions. Related to this was a concern suggesting that the OEVPP was overly cautious and perhaps timid with regard to decisions, particularly those reflecting issues of compliance. The OVEPP should be more communicative and transparent; this suggestion was made by a number of faculty respondents to the survey. Related to communication and transparency, one suggestion was to update the OEVPP organizational chart. It was also suggested that there needs to be more faculty input in decisions made by the OEVPP. Finally, respondents suggested that the OEVPP work more effectively to address issues of faculty morale (Appendix 9).

The faculty survey is but one perspective in conducting an evaluation of the OEVPP. Given that many faculty reported they do not have much direct contact with the OEVPP, the overall assessment was somewhat subjective and perhaps was shadowed by overall impressions of how well Iowa State University has been faring rather than how well the functions of the OEVPP are being performed. This is particularly evident in analysis of performance of the OEVPP by level of contact; those with more frequent contact were more likely to hold positive assessments on the performance of the OEVPP.

Given the budget cuts and turbulence surrounding ISU in the past decade, the findings from the survey suggested there are important difficulties and challenges of the OEVPP being viewed positively by all faculty in the academy.

b. Interview results

The OEVPPRC was impressed and appreciative of the candid, insightful and forthcoming statements provided by those interviewed. The opinions were most helpful in developing a clear understanding about how the OEVPP functions and interacts with administrators, particularly the deans. All who were interviewed agreed that the OEVPP and the EVPP in particular were accessible and there was an openness of interactions that were most appreciated. All who participated in the interviews reported that they had excellent interactions and a good working relationship with the OEVPP.

The OEVPP was described as being staffed with people dedicated to being fair and responsible. Comments suggested that people were highly satisfied with the performance of the OEVPP on equity and personnel issues. It was also suggested that the OEVPP is clearly supported of strong shared governance.
Another universal opinion offered was that the OEVPP understaffed for the myriad of responsibilities under the leadership of the EVPP. To that end, there was some concern expressed that the over-burdening of staff may compromise effectiveness.

Another very positive perspective was expressed about how promotion and tenure processes have been managed. It was suggested that the process has been considerably improved and this is directly attributable to the efforts of the OEVPP and EVPP, particularly with how the third year reviews are now conducted.

The Resource Management Model (RMM) was suggested to cause considerable concerns and problems by those who were interviewed. It was suggested that the RMM is not responsive to all units across Iowa State University and lacked flexibility, particularly for atypical units across campus. There was dissatisfaction expressed that the RMM may impair strategic planning in some instances. It was also suggested that the RMM creates “silos” rather than to promote interaction across campus. It was further suggested that because of the RMM and resultant centralization of decision making on campus, entrepreneurship may be hampered and opportunities lost. Perhaps the OEVPP should consider delegating some responsibilities to the budget centers and then hold them accountable.

Concerns were expressed about some redundancy and confusion with regards to hiring policies that were found to co-exist within the OEVPP and human resources. Different perspectives and opinions about hiring processes have been expressed depending upon the source of the information. In some cases, the different perspectives and opinions provided by the OEVPP and HR created problems with the timely hiring of qualified individuals. There may be other areas where dual-administration is a concern.

Other areas that were mentioned were the responsibilities for academic personnel and diversity being handled by one faculty member and the visibility of international programs leadership. The two responsibilities of academic personnel and diversity are extremely important to the academy and it is suggested that the OEVPP should have one faculty assigned to each of these areas. It was also suggested that the OEVPP needed to be more visible in the leadership of international programs.

There mixed comments about several areas; some suggested that greater transparency of processes and decisions was needed while other reported that the transparency of the OEVPP was good. Faculty leadership development and mentoring of administrators was also an area of mixed opinions. Some felt that there was good faculty leadership development while others suggested that this was an area that required strengthening.

Finally, the OEVPP has demonstrated a tendency of risk aversion which may have hampered creativity and the development of bold new initiatives. It was suggested that the OEVPP has over-subscribed to rules and compliance standards which has subsequently been problematic to specific units on campus. Compliance to rules may too often take precedent over doing the right thing.
6. Conclusions

Overall, the OEVPP and EVPP were reported by Iowa State University faculty and administrators as doing a good job. There were many areas and responsibilities that were reported to be done well and generally meeting the expectations of the faculty. Generally, comments were positive about the performance of the OEVPP and EVPP. It is clear that the implementation of the RMM and addressing disastrous financial crises in the state budget has required considerable time and effort of the OEVPP. It is important that the OEVPP and EVPP communicate to the Board of Regents, state legislators and the citizenry of Iowa what Iowa State University contributes. It is also clear that the OEVPP needs more positions in order to handle all of the responsibilities within the unit.

Interestingly, the conclusions and main areas of concern in this review mirrored those expressed in the 1999 review of the OEVPP. In that review, it was stated that the OEVPP was understaffed, that there was a concern for the timeliness of responses and decision making, and the transparency of communication. These areas were also mentioned in this review.

7. Recommendations

1. It is important to place this evaluation of the Office of Executive Vice President and Provost in the overall context of declining state financial resources which has added additional pressures and constraints on the faculty. Hence it is not surprising that declining faculty morale was evident in the assessment.

2. While our charge was not to assess the RMM, it is apparent that implementation of a new budget model was problematic given declines in state financial resources. Implementation of the RMM during a budget crisis resulted in some confusion as to whether decisions reflected new priorities embedded in the RMM or were the result of declining state resources.

3. During financial stress, it is not surprising that the OEVPP was often viewed as cautious in taking new initiatives. There is a tendency to buckle down the shutters and wait out the storm when faced with financial uncertainty. However, an important element of leadership is to inspire confidence even during times of financial stress. Being overly cautious and over-subscription to rules often leads to more attention to management than leadership.

4. It is suggested that the responsibilities for academic personnel and diversity need to have individual faculty for each of these important areas of the academy.

5. The importance of international programs continues to increase and the OEVPP should have a significant and visible leadership role.

6. The Provost is the chief academic officer of the academy and placing the RMM in the OEVPP without commensurate new resources to manage the budget may have contributed to less
attention to academic issues and perceptions that too much attention was devoted to the budget.

7. More responsibility for budget decisions should be delegated to the Colleges so that the OEVPP can focus on the major academic issues. Separating the academic functions from the budget management likely makes sense. It is tough balancing act to have such broad responsibilities lodged within one office.

8. Over the past 7 years the OEVVP has left two important legacies: institutionalizing a uniform P&T process, including third year years, a formal mentoring process, and standardization of the process across the colleges; and the emphasis on faculty diversity and STEM. The OEVPP has made important contributions in faculty development and diversity which will have long-lasting impacts on the future of the academy.

9. Faculty are the core of the academy and efforts to strengthen the faculty through shared governance, clear policies on faculty advancement and diversity should be continued.

Communication with faculty is critical and it hard to understate the importance of communication with faculty and staff. While email and electronic postings are important, the EVPP should strive to be more public in explaining the status of the institution, new directions and initiatives, etc. The Provost should consider monthly forums for discussions on academic issues that could be modeled after the President’s Council. Brown bag luncheons for open-ended discussions with rank and file faculty and staff should be

8. Tables
Table 1. Demographic information about the respondents to the survey to review the office of Executive Vice President and Provost (N = 505)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What is your academic rank?</th>
<th>Instructor</th>
<th>Assistant Professor</th>
<th>Associate Professor</th>
<th>Professor</th>
<th>University or Distinguished Professor</th>
<th>No answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>65 (13%)</td>
<td>97 (19%)</td>
<td>135 (27%)</td>
<td>172 (34%)</td>
<td>32 (4%)</td>
<td>4 (1%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Which college is your primary appointment located?</th>
<th>CALS (19%)</th>
<th>Bus (6%)</th>
<th>Des (6%)</th>
<th>Eng (11%)</th>
<th>HS (12%)</th>
<th>LAS (37%)</th>
<th>Lib (2%)</th>
<th>VM (7%)</th>
<th>No answer (1%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>95 (19%)</td>
<td>29 (6%)</td>
<td>28 (6%)</td>
<td>55 (11%)</td>
<td>63 (12%)</td>
<td>187 (37%)</td>
<td>9 (2%)</td>
<td>37 (7%)</td>
<td>2 (1%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How many years have you been on the faculty at ISU?</th>
<th>Less than 6</th>
<th>6-10</th>
<th>11-20</th>
<th>Over 20</th>
<th>No answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>165 (33%)</td>
<td>95 (19%)</td>
<td>113 (22%)</td>
<td>129 (26%)</td>
<td>3 (1%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What is your gender</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>No answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>177 (35%)</td>
<td>326 (65%)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(&lt;1%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2. Contact with the office of Executive Vice President and Provost (N=505)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Since January 2007, since EVPP Hoffman was appointed, how much contact have you had with the Office of Executive Vice President and Provost?</th>
<th>Extensive (6-8 times/yr)</th>
<th>Some (&lt; 5 times/yr)</th>
<th>Limited (&lt; 5 times/yr)</th>
<th>None</th>
<th>No answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>48</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(10%)</td>
<td>(16%)</td>
<td>(50%)</td>
<td>(24%)</td>
<td>(&lt; 1%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3. Assessment of the office of Executive Vice President and Provost (N=505)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Not sure</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>No answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Actively promotes an environment for excellence in scholarship</td>
<td>140 (28%)</td>
<td>191 (38%)</td>
<td>110 (22%)</td>
<td>40 (8%)</td>
<td>14 (3%)</td>
<td>10 (2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actively promotes an environment for excellence in teaching</td>
<td>99 (20%)</td>
<td>173 (34%)</td>
<td>142 (28%)</td>
<td>58 (11%)</td>
<td>13 (3%)</td>
<td>20 (4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actively promotes an environment for student learning</td>
<td>97 (19%)</td>
<td>161 (32%)</td>
<td>190 (38%)</td>
<td>32 (6%)</td>
<td>9 (2%)</td>
<td>16 (3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actively promotes policies that support the mission of the university</td>
<td>105 (21%)</td>
<td>190 (38%)</td>
<td>150 (30%)</td>
<td>29 (6%)</td>
<td>7 (1%)</td>
<td>24 (5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>relative to the strategic plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Works effectively with other administrators anticipating future</td>
<td>82 (16%)</td>
<td>145 (29%)</td>
<td>215 (43%)</td>
<td>37 (7%)</td>
<td>13 (3%)</td>
<td>13 (3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>needs (technology, infrastructure, classroom and laboratory space, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allocate resources so that your department or academic unit can</td>
<td>57 (11%)</td>
<td>134 (27%)</td>
<td>182 (36%)</td>
<td>71 (14%)</td>
<td>43 (9%)</td>
<td>18 (4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>accomplish their mission</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provides academic leadership in planning for the University</td>
<td>116 (23%)</td>
<td>173 (34%)</td>
<td>157 (31%)</td>
<td>35 (7%)</td>
<td>13 (3%)</td>
<td>11 (2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provides academic leadership in developing academic programs</td>
<td>77 (15%)</td>
<td>132 (26%)</td>
<td>207 (41%)</td>
<td>54 (11%)</td>
<td>17 (3%)</td>
<td>18 (4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provides academic leadership in implementing new initiatives</td>
<td>95 (19%)</td>
<td>158 (31%)</td>
<td>195 (39%)</td>
<td>29 (6%)</td>
<td>12 (2%)</td>
<td>16 (3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provides academic leadership in program assessment</td>
<td>64 (13%)</td>
<td>125 (25%)</td>
<td>240 (48%)</td>
<td>44 (9%)</td>
<td>16 (3%)</td>
<td>16 (3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supports faculty governance at all levels</td>
<td>89 (18%)</td>
<td>157 (31%)</td>
<td>181 (36%)</td>
<td>43 (9%)</td>
<td>23 (5%)</td>
<td>12 (2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consults with the faculty adequately before making important</td>
<td>61 (12%)</td>
<td>120 (24%)</td>
<td>195 (39%)</td>
<td>68 (13%)</td>
<td>42 (8%)</td>
<td>19 (4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>decisions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provides leadership in advocating for diversity</td>
<td>127 (25%)</td>
<td>176 (35%)</td>
<td>158 (31%)</td>
<td>20 (4%)</td>
<td>9 (2%)</td>
<td>15 (3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensures that university policy, procedures and available resources are</td>
<td>92 (18%)</td>
<td>154 (30%)</td>
<td>174 (34%)</td>
<td>48 (10%)</td>
<td>21 (4%)</td>
<td>16 (3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>transparent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provides effective leadership in international engagement</td>
<td>54 (11%)</td>
<td>112 (22%)</td>
<td>287 (57%)</td>
<td>23 (5%)</td>
<td>10 (2%)</td>
<td>19 (4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>1355 (18%)</td>
<td>2301 (30%)</td>
<td>2783 (37%)</td>
<td>631 (8%)</td>
<td>262 (3%)</td>
<td>243 (3%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
9. Appendices
5.7 Evaluation of Central Administrators

Section 5.6 was approved by the Faculty Senate on 1/23/90.

5.7.1 Purposes

This review program has the following two primary purposes:

- to provide an occasion for central administrative officers to evaluate their programs and subunits and, in return, to explain the roles, procedures, and activities of their offices to the university community
- to provide a means for constructive and systematic faculty evaluation of central administrative offices and officers

The review procedure is intended to improve the capacity of administrative offices and officers to provide system maintenance, goal attainment and resource development efforts that support the teaching, research, and service functions of the university. Moreover, the conduct of a review should facilitate communication between central administrators and the faculty, and promote the concept of responsible shared governance in the university.

5.7.2 Scope of Review Program

Central administrative officers are defined as the vice presidents, provost, and above. Under the present administrative structure, the offices of the following officers are to be served by this review program: president of the university, provost, vice president for business and finance, and vice president for student affairs.

Each review will have the following three parts:

- a self-study by the office to be reviewed
- a faculty review of the office and its subunits
- a faculty review of the administrator's performance

Three reports will be issued and a follow-up conference scheduled one year after completion of the review.

5.7.3 Preparatory Office Self-Study

In preparation for a review, an office will conduct a self-study. A Self-Study Report will include, but not be limited to, the office's goals, programs, services, staffing, resources, internal evaluation processes, and relations with other offices. The document should describe how the office and its responsibilities
have changed over the past five years and what the impact has been on the university. Within the general categories indicated, the following questions should be addressed:

• **Goals.** What are the purposes and goals of the office and its subunits? How are goals established and what is the faculty's role in this process? What priorities are given to the principal goals, and what changes in priorities are envisioned? How do the goals of the office support the university's mission statement?

• **Programs.** What are the program activities of the office? What subordinate administrative units are involved in these programs? Exactly how is the program effectiveness of the office evaluated? How are the programs administered by the office responding to the needs of the faculty, staff, students, and the people of Iowa?

• **Services.** What services are provided by the office and its subunits? How effective are these services? What plans for discontinuing or adding services are being considered? What priorities are attached to present services?

• **Staffing.** What is the table of organization for the office? How are staff persons recruited and evaluated? Is the present staff adequate to provide the programs and services of the office? What are future staffing plans?

• **Resources.** What is the budget for the office? What priorities govern the allocation of budget resources administered by the office? What have been the changes in budgetary support for the office in recent years? How does the office evaluate its budget success? Are administrative costs too high, or too low? What facilities does the office have at its disposal and are changes needed or planned?

• **Internal Evaluation.** What are the procedures and timetable used for on-going self-review of subordinate administrative units? Have there been external reviews of subunits? What areas in the office's performance need improvement? How does the office intend to improve its performance? What development plans are being pursued? Are annual or planning reports available?

• **Relations with Other Offices.** How are the office's goals and purposes coordinated with those of other university offices and agencies, with the other Regents institutions, and with the Board of Regents? Is there overlap of functions and responsibilities with other offices? Where appropriate, what are the relationships between the office and the Governor's office, the Iowa General Assembly, and other sources of support for the university?

Finally, the report should mention any other activities or functions that are not addressed in this list, but which the faculty should recognize as important aspects of the office's responsibilities.

In preparing the Self-Study Report, the emphasis should be on evaluation and analysis of activities that directly support the university's mission statement in terms of maintaining the basic academic system, attaining the goals established for the university, and developing the resources necessary to advance the multifaceted purposes of a land-grant university. This report will become a public document.
The office is also encouraged to provide the review committee with the names of faculty members who, because of their interactions with the office, may be able to provide insights about the operations and performance of the office.

5.7.4 Appointment of Review Committee

A separate review committee will be appointed for each office to be evaluated. Before establishing any review committee, the president of the Faculty Senate, in consultation with the president of the university, will provide an appropriate budget so that the committee can effectively perform its duties.

Review committee members will be appointed by the Senate president with suggestions from the Faculty Senate and approval of the Senate Executive Board. Normally, a review committee will consist of seven persons as follows:

- chairperson appointed with the approval of the Senate
- two members from the Faculty Senate's councils appointed one each from the Academic Affairs Council and the Faculty Development and Administrative Relations Council
- three additional faculty members appointed after due consideration is given to the representation of various faculty concerns, and to the needs of the review committee for particular kinds of expertise, depending upon the office to be reviewed
- one or more external reviewers appointed from among off-campus persons nominated by the review committee after consultation with the administrator of the office to be evaluated. An external reviewer should have expertise relevant to the office being evaluated and should have experience at a higher educational institution comparable to ISU. External reviewer(s) should be consulted about the design of the review and visit campus to gather information before preparing a report evaluating the operation of the office under review.

5.7.5 General Review Procedures

Specific procedures for conducting a review will be designed by each committee in collaboration with the Executive Board of the Faculty Senate as appropriate for the office being evaluated. The following policies pertain to all reviews.

5.7.5.1 Schedule

Usually a single administrative office will be reviewed each year. However, the Faculty Senate can call for the evaluation of more than one office in a year or for the evaluation of an office more than once every five years, but never more than once every three years. A majority vote of the Senate is required to initiate the review process each year. As turnover of personnel occurs, first reviews should be scheduled about three years into the appointment so as to provide timely constructive advice.

The following order of review is established, subject to considerations of timeliness and annual Senate confirmation:
• Office of the University President
• Office of the Vice President for Business and Finance
• Office of the Executive Vice President and Provost
• Office of the Vice President for Student Affairs
• Office of the Vice President of Research and Economic Development
• Office of the Vice President of Extension and Outreach

Approved by Faculty Senate (November 9, 2010); by president and provost (December 6, 2010)

5.7.5.2 Conduct of Reviews

In conducting a review, a review committee will confer with persons responsible for framing or approving policies that affect the relationship between the office and the faculty. In addition to the Self-Study Report prepared by the office under review, the committee will have access to all necessary documents and administrative information unless the requested information is considered confidential under state or federal laws. Opinions concerning the performance of the office and officer under review shall also be solicited by at least the following means:

• publication in Inside Iowa State of a call for such opinions
• notification of the request for such opinions through the channels of administrative organization
• deans to request responses from chairs;
• chairs to urge individual faculty to submit comments; all responses should be sent directly to the review committee
• solicitation of comments from faculty and others who, because of their interaction with the office being reviewed, may have especially useful information

All responses sent to a review committee will be treated as confidential correspondence, subject to applicable laws.

5.7.5.3 Review Committee Reports

The review committee will prepare two written reports. The first, or Office Evaluation Report, is a public document and should not contain confidential information related to the evaluation of the administrative officer. The second, or Officer Evaluation Report, is a confidential evaluation of the performance of the administrative officer. Both reports will summarize the findings of the review committee, and will include any recommendations it deems appropriate.

Office Evaluation Report. This report will address the issues listed above. A draft of this report will be submitted to the administrator of the office under review, primarily to allow an opportunity for
corrections to assertions of fact. The committee will confer with the administrator under review and with the university president (or, if the office of the university president is under review, with the president of the Board of Regents) to discuss the draft report.

Once these processes have been completed, a final report will be written and forwarded to the president of the Faculty Senate who will inform the Senate about the major recommendations. Copies of the final report will also be submitted to the administrator of the office under review (who may make copies for subordinates), to the president (or, if the president's office is under review, to the Board of Regents), and to the Faculty Senate Executive Board. A brief summary will be published in Inside Iowa State to alert the faculty to the fact that a review is completed.

Appropriate provision will be made to have reading copies of the office's Self-Study Report and the review committee's Final Office Evaluation Report accessible by all university faculty members.

Officer Evaluation Report. The review committee will solicit from all members of the university community written and/or oral evaluations concerning the performance of administrators under review. The Iowa State faculty members of the review committee will summarize the results of this survey in writing and prepare recommendations.

This report will be distributed to the administrator being evaluated, to the university president or Board of Regents depending on to whom the administrator being evaluated directly reports, and to the president of the Faculty Senate. The Faculty Senate president will, in turn, summarize the recommendations before the Faculty Senate Executive Board, meeting in closed session, subject to the requirements of applicable laws.

Follow-up Conference. The Senate president shall instruct the chairperson to reconvene the review committee approximately one year after the two evaluation reports are submitted to determine to what extent the recommendations contained in these reports are being adopted. The committee will solicit, through Inside Iowa State, perceptions of the effectiveness with which the recommendations of the Final Office Evaluation Report have been implemented. The committee will request that the reviewed administrator provide a statement indicating how the recommendations in the Office and Officer Evaluation Reports are being addressed. The review committee will prepare a brief perceived progress report and forward it to the officer of the office which was reviewed. The chairperson of the committee will then schedule a follow-up conference.

When the review was of the Office of the Executive Vice President and Provost or a vice president's office, this conference will include the president of the university, the official of the office that was reviewed, and the president of the Faculty Senate. When the review was of the president's office, this conference will include the president of the Board of Regents, the president of the university, and the president of the Faculty Senate.

The Senate president will report to the Senate on the outcomes of these follow-up conferences.
Appendix 2
I. Introduction

The context of public higher education in the United States and throughout the world has changed dramatically in the past decade, and most especially since 2006. Iowa State University has experienced similar change, particularly: a dramatic decrease in state appropriations during a time of growing enrollment; increasing expectations for break-through results in applied research, technology transfer, and economic development; and engagement with citizens across Iowa and around the world, through outreach and extension, to address increasingly complex and difficult economic and societal issues. By some measures we are better off than public universities in many states, however, the strain on our resources to meet the increasingly complex needs of our students and other significant stakeholders is substantial.

The current contextual environment of public higher education suggests that strong strategic leadership, institutional focus, and operational effectiveness and efficiency will be increasingly important at Iowa State for continued institutional viability. Identification, cultivation, and effective utilization of current and future resource streams will be an increasingly important role for institutional leadership, in particular for the Executive Vice President and Provost.

The period since the last review of the Office of the Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost in 1999 has been a time of transformative change in scope, mission, and responsibility of the Office, including its 2007 expansion to the Office of the Executive Vice President and Provost (EVPP). It has also been a time of transformational change for many of the units that report to the Office, as well as for the institution as a whole. Although some of the significant transformations occurred prior to 2006, the most substantial ones in terms of the current and future institutional leadership provided by the EVPP have occurred since then. Therefore, the focus of this self study is on the five year period beginning in 2006.

II. Mission

The EVPP provides institutional leadership for the development and implementation of the university’s strategic plan and the prioritization and allocation of institutional resources (human, fiscal, and physical) to enable the accomplishment of institutional goals and aspirations. Elements of this leadership mission are inherently collaborative with other senior leaders of the institution, with the EVPP having primary facilitative and integrative institutional leadership responsibility.

The mission statement of the Office of the Executive Vice President and Provost, developed in Fall 2010, states that the EVPP leads Iowa State University’s efforts in the creation, sharing and application of knowledge that will make Iowa and the world a better place. In support of the Iowa State University 2010-2015 strategic plan, Meeting the Challenges of the 21st Century, the EVPP role is to emphasize interdisciplinary thinking, collaboration, and facilitation in the following ways:
• By supporting the educational mission of Iowa State University by offering programs that support a challenging environment for teaching and learning;

• By nurturing a culture that recruits, advances, and retains an outstanding and diverse faculty, staff and student body;

• By guiding the institutional budgeting and planning process to effectively leverage resources; and

• By supporting excellence in research, outreach, extension, education, academic support services, and information technology resources that enhance the impact of Iowa State University.

The Executive Vice President and Provost is responsible for much of the university's missions of teaching, research and extension. The mission of teaching has grown to nearly 30,000 students from all 50 states and more than 100 other countries, to study in more than 100 undergraduate degree programs and nearly 200 fields of study leading to graduate and professional degrees. Iowa State University houses one of the nation's premier colleges of agriculture and life science, including the world's largest concentration of faculty involved in sustainable agriculture and was the first university in the country to create a graduate program in biorenewable resources. The college of engineering is one of the largest in the country and ranked in the top quartile of U.S. colleges of engineering. The college of veterinary medicine is the oldest in the U.S. and has recently undergone a transformation to a world-class, 21st century college of veterinary medicine, diagnostic laboratory, and teaching hospital and clinics. The college of design is one of the few comprehensive design colleges in the country, with several highly ranked, accredited degree programs and with strong linkages to engineering and business. The college of business is now ranked among the top 50 colleges of business in the country. The college of human sciences was formed by combining the college of family and consumer sciences, one of the nation’s premier colleges of its kind, and the college of education. The college of liberal arts and sciences includes some of the university's highest ranked departments.

Iowa State is affiliated with the Department of Energy's Ames Laboratory, as well as with USDA laboratories involved in veterinary medicine, seed science, and plant and soil health. Iowa State founded one of the first statistical laboratories in the world and remains a top five statistics department with one of the strongest applied statistics programs. Other highly ranked programs include agricultural and biosystems engineering, agricultural and applied economics, chemistry, condensed matter physics, materials science, agronomy, and animal and meat science.

The mission of research has grown dramatically, with annual sponsored funding now in the $350 million range. The college of agriculture and life sciences leads in research funding, with engineering and liberal arts and sciences not far behind. Engineering faculty garner the highest funding per faculty FTE. Major transdisciplinary research centers, with faculty participation from across campus, include the NSF Engineering Research Center for Biorenewable Chemicals, the Bioeconomy Institute, the Biobased Products Industry Center, the Plant Sciences Institute, the Virtual Reality Applications Center, the Institute for Physical Research and Technology, the Nutrition and Wellness Research Center, and the
BioCentury Research Farm. Not surprisingly, these highly productive research centers focus on the intersection of basic science, agricultural and veterinary science, and engineering.

The mission of extension with practice leads Iowa State University to have an ISU Extension and Outreach presence in all 99 counties (organized after reorganization into 20 regions), staff and faculty on campus and more than 16,000 volunteers. ISU Extension and Outreach engages Iowans with education and information in agriculture and natural resources; business and industry; community and economic development; families; and 4-H youth development. After a major reorganization, ISU Extension and Outreach heads into fiscal year 2012 with a new leader, new name and renewed focus on serving the needs of Iowans through university outreach to achieve healthy families, healthy environments and a healthy economy.

III. Historical Context

Looking back to 2006, the Office of Academic Affairs was led by Benjamin Allen, Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost. When Provost Allen stepped down to become President of the University of Northern Iowa in June 2006, President Geoffroy expanded the role of Academic Affairs by creating the Office of the Executive Vice President and Provost. A national search for a leader led to the naming of Elizabeth Hoffman as Executive Vice President and Provost effective January 1, 2007, a position she continues to hold today.

The transition to an Executive Vice President and Provost has been the most substantial transformation in leadership structure that the institution has undergone in recent history, evidenced by its significant philosophical and operational implications. Expanded responsibility and scope associated with this transformation include institutional leadership responsibility for strategic planning, operational planning, budget development, resource allocation, and increased shared leadership responsibility for human resources, academic facilities, campus climate, and diversity.

In response to these significant increases in responsibility, staffing in the office has grown. The number of units that report to the EVPP has also grown as a result of these new functional and programmatic responsibilities. These major expansions have contributed to a number of the additional changes in scope and responsibility of units reporting to the EVPP:

• Leadership in the development and implementation of the 2010-2015 ISU Strategic Plan and the ongoing development of an associated institutional operational plan.

• Leadership in the development and implementation of the resource management model (RMM) for institutional budget, including the creation of an Associate Vice President for Budget and Planning.

• Reorganization of ISU Extension and Outreach, including the transition from a Vice Provost for Extension to a Vice President for Extension and Outreach.

• Reorganization of ISU Research and Economic Development and associated units, including transition from a Vice Provost for Research and Graduate Education to a Vice President for Research and Economic Development.
• Reorganization of information and communication technology units including transition to the Vice Provost and CIO position.

• Reorganization of leadership for undergraduate and graduate academic programs including transition from a Vice Provost for Undergraduate Programs, moving responsibility for graduate programs from the Vice Provost for Research and Graduate education, and distance credit course responsibility from ISU Extension to an Associate Provost for Academic Programs and Dean of the Graduate College.

• Reorganization of leadership for academic human resources and diversity, including transition to an Associate Provost for Academic Personnel and Chief Diversity Officer.

• Reorganization of institutional approaches to academic policy development and implementation including transition to a Director of Academic Policy and Personnel.

• Enhanced collaborative leadership with the VPSA, particularly in student recruitment, student success, and articulation with community colleges; and with the VPBF, particularly in strategic resource planning and utilization with respect to human, physical, and fiscal resources.

IV. Institutional Leadership and Administrative Scope

The Office of the Executive Vice President and Provost provides leadership within the university for academic affairs, strategic and operational planning, and prioritization and allocation of institutional resources. The Office of the EVPP is also responsible for the administration of the academic colleges, multiple units and programs as indicated by the institutional organizational chart available at: http://www.provost.iastate.edu/about/OrgChart211.pdf

As illustrated by the organization chart above, the EVPP provides administrative leadership for the academic colleges and multiple major units and central programs of the institution including:

Colleges:

• College of Agriculture and Life Sciences
• College of Business
• College of Design
• College of Engineering
• College of Human Sciences
• College of Liberal Arts and Sciences
• College of Veterinary Medicine
• Graduate College
Major Administrative Units:

- Extension and Outreach
- Research and Economic Development
- Information Technology Services
- University Library
- The Department of Energy’s Ames Laboratory

Central Programs and Organizational Units

- ADVANCE Program
- Budget Planning, Development and Implementation
- Center for Excellence in Learning and Teaching (CELT)
- Continuous Academic Program Improvement and Program Review
- Faculty Development
- Diversity
- University Honors Program
- Institutional Research
- University Lectures Program
- Study Abroad Center
- Program for Women in Science and Engineering (PWISE)
- Margaret Sloss Women’s Center

A. Staffing

The Office of the Executive Vice President and Provost has been restructured several times. The most significant of those reorganizations occurred with the expansion of the EVPP leadership role and the implementation of the resource management model. The EVPP staff totals 20 people, with three on partial appointments, to bring the total FTE to 18.25. The basic structure of the office includes a senior staff group which provides overall coordination to the work of the office. Three additional, loosely configured groups have formed around broad sets of activities: academic personnel, academic programs, and budget and planning.

Currently, the senior staff in the Office of the Executive Vice President and Provost includes:
• Elizabeth Hoffman, Executive Vice President and Provost
• David Holger, Associate Provost for Academic Programs and Dean of the Graduate College
• Dawn Bratsch-Prince, Associate Provost for Academic Personnel and Chief Diversity Officer
• Ellen Rasmussen, Associate Vice President for Budget and Planning
• Brenda Behling, Director of Academic Policy and Personnel

A fuller description of each individual’s responsibilities follows:

Executive Vice President and Provost: Elizabeth Hoffman provides leadership for all aspects of the university's academic mission and leads its efforts in the pursuit of academic excellence. The Executive Vice President and Provost has broad authority for strategic planning, diversity and equity, capital planning, budgeting, information technology initiatives and goals of the university, and for the recruitment and retention of faculty and students. Hoffman is responsible for the formulation and implementation of institutional policies and operations, consulting with the vice presidents, associate provosts and associate vice president, deans, chief information officer, the director of the Ames Laboratory, and university governance.

Associate Provost for Academic Programs and Dean of the Graduate College: David Holger supports academic and institutional excellence by providing leadership and support for the educational mission of Iowa State University, through collaborative efforts across campus that create a supportive and challenging environment for teaching and learning. As Associate Provost for Academic Programs, Holger has responsibility for university-wide programs at the graduate and undergraduate levels, and provides leadership for many academic initiatives, particularly those that involve collaboration among colleges and with student affairs. In addition, Holger has responsibility for assessment and systematic academic program improvement at both the undergraduate and graduate levels. In collaboration with academic units and student affairs, he participates in recruitment and retention efforts for both undergraduate and graduate students. As Dean of the Graduate College, Holger also provides leadership and coordination for graduate student policies, as well as recruitment and retention, particularly for interdisciplinary programs.

Associate Provost for Academic Personnel and Chief Diversity Officer: Dawn Bratsch-Prince supports academic and institutional excellence, by providing leadership for faculty and staff recruitment, retention and diversity through collaborative efforts with colleges and all administrative units to create an inclusive and welcoming environment. Bratsch-Prince manages a range of faculty personnel policies and initiatives, including the part-time tenure track policy, the tenure-clock extension policy, flexible faculty work policies, and all policies related to faculty performance evaluation (preliminary review, P&T, post-tenure review). Bratsch-Prince has responsibility for the University Committee on Women, and she chairs the University Committee on Diversity, the University Work/Life Committee, and the Martin Luther King, Jr. Celebration Committee. She administers the university awards program and is the institutional representative for the Fulbright Scholars Program for faculty. Bratsch-Prince serves as the
EVPP liaison with the Faculty Senate on the Governance Council, FDAR, Documents Committee (Faculty Handbook), College and Department Governance Document Committee, and Compensation Committee. Bratsch-Prince is the EVPP liaison with the university’s department chairs, meeting monthly with the University Chairs Cabinet and organizing regular training through workshops. She oversees the Emerging Leaders Academy leadership development program. She manages all faculty grievance and conduct cases, working closely with the Executive Vice President and Provost, the President of the Faculty Senate, University Counsel and Human Resources.

Associate Vice President for Budget and Planning: Ellen Rasmussen supports academic and institutional excellence by providing leadership and support for overall budgeting and planning at Iowa State University through collaborative efforts that integrate the priorities and processes of the institution and individual colleges and administrative units. Rasmussen is responsible for and takes a leadership role in developing and implementing institutional policies for budget planning and development, capital planning, space and facilities management, and IT data systems, such as eData and enterprise administrative systems. She is also responsible for developing and implementing processes for budget planning and development, institutional and operating plan development, enterprise risk management and internal capital planning. Rasmussen also represents the interests of academic units as procedures and systems are developed for financial activity, as well as space, facility and capital projects management. In addition, she also serves as a liaison between the Executive Vice President and Provost and the President and academic units and other university offices.

Director of Academic Policy and Personnel: Brenda Behling supports academic and institutional excellence by providing leadership for policy development through a collaborative process that involves all organizational units and reflects that broad range of activities that occur on campus. Behling is responsible for implementing personnel policies and developing systems to support those policies with significant effort being committed to faculty appointments and P&S staff recruitment, retention and reclassification. Behling serves as a liaison to the Board of Regents office, to the University Policy Library Advisory Committee and to the Associate Vice President for Human Resources. She works closely with the P&S Council and maintains strong collegial relationships with that representative group.

B. Organizational Structure and Committees

Decisions are made via a collaborative process at Iowa State University. The EVPP leads the ISU Senior Leadership Team which includes the vice presidents and vice provost, deans, associate provosts, associate vice presidents, and the director of the Ames Laboratory. The EVPP also chairs the University Budget Advisory Committee (UBAC) which has faculty and staff representation. The EVPP formed the Provost Leadership Team and the Provost Senior Staff Team to allow for discussion and input on a variety of matters that cross functional line responsibilities.

The Executive Vice President and Provost staff members oversee many university committees, including:

- Associate and Assistant Deans for Graduate Programs (ADGP)
- Associate Deans for Academic Personnel (ADAP)
• Undergraduate Programs Council
• Articulation Coordination Council
• Course Availability Group
• Financial Officers Group
• Retention Task Force (Collaborative Effort with VPSA)
• Associate Deans and Directors for Distance Education
• Department Chairs Cabinet
• Martin Luther King, Jr. Celebration Committee
• Council on International Programs
• University Committee on Diversity
• University Committee on Women
• Women’s Leadership Consortium
• Work/Life Advisory Committee

C. Policies

The Executive Vice President and Provost is responsible for oversight of various policies that impact faculty, staff and students. The office provides leadership for the review of existing policies and for the development of new policies for the institution. Since the last review of the office, an electronic ISU Policy Library was proposed, developed, and implemented by a team which included members of the EVPP Office. The goal of the ISU Policy Library is to provide better accessibility, maintenance, and archiving of electronic policy records, and for improved and consistent policy administration resulting in mitigation of risk for the institution.

Examples of the various, major policies that the Office of the Executive Vice President and Provost promotes and/or develops include: flexible careers and work/life balance, faculty promotion and tenure (including post-tenure review), faculty conduct, research misconduct, conflict of interest and commitment, effort reporting, IT acceptable use, salary adjustments, P&S compensation structure and pay administration, and academic progress (academic probation).

The office partners with the Faculty Senate and Professional & Scientific Council to assess current policies and to develop new policies that, in particular, further the success of the institution in recruiting, rewarding and retaining excellent faculty and staff and in furthering the mission of the university. Shared governance is embraced by the administration as important to the success of the university; thus, in addition to Senate and Council participation in policy development, the EVPP solicits
input directly from the constituent groups on a regular basis. A further example of this is in committee structure and general decision-making.

D. Leadership and Leadership Development

The EVPP has the responsibility for recruiting and mentoring many institutional leaders, including the deans of each academic college. Administrative searches that have resulted in the hiring of an excellent, diverse leadership team include (since 2006): Wendy Wintersteen, Dean of the College of Agriculture and Life Sciences; Luis Rico-Gutierrez, Dean of the College of Design; Pamela White, Dean of the College Human Sciences; Jonathan Wickert, Dean of the College of Engineering; Lisa Nolan, Dean of the College of Veterinary Medicine; Sharron Quisenberry, Vice President for Research and Economic Development; Dawn Bratsch-Prince, Associate Provost and Chief Diversity Officer; and Cathann Kress, Vice President for Extension and Outreach. A search for a new Dean of the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences is in process.

The Executive Vice President and Provost conceived of and implemented the Emerging Leaders Academy program to offer leadership development for current administrators and/or those faculty and staff who desire to take on leadership roles at ISU. The office will soon select the third cohort of emerging leaders for classes to begin in 2012.

V. Resources

The Office of the Executive Vice President and Provost provides leadership for the policies that guide budget planning and development and oversees the process that results in an annual operating budget. After decades of utilizing a traditional, incremental approach to budgeting, Iowa State transformed its budget development process to a responsibility-centered approach, called the Resource Management Model (RMM). The model was developed over a three year period and has been in place since the development of the FY09 operating budget.

- The development process for the new model can be found at http://www.public.iastate.edu/~budget/rmm/.
- Documentation for the annual budget development processes for FY08 through FY12 can be found at http://www.public.iastate.edu/~budget/budget_development.shtml.
- A manual describing Iowa State’s budget policies, processes and procedures can be found at http://www.public.iastate.edu/~budget/rmm/RMMPPP.pdf.

When the resource management model was initiated a commitment was made to implement a formal review of the model after three to five years. The time for a formal review of the RMM has come and the campus is in the midst of reviewing the impacts and results of the model on the finances, programs and culture of the institution. The review, which is being conducted by a nine-person, broadly representative committee, will solicit input from the campus in a variety of ways. The final report is expected by May 2012.
The Executive Vice President and Provost has responsibility for both strategic planning and annual budget development and has begun to develop a stronger connection between those two crucial activities by developing an institutional operating plan and asking all administrative units to develop individual operating plans. The three year rolling plans include concrete strategies for achieving the broad goals in the institutional and unit strategic plans and require metrics for assessing progress. This is a work in progress that is expected to be completed during the current operating cycle.

The operating budget for the Office of the Executive Vice President and Provost is approximately $2.6M for the current operating year. The table below provides a summary of that budget for FY2006 to provide a comparison point and the most recent three years—FY2010, FY2011 and FY2012. The main goals for the office budget are to provide adequate support for the staff, which makes up 94% of the budget for the current year. That support takes several forms: basic supplies and services needed to do the on-going work, professional development to maintain skills and competencies, and occasional equipment upgrades.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY 2006</th>
<th>FY 2010</th>
<th>FY 2011</th>
<th>FY 2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Salaries and Benefits</td>
<td>1,513,552</td>
<td>2,348,211</td>
<td>2,395,400</td>
<td>2,462,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplies and Services</td>
<td>289,374</td>
<td>199,292</td>
<td>180,663</td>
<td>152,477</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,802,926</td>
<td>2,547,503</td>
<td>2,576,063</td>
<td>2,614,727</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Staff 3 Faculty; 8.25 P&S; 1.75 Merit 3 Faculty; 14.5 P&S; 2 Merit 3 Faculty; 13.5 P&S; 2 Merit 3 Faculty; 14.5 P&S; 2 Merit

The increased number of staff from FY 2006 to FY 2012 is the result of the following:

- The enhancement of programmatic support for diversity, academic program quality, and communications, which added 3.5 FTE.
- The implementation of the Resource Management Model, which added 2.5 FTE to provide additional analytic, programmatic and administrative support.
- Increased administrative support, which added .25 FTE.

VI. Evaluation and Continuous Improvement

The Office of the Executive Vice President and Provost provides leadership and administrative management for the development and implementation of systematic academic program evaluation processes. The primary goal of this effort is to enhance the quality of academic programs and units
through systematic approaches to program review and improvement. In 2004 a new staff position was created to coordinate and manage all continuous academic improvement processes for the Office of the EVPP.

Elements of the academic review and evaluation process include external reviews, internal reviews, accreditation reviews, and targeted multi-unit reviews. Consistent with Board of Regents policy, all academic programs undergo external review on an approximately seven year cycle. At ISU we have interpreted academic programs in this context to include degree programs, departments, colleges, and central academic program units that report to the Office of the EVPP. In some instances, external reviews are conducted for groups of related programs by a single external review team. Since 2004, with few exceptions (typically for sound programmatic reasons such as a major program reorganization) the seven year external review cycle has been maintained for all academic programs including the central academic programs and units that report to the Office of the EVPP.

The schedule and process for external academic program review on a seven year cycle are centrally led by the Associate Provost for Academic Programs and managed by the Coordinator of Continuous Academic Program Improvement. During spring semester of each year meetings are held with the academic college and central unit administrators who coordinate academic program reviews to foster planning for and scheduling of academic program reviews for the following year. At these meetings the process and expectations are reviewed, and any potential modifications to the schedule of reviews for the upcoming year are discussed and agreed upon. Later in the spring, or early in the fall, the membership (usually 3 to 5 members) of the external review team is proposed, discussed and approved by the Associate Provost. Team members are expected to be senior faculty members or unit leaders at peer level or above programs.

In preparation for the external review a self study is developed by the program and submitted to the team as well as to appropriate ISU administrative leadership. A review team visit is typically 3 days and includes entrance and exit meetings with the EVPP, the associate provost, and the coordinator. The team report is received by the program, as well as the appropriate college/unit administrators and the Office of the EVPP. Following the development of a response to the report by the program, a meeting is held including program, unit, and central leadership to discuss appropriate actions by the program. A summary of the program review and resulting actions is also submitted to the Board of Regents. Approximately three years after the review, a concise “mid-cycle” progress report describing progress is submitted and discussed with appropriate unit and central administrators.

In addition to academic program reviews, a significant number of academic programs at ISU are accredited by external organizations. Although the processes associated with accreditation reviews are generally quite specific for each organization, institutional elements of the process that involve central administrators are coordinated by the Office of the EVPP. The results of accreditation reviews are reported to the Board of Regents by the Office of the EVPP and in some instances result in modified foci for subsequent academic program reviews. Accreditation reviews are generally in addition to, rather than in place of, academic program reviews, although the emphasis of a particular accreditation review may shift the emphasis of a program review to other aspects of the academic program. The Office of
the EVPP is also responsible for organizing and leading preparation for the normally 10-year cycle institutional accreditation by the Higher Learning Commission of the North Central Association.

Additional elements of a comprehensive approach to academic program improvement at ISU include internal reviews of programs, programmatic areas, units, or groups of units, often as a supplement to the academic program review process described above. Examples of internal reviews include recent reviews of interdisciplinary graduate PhD programs, international activities, several research centers, and a number of organizational reviews. In some instances internal reviews are conducted in association with the development of strategic plans for units or programs, and in others they have been primarily motivated by the need to reorganize to more effectively utilize available resources while maintaining or enhancing program quality.

VII. Relations with Other Offices

The Office of the Executive Vice President and Provost maintains excellent relationships with other university offices and agents, with other Regents institutions and with the Board of Regents. The Executive Vice President and Provost regularly meets with the provosts at the other Regent institutions as part of the Council of Provosts, and the Associate Provost for Academic Personnel meets regularly with her counterparts at the University of Iowa and University of Northern Iowa. The Associate Provost for Academic Programs works with colleagues at the University of Iowa and the University of Northern Iowa on inter-institutional academic cooperation. The Office of the Executive Vice President and Provost provides information on the academic and budgetary divisions of Iowa State University for the Board of Regents, including the annual Strategic Plan Progress Report, the Faculty Activities Report, the Diversity Report, the Distance Education Report, and the Faculty Professional Development Assignment Reports.

The Office of the EVPP maintains an active partnership with the senior leadership of Iowa State University, including the President, the Vice President for Student Affairs, the Vice President for Business and Finance, and the Associate Vice President for Human Resources. These are longstanding relationships that continue to be enhanced through partnerships and collaboration on cross-cutting institutional issues. The Executive Vice President and Provost works closely with the academic vice presidents who report to her (Vice President for Research and Economic Development and Vice President for Extension and Outreach), as well as with the college deans, the Chief Information Officer, and the Director of the Ames Laboratory.

The Office of the EVPP has developed a strong relationship with employee groups, including the Faculty Senate, the P&S Council and the Supervisory & Confidential Council. The Office works with the Faculty Senate and the P&S Council in a shared governance role, ensuring that the Faculty Senate and the P&S Council are represented in university decision-making by having a role in all university-wide committees led by the Office of the EVPP.

During the past five years, the point of contact for the university and the ISU Foundation was moved from the Office of the President to the Office of the President and the Office of the EVPP. This occurred as a result of the changing relationship of responsibility for university budgeting. The Executive Vice
President and Provost’s leadership role with the ISU Foundation has resulted in increased communication about the fundraising and academic missions of the university.

During the past five years, the Office of the EVPP has improved how it relates with the university community in a variety of ways. Most visible is the transition to a more transparent method of budgeting. The university community participated in the development of the Resource Management Model, and persons representing all levels of the organization are included in the annual budgeting process through the committee structure that is unique to the budgeting process developed at ISU. Information about the budgeting process is available online, and has proved to be an excellent resource for the Iowa State community as well as other institutions who are considering this approach to budgeting.

The Office of the EVPP supports the university involvement in United Way, as well as the university Relay for Life event.

VIII. Summary

The Office of the Executive Vice President and Provost has changed its focus during the past five years to adapt to changing university needs. This includes changing how budgeting is done at Iowa State University, updating university policies, enhancing diversity programming and expanding programs for improving employee recruitment and retention. The Office of the Executive Vice President and Provost provides university leadership for academic affairs, budgeting, and diversity and coordinates the work of all university offices to present a consistent message to the President, the university community, and external audiences. Finally, the Office of the Executive Vice President and Provost coordinates and facilitates a strong culture and tradition of transparency and shared governance that enhances the university’s mission to create, share, and apply knowledge to make Iowa and the world a better place, while also ensuring that Iowa State University is a great place to work and learn for all faculty, staff, and students.
Appendix 3
Review of the Office of the Executive Vice President and Provost

Pursuant to the ISU Faculty Handbook Section 5.7.5, the Office of the Executive Vice President and Provost (OEVPP) will be reviewed by a Faculty Senate Committee and a report of findings submitted to the Executive Vice President and Provost in the form of a public report and to the President as a confidential report. In order to best assess the performance of OEVPP, Iowa State University Faculty are requested to participate in an on-line survey that will be made available beginning January 18, 2012 for two weeks. The Faculty Senate requests that all Faculty become involved in this important review and complete the brief survey and submit comments as appropriate. If you have questions, please contact Mike Owen, Past President of Faculty Senate and Chair of the Office of the Executive Vice President and Provost Review Committee.
Appendix 4
Dear ISU Faculty Member,

This survey is being sent to all ISU faculty to gather information regarding your interactions with and impressions of the Executive Vice President and Provost Office. The Executive Vice President and Provost is the chief academic officer of the university and works closely with the president in providing overall leadership for the university. The organizational structure, key personnel and functions of the office can be found at Http://www.provost.iastate.edu/about/OrgChart211.pdf

The college deans, the vice presidents for extension, undergraduate programs, business and finance and research and advanced studies, the dean of the library, the director of Institute for Physical Research and Technology, and the Academic Information Technology Director report to the Provost. In answering this survey, please consider only the Executive Vice President and Provost Office in 107 Beardshear, and not the other units that report to the Provost.

This survey is part of an evaluation of the functioning of the Executive Vice President and Provost Office. It is not an evaluation of the individuals who work in that office. The goal of this survey is to provide a cross-section of faculty perceptions of and evaluation of the Executive Vice President and Provost Office. Please provide your candid assessment to the following question. We estimate that the questionnaire should not take more than 15 minutes to complete. Your replies will be aggregated in summary form, and individual identities will be confidential.

Please click on the link to take the survey. {Project property: mrlInterview/InterviewStartURL}&id={Sample field: Id} (Copy and paste link into web browser if link is not active.) Thank you very much for your participation.

Micheal D.K. Owen
Faculty Senate Executive Vice President and Provost Evaluation Committee Chair and Faculty Senate Past President
Appendix 5
This survey is being sent to all ISU faculty to gather information regarding your interactions with and impressions of the Office of the Executive Vice President and Provost (Provost). The Provost is the chief academic officer of the university and works closely with the president in providing overall leadership for the university. The organizational structure, key personnel and functions of the office can be found at http://www.provost.iastate.edu/about/OrgChart211.pdf

The college deans, the vice provost for extension, undergraduate programs, and research and advanced studies, the dean of the library, the director of Institute for Physical Research and Technology, and the Academic Information Technology Director report to the Provost. In answering this survey, please consider only the Provost Office in 107 Beardshear, and not the other units that report to the Provost.

This survey is part of an evaluation of the functioning of the Provost Office. It is not an evaluation of the individuals who work in that office. The goal of this survey is to provide a cross-section of faculty perceptions of and evaluation of the Provost Office. Please provide your candid assessment to the following questions. We estimate that the questionnaire should not take more than 15 minutes to complete. Your replies will be aggregated in summary form, and individual identities will be confidential.

1. What is your academic rank?
   a. Instructor
   b. Assistant Professor
   c. Associate Professor
   d. Professor
   e. University or Distinguished Professor

2. Which college is your primary appointment located?
   a. Agriculture and Life Sciences
   b. Business
   c. Design
   d. Engineering
   e. Human Sciences
   f. Liberal Arts and Sciences
3. How many years have you been on the faculty at ISU?
   a. Less than 6
   b. 6-10
   c. 11-10
   d. Over 20

4. What is your gender?
   a. Female
   b. Male

5. Since January 2007, (since Provost Hoffman was appointed) how much contact have you had with the Provost Office?
   a. Extensive (at least once a month)
   b. Some (6-8 times a year)
   c. Limited (less than 5 times per year)
   d. None
6. For the following series of questions, please indicate your level of agreement with them, with one indicating “strongly agree”; 2 indicating “agreement”; 3 indicating “not sure”; 4 indicating “disagreement” and 5 indicating “strong disagreement”.

   Strongly
   Agree   Agree   Not
   Sure    Disagree  Strongly
   Disagree

The Provost Office:

a. Actively promotes an environment for excellence in scholarship 1 2 3 4 5
b. Actively promotes an environment for excellence in teaching 1 2 3 4 5
c. Actively promotes an environment for excellence in student learning 1 2 3 4 5
d. Actively promotes policies that support the mission of the university relative to strategic planning 1 2 3 4 5
e. Works effectively with other administrators anticipating future needs (technology, infrastructure, classroom and laboratory space, etc.) of the faculty 1 2 3 4 5
f. Allocates resources so that your department or academic unit can accomplish their mission 1 2 3 4 5
g. Provides academic leadership in planning for the University 1 2 3 4 5
h. Provides academic leadership in developing academic programs 1 2 3 4 5
i. Provides academic leadership in implementing new initiatives 1 2 3 4 5
j. Provides academic leadership in program assessment 1 2 3 4 5
k. Supports faculty governance at all levels   1  2  3  4  5  
l. Consults with the faculty adequately before making important decisions  1  2  3  4  5  
m. Provides leadership in advocating for diversity  1  2  3  4  5  
n. Ensures that university policy, procedures and available resources are transparent  1  2  3  4  5  
o. Provides effective leadership in international engagement  1  2  3  4  5
7. Thinking back over the interactions you have had with the Provost Office, what programs (s) or issues(s) did this contact occur? What was your overall level of satisfaction with the process (i.e. its fairness, promptness, effectiveness of communication, etc.)?

8. In your opinion, what does the Provost’s Office do well?

9. In your opinion, what needs improvement?

10. Please add any additional comments that might assist the committee that is conducting this evaluation.

In order for your input to be considered in the final report, please respond to the confidential website by January _____, 2012.
Appendix 6
Date: April 28, 1999

To: Martin Jischke, Iowa State University President  
Denise Vrchota, ISU Faculty Senate President  
Richard Seagrave, Interim Provost

From: Provost Office Review Committee  
Bonita A. Glatz, Chair, Food Science and Human Nutrition  
David Hopper, Veterinary Diagnostic and Production Animal Medicine  
Nelle Hutter Kottman, Foreign Languages and Literatures  
Dean Isaacson, Statistics  
Kenneth Kruempel, Electrical and Computer Engineering  
Barbara Licklider, Educational Leadership and Policy Studies

Re: Final report of the Provost's office review committee

The above committee was appointed by ISU Faculty Senate President Denise Vrchota in December, 1998 to carry out a review of the Provost's office, as authorized by the ISU Faculty Handbook and the Faculty Senate. The activities, findings, and recommendations of the committee are described in the accompanying report. For ease of reference, committee recommendations are also given below. The committee will be glad to discuss this report with you.

Committee Recommendations:

The committee found considerable agreement in the comments obtained from various sources. Based upon the information obtained in interviews and surveys, as well as its own deliberations, the committee makes the following recommendations for strengthening the Provost's office:

1) The majority of those surveyed thought that the Provost's office occupied an appropriate place in the present administrative structure of the university, and that it functioned well. Some suggestions on alternative structures were made. However, the committee recommends continuing the current structure for the Provost's office.

2) One of the overarching concerns of administrators at various levels, and also expressed by faculty, is the degree of decision-making autonomy of the Provost's office. As its chief academic officer, the Provost should have a highly visible role and clear autonomy in providing academic leadership for the university.

3) Another fundamental concern of faculty and administrators is the limited budgetary resources and authority of the Provost's office. Increased budget and budgetary authority would significantly enhance the ability of the Provost to support new initiatives, recruit outstanding faculty and promote academic excellence across the institution.
4) Concern was expressed that the Provost’s office is understaffed. The amount of time that is taken up in responding to issues, handling paperwork, and answering questions means that the Provost and staff have little opportunity to think about new initiatives. The addition of one or two faculty members to the office on an interim, part-time, or special-project basis would provide more people to suggest and discuss issues and ideas and would give the Provost more time to lead the academic programs of the university.

5) Timeliness of response and decision making was cited as a problem by many faculty and administrators. Greater decision-making autonomy, more staff, and an administrative emphasis upon timeliness in the Provost’s office should effectively address this concern.

6) Many of the problems expressed above are related to communication. To foster better communication we recommend that the Provost visit each college at least once a year, to see department activities, talk to DEOs and faculty, and possibly conduct forums similar to those given by the President. Also, the Provost’s office needs to explore better ways to communicate with the faculty, staff, and students of the university on a regular basis.
Committee Members

Bonita Glatz (Committee Chair), Professor, Food Science and Human Nutrition
David Hopper, Professor, Veterinary Diagnostic and Production Animal Medicine
Nelle Hutter-Kottman, Adj. Instructor, Foreign Languages and Literatures
Dean Isaacson, Professor and DEO, Statistics
Kenneth Kruempel, Associate Professor, Electrical and Computer Engineering
Barbara Licklider, Associate Professor, Educational Leadership and Policy Studies

Committee Activities

As authorized by the Iowa State University Faculty Handbook and Faculty Senate, the above committee was appointed by Senate President Denise Vrchota in December, 1998 and was directed to carry out a review of the Office of the Provost. This is one of a series of reviews of university central administrators and offices conducted on a periodic schedule, as described in the Faculty Handbook (Faculty Handbook, July 1995, pages 122-125).

The primary purpose of these reviews is to provide an occasion for central administrative officers to evaluate their programs and subunits and to provide a means for constructive and systematic faculty evaluation of these offices. Because of the retirement of long-time Associate Provost Edwin Lewis, the resignation of Provost John Kozak, and the on-going search for a new Provost, the conduct of this review was different from that of other reviews. The charge to the committee was to evaluate the office, not the officer. Specifically, the committee accepted as its mission to (1) provide the Provost’s office with the opportunity to explain its roles, procedures, and activities to the university community and (2) perform a constructive and systematic faculty evaluation of the office with the intent to improve the capacity of that office.

The committee began meeting late in December, 1998. Although all meetings were open, they were not initially publicized. The meeting schedule was provided to Faculty Senate President Vrchota in February.

After examining the structure of the Provost’s office and the organizational chart of units reporting to the Provost, the committee limited its review to the office located in 107 Beardshear. The committee did not review the many units that report to the Provost, e.g. Vice Provost for Extension, Vice Provost for Research and Advanced Studies, Vice Provost for Undergraduate Programs, Computation Center, Library, and Institute for Physical Research and Technology. Reviews of these units should be conducted regularly as directed by the Provost. The committee interviewed those in charge of these units regarding their interactions with the Provost’s office.

The committee acknowledged that because of the transition in the Provost’s office at the present time, it would not be realistic to obtain a newly created self-study document. Instead, the committee chose to seek information from existing sources and from interviews with key individuals. Initial questions generated by the committee were as basic as: What does the office do now, and what budgets are involved? Who are the staff members in the office, and what do they do? Why are certain programs located where they are? In the perceptions of the staff members, what appears to be working well, and what may need some attention? How does the structure of the office compare with that at other key institutions?
Important sources of written information included:

1) Office of the Provost homepage (http://www.iastate.edu/~provost/), for an organizational chart of the offices reporting to the Provost, a list of the Provost’s office staff members and their current responsibilities, and a mission statement for the office;
2) ISU Fact Book 1997-1998, for information about Iowa State University;
3) Report of the committee that reviewed the Office of the President, for guiding framework for the conduct of this review and information on perceptions of the Office of the President;
4) Questionnaire sent to faculty as part of the review of the Office of the President, which generated initial conversation about faculty input;
5) Organizational charts of central administrative offices for Peer 11 and Iowa Regents universities.

The committee gathered information from faculty, DEOs, deans, assistant and associate deans, directors of key units, and key central administrators. All faculty were sent a written survey (included in Appendix 1), which they were requested to return to the Faculty Senate office. Answers to machine-scored questions were tabulated by Test and Evaluation Services; written responses to open-ended questions were transcribed. Faculty senators were asked to solicit input from their department colleagues via whatever means they considered best. Individual communications to the committee were encouraged through an announcement in “Inside Iowa State.” The Professional and Scientific Council was asked to provide input if they desired. Administrators were sent an additional set of questions via email (see Appendix 2). All DEOs, associate deans, and assistant deans were asked to return their responses to the committee chair via email or anonymously via campus mail. The responses were grouped by like positions, identifiers were removed, and responses were typed verbatim.

The committee decided it was important to interview the President, Vice President for Business and Finance, Vice President for Student Affairs, former Provost, Interim Provost, assistant provosts, vice provosts, Assistant Vice President for Human Resource Services, Computation Center Director, Director of the Institute for Physical Research and Technology, and college and library deans. President Jischke, former Associate Provost Edwin Lewis, Assistant Provosts Faye Whitaker and Ellen Rasmussen, and Interim Provost Richard Seagrave met with the committee as a whole. Other administrators were contacted by individual members of the committee for one-on-one interviews. These administrators were given the opportunity to 1) respond to the email questionnaire in writing or by email; 2) respond orally to the interviewer; 3) respond both in writing and via interview; or 4) choose not to respond. Written responses were shared with all committee members as received. Interviewers shared summaries of their interviews with all committee members. The interviews provided information about the internal operations of the Provost’s office, perceptions about staffing, interactions with other groups on campus (e.g., President’s Cabinet, deans, DEOs), decision making processes, budgets and budget management.

Recent History of the Provost's Office

Beginning about 1960 and continuing through President Robert Parks’s administration, Iowa State University’s chief academic officer was the Vice President for Academic Affairs. Only the Vice President for Business and Finance predated it. During the Parks administration, several other vice president positions were added, including the Vice President for Student Affairs, the Vice President for Research (who was also Dean of the Graduate College), and the Vice President for Information and Development. All of the vice presidents, along with the Dean of University Extension, reported to the President.

In 1987, President Gordon Eaton restructured the central administration and created the position of Provost. He had been Provost at Texas A & M before coming to ISU and was presumably more comfortable with that arrangement. The Vice President for Research became a Vice Provost for
Research and Advanced Studies and reported to the Provost. A study of University Extension shortly thereafter recommended the creation of a Vice Provost for Extension. Milton Glick was hired as Provost in 1988, Patricia Swan was appointed Vice Provost for Research and Advanced Studies in 1989, and Robert Anderson was appointed Vice Provost for Extension in 1990. President Eaton left in Fall 1990, at which time Milton Glick was named Interim President and Patricia Swan was named Interim Provost. When President Martin Jischke was appointed in 1991, Milton Glick left the university and Patricia Swan continued as Interim Provost. John Kozak was appointed Provost in 1992.

When the position of Vice President for Student Affairs was created by President Parks in 1966, the offices of the Registrar and Admissions were included in its portfolio. At that time both of these offices reported to a Dean of Admissions and Records, who in turn reported to the Vice President for Student Affairs. The dean's position was subsequently eliminated. These groups may have reported to the Vice President for Academic Affairs before 1966.

The most recent changes in the office of the Provost were the creation of the position of Vice Provost for Undergraduate Programs in 1998 and the retirement of Associate Provost Edwin Lewis. The Provost's office moved to its current location of 107 Beardshear in 1989.

(Much of this history was written by Dr. Ed Lewis. The committee appreciates his willingness to share it with us.)

**Current Organization of the Office of the Provost**

Two organization charts are included in this report. Chart 1 (see Appendix 3) is from the Provost's office web page (http://www.iastate.edu/~provost/staff/staff.html) and shows the people and offices that report to the Provost. These include the three vice provosts (Vice Provost for Research and Advanced Studies, Vice Provost for Extension, and Vice Provost for Undergraduate Programs), the Director of the Computation Center, the Dean of Library Services, the Director of the Institute for Physical Research and Technology, the Director of the International Institute of Theoretical and Applied Physics, and the deans of the eight academic colleges. Chart 1 also shows the departments and some centers and institutes that report to the deans.

Chart 2 (Appendix 4) was prepared by staff in the Provost’s office and shows the internal organization of the office. It shows the division of responsibilities between the two assistant provosts and among others in the office. A listing of "staff responsibilities by topic" can also be found on the Provost’s office web page (http://www.iastate.edu/~provost/staff/bytopic.html).

The responsibilities of the Provost and the qualifications of the individual who would hold this position are stated in the current position announcement included in Appendix 5.

**Mission Statement of the Office of the Provost**

The following mission statement for the Provost’s office is found on its web page (http://www.iastate.edu/~provost/staff/mission.html):

The Office of the Provost is the heart of the academic enterprise at Iowa State University. In support of the land-grant philosophy and Iowa State University's goal of becoming the premier land-grant university, the fundamental mission of the Office of the Provost is to provide academic vision and leadership to advance and support excellence in teaching/learning, research, and outreach. The Office of the Provost emphasizes and fosters the integration of the mutually dependent activities of the institution's tripartite mission. To that end, the Office:

- Supports development of a supportive and challenging environment for student learning and research.
Advances the goals of the colleges and other academic units by sustaining a supportive atmosphere for the creative efforts of faculty and staff.

Develops, encourages, and supports communication, coordination, and collaboration among the university's colleges, centers, and other academic units.

Responses of Administrators

The responses of administrators (DEOs and above) obtained from the set of questions sent to them via email, and from interviews with deans and other selected administrators, are summarized here. The issues raised are listed and differences of opinion among administrators are pointed out.

Administrators mostly contact the Provost’s office on matters related to the hiring and promotion of faculty and staff, although all functions of the office were mentioned by someone. The issues and concerns raised through these contacts are as follows:

1) Timeliness of response: About half of the administrators thought that response time was too slow, while the rest reported that responses were timely.

2) Thoughtfulness and fairness of response: Most administrators thought that the responses were well considered, fair, and appropriate.

3) Administrative structure: Most thought that the current structure was adequate. There was general support for the three vice provost positions, and strong support was expressed for the establishment of the Vice Provost for Undergraduate Programs. Despite the general support of the current structure, many opinions were expressed regarding suggested changes. Common suggestions included the following:

   a) There should be more of a faculty presence in the Provost’s office, probably most effectively achieved by adding part-time faculty positions.

   b) The office is understaffed; more staff at various levels should be added.

   c) The Offices of the Registrar and Admissions should report to the Provost and not to the Vice President for Student Affairs.

   d) The Provost should function as an Executive Vice President; all vice presidents should report to the Provost.

4) Budget: Some administrators supported the status quo, but others expressed the following concerns:

   a) The Provost and especially some of the vice provosts do not have adequate budget to initiate changes, especially changes that require cooperation across colleges. Can the university respond quickly enough to opportunities involving interdisciplinary teaching and research, without adequate budget to support new initiatives in the Provost’s office?

   b) There should be more resources in the Provost’s office to provide matching funds for instructional grants.

   c) The Provost’s office is not involved in fundraising. Very little if any new money raised from external sources through such campaigns goes to the Provost’s office.

5) Visibility: There was general agreement that the Provost needs to be more visible on campus. It was frequently stated that the President visits the colleges more often than does the
Provost. Visibility will be even more important as the university adjusts to a new promotion and tenure document.

6) Communication: Going hand-in-hand with a lack of visibility is a lack of good communication from the Provost's office. There was general agreement that most faculty and staff probably don't have a good idea of just what the Provost's office does.

7) Power of the office: Some administrators stated that there should be more representation from the academic side of campus on the President's Cabinet, to provide support to the Provost in this forum. (Note: The President's Cabinet consists of the vice presidents, Provost, vice provosts, Executive Assistant and assistants to the President, Director of University Relations, Director of University Legal Services, Affirmative Action Director, and Advisor on Diversity Issues.) Many expressed the belief that the Provost does not have the authority to make major decisions. This could be mainly a perception problem, which reinforces the need for better communication regarding what the Provost does.

Results of Faculty Survey

The faculty survey was sent to approximately 1850 individuals; 442 surveys were returned by April 5, 1999, for a response rate of 24%. All questions were not answered on all survey forms, and many returned surveys did not include answers to any of the open-ended questions (questions 7-10). The responses to each of the open-ended questions were summarized by different members of the review committee; these summaries are included below. Considerable redundancy may be seen among the responses to these questions. No attempt was made to eliminate this redundancy, so that an accurate picture of the range of responses to each question could be presented.

Demographics of respondents are as follows:

1) Academic rank: 2) Tenure status:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instructors</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Professors</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professors</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professors</td>
<td>179</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3) College affiliation: 4) Length of time on ISU faculty:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family and Consumer Sciences</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal Arts and Sciences</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veterinary Medicine</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5) Gender:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>male</td>
<td>296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>female</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6) Personal contact with the Provost's office since January 1, 1998:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contact Status</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>had contact</td>
<td>183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>had no contact</td>
<td>257</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In their answers to the open-ended questions on the survey, the faculty identified many of the same issues as did the administrators. Summaries of these responses follow.
7). If you have had personal contact with the Provost’s office, what program(s) or issues(s) did this contact concern? What was your overall level of satisfaction with the process (i.e. its fairness, promptness, effectiveness of communication, etc)?

Out of 185 responses (excluding those that concerned other offices),
   78 were positive or indicated no problems.
   37 were negative or expressed some concern.
   23 were mixed positive and negative.
   11 commented that they didn’t know enough to form an opinion.
   36 were simply factual with no opinion expressed.

Types of contacts listed were varied; most frequently cited were new faculty hires, promotion and tenure, personnel issues, and searches.

Positive comments cited general satisfaction; prompt and efficient handling of issues; complete and candid answers to questions; interest in faculty welfare; helpful insights provided; fairness; high standards; respect for faculty; full discussion of issues; accessibility; responsiveness.

By far, the most common complaints concerned lack of communication and slow response time. Other concerns cited by several faculty included: no explanation for decision made; lack of follow-up; lack of fairness; inconsistency; disregard for committee recommendations and information from departments; rigid interpretation of rules.

8) In your opinion, what does the Provost’s office do well?

Among 208 responses, the following opinions were expressed:
   43 stated that they didn’t know what the office does.
   31 stated that the office did very little well.
   23 stated that the office did most things well.
   21 commented on the good leadership and new initiatives that have come from the Provost’s office.
   19 stated that the office was friendly and timely in its responses.
   17 stated that the office was helpful on personnel issues such as hiring and promoting faculty.
   14 stated that the office was supportive of teaching issues.
   9 stated that the office was supportive of research issues.
   9 stated that the office supported faculty development.
   A few faculty commented on budget management, support of diversity, and globalization as areas of excellence for the Provost’s office.

9) In your opinion, what needs improvement?

Among the responses to this question, certain clear patterns emerged. Summarized comments are presented here in decreasing order of the number of responses related to each topic. Numbers in parentheses are the number of comments included in that group.

Communication/visibility (65): According to respondents, the area most in need of improvement was communication, especially two-way communication. Many faculty were unsure of the duties of the Provost’s office and asked ”What exactly are the functions of this office?” Others wanted to be reassured that the Provost’s office understood the faculty, their concerns and their needs. There was reported a lack of communication regarding specific policies or decisions. When requests were made, policies were set and decisions were handed down, but inadequate explanations were given.
Respondents suggested that they would very much like more personal and direct contact with the Provost. More visibility (visits to individual colleges and departments, small-group or one-on-one discussions) would be both informative and reassuring. Newsletters or memos that shared issues directly related to the faculty could prove beneficial to communication between the Provost and the faculty.

**Timeliness/promptness (25):** Comments consistently indicated that response time to questions and requests for decisions and/or explanations was inordinately long. On some occasions, no answer was forthcoming.

**Standards/leadership (22):** Survey respondents stated that the Provost should be a dynamic leader who is bold, proactive, decisive, innovative, and knowledgeable about local issues and national initiatives; a leader who sets and maintains high standards for him/herself and expects no less from the ISU faculty. Specific leadership areas cited included diversity, women and minorities, agriculture, extension, scholarly activity.

**Faculty advocacy (17):** Many respondents indicated that there should be a stronger sense of advocacy for the faculty emanating from the Provost’s office. The voice of the Provost should be independent of and distinct from that of the President and should reflect the wishes of the faculty and academic interests.

**Instructional programs/teaching (16):** Respondents stated that although the importance of teaching is stressed by the administration, many faculty believe that good teaching is not sufficiently rewarded or funded. This perception discourages those faculty whose primary responsibilities are in the area of teaching and who strive for pedagogical excellence.

**Promotion and tenure (12):** Several faculty expressed a significant need to clarify expectations before P and T dossiers are presented, as well as a strong desire for explanation and justification for decisions rendered.

**Funding decisions (8):** Faculty expressed a desire for more fairness and less bias in funding colleges and academic units. They stated that science and technology seemed to benefit from favorable allocation of resources, but frequently at the expense of education, humanities, the arts and other nonscience areas.

**Bureaucracy (8):** The message from these respondents was that less is better. They were concerned that faculty today filled out more reports and forms and spent less time being creative and innovative. Enrollments increased, but there was less funding for teaching. Faculty salaries lagged behind those of administrators.

**Shared governance (6):** These respondents proposed more faculty input into the decision-making process, particularly more involvement of the Faculty Senate, thereby making it stronger, more autonomous, and more effective.

**Management style (5):** Faculty addressing this point would like more flexibility, more freedom, more autonomy in subordinate units (i.e. departments).

**Stability (4):** Concern was expressed about the turnover rate among deans and other top-level administrators. The question was posed whether this phenomenon was a national trend or a reflection of some problem(s) at ISU. In either case, this pattern was seen as not optimal.

**International programs (3):** Faculty called for more understanding of existing programs, as well as better design of and more faculty involvement in new programs.
Faculty Improvement Leaves (2): There was an expressed need for better organization, and the observation that a three-month period without pay (in order to take a full-year leave) constitutes a hardship for newer, younger faculty and favors more established faculty.

Graduate education (2): Faculty wanted to see more concern for graduate education, particularly funding for talented and qualified graduate students.

Nothing/no opinion (12)

10) Please add any additional comments.

The comments made in response to this question can be grouped into several categories. These are presented below in decreasing order of the number of responses related to each topic. Numbers in parentheses are the number of comments included in that group.

Communications (24): The need to improve communication between the faculty and the Provost’s office was expressed by many. A number of faculty members have never had the opportunity to interact with the Provost.

Degree of independence in decision making (12): The relationship between the Provost’s office and the President’s office is a concern to several faculty members, who believe that the Provost’s office has little or no autonomy of action and must clear decisions with the President’s office. Many faculty members expressed the opinion that the Provost’s office could function far more effectively if it were given greater independence to make decisions relating to academic issues and programs.

Leadership style (8): A number of faculty believe that the leadership style of the university upper administration is autocratic, hierarchical, and places little value on faculty opinion.

Timeliness of response (5): Some faculty complained that the Provost’s office is too slow in responding to requests and communications it receives, particularly when these communications require major decisions.

Budget (4): A number of faculty members stated that the Provost’s office could more effectively address the university’s academic needs and programs if the office had a larger budget for discretionary spending.

Promotion and tenure (4): A number of faculty believe that the promotion and tenure process remains problematic and that the Provost’s office needs to continue to communicate more effectively regarding promotion and tenure policy and issues.

Teaching and research (3): A number of faculty members expressed concern about how well teaching was rewarded, while others expressed a need for more and better research. Both groups want more attention given to these issues by the Provost’s office.

Committee Recommendations

The committee found considerable agreement in the comments obtained from various sources. Based upon the information obtained in interviews and surveys, as well as its own deliberations, the committee makes the following recommendations for strengthening the Provost’s office:

1) The majority of those surveyed thought that the Provost’s office occupied an appropriate place in the present administrative structure of the university, and that it functioned well. Some suggestions on alternative structures were made. However, the committee recommends continuing the current structure for the Provost’s office.
2) One of the overarching concerns of administrators at various levels, and also expressed by faculty, is the degree of decision-making autonomy of the Provost’s office. As its chief academic officer, the Provost should have a highly visible role and clear autonomy in providing academic leadership for the university.

3) Another fundamental concern of faculty and administrators is the limited budgetary resources and authority of the Provost’s office. Increased budget and budgetary authority would significantly enhance the ability of the Provost to support new initiatives, recruit outstanding faculty and promote academic excellence across the institution.

4) Concern was expressed that the Provost’s office is understaffed. The amount of time that is taken up in responding to issues, handling paperwork, and answering questions means that the Provost and staff have little opportunity to think about new initiatives. The addition of one or two faculty members to the office on an interim, part-time, or special-project basis would provide more people to suggest and discuss issues and ideas and would give the Provost more time to lead the academic programs of the university.

5) Timeliness of response and decision making was cited as a problem by many faculty and administrators. Greater decision-making autonomy, more staff, and an administrative emphasis upon timeliness in the Provost’s office should effectively address this concern.

6) Many of the problems expressed above are related to communication. To foster better communication we recommend that the Provost visit each college at least once a year, to see department activities, talk to DEOs and faculty, and possibly conduct forums similar to those given by the President. Also, the Provost’s office needs to explore better ways to communicate with the faculty, staff, and students of the university on a regular basis.
APPENDIX 1
March 12, 1999

Dear ISU Faculty Member:

The faculty committee charged with reviewing the functioning of the Provost’s Office seeks your help. The basic document of the ISU Faculty Senate calls for the review of central administrative offices on a five-year cycle; this is the year for a review of the Provost’s Office. Committee members are David Hopper, VDPAM; Dean Isaacson, Statistics; Nelle Hutter Kottman, Foreign Languages and Literatures; Ken Kruempel, Electrical and Computer Engineering; Barbara Licklider, Educational Leadership and Policy Studies; and Bonnie Glatz, Food Science and Human Nutrition and committee chair.

The enclosed questionnaire is one of three mechanisms we are using to solicit input from faculty members. The second is an open invitation for members of the university community to submit comments in writing directly to the committee through the Faculty Senate Office, or by email to me as chair of the committee. The third is through your department’s Faculty Senator, who has been encouraged to solicit your comments.

We invite you to complete the enclosed questionnaire and mail it back to the Faculty Senate Office in the enclosed envelope by March 31, 1999. No information on the questionnaire will be used to identify the respondents, and the comments will be treated confidentially. The results of this survey will be contained in our report which will be submitted to the President and to the Faculty Senate Executive Board and will also be made public.

We greatly appreciate your help in this important undertaking, which has as its ultimate goal the improvement of the environment for teaching and learning, research and scholarship, and outreach at Iowa State University.

Thank you.

Very truly yours,

Bonnie Glatz, Chair
Provost Office Review Committee
PROVOST OFFICE FACULTY SURVEY

This survey is being sent to all faculty to gather information regarding your interactions with and impressions of the Provost’s Office. The Provost is the chief academic officer of the university, and works closely with the president in providing overall leadership for the university. The college deans, the vice provosts for extension, undergraduate programs, and research and advanced studies, the dean of the library, the director of the Institute for Physical Research and Technology, and the Academic Information Technology Director report to the Provost. In answering the questions on this survey, please consider only the Provost’s Office in 107 Beardshear, and not the other units that report to the Provost. Some of the primary functions and oversight responsibilities of the Provost’s Office include the hiring of new faculty and P&S staff, promotion and tenure of faculty, administrative searches, faculty and P&S grievances, academic program reviews, and faculty professional development programs.

This survey is part of an evaluation of the functioning of the Provost’s Office. It is not an evaluation of the individuals who work in that office. The goal of this review is to provide an opportunity for the Provost’s Office to explain its functions to the university community, and for the university community to give feedback to the Provost’s Office.

Please use a number 2 pencil to fill in the appropriate circle to answer questions 1 through 6. Write your answers to questions 7 through 10 in the spaces provided, and fill in the “a” circle for each question for which you give a written answer.

1. What is your academic rank?
   a. Instructor
   b. Assistant Professor
   c. Associate Professor
   d. Professor

2. Are you tenured or on a tenure track appointment?
   a. yes
   b. no

3. In what college is your primary appointment?
   a. Agriculture
   b. Business
   c. Design
   d. Education
   e. Engineering
   f. Family and Consumer Sciences
   g. Liberal Arts and Sciences
   h. Library
   i. Veterinary Medicine

4. How long have you been on the faculty at Iowa State?
   a. less than 3 years
   b. 3 to 10 years
   c. 10 to 20 years
   d. more than 20 years

5. Are you ...
   a. male
   b. female

6. Since January 1, 1998, have you had personal contact with the Provost’s Office?
   a. yes
   b. no
7. If you have had personal contact with the Provost's Office, what program(s) or issue(s) did this contact concern? What was your overall level of satisfaction with the process (i.e. its fairness, promptness, effectiveness of communication, etc.)?

8. In your opinion, what does the Provost's Office do well?

9. In your opinion, what needs improvement?

10. Please add any additional comments.

Please mail your response in the enclosed envelope to the Faculty Senate Office, 103 Lab of Mechanics, before March 31, 1999. Thank you for your participation.
1. What is your administrative position?

    DEO
    Assistant/Associate Dean
    Dean
    Other

2. Since January 1, 1998, on how many different issues have you been in contact with the Provost’s Office? What have been the most common types of issues that you have discussed? (Examples of issues: hiring of new faculty or P&S staff; promotion and tenure; academic program review; administrative searches; faculty and P&S grievances; faculty retention; faculty professional development programs; financial support for new initiatives)

3. How well has the Provost’s Office worked with you? e.g. How accessible was the office to you? How prompt was the response? How complete and useful was any information that was provided? How fair did you consider the process to be? How flexible was the decision-making? Was there sufficient follow-through? Please comment on performance in relation to specific, identified issues if your experience has varied with different issues.

4. In the current administrative structure at Iowa State, the vice presidents for business and finance, external affairs, and student affairs, together with the Provost, report to the President. All academic units report to the Provost through the vice provosts and college deans. How well does this structure work? What changes would you suggest, if any?

5. What changes, if any, would you suggest to improve the functioning of the Provost’s Office? What problems would these changes address and what would be the impact of these changes?

6. Please note any additional comments here.
Biotechnology
Ctr. for Transp Research & Ed
Contracts and Grants
Geographical Info Systems Facility
Interdisciplinary Graduate Programs
Iowa Energy Center
ISU Research Foundation
ISU Research Park
Iowa State Water Resources Research Institute
Office of Intellectual Property & Technology Transfer
Statistical Laboratory
Agricultural Extension
Business & Industry Extension
Communities Extension
Families Extension
Iowa Manufacturing Tech Ctr
Youth & 4-H Extension
Extended and Continuing Education
Extension Communications
Extension Field Operations
Extension Finance
Extension Human Resources

Acad Experience of Undergrad Stud
Career Services
Center for Teaching Excellence
Honors Program
Instructional Technology Center
International Programs
Lectures Program
Student Grievances
Student Outcomes Assessment
Teaching Awards
University Bulletin
University Studies
Women in Science and Engineering
(Mary Ann Evans)

Vice Provost for Research
and Advanced Studies
Dean, Graduate College
Patricia Swan

Vice Provost for Extension
Stanley Johnson

Vice Provost for Undergraduate Programs
Howard Shapiro

Vice Provost for Research
and Advanced Studies
Dean, Graduate College
Patricia Swan

Assistant Provost for Budget/Facilities
Ellen Rasmussen

Administrative Searches
Administrative Systems Development
Budget Development and Management
Facilities and Capital Planning
Information Technology
Personnel for P&S
P&S Grievances
P&S Council
Space Planning and Allocations

Secretary III
Pam Minion

Budget Analyst
Frances Smith

Computer Support for Office

Administrative Specialist
Brenda Behling

Board of Regents Reports
Office Work Flow Coordination
Personnel Matters for Faculty and P&S

Assistant Provost (60%)
Faye Whitaker

Academic Program Review
Administrative Searches
Faculty Grievances
Faculty Handbook
Faculty Professional Development Programs
Faculty Senate Councils & Committees
Mentoring for New Faculty
Personnel for Faculty
University Committee on Women
Women's Faculty Network
Women's Center

Secretary IV
Julie Ham
(May 3, 1999 start)

Secretary III
Ruth Birch

Provost's work flow

Note: Jane Henning handles projects for the Office of the Provost and serves on the staff of the Center for Teaching Excellence. She is on temporary loan to the office to handle the Interim Provost's calendar and work flow.
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IOWA STATE UNIVERSITY

Where you can become your best.

Provost

Iowa State University invites nominations and applications for the position of provost. As chief academic officer of the university, the provost has key responsibilities for helping Iowa State achieve its strategic goal of becoming the best land-grant university in the nation. The provost reports to the president.

One of only 34 public AAU universities, Iowa State University is a comprehensive educational and research institution located in Ames, a community of 50,000 people recently recognized as the second most livable small city in the nation. Iowa State has 25,500 students, 1,800 faculty, 4,300 staff, and a budget in excess of $700 million. The university offers undergraduate, graduate, and professional degrees through its colleges of Agriculture, Business, Design, Education, Engineering, Family and Consumer Sciences, Liberal Arts and Sciences, Veterinary Medicine, and the Graduate College. Iowa State is a Carnegie Foundation Research I university, and operates numerous research centers. It also operates the Ames Laboratory under contract with the U.S. Department of Energy. The university has just completed its two most successful fundraising years and is in the midst of a $425 million capital campaign. Visit Iowa State's Web site at www.iastate.edu for more about the university, and www.iastate.edu/isuSearch/provost/ for more about this position.

The provost works closely with the president in providing overall leadership for the university. The provost oversees the university's academic programs in teaching, research, and extension and the University Library, the Computation Center, the Institute for Physical Research and Technology, the Ames Laboratory, and the Agriculture and Home Economics Experiment Station. Recruitment, hiring, and review of deans and directors are also among the provost's responsibilities.

The successful applicant must have a distinguished record of scholarly accomplishments commensurate with that of a tenured professor in one of the university's departments; must have an understanding of the broad spectrum of academic research; must have a strong commitment to high quality programs of teaching, research, and outreach; and must have a commitment to the land-grant philosophy and the principles of diversity. Administrative experience in a complex academic organization and experience in strategic planning, program development, and fundraising also are preferred.

To receive full consideration, nominations and applications should be received by January 20, 1999. Applications should include a letter addressing the applicant's interest, relevant experience, and qualifications; and a current curriculum vitae. Send nominations or applications to: Dr. George Kraus, Chair, Provost Search Committee, Office of the President, Iowa State University, 117 Beardshear Hall, Ames, LA 50011-2033.

Iowa State University is an equal opportunity/affirmative action employer and encourages the nomination and application of women and minority candidates.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date/Time</th>
<th>Interviewee</th>
<th>Where</th>
<th>Attendees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday, February 1,</td>
<td>James Dorsett</td>
<td>2350 Beardshear</td>
<td>Mike, Sidner, Suzanne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:45-1:15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CANCELLED</td>
<td>Lisa Nolan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday, February 1,</td>
<td>David Oliver</td>
<td>2350 Beardshear</td>
<td>Mike, Sidner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:30-2:00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday, February 1,</td>
<td>P&amp;S Council, David</td>
<td>2350 Beardshear</td>
<td>Mike, Sidner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:00-2:30</td>
<td>Orman and Dan Burden</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday, February 2,</td>
<td>Warren Madden</td>
<td>1350 Beardshear</td>
<td>Mike, Paul, Kristen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:00-11:30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday, February 2,</td>
<td>David Holger</td>
<td>1350 Beardshear</td>
<td>Mike, Paul, Kristen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:30-12:00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday, February 2,</td>
<td>OPEN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:00-1:00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday, February 2,</td>
<td>Tom Hill</td>
<td>2350 Beardshear</td>
<td>Mike, Paul, Kristen, Andrew</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:00-1:30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday, February 2,</td>
<td>Sharron Quisenberry</td>
<td>2350 Beardshear</td>
<td>Mike, Kristen, Andrew</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:30-2:00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday, February 2,</td>
<td>Paul Tanaka</td>
<td>2350 Beardshear</td>
<td>Mike, Sidner, Andrew</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:00-2:30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday, February 2,</td>
<td>Cathann Kress</td>
<td>2350 Beardshear</td>
<td>Mike, Sidner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:30-3:00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday, February 2,</td>
<td>OPEN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:00-3:30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday, February 2,</td>
<td>Luis Rico-Gutierrez</td>
<td>2350 Beardshear</td>
<td>Mike, Sidner, Suzanne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:30-4:00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday, February 2,</td>
<td>Pam White</td>
<td>2350 Beardshear</td>
<td>Mike, Suzanne, Sidner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:00-4:30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday, February 2,</td>
<td>Olivia Madison</td>
<td>2350 Beardshear</td>
<td>Mike, Suzanne, Sidner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:30-5:00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday, February 15,</td>
<td>Wendy Wintersteen</td>
<td>142 Curtiss</td>
<td>Mike, Kristen, Paul, Sidner, Andrew</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:00-8:30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday, February 15,</td>
<td>OPEN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:30-9:00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday, February 15,</td>
<td>Jonathan Wickert</td>
<td>104 Marsten</td>
<td>Mike, Kristen, Paul, Sidner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:00-9:30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday, February 15,</td>
<td>Labh Hira</td>
<td>2350 Beardshear</td>
<td>Mike, Sidner, Kristen, Andrew</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:00-1:30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday, February 15,</td>
<td>Lisa Nolan</td>
<td>2350 Beardshear</td>
<td>Mike, Sidner, Kristen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:30-2:00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 8
1) On what sorts of issues do you interact with the Provost’s office and how often? For your key issues, what has been your overall level of satisfaction with the resolution of your concern (i.e., timeliness, fairness, effectiveness of communication) and why?

2) What is the Office of the EVPP doing well and why?

3) What aspects of the Office of the EVPP need improvement and why?
Appendix 9
7. Thinking back over the interactions you have had with the Provost Office, what programs (s) or issues(s) did this contact occur? What was your overall level of satisfaction with the process (i.e. its fairness, promptness, effectiveness of communication, etc.)?

Lack of vision, ineffective effort.

Everyday university business. We often do not agree, but we agree to disagree.

Programs: faculty meetings, One health symposium, indirectly via departmental chair

Satisfaction: very satisfied. Information was disseminated clearly and in a friendly, congenial manner that promoted active involvement of the faculty.

Could have more faculty input (beyond faculty in administration) before options are presented for major initiatives and decisions

The Provost has overseen a dramatic downgrading of the humanities and non-grant funded social sciences, undoing all the work of the Parks' presidency WHEN IT WAS NOT NECESSARY. It was unfair and will ultimately backfire. It puts the institution at risk of no longer being a university, which implies broad support across all fields of study.

Only interaction has been as passive listener at presentations (i.e., orientations). My overall level of satisfaction with those interactions is neutral.

visits to the college yearly

tenure workshops

tenure receptions

I have had very little direct contact with the Provost's office personnel.

hiring, support for grants, -- all were positive experiences

I had contact with the office as a member of the faculty senate during the development of the new budget model.

Promotion and Tenure, curriculum, and students.

clear communications, fair and prompt.

very fair, prompt, and effective in all interactions
member of faculty senate councils. I have been satisfied with her attempts to distribute funding fairly, her communication with others, and her efforts with shared governance under very difficult budget conditions.

The only significant interaction I have had with the Provost Office resulted in swift and decisive action related to a complaint that I submitted. The Provost's Office handled the situation extremely well, but at the time, the College of Engineering had a Dean that was incapable of handling problems. Had it not been for the way in which the Provost handled the situation, I would have sought legal counsel.

Observations of general management

Process appears fair, promptness could be improved somewhat but given all that goes on I understand that delays may occur.

I have not directly, personally interacted with the Provost Office.

Mixed

Grad student issues, diversity issues and Women's Center-related issues, and communication was good with all of them.

Through Faculty Senate -- Provost is very responsive, supportive, informative. I have enjoyed my contact with her and value her interaction.

Upon accepting a position at ISU, I was reassured that the Provost office would work with me in terms of securing a position for my spouse. I contacted the Provost's office 4 times, sent in my spouse's CV and did not receive ANY assistance or response from the Provost's Office. This dramatically impacted the financial mobility for my family and ultimately meant that my decision to relocate my family to Iowa and work at ISU was a downgrade from my previous job. I recognize that this is not the fault of the Provost, but the office in general. Very disappointing.

In some areas of advancement for women in STEM fields, I felt the provost office did not provide effective implementation of objectives.

Betsy has been very supportive of the ADVANCE program and efforts to increase transparency in policies and procedures and consistency in hiring practices. She has led the efforts to improve department chair training and new faculty orientation. The university faculty and administrators are better informed about policies, procedures, etc. than ever before.

I have not had any interactions with the Provost Office.

Tenure. Satisfied

Faculty governance, budget and planning, academic issues
Very satisfied

The Provost has not provided effective leadership on many issues and has unilaterally made decisions without valuable input from faculty. It seems, despite budget issues, the university is at a stand-still and has been so for at least 5 years. With regards to International Engagement, since I have been at this university no high-level administrator has advocated for international programs abroad, hence the numbers of our students studying abroad has not increased over the past 8+ years. Regarding Teaching, little has been said about quality undergraduate teaching. We all know that it is not rewarded. As for research, this area is where most attention has been paid, but scholarship at ISU is only valued if it can earn the university something in dollars or bragging rights. In other words, scholarly output must have material implications.

Faculty and staff recognition - awards

High level of satisfaction

my contacts have mainly been regarding clarifications of policy for action reviews/advancements of faculty. Our questions have been answered promptly and clearly

no comments.

I do not understand your first sentence.

The processes are way too slow. It takes forever to get faculty positions approved. This creates real problems for departments to effectively function in a timely manner. I feel that some of the routine functions of the office relative to hiring faculty could be delegated to the colleges since that is where the fiscal responsibility lies.

As a new faculty member I have been amazed by the levels of confidence and support that have been extended to see that I succeed. I feel like the people in this office know me personally, and that is very meaningful to me.

Program review procedures: well satisfied

unfair. she talks but actions don't support talk.

Provost office too often is the barrier to making effective and efficient decisions. It seems that the Office prides itself on being the watchdog rather than facilitating change. Many college and departmental decisions are double checked, rejected or ignored, as a result people try to figure out how to not engage the provost office

cannot describe without losing confidentiality of survey
satisfaction level: not acceptable

Very poor feedback and support of faculty with regards to promotion issues.

My observation is that very little gets done at ISU in a truly timely matter. The Provost's office must take some responsibility for this debilitating tendency. Mediocrity is allowed to flourish to a degree that is surprising.

The effectiveness of the Provost office depends in part on the effectiveness of offices of the VPR-ED and others that report to it. The VPR-ED office has been dysfunctional for several years. The new budget model has been a disaster in that it has encouraged departments to poach each others' students, offer courses that their faculty are not qualified to teach simply to corner the tuition revenue that would have gone to another department (which is qualified to offer the courses in question). Rewards to faculty are not based on their performance; there appear to be no university-wide standards for distinguished or chaired professorships; or for matching resources with university priorities and faculty performance. There is no leadership or vision that is informed by the societal needs and global trends in science and technology.

It was reasonably fair and effective.

I had hoped the Provost Office would work more to help LAS leadership work through this budget crisis.

Several confidential matters that were handled very well.

grant proposal, very satisfied

hiring, personnel issues - very supportive and responsive

Met the Provost once a year while she had her annual college visit with the President.

Mostly on centrally managed proposal call; not managed fairly, too much time consumed by administration, seems to have proposal selections prewired in advance.

I was particularly impressed how knowledgeable the Provost became on the heels of the "swine flu" H1N1 health crisis. She was sufficiently commanding (in a good way) that she corrected an errant faculty member during a Faculty Senate meeting when that faculty meeting made a crude comment about "not kissing pigs." She was polite but powerful in standing up for an evidence-based understanding of our situation. This is just one example of the clarity of authority that she can show; but not to my knowledge at the expense of the rights or dignity of the faculty.

I have had none. I'm not really sure what they do.

member of committee/council that would meet

felt communication was open; fair
delays in getting things approved in the hiring process; frequent changes in policies without time to react; roadblocks to get things done (seems to be one person who can do what you need done and that person is out or busy)

Well organized, informed, and professional.

During an outside evaluation of our department, the provost communicated to the evaluation team that she was very dissatisfied with our department, but could produce no actual reason to base this opinion on.

No contact to this point.

applications for grants as principal investigator, non PhD, I am a clinician, this was supported for teaching effectiveness.

I attended events organized by the Provost when she would meet with department chairs and speak on specific issues regarding University policy. I found these meetings informative and useful.

I deal with the library leadership extensively. I deal with the Graduate College much less often. I have had no problems with either.

Interactions with VPRED have on the whole made research projects worse. Communication is frequently ineffective, advice sometimes faulty, and in general the office represents a hurdle to go through that takes time and energy away from e.g. putting together a major grant application.

Fairly low.

Provost Office eliminated CEAH programming.

No appearances at the ACD Diversity Committee meetings.

No visible support for the Humanities or Social Sciences.

I am very impressed by our Provost and her office. I am highly satisfied.

I have worked with the curriculum committees at the department, college, and university level. It appears that sometimes paperwork gets stuck in the Provost’s office and doesn't go through channels in a timely manner.

College of LAS Dean and admin. (past 5 years) have been fair, prompt and helpful.

interview for job - fair, effective

faculty performance policies; a new post-tenure review policy was implemented rapidly; communication about standards remains ongoing and unresolved; question if having a small fraction of "superior" faculty will be fair to the rest who are working hard and performing well
primary issue was over subject matter appropriate in course. I do not believe the office was particularly fair, although primary individual involved did a good job in listening. In summary, I guess I'd say I was slightly dissatisfied.

satisfied - assistance with tenure materials. Very prompt and supportive!

Participation in leadership academy. I was very satisfied with this new program, and the contributions of the provost office.

I do not have enough contact to make a rating.

I am not sure what are the accomplishments she has at the ISU. I once sent request to her office asking for possible spousal accommodation, and there was not even acknowledgment for several requests. It is like she is high up, and just does not care.

I think she has been fare, cares about the employess and students.

I am afraid I have not had enough direct interaction to respond to this question.

Most of my interactions with the Provost Office were with Susan Carlson or Dawn Bratsch-Prince, as well as the office staff. That’s all been fine. To talk to the Provost in person was more rare, and I did not always get the support I had hoped for.

She has been outstanding provost.

I've had no contact.

Consulted with associate provost about rules governing my contract and work agreement

Not too satisfied with the communication. Wasn't open to new ideas.

Her interaction with the faculty senate. I think it was always pretty good.

Have always enjoyed hearing what Provost Hoffman has to say, no matter the setting (new faculty orientation, T&P processes, etc.)

My interactions have been limited. I've always had positive interactions with the Provost office but most information I receive is filtered though the Dept. Chair and Dean's office.

1. Chairing a University Committee: excellent staff support; decision-making by the Provost seemed untimely.

2. Chairing a University-initiated conference: excellent support; Provost participated in only 1 portion of conference in person.

My interactions with the office of the Provost has been minimal but what I have had has been favorable.

fair and effective
always prompt

My most direct interaction with the Provost Office concerned questions I had about resources available on campus. I received prompt, helpful, friendly service. I have appreciated the mission of the ADVANCE program and admired its work. In general, I have been impressed with the leadership of the Provost Office. An important exception came through indirect contact. I heard through the grapevine that the center for intercultural studies was under threat. I am not connected to the center in any way, but found the rumor to be disturbing. If true, it would be in my view be a short sighted and potentially socially and academically harmful means of trimming the budget. Would women's studies (with which I'm also not affiliated) be next?

not sure

Overall level of satisfaction was good.

Issues of funding

very satisfied with the process

Absolutely fair

Prompt and effective

I believe the Provost made some really bad decisions regarding the Sociology department. She ignored data in order to promote an unproductive, destructive faculty member. When faculty members give a majority negative vote on tenure, the Provost should respect that, rather than seeking to reduce the department's resources.

I also question the use of the RMM, which has never been tested against clear criteria. How has it improved life at ISU?

I have been a mentor for 2 assistant professors. Provost Hoffman has been at several events. She always conveys such a great attitude and interest in the junior faculty. Additionally she has talked several times about the importance of balancing career and family. As a female professor with students this is really nice to finally hear from the top levels of the university.

I also work through a research center under Sharon Quisenberry.

There is a disconnect between this office and faculty. There is lack of engagement. It has to be some effort or activities to involve faculty to give a good evaluation.

I haven't been here long enough to adequately answer this question.
I've had no interactions with the Provost Office personally.

Not very satisfied. Arbitrary seeming decisions.

Arranging interviews with potential candidates for an endowed chair position

OK

prompt, responsive,

no interaction

Research & teaching excellence for women in the sciences & humanities. Programs promoting diversity within the university.

I was quite favorably impressed with the way Betsy and her staff conduct business in the Provost's Office.

The Provost Office has been very receptive and supportive of shared governance at all levels. I have been very satisfied with the results of these interactions.

Annual visits to our college. Limited contact on specific issues. My general impression is that the Provost's Office is providing strong leadership within the University. I have been satisfied with my limited interactions.

Some things were addressed in a timely manner, other things took extended amounts of time to reach a conclusion.

Salary reversions and program cuts. Totally ridiculous.

found the interactions to be prompt, fair and relatively informative

Issues regarding personnel policy, budget issues and SCH inquiries, graduate and undergraduate education issues. Overall, my interaction was very positive, I was always directed to the right people that spent time with me to provide me the resources and explanation/discussion I needed. Often, the provost is proactive in training and providing information for the faculty/personnel that need it.

none

Lots of administrative contact over meetings, policies, procedures, etc. Satisfied.

Promotion. Her interactions were fair, prompt and communications were clear and appropriate.
Most interactions are in meetings and forums so not much truly direct interaction. However, I feel this office and current person have no appreciation for extension as the 3rd leg of a land grant system and thus minimal or no support.

It was regarding AGEP and interdepartmental graduate programs. She was extremely supportive of these efforts.

moderate satisfaction

I’m new to ISU and have been here less than 1 month. As such, I have not had any interaction.

New faculty events have been primary, followed by discussions re. risk management for international programs and strategic initiatives. Generally I am satisfied although I with there was more discussion with new faculty about a broader range of scholarship for tenure. While the university's policy is relatively broad, in meetings and discussions traditional venues were still heavily emphasized. Better understanding and communication about public scholarship, for example, are important particularly with respect to the land-grant mission. Working with faculty with split appointments (extension/department, for example) would also be very helpful.

I have interacted frequently with the Provost Office personnel. In all areas, the office is fair, prompt, considerate and very effective.

Totally unsatisfied. Provost is very biased in protecting the univ. administration, such as Dean, politically powerful persons, etc. instead of fairness on issues.

Faculty senate. There was always a sense of openness.

The period I was department chair, 2001 - 2008, overlapped with Betsy's tenure as Provost. There were a number of issues that involved the Provost.

Good--although sometimes hard to find the right person in the office.

I have had no interactions with the provost office

My involvement with the provosts office was indirect; had to do with tenure. That was a fair process. When I think about the provosts office, I really don't know what the provost is supposed to do. Upon reflecting about this, I don't know if it is good or bad if I don't have an answer for this. I

Highest satifaction - the organization is both competent and profesional.

I proposed a curriculum project that was initially rejected because the Provost Office misunderstood some of its components. Eventually it was funded but initial communication could have been better.

General information - effective

I also serve as a Department Chair and thus have frequent questions for Provost Office. I have been quite satisfied with the work done.
In serving on provostial task forces, I have been impressed by the effectiveness of the Office of the Provost in bringing together a diverse group of faculty and staff to tackle complicated issues.

Provost Hoffman has always been an advocate of the scholarship of teaching and learning. He appreciates the efforts of faculty who devote a good portion of their time to teaching and learning.

Undergraduate and graduate education

No contact with the Provost Office.

Process is always fair, prompt, and direct. With regard to communication: it would be good to allow for more in-depth problem-solving and discussion, and to encourage more input from all involved persons during meetings rather than letting meetings become Q & A sessions.

1) New faculty orientation and 2) Mentor meeting. I was satisfied with the process for both meetings.

Consultations on hiring policies, personnel issues, departmental issues have all yielded sensible and prompt feedback. Very effective communication.

Honestly, I can't remember any direct interaction with the office.

Advising items and the process seemed fair, prompt and was well communicated. CELT is great, but my interactions have been lower than the provosts level.

relatively satisfied

The provost effective in communications and she will argue all the faculty to apply for grants (research and improve teaching) and will help ISU.

I serve on the Faculty Senate and have an active role in it. The Office of the Provost in general engages constructively with the Faculty Senate, but occasionally appears to demonstrate a kind of administrative prerogative in areas where administrative action has primacy over faculty governance (particularly budget and departmental and college organization) that seems to test whether the faculty take their governance role seriously. I have generally been satisfied with the outcome of discussions coming out of such discussions, but nonetheless have the impression that the Office of the Provost is not proactive or even especially forthcoming with information, plans, or goals that it is not required to share with the faculty. The process by which new Faculty Handbook language was developed about program elimination is a case in point.

Primarily related to research. Very satisfied with the process - I found the Provost Office very responsive.

No contact

Most of my contact was in my first 2 years of being at ISU--Contact related to new faculty. All of that contact was handled really well.
General support for departmental requests, interest in department's research facilities, funding for special new classrooms. Excellent on all counts.

I have been mostly unsatisfied. I repeatedly got the impression the office was not particularly open and that it lacked fairness on a number of issues. The way the office has handled budgets and budget cuts has been ludicrous. One can easily find multiple examples of mismanagement.

Satisfied

ok

Mostly regarding hiring and my P&T case. Overall everything went fine. I don't have sufficient experience to have opinions about many of these questions...

Communications were prompt and helpful.

Communication with the office has been very poor. Little transparency or consideration for faculty needs.

My interactions with the Provost primarily occurred during meetings of the Directors of Graduate Education. I was satisfied with the Provost's level of involvement and the ideas she generated in response to some of the issues at the time.

ADVANCE program, STEM teaching and research, Honors program, faculty governance

My most common interactions with the Provost Office relate to personnel matters. In that regard personnel in the office have been accessible, responsive, and helpful.

Contacts have been only at department events or discussions. The Provost is a good communicator and appears to hold a deep interest in the welfare of the university.

I served on the University Committee on Women for six years, four of those overlapping her tenure. Provost Hoffmann was always willing to meet with us, share opinions and support our efforts.

Positive

She listens and she responds rapidly. One can count on her to respond to any mail and issue sent to her way.

I have worked through many issues with Betsy. She is always available when there is a need, and provides appropriate and useful input on every occasion.

On all accounts, my interactions with the Provost and her office have been professional and effective.

....... 

I do not believe that the Provost has provided adequate visibility, autonomy, and financial support for the humanities within the institution. Huge levels of resources have been drained from the humanities,
and the Provost should have prevented that from occurring as well as provided avenues for the humanities to have a more prominent role within the organizational structure of the University, perhaps by allying the humanities with cognate fields in the College of Design (the CEAH does not provide this kind of structural alliance).

I was very satisfied with the service.

Very satisfied in all respects.

no contact

not sure

CVM activities

fair, prompt, and effective

No interactions

My contact was mainly during my promotion and tenure evaluation. She treated me with fairness and respect, was responsive and quick to answer questions and meet with me, followed on her word, and was very pleasant to work with.

I have mainly contacted the office as needed for basic information. Information was shared promptly.

I've "interacted" with the Provost's Office only insofar as I've been affected by cuts imposed and resources diverted away from LAS. The neglect of the humanities under Provost Hoffman has been disheartening.

In terms of positive leadership, the Provost's Office might as well be on the moon.

I have found the provost and her office to be wise and decisive in handling difficult personnel issues. We are lucky to have such a great team.

NA

Overall Good

I have had no interaction with the Provost Office.

I have not had any interaction directly with the Provost Office

I do not have much interactions with the office at present, I can not put my comments on this question.

My only real interactions were during Convocation type events.

Excellent.
Orientation, P&T

fair and reasonably responsive

Very involved with the office related to the ADVANCE program. There has been good support, overall, but D.B.-P. is terribly over committed and it is being asked to do more than any one person should.

No concerns

My only interaction was for the tenure process which seemed fair and thorough.

Mostly personnel issues. They have been dealt fairly and promptly.

Not applicable (I have not had any direct interactions with the Provost's Office).

I may have interacted one or two times. Found her very proactive.

I am not in a position that has a lot of contact with the Provost's Office, but I did hear Provost Hoffman speak at new faculty orientation. I feel that I could contact her office for help if I needed it.

I worked with the provost personally on many issues and find her to be fair, prompt, and effective -- a good listener in tough climate - believes in the best for ISU for faculty, students.

My interactions have been few and related to research collaborations. These have been supportive without being overly intrusive.

I had very limited interactions so far, and can not evaluate it. However, from the few interactions I had, I view the Provost Office as a very engaged entity on many different levels.

The main issues were related to Faculty Governance, in which Provost Hoffman excels

none

She does not know how to communicate with people. She has poor communication skills.

I've had no interactions of substance with the Provost, and no real opportunity to assess the quality of her work.

I don't have any interaction, thus I cannot comment on this

I have just started at ISU (3 weeks ago) and hence have had no interactions yet with the Provost office - hopefully the next time around of this survey I will have useful feedback to provide

The Office is not sufficiently responsive on hiring efforts by Departments. On personnel matters, it certainly tries to be fair, but it is also quite slow in completing matters.

I was a member of a faculty review board. I thought the process went very well.
Faculty diversity, grad education, faculty conduct, Honors programs, faculty hiring

Committee activities for selection of University Professors, interactive lunches with President Geoffroy and Provost Hoffman

Communications, coordination, etc. have been very good

I haven’t had enough contact to give an impression

I liked the way the P & T documents were made available for new faculty to look at and staff assistance in the office.

I have sensed that the provost's office has been supportive of new faculty for example through CELT programs such as Teaching partners, Wakonse, etc.

Although I have a limited exposure or contact with the provost's office, I feel that this office has been fair and supportive of me and my efforts.

prompt, fair, effective, pleasure to deal with

Very positive experience

I met at least twice with Susan Carlson to discuss continued creation of a hostile work environment and ongoing harassment/retaliation by a VCS faculty member. I was seeking guidance in regards to valid options that would prevent further harassment without worsening the already existing acts of retaliation.

I appreciated the time and open discussion with Dr. Carlson, although it did not result in resolution of the problem. During a recent investigation into this faculty member's harassing behavior towards many individuals I was appalled to learn that there was no record of my prior interactions with Susan Carlson. I was told that since Susan Carlson had left ISU, the files were no longer available.

Through the Plant Sciences Institute, office of the VPRED. Very effective.

Matters of the college. Yes, fair, prompt and effective communication.

high satisfaction

I am new this year and I have not had any reason to contact the provost.
I once visited the Provost's Office to review sample tenure portfolios. On another occasion, I gave a short presentation about my research to the Provost during her visit the college. In both instances, the Provost was quite gracious.

The new budget model is problematic. It motivates departments to offer courses that they do not have expertise to teach.

Most of my contact was indirect.

Research activities. Satisfaction was high.

One-on-one meetings about grant proposals and grant-funded research, group meetings about grant proposals and grant-funded research, department chair luncheons and workshops, public forums, meetings with advisory boards, celebration dinners, department meeting. My satisfaction with the provost's efforts and practices (or "process") was very high.

I have had no contact with the Provost's Office. The Provost did attend one departmental meeting and left most feeling quite unhappy.

As Faculty Senate President in 2008-9, I had extensive interactions with Provost Hoffman at Faculty Senate Executive Board meetings and other Faculty Senate committees; at University Budget Advisory Committee meetings and other administrative committee meetings; and in monthly meetings in person, and with President Geoffroy. Discussions covered the full range of ISU academic issues. I was very impressed with the dedication, integrity, and enthusiasm Provost Hoffman showed. She was responsive, interested, communicative, and always willing to work hard to find creative solutions to difficult problems.

Poor. Doesn't follow published rules and guidelines set forth by university. Arbitrary. Known around campus as a "black hole"....issues go in and nothing gets done.

no interactions

Mentoring -- I am fairly satisfied with the program

Fairness

N/A

I have yet to have a single interaction with the Provost at ISU

1. the P&T process

2. faculty retention.

Overall satisfaction - good,
Hiring at the senior level - they seem pretty good here.

International program - again they seem pretty supportive here.

Limited contact ... mainly her hosting a University lecture I was presenting at.

As part of my service to faculty senate, I interacted with various individuals from the Provost Office on a regular basis. My concern would be that not everyone in the Provost Office has the same views of shared governance as the Provost or Assoc Provosts yet these other individuals are often those that senate committees work with.

This provost has low regard for research (probably because she never did much of it) and seems only interested in teaching performance. Bad for ISU!

Satisfied

no interactions

Served on a committe that reports to the Provost. Intereacted with the Provost at various functions. Very fair, effective, receptive.

The Provost seems thoughtful and fair.

diversity and promotion/tenure.

Information was delivered through effective and thoughtful communication, in a timely manner, also fair and inclusive.

I have been very impressed with the Provost's willingness to interact with faculty at ALL opportunities. She remembers names and what individuals are working on for research.

I have no grounds upon which to base an answer for this question. I have had no interactions with the office.

subission of diversity grants; information and communication were excellent

Very prompt and professional

very good.

African and African American Studies. I was very satisfied.

The interactions were at various scheduled events open to multiple faculty or groups. My impression has been that the Provost Office has worked effectively and diligently to increase transparency and to advance diversity.
N/A

Extremely satisfied

unsure

1) NSF MRI pre-proposal and 2) strategic research initiative proposal

I with dissatisfied with the transparency of the MRI pre-proposal process. Do faculty get to see what was allowed to move forward to NSF? The level of feedback from the Provost office, especially to new faculty is very limited (i.e., little guidance is provided). Who makes these decisions? Who is on this panel?

The strategic research funding initiative seemed like a hoax to me. Was any science actually funded? It appears that most of the money was just used to upgrade facilities. If that was the intent of the call-then just be honest with us.

Dr. Hoffman explained the new way that monies would be allocated to departments under the new budget model several years ago.

interactions with the Provost involved two 10 minute summaries of research.

No interactions

NA

Good interactions, no complaints

The only interaction I can remember is an invitation to a new staff reception.. after I had been here 3 years... I went and heard speakers and interacted some.

sefgh

na

Questions regarding advancement. The response was helpful and prompt.

distance education, assessment, new program development. Generally satisfied.

university budgetary advisory committee, lectures, departmental business. quite satisfied overall

I've had limited contact with the Provost's office, primarily related to tenuring. Any questions or requests to the office (for instance, to see samples of tenure portfolio) received a quick, positive, and polite reply.
Fairness and promptness

Prompt communication

Her leadership in matters of university budgeting has been fair, inclusive, timely, and ethical.

My interaction with the Provost was excellent. She was always responsive and supportive of me and my research. She is an excellent listener and was effective in making recommendations of how to connect with other key faculty on the ISU campus to foster collaboration.

I have had no direct contact with the Provost's Office.

Excellent.

Promotion & tenure. Very satisfied, prompt, effective communication.

Occurred as part of department reviews, workshops, and committee assignments. Very satisfied: considerations were fair and decision-making was done with the support of data and evidence. Communicated information and made decisions in a time of severe budget cuts.

Dr. Hoffman was very helpful in establishing a strong research program in our college. She understands the important to being a ISU as a research intense university

The Provost is typically clear in her comments and intentions. She is highly supportive of quality scholarship. Communications with the Provost's office have almost always been responsive and effective.

I have not had any interactions with the provost's office wherein that was the first office contacted. The office was generally part of the chain of responses needed for action.

I have had little to no interaction with the provost office; my interaction has been limited to second-hand relay of information.

The response was prompt but there is confusion in communicating when the university policy and common practice differ significantly

Mostly policy development and faculty conduct issues. Satisfied overall.

I have only had 1 interaction with Dr. Hoffman in the several months I've worked at ISU. We engaged in a tremendous discussion about learning and outreach at ISU. This discussion included another faculty member and several students (graduate and undergraduate). I was impressed with the breadth of her knowledge and her passion for teaching/learning/research.

No interactions have occurred.

grant writing workshop

reviewing P and T documents
e-mails about research opportunities

I have not directly contacted the Provost Office.

General visit to college, perhaps not the best forum for discussion of all issues/concerns

I was on the LAS Dean's Search Committee, 2011-2012, and she organized the Committee and Provost's Office interaction in a very professional and collegial manner, listening very effectively to the committee's opinions after interviews.

My interactions are limited to presentations made by her. The impression I got was that she is an effective communicator.

NA

Provost Hoffman is exceptionally proactive about making sure the University is serving not only the students, but also the faculty, the State, and the world at large. She is always available, shows great interest in our Department (Interior Design) and has shown amazing leadership at every level.

N/A

As a faculty member on a promotion and tenure committee hearing the Provost discuss her expectations; satisfied with process

promotion and tenure

did not get any response from Brenda Behling - needed to get my dept. chair to ask for a response - delayed about a week.

Accreditation: Fair, prompt, and effective

External Review: Lack of proper communication; many faculty members were not even consulted about problems

Interactions were primarily during the annual visit to our college. Current university initiatives and encouragement for scholarship and research were usually presented. Our dean updates faculty on his interactions with the Provost. We had support for new college programs recently.

Faculty searches. She was fast and fair

About the only time I see the Provost is in the annual visit to the Library

I have had extensive contact with this Provost and several previous Provosts and Presidents. I have been generally satisfied with the current Provost personally. She is an intelligent, highly experienced
university administrator. When dealing with her on a personal level she is prompt and effective and is willing to be open about her decisions. Personally she is an effective communicator. However, the Provost has a very difficult job in that it combines classic Provost duties (academic leadership) with many duties that previously were done by the President (budget planning, overseeing Business and Finance, etc.). As a result the provost has much less time and energy for the academic side of the university mission, and has not provided effective leadership / oversight in many cases. The new budget model in particular has been complex and very time consuming. As a result the Provost has spent far too much time dealing with details and implementation and less on strategic planning (outside of budget) and a

Generally, effective, but occasionally the provost seemed rather frazzled.

The Provost's office exists outside of normal university/department life. Whenever the Provost's office is in contact, it seems, it is to tell us what is happening, not to seek input.

P&T decision process and problem resolution: High level of satisfaction

International undergraduate academic issues and problems: Moderate level of satisfaction

International graduate academic issues and problems: Moderate to low level of satisfaction (but, truthfully, this was not the Provost's fault)

Student life issues (RE: student death and resultant actions): Outstanding level of satisfaction

Fiscal management: High level of satisfaction

Diversity advancement: Outstanding level of satisfaction

Faculty recruiting issues: Outstanding level of satisfaction

Not pleased. Two examples: The Provost was heavy-handed in the debate concerning termination of faculty in exigent circumstances. The Provost provides lip service to concerns facing women and faculty of color (for example, problems meeting the requirements for tenure within the timetable, modified duties, etc.) and yet her policies do not align with her rhetoric.
Provost Hoffman has done an outstanding job in dealing with promotion and tenure cases. Provost Hoffman has also been effective in mentoring the Dean of my colleague on issues of shared governance.

Satisfactory

Most of my interactions have been with the ADVANCE program. All were positive interactions.

8. In your opinion, what does the Provost’s Office do well?

self-promotion

Promotion and Tenure.

Provides excellent explanation and execution of the tenure process; advocates for the university (students, faculty, staff); provides excellent services to the students.

Yes.

supports diversity

Nothing as significant as what it does not well.

Provost Hoffman did an excellent job of welcoming new faculty at orientation.

support those with grant money and certain colleges

balance teaching, research and service in the P&T process

Faculty improvement

Not sure what they do.

They do an excellent job of working with the faculty senate.

creating an environment that colleges and departments can be successful

see ratings

manages budget according to the RMM. Establishes policies for faculty and staff. Responds to the public and the faculty/staff on important issues. Participates in shared governance.

The Provost’s Office is a strong advocate for fairness and it holds administrators in its chain of command responsible. The appointment of Jon Wickert as Dean of Engineering demonstrates the Provost’s commitment to hiring strong and competent leaders.
manage for control

encourage diversity; communicate budget issues

Not very much

The Provost's Office appears to be a good advocate for forwarding its vision of the university's mission.

Supports diversity

Promote scholarship in research, recruit and support excellent students

Good support for questions/issues; strong interface with faculty governance and strong support for faculty governance.

I have had limited interaction with the office, and am not quite sure.

Cooperates well with the President

support the president's office

Respond to issues with fairness. Provide a resource for information on policies and procedures. Provide incentives for large research efforts that align with the strategic plan. Support efforts to change the culture to one of consistency and fairness regardless of gender. Works well with the president.

Communicates with the faculty via senate meetings the primary decisions and budget issues currently facing the university.

not sure

Promoting of a diverse faculty, especially female faculty. Also evaluation and acceptance of early tenure cases.

Communicate

Support faculty

Allocate resources

I really don't know. There is so little that is shared with faculty I cannot say. I suspect they could do better with public relations.

Issues of gender and ethnic diversity

answer questions regarding policies for advancement, promotion, tenure, etc.

Very professional, communication with faculty, sense of confidence in decisions; opposite end of the spectrum from the fascist mode of operation of some upper administrators at other institutions
Excellent people skills in terms of those visiting the office. The individuals who greet you are prompt, very courteous and show sincere interest in who you are when they engage with you. As for the Provost, she is an extremely good listener, very approachable is very good at getting back to you if that is what is required after a conversation and is fair.

Placing a high value on student success

P&T

Diversity

Not sure really. All I know is indirectly through the dep chair. Little or no contact with Faculty (not suer about faculty senate)

Has raised the profile and importance of teaching as a primary mission of the university

They are inspirational, and they provide guidance—it is more than a pep talk, they show that they are invested in my success as an individual and not just the overall success of the university. It is nice to be at a university where noone seems to be viewed as expendable.

Sharing information

they are polite to talk to

They are very effective at blocking progessive change. Good ideas languish and there is not a committment to getting things done efficiently. Too many staff are concerned about doing things right rather than doing the right things.

The university has weathered challenges reasonably well under the present Provost (and former President).

There is a lot that the provost's office could do well. At present, I am not sure if it does anything well.

Promotes family friendly policies.

Considers faculty opinion and solicits input.

Provides excellent support for legal and difficult confrontational issues between faculty or faculty / administration.

RATIONALIZE what it means to be different on many level

dealing with personnel issues, assist in hiring, work- life balance issues, support scholarly advancement, support collegiality

No idea...

Support for research.
This will seem strange but OSPA - so much improvement in the past three years, now ISURF as well.

I have been a member of several short-term task forces for sticky issues, or for revision and/or implementation of new policies. Also, the current Provost pioneered at ISU a check on third year tenure-eligible reviews, such that the faculty member, if weak in particular areas, would be sufficiently informed such that she or he could remedy the situation. Or, if improvements were not made, the 3rd year review would inform the negative results of a promotion endeavor.

I don't really know anything about this office.

communication

generating reports and giving presentations about policies

Brings unity to the university.

Come up with more and more rules, and more and more forms to fill out, every year, to add to the paperwork burden of faculty and staff

support of faculty and teaching., responsive to requests for more information or clarification.

I have seen tremendous improvements in policies helping parents balance their work and domestic responsibilities in the last decade or so. My understanding is that leadership here came from the Provost’s Office.

Most everything, as indicated by my answers to the individual questions.

The budget cuts over the last few years have been done as rationally, fairly and transparently as I think was reasonably possible.

Advertise themselves, without real substance.

Not sure. Keeps us out of major disasters.

The Provost's Office balances the needs of today and our programs of today with the need to evolve programs in order to insure they are positioned for success tomorrow.

Pretty well overall.

College of LAS Dean and admin. (past 5 years) have been fair, prompt and helpful

listens to faculty input; shares governance

The Provost's is a steady pair of hands.

on rare occasions when extra funding has been available, they seem to do a good job in selecting the most worthy areas for funding -- on those occasions when proposals were solicited
support faculty - especially new faculty - but that is my experience so far here at ISU.

yes

Strategic planning, striving for excellence and appropriate long-term visions

Budget management

Represents ISU Academics and processes personnel decisions.

Everything. One example of important initiatives is her development of a real spousal accommodation policy.

No opinion.

I have very limited contact with them. The associate provost was helpful and fair when I contacted her.

I think it is very fair with P&T; shared governance.

Clear and open lines of communication.

The Provost's office is genuinely concerned with the affairs of each college and attempts to support units as much as possible during difficult economic times.

Staff generally works well and promptly. There is good support for research.

I do not have enough interaction with the Provost's Office to say one way or the other.

has a good view of the university as a whole

Promote scholarship

Provide knowledgeable staff, guidance in response to questions

Not sure

Responds to personnel issues.

Care for the academic environment with the resources we have

Public relations is good. Reaching out to new faculty and making them feel welcome is well done.

I fear that more experienced faculty are not happy with some of the reorganization and how that process is carried out.

advocate diversity, advocate for research, provides a professional face for the university

I do not know

I haven't been here long enough to adequately answer this question.
Supports research

I’m not very familiar with what they do.

There has been improvement in the evaluation of faculty for promotion and tenure compared with the previous two Provost Offices

Yes --- with a very small staff.

I don't know; in fifteen years at the university, the provost's activities have been relatively unknown to me, unless the activities have had an adverse impact on my department.

Public relations, achieves great visibility for Iowa State, promotes research efforts within the institution.

Supporting shared governance. Providing leadership and coordination of academic programs.

Not enough contact to offer comments.

Updates information to website. Makes Provost Hoffman aware of activities going on around campus. Open to needs of faculty

Oversee the daily operations of the University

Maintains the status quo

promotion of diversity and programs meant to personnel at the institute on a personal level

Understands the diversity of the programs and colleges across campus. Has a strong voice without alienating other voices in her office and across the university.

Provides some means for me to succeed and does not impede my work...?

Diversity support, create and follow policies and procedures

Advocates for equality and deals with the state leaders and regents

Don't have enough interaction to know

diversity

n/a

Providing funding for new initiatives - the recent strategic initiative program is excellent in promoting, making possible new types of work in research, outreach, and teaching.

1. Work with faculty (faculty senate) to make joint governance work. 2. Responsive on personnel questions. 3. Strong research, teaching & external funding supporters.
I do not have enough information about the provost's activities in other universities for comparison to answer this issue. I guess, she can talk well, but without much resulting action.

Mentoring program for junior faculty, occasional programs for associate professors. Fair, flexible policy on tenure clock extensions.

Help all units move toward achieving their academic goals.

My impression is that the office is well administered, and most of the responsibilities are carried out well.

Agreements with other universities abroad.

In my view, the Provost's office really is in charge of the day-to-day running of the University. Given recent year's budgetary constraints, this office has done really well in maintaining the quality educational programs for the student population, both at the graduate and undergraduate levels.

I don't know.

See my previous comment.

Advocate for excellence in research.

I believe that the Provost's office is focused on the "right things"—student success in all aspects, faculty career success, alignment of institutional goals, efficiencies, etc. They accomplish an amazing amount of work with fewer staff than peers.

I believe so.

Responding to questions posed. Providing supportive help for faculty and staff.

--It articulates and maintains a clear vision of ISU's mission.

--It offers greater transparency under the new budget model than it did under the old one.

--It has managed to create a climate to boost enrollment at a time of declining state appropriations.

--It continues to work on ways to recruit and retain the best faculty.

supports resolution of problems (through the Associate Provosts typically).

Probably communicates with Deans and Directors.

Addresses issues directly and quickly; directs matters to appropriate people; schedules appropriate meetings with the relevant principals; tries to stay on top of critical situations.
Effective communication during meetings.

The Provost's Office has provided an outstanding set of new training sessions and resources for department chairs. Guidance to department chairs is absolutely crucial for smooth running of the university.

It is evident that considerable effort has been expended on the RMM.

in my limited interactions, yes.

Not sure

Diversity-related issues

Promotion and Tenure Evaluation

Sponsoring workshops for faculty advancement

To help to increase the female faculty.

To argue all the faculty to obtain grants.

To have excellent committees to to give ISU awards.

Maintain the primacy of and high level of budgetary investment in the limited number of privileged, high-priority programs upon which ISU's reputation as an international research institution is believed to rest.

Promoting and encouraging collaborative research.

I have no idea.

Steering ISU in continued leadership in R&D, and promoting improved excellence in teaching and research, especially through the colleges.

As I said, most of my contact has been related to new faculty orientation and like events. All of that was done well.

Communicating with departments and faculty, and supporting innovation in teaching and research.

Very little.

Articulate the importance of academic excellence.

Working with the faculty senate on key issues. Addressing faculty hiring and retention issues.

makes sure all voices get heard.
takes an a vigorous look at preliminary tenure reviews.

That's a toughie... My general perception is that the provost is doing a decent job, but I have to confess I'm not very knowledgeable and I don't pay as much attention as perhaps I should.

The Provost Office encourages diversity in hires and manages budgetary issues reasonably well, considering the financial exigencies since 2008.

The Provost's Office does a fine job of representing the business-end of university operations.

Maintain strong bureaucratic framework; enforce hierarchical communication layers.

Supports policies and procedures that ensure fairness in the promotion and tenure decisions

The provost seems to work very supportively with the president.

everything in which I have been in contact with the Provost's office has been handled well

Implementing academic and personnel policies and procedures and assisting faculty and departments in using these policies and procedures.

Communicate, plan, and monitor academic issues and trends.

They are approachable, plus support diversity, families, and minorities.

Promote life/work balance, address the particular needs of female faculty, training and mentorship of junior faculty

Planning and organising. Leadership in changes and promote campus positive working environment.

Betsy is more highly engaged than any other provost I have worked with. She does not micromanage, but assists and mentors very effectively.

1. Think about broad issues that affect the University

2. Avoids micro managing

Has provided leadership to ensure that core ISU strengths have not been sacrificed as state funds have dried up.

..............,?????

Strong advocate for science and technology, both within the University and beyond.

Provides matching support (funds) for scholars in the USDA programs (eg National Needs Program) at ISU.

Interacts with faculty- shared responsibility.
Not sure
not sure
encourages excellence at ISU
Basic management
provides leadership
communication with departments
I really do not have much of a basis to comment.
Not interact directly with the faculty.
Promoting an atmosphere in which the pursuit of grant and contract dollars effectively takes precedence over all else.
Maintaining excellent relations between all people on campus.
dictate decisions
Not sure
Yes
I have no idea.
Helps Colleges move toward ISU strategic Mission through guidance and funding.
No opinion
Sure.
She seems to be level-headed and has a good relationship with her faculty. Has experience way beyond the demands of her job.
Fairness in Promotion and Tenure
They have handled the impacts of budget cuts very well. It's been a tough time as of late.
Leadership in balancing academic programs
Very support of faculty development.
Has excellent support staff.
Technology
Communicating important university policies

Responds to concerns of Faculty.

I must admit I have not had much interaction with the Provost's Office, but I also know that basically everything from classroom space to research funding has benefitted from what seems to be a competent level of engagement.

Working on policy, budgets and faculty support with the resources they have

Supportive of efforts to expand research.

It is impossible for me to have a set opinion about it.

Yes. I think the Provost had done an excellent job considering the woeful budget situation she has had to deal with since her arrival. Her dealings with P & T cases have been particularly senisitive and she has made some wise choices in situations in a couple of cases (two different Colleges) with which I have been familiar.

Communication with faculty is excellent

not sure

Nothing

I do not have enough interaction with the Provost's Office to answer this.

Promote research

n/a

Support the Colleges of Engineering and Agriculture; promote the wishes of the President

Over the years I've seen an emergence in leadership and better support regarding climate and strategic planning with due importance given to the need for faculty support of initiatives.

Program planning

It appears that the office works well with the presidents office to steer the ship of ISU. It is probably important for effectiveness that the Provost respect the President and vice versa which I believe they have, demonstrating common goals for the University.

1. Guiding and managing our university's day -to-day business;

2. Leading and implementing a long-term strategic planning

3. Support, promote, encourage and inspire academic excellence

Caring and effective
Eliminate wasteful centers. Recognition of the distinction between effective managers and leaders (visionaries).

Always being available, and trying to be understanding and fair.

I am pleased that the Provost's office has, in certain cases, given faculty with negative tenure votes extensions rather than denying tenure altogether. I believe the Provost also supports a family friendly atmosphere at the University which helps to retain women.

Operate with an appropriate vision of what is important for a strong research-oriented university

I don't have first had experience, but I've heard that the Provost takes great care in reviewing all promotion and tenure cases.

Not sure.

Don't have a good feel for the scope of activities.

Provide overall leadership and vision regarding the the overall success of the university; coordinate the efforts of the colleges in increasing grant-funded research, graduate and professional education, undergraduate education, faculty governance, work climate for faculty and staff; campus climate for students; and all aspects of recruiting, promoting and retaining excellent faculty.

I have not had sufficient involvement with the Provost's Office to speak with any authority on this topic.

The Provost office acts responsibly and fairly to promote academic achievement at ISU, and to solve problems behind the scenes that allow Colleges, Departments, Faculty, and Students to succeed.

the provost's office takes very good care of the provost's office

Promote serious academic scholarship

Mentoring of young/new faculty

N/A

The new faculty information set looks good

provides leadership and standards for research, teaching and student engagement; commitment to diversity, excellent communication and transparency in area of research including development and implementation of COIC policy.

Post-award grant work is good.

Not sure what role or influence the Provost has on my position or department.
If there is a role/influence, it is indirect and I have not opportunity to comment on this influence.

I think the Provost Office runs the university; i.e., they are the internal operating mechanism as compared to the president's office that seems to be more involved in fundraising and cultivating external partnerships. Considering the enormity of the role the Provost Office carries, I think they do their work very well.

In general, they do very well in supporting the research effort.

I do not have any direct experience or information that would allow me to formulate a meaningful response to this question.

Academic leadership

Interacting diplomatically and listening to all opinions and perspectives.

The Provost and her office have an outstandingly professional and effective way of representing the University.

promotes research, diversity, fairness

Building relationships with faculty.

NA

Provides strong leadership by being visible and engaging to those of us who have limited contact with the office

Absolutely

provides leadership and advocacy for academic program needs; communication between administration and faculty; fair in support of all academic areas

Yes, very well, although I have limited basis for that evaluation. I admire the Provost's commitment to diversity.

Effective leadership. Sensitive to faculty concerns and needs

The Provost Office has increased transparency and has clarified policy and university guidelines. They have clarified policies for faculty advancement, and they have promoted policies that enable a diversity of people to succeed. The post-tenure review process should be viewed as a step forward.

Don't know

na

program development
I don't really see the provost's office accomplishments. I am sure it does - but I don't see it.

The Provost is a well-regarded academic leader; she is smart and appears to be doing a good job.

Budget and plan for the future

Probably the Provost's duties.

Takes care of problems as they arise

I'm not sure what it does so this is hard to comment on. I did skim the description but in my day to day existence...

?

yes

na

Yes though my experience is limited.

Promoting the land grant mission of ISU. Navigating the morass of information and procedures.

Enrollment and budgetary planning, personnel issues, business management of the academic and research enterprise, adapting to changing budgetary realities within as well as between academic years.

Support innovative programs and academics.

I think the Provost's office humanizes the role of the provost. Dr. Hoffman comes across as a person who cares for U and its faculty. Compared to similar institutions, the office has done a good job of demonstrating in word and deed that both scholarship and teaching are valued (although to different extents) by the University.

Support for research and teaching.

Overall, I have had little contact with the Provost office.

Faculty Senate reports

Faculty leadership group

Diversity encouragement

Provide leadership
I think the Provost Office provides clear communication about the academic arm of the university. Information and policies related to faculty issues (P&T, FPDA, etc.) are clear.

Act as a buffer zone between teaching and research faculty and the world of politics.

I am not aware of the Provost doing anything poorly.

Connects with faculty and supports them in multi-faceted ways.

Work with the President.

Has introduced greater awareness and use of data from higher education associations. Works well with President's office.

Overall administration, faculty promotion and tenure, retentions and promoting research activities

Advocate for high quality scholarship

Advocate for work/life balance

Provide information to colleges and department chairs (e.g. various workshops for new faculty, dept. chairs, etc.)

Although I don’t have any direct evidence of this, I generally have the feeling (based on what I read and what others say) that the provost is very competent and interested in making things better. Thus, a great administrator.

The Provost seems to promote scholarship at Iowa State.

Values academic research and scholarship

Timely professional response to requests

Handling of faculty conduct issues with sensitivity and fairness.

I do not feel informed enough to answer this, or several of the previous, questions...sorry I cannot be more helpful.

Public relations

It is hard to say

I believe ISU is taking the correct steps forward in regards to technology. I've appreciated the advancements with Blackboard as the online portion of my classes has improved my courses.

Tries to pull together faculty in different areas for new initiatives

It has been very good at faculty mentoring programs, awards and recognition of quality faculty, taking part in university wide events and lectures.
Supporting research and teaching

Assist the president.

I think the Provost's Office leverages its control of the budget to great effectiveness in advocating for excellence on every level and in every arena.

N/A

I'm not really familiar with the Provost's Office

Take into account differences in life circumstances that could influence an individual's success in promotion and tenure

make promotion & tenure guidelines clear

support family-friendly policies

Provide information for faculty

Manages and coordinates a large land-grant university very well and in keeping with its stated mission.

I am not sure. Probably developing the new Strategic Plan for the university, overseeing program development and financial planning.

Promote scholarship and teaching.

Very hard for me to tell. I believe that funding has been managed fairly well.

It is doing a good job of managing central administration activities. It has done a good job of implementing the new budget model.

Most everything

The Provost's Office is rarely intrusive.

Our Provost has outstanding soft-skills in dealing with, and resolving, the moreso personal aspects of faculty and administrative conflict

Collect and present statistics about faculty and students (FSSE, NSSE, yearly P&T data, etc.)

Outstanding job on shared governance and promotion and tenure review. Very candid about budget items and sharing with faculty through the faculty senate.

Promotes and enhances diversity

Promotes and enhances the sciences
Associate Provost Holger provides outstanding leadership in academic programs and with international programs.

9. In your opinion, what needs improvement?

everything else

Strategic planning. Budget oversight.

I'm not sure that I have a vantage point from which I could see areas to improve. I do know that the Provost office is extremely engaged, busy, and successful. If there are areas of university life that need improvement, I do not assume that it's due to a lack of awareness or effort on the part of the Provost's office--some things simply can't be fixed quickly, or at all (like state budgets).

more communication of solutions to ongoing challenges

See response to #7.

Communication. NOT clear what they do or what programs they actually implement. Communication on many of the things you asked about in the questionnaire would be helpful.

research convicts of interest policies are over cautious

There is a desperate need to FIX OSPA and Purchasing to make them have a mindset of serving faculty. These units are TERRIBLE. Obstructionist. They need to work like Transportation Services does - very service oriented. The folks in OSPA and Purchasing work for the faculty, not vice versa. But they sure don't act like it. And it has been that way for years. Who in administration can show enough leadership to correct these chronic units?

I do not perceive any problems in how the office conducts its business.

The budget model

nothing

rethinking the distribution of budget funds to colleges.

There are too many administrative layers--eliminate many, if not all of the layers between the Deans and the Provost.
openness, transparency,
promptness of replies

Everything

Staff in our department indicates that administrative staff in the provost's office is either unaware or unconcerned about how the timely performance of its duties, or lack thereof, affects the ability of administrative staff in other divisions to perform in a timely manner.

More broadly, the provost's office appears to be unaware of the differences between a large public land grant university and a small, private technical institute. This has led to a gross misappropriation of funding toward engorging administration salaries rather than replacing and hiring faculty, and toward funding pet projects rather than adhering to the spirit of the RMM and supporting tuition generating areas key to quality undergraduate education. This misappropriation of funds has resulted in severe damage to the institution and its ability to education the population it actually exists to serve.

If this perception is not correct, it is because the Provost’s Office seems to operate under a veil of secrecy, making only hollow, che

1. leadership is the main issue.

2. support departments faced with course poaching created by the budget model.

Promote excellence in teaching, advising, and outreach or extension (NOT scholarship of teaching and advising) and support high-risk students after we recruit and accept them and take their tuition dollars

Better sense of the role of a university

Better communication surrounding policy decision that effect tenure-track faculty. On more than one occasion, we have just had things sprung on us, essentially telling us "This is what you are going to do." without democratic discussion. I sometimes feel as if I am a factory line worker.

I am not sure

transparency

Not much that I can see...

more interaction with individual departments. Perhaps a once very 2-year cycle of visits to individual departments to maintain a sense that units have direct say to the chief academic officer.

visibility. the provost swings by our college once a year with the president. little or no interaction beyond that.
The provost is sometimes unclear when speaking to faculty and staff. I'm generally more confused after having heard her at a meeting than before.

international programs

See previous question.

Transparency in funding strategies

Greater concern for the role of undergraduate teaching

The office seems invisible to me. Provost H. is more remote than Pres. Geoffroy was. I feel the provost office is an enforcement arm for personnel matters. ????

We ALL need a route to more money to support programs in teaching, research, and public service

In my opinion what needs improvement is the administration as a whole - President on down to accept and acknowledge that Iowa State can no longer remain a Black and White campus. That should not solely be the responsibility of the Provost office it needs to be a university wide effort starting with the President.

communication (particularly listening) - I was particularly disappointed in the Strategic Initiatives process, in a time of budget cuts these funds should have gone back to the departments that lost funds, not be redistributed through a hurry up process of proposal writing

collaboration with other regents universities to find efficiencies in programs

Communication with faculty?

Visibility. Needs to communicate direction. Listen to needs.

All functions need to be streamlined. More accountability on why processes take too long to accomplish

I do not get the feeling that journal publications are quite as important as grants. I get a bit concerned when I see reports at all levels that want grants listed first and then journal articles. In the senior faculty I see much more passion about getting a grant than about making discoveries. That will hurt us in the long run.

More involvement with Faculty, being in touch with what faculty do in teaching, research and outreach.

engagement- actual understanding, not washed opinions that work up hill

I am a new faculty member and from my limited perspective, the Provost has very little visibility among faculty.
Give colleges and department latitude in decision making and then hold them accountable for poor decisions. The redundancy in the approval process bogs the system down. The Provost staff should view their role as facilitating not enforcing rules or thwarting change.

Openness, decentralization of power

Some indication of respect and support for those faculty working outside of the scientific fields and professional schools.

Same comment as before.

Timeliness of decisions; willingness to take risks in matters that make good universities great; sunsetting obsolete or ineffective programs and moving resources to more successful or promising programs; improving performance of service units on campus, which is shockingly poor in the eyes of outsiders.

Vision, Priorities, Engagement, Implementation. In other words, pretty much everything.

Providing support for departments whose primary mission is teaching. We tend to get penalized and devalued.

Listening to faculty with regards to improving the environment within our respective colleges. Considering key faculty input when looking a major programatic changes. (We have a lot of good experience and great ideas that can save a lot of money, aggravation, and stress.)

look around the campus really look

communication between staff, faculty and administrators to be sure all informed- has greatly improved past 1-2 years

--Make your office more transparent.

--Provide more research funding initiatives.

--Make more connections to faculty and let everyone knows that this is a research university.

--Maintain research quality by establishing higher standard and requirements on scholarship across colleges.

None, I am glad she is sticking around.

This office does not show transparency in its decision-making processes.

Cumbersome process; too much central decision making that takes ideas and other input off the table

Mentoring resources for assistant professor, and associate professor employees. Resources and evaluation are adequate but slim, especially at the associate professor level.

I don't really know anything about them.
do not have enough knowledge of all the office does to make suggestion

efficiency of process - more electronic forms and submissions - use technology to streamline approvals

Don't know of any weak areas.

Support of the faculty that is the supposed reason why we have a university in the first place.

Big area of responsibility and hard to communincate with so many constituents.

Resist the relentless corporatization of the University.

Nothing major.

Central support for assessment of student learning is poor. The provost's office should not of course dictate academic programs to the faculty. But it can and should provide the faculty strong formative feedback about what ISU students--especially undergraduates--are and are not in fact learning. The NSSE results (a VERY rough measure) show that we're not doing a good job in offering students challenging classroom environments. Recent national studies (e.g. Academically Adrift) suggest that many colleges are not successful promoting basic skills of critical thinking. We need a centrally supported system for overall outcomes assessment, and high central expectations for meaningful assessment at the college/department levels.

Provost office needs re-structuring and good leadership that will care for the mission of ISU, not focused on collecting indirect costs and athletic revenues.

Faculty morale in Humanities and Social Sciences.

Support for programs and departments other than the STEM units.

I think we over-reward narrow scientists and do not adequately hire/encourage faculty who are strength in science is matched by an ability to succeed in the classroom, with advising, and in communicating outside of the university.

My personal opinion is either some of the people in the Provost's office either have too much on their plates or they don't pick and choose what goes through in a timely manner and what doesn't. I'm hoping it's the former rather than the later.

The amount of epaperwork faculty are required to create is stupendous. The more productive we are, the more paperwork. I spend hours every day on forms for OSPA, preawards, redoing CVs and current and pendings for all sorts of folks, IRBs, safety courses, and much more.

This in infuriating and decreases the productivity of ISU faculty.

attention to student learning and outcomes assessment, setting a tone that is more respectful of the generally hard-working loyal faculty who keep ISU moving ahead, development of department chairs
who uphold fair and high standards and see facilitation/helping faculty members to do their jobs as the most important priority.

The Provost's Office needs to be much more active in monitoring senior administrators. Let me be specific. Dean Wintersteen is not a competent manager, is not fair-minded, wastes resources for purely political purposes, and cares little about educating students. Incidents such as the Leopold Center Search and the Tanzania project reveal a complete want in judgement. But these are just what are visible. Behavior at less visible levels, including chronic disrespect for the rank and file in CALS, is much worse. For the good of this University, Dean Wintersteen needs to be removed. The Provost's Office, in failing to act on removing the Dean, has not provided the leadership one should expect from this office.

I do not believe this office effectively plays a role to encourage intellectual diversity.

can't identify anything..

appearance of listening before action.

support for diversity and transparency

If this includes VPRED, sometimes the decision process on proposal selection for submission to external funding sources seems not sufficiently transparent.

More transparency

Real commitment to academic excellence

Willingness to work directly with faculty instead of through a bureaucratic structure.

N/A

Fulfilling the land grant ideals of ISU which would enable it to more directly serve the people of Iowa (e.g. Community Engagement).

Support for Campus Compact

Perception exists that the Provost's office hoards money generated by the RMM (in other words, it takes too big cut of the money generated by each college, esp. with respect to tuition increases). I do not personally know this to be true, but this definitely is the perception way down here at my level.

The Provost's office could spend a little more resources to help faculty be successful researchers in terms of time. I know all of these policies initiate from the Provost's office and I believe faculty (at least in our area) are so swamped with teaching and service, it is difficult to conduct effective research.

There is too little willingness to make and implement tough decisions on discontinuing programs. There seems to be a return to a Gordon Eaton "wither and die" approach to decisions.
has too much faith in the person advocating for ISU at the Federal level
Decision making about diversity related programs
revamp HR - it is out of touch with reality
Be more responsive to feedback regarding incentivizing distance education; more coordination and leadership for internationalization efforts
cannot think of everything, because my interaction have always been extremely positive and effective.
I would not be here, if it were not for the Dr, Hoffmann.
Faculty should be listened to more. The Provost should not pick favorites in a dispute before she listens fully and without bias. The data on the Sociology department do NOT indicate an overall problem; one person with a terrible record of moving from school to school should not be allowed to blame his poor research productivity on others.
1) it continues to be difficult to pay administrative staff at centers since we cannot pay them from most grants and contracts. They make it much easier for researchers to get things done but it is difficult to find ways to keep them funded

2) I do not understand why university offices close down for 1 to 2 weeks over christmas. Some of us actually have proposals due over the break and having OSPA shut down completely doesn't make sense. We needed a gold sheet signature from extension over the christmas break and they were out for 2 weeks. If the university wants us to double research expenditures shouldn't the staffing reflect that. Even having one person around checking email would be helpful. Our competitors in industry don't shut down.

See previous comments

I haven't been here long enough to adequately answer this question.

Bridge funding for graduate students
I'm not familiar with what they do.

Willingness to introduce and encourage new ideas. Evenhandedness in dealing with different departments.

Make the office not bureaucratic.

Clarity about and support for the importance of undergraduate education at the university.
Support for undergraduate education could mean many things. One would be recognition of effective teaching as a critical component of job performance for all faculty members. One would be additional support to hire more faculty members and graduate students who are focused on high-quality undergraduate education.

More attention to work-life balance issues. The Provost is interested in this, but much more still needs to be done if we are to be able to recruit and retain talented female faculty.

direct communication with departments and faculty regarding academic direction and support for major programmatic changes advocated by the provost's office. Overall direction to combine two departments was clear but support for successful implementation was weak at best.

The provost is invisible to lecturers. Improvement would mean she would be more visible.

This Office needs to be a-swirl in nonstop thinktank-like "outside the box" ideas, strategies and approaches.

Associate Provost Holger has too many diverse issues under his responsibility - this often results in issues not getting the attention or leadership they need, but instead just getting by with the status quo.

There also appears to be some Provost office staff that have significant influence over academic issues without accountability.

Not enough contact to offer comments.

None

Overall communication

Leadership in faculty development.

This is not a comment on the provost office as this is not their role. I think there could be more staff devoted to administrative and support tasks for faculty (so there is more time for research and grant writing) and less devoted to creating more surveys

Stronger international engagement (especially quality); closer interaction with faculty.

Adjunct faculty salaries are shameful and the university ought to rectify this. I earn less than secretaries and even janitorial staff.

I have no complaints at this time.

More need for a wider view of how policies and procedures impact and are implemented by a variety of units, more focus needed on realizing the land grant mission through university engagement support

Leadership is knowing when and when not to micro manage. Too much micro management results in less transparency and undervalued employees.
Knowledge of extension, spend less of their time on perusing P & T documents when others ahead of them were far more knowledgeable and better at that assessment.

academic excellence

n/a

While the lunches, etc. with new faculty during the first year are generally good, it would be helpful to have more interaction during the tenure track process. A program for mentorship that goes across colleges, for example, would really help the colleges that don't have well-developed mentorship programs. An interactive website and contact person for tenure track faculty would also be very helpful to be able to access resources, make decisions about what is appropriate to take on, etc.

Keep proceeding with the RMM process.

Fairness and honest concern for a good future of the university.

Very little--I know it's precedent for provosts to step down when a new President comes in, but I hope this doesn't happen--would like to see the Provost stay in her position

There was one major problem during my tenure as Chair, which happened during the external review of the Department. The problem, which I prefer not to describe in detail, involved the Dean's office. The external review team, after doing a thorough job reviewing the Department, was convinced that the Department was effectively carrying out its duties. The Dean had tried to convince Betsy that we were not teaching effectively.

My criticism of the Provost is that she might have been more open to a different--and correct--viewpoint, and less reliant on the Dean. Eventually she came around, but it took several months.

Reasons for cuts and reorganization of units.

More transparency and consultation with individual units is needed.

Needs to see value outside of science and engineering fields.

The faculty have taken a beating regarding the tenure issues with the general public. Combine this with little pay raises and increased responsibilities that most faculty members have taken on as a result of budget tightening and increased enrollment, faculty morale is relatively low.

I don't know

Maybe more involvement without micro managing.
We desperately need an undergraduate research office to promote and get more students involved in research. It is too important to leave to mixed implementation in colleges.

They are very underappreciated.

Support for excellence in teaching and quality of academic programs

Not sure

Perhaps more focus on the importance of teaching excellence balanced with scholarship expectations.

The Office of the Provost juggles an amazing array of responsibilities, and I hope to see further improvement in a few of these:

--Recruiting and retaining of faculty of color.

--Working out the arrangements for joint appointments so that faculty do not find them onerous.

--Creating a more congenial climate on campus for interdisciplinary initiatives.

--Giving the "uni" in university its rightful due so that Iowa State does not allow its mission to be defined as a high-level vocational school.

Funding is always an issue. Support of the core functions of the university especially in teaching and learning should come before some other initiatives.

Budget model and academic planning

No basis for an opinion.

1) improve communication style; 2) make efforts to better understand what is going on within the colleges; 3) take measures to not duplicate college-level activities OR eliminate the duplicative college-level activities; 4) spend more time on academic issues; 5) help Faculty Senate by mediating issues with the College Deans and Chairs.

the Provost’s office needs to be more supportive of the faculty. It now seems to be working against faculty interests too often

I can’t think of anything.

Would like to see the Provost interacting with faculty more.
maybe more interaction with the general faculty so we know exactly what they are doing.

Making more decisive decisions

There are doing very well.

Serious action and policy on academic excellence and faculty governance

Support for the departments and programs that generate large numbers of student credit hours but have low salaries and minimum investment in research support. It generally appears to me that it is a priority at the Provost level to continue to grow the number of students in such programs so that the tuition revenue generated can be used to cross-subsidize privileged high-priority programs with high salaries that do not cover their RMM-allocated costs either through tuition revenue or grant support.

I have no idea.

I don't know that I ever received official notification from the Provost's office that my 3rd year review went well. If I received it, I don't remember. The year I went up was the first year the packets went all the way to the Provost's office, but I didn't understand what the timeline would look like for getting a yea or nay. I think eventually a contract showed up for me to sign.

nothing

Salaries of faculty are quite low. Well-performing faculty need to be recognized and rewarded in the form of awards and salary raises. The current situation is that salaries and recognition are both quite stagnant.

We need a new Provost.

Convince key departments teaching important service content (e.g., Math, Physics) to focus on quality of instruction in those courses.

Better communication related to the Provost office activities to the staff and faculty.

More support for interdisciplinary programs.

The university needs to switch from MWF classes to only MW, so that Fridays can be open for other necessary activities such as hiring, visiting speakers, research, and committee meetings. That would be a massive improvement. Also, there should be clearer rewards for achieving outstanding publications, such as course reductions and/or one-time pay bonuses.

Greater support for the Liberal Arts, especially the humanities.

1. Toss the RMM and it's lopsided emphasis on giant classes. Student learning benefits from smaller sections in most courses.

Transparency; openness; availability; communication; consideration.
Transparency in relation between academic and budget decisions

Needs to do a better of job of requiring deans to adopt the strategic mission of the university. Our dean and chairs seems to operate only with regard to budget.

HR

Can't think of anything at the moment.

There needs to be a blanket approach to family support across campus. Some departments are great and others not. It's hit and miss. You just have to hope you fall into the right pocket.

Still more room for improvement around supporting and funding faculty research and needs of female faculty especially around family leave policies

Oversight on deans and colleges. The new budget model has brought out many dark sides of the deans.

Very little.

I'm not sure much more could be done given the terrible budget environment that has been in place during much of her tenure as Provost.

Better understanding of the differences in research/service activities of the various types of faculty

More recognition and concrete actions to support (i.e., re-establish) ISU as a comprehensive University.

Nothing that I can think of at the moment.

Not sure.

Individual faculty needs support not administrative units

not sure

nothing that I can think of

The University needs to do much more in the way of anticipating future challenges that students will have to face in their new world—end of cheap energy, depleting natural resources, etc. and provide them with an education that will enable them to adapt.

communication with departments (although some of that lack could be due to inefficient department chairs)

not sure

Would like to see more face to face, personal interaction with individual faculty members. Faculty morale is low, and the VPR Office needs to see/listen to it first-hand.
A new leader and a new culture, I'd say. So long as Betsy Hoffman is Provost, it's hard to expect much improvement or a new beginning.

Treat all colleges equitably, in the true spirit of a university, rather than giving preferential treatment to colleges the provost considers to be at the core of ISU's mission.

The university needs to emphasize doing what's right for the people of Iowa, not what's most lucrative for industry to support at the university.

The VP for Research could be more sympathetic to individual researcher needs. Too bureaucratic now.

RMM, budget model, allocation of resources

I have had no contact or knowledge of the Provost and what they do.

More visibility by periodically providing initiatives, accomplishments and ongoing activities that are represented by the previous set of questions

There has been too much emphasis placed on growth in enrollment and retention. While retention is important, it is coming at the expense of quality and rigor. Our students seem less prepared for college every year and perhaps we should tighten our admissions standards. It is better to have a smaller enrollment and do what we do well than to turn out a product of lower quality. We are struggling more and more each year to get the students up to the level we deem appropriate to graduate from our college.

not sure

common sense, as opposed to rules for everything. In a complex environment, with legal liability issues, i do understand a level of regulation is necessary. However, the lack of flexibility that comes from an overabundance of regulation is just as stifling in a university as it is in business...maybe more so.

I have no idea.

Not sure

I don't have enough interaction to make a reasonable suggestion.

She needs to view the whole institution as a Research 1 university, including the Arts and Humanities.

P&T criterion could be better communicated and more consistent

While I appreciate the display of dedication, many administrators in that office do not model the work-life balance that would make ISU a great place to work and live.

They are too slow at handling important issues sometimes because they are simply overburdened.
Leadership to the faculty. Which means more visibility to the faculty.

Unambiguous language in communication

Should be more involved in promoting research at Vet Med.

I’ll resist the urge to read this question as what can the University do better. We all have ideas about that, but if I had to say (with my very limited interaction with the Provost's Office in mind) that at no level should we forget the role in higher education and research an institution like ISU is supposed to represent. That means we must never lose sight that a university like ours is not just about making money, whether for ourselves, our students, our funding sources, of the state of Iowa. Sometimes learning or new knowledge does not result in a salable commodity but is still valuable nonetheless. Promoting the humanities is a great place to foster that commitment to learning and knowledge that speaks to life, not just to the wallet.

It seems that there are some issues surrounding graduate education and articulation with community colleges that could be improved; also around distance education

No opinion.

See above

The graduate program at ISU. The ratio of graduate students to undergraduates at ISU is low and should be ramped up. It has always been low and is in my opinion a direct measure of the priorities of ISU. The best universities have high ratios and is a reflection of the importance of research. It does not help that the Dean of the Graduate College lacks imagination and that graduate students still have to pay tuition. It is hard to compete with other schools for graduate students when stipends are poor.

Focus on learning, which should be reflected on real rather than political student outcomes

Get out of the office and involve directly with the faculty. The last time this faculty interacted was with Dean Topel.

Transparency

Answer to question 8 applies here also.

Providing more resources to junior faculty to help them succeed

Not yet ready to rate

An overhaul would be useful for getting an Office more attuned to the needs of faculty. Several activities (e.g., the various workshops) are job preservation for those in the Office with limited aid to Departments.

There has already been significant improvement over say 12 years ago.
More direct communication with faculty

I am personally satisfied.

I don't have a particular suggestion. The office should continue the good job it does and maintain excellent communication with the faculty.

N/A

Cultivating leaders from among the faculty. We have too many managers who are more interested in avoiding risk and innovation.

I'm not sure.

Diversity, watch each departmental or college unit to see whether each perform a fair treatment for minority and international faculty.

I'm not sure.

Again, budget model is problematic.

Education about different faculty definitions across the university.

More engagement with faculty. I have had more engagement with the President than VP.

During this time of economic belt-tightening and changes in key leadership roles (the university president, the LAS dean, etc.), it's difficult to pinpoint areas in the Provost office that need improvement because the former President, the Provost, Associate Provosts and VPs have done a very good job of steering the university through these difficult times. I would love to see continuity in the initiatives and efforts already underway.

I know the Provost is very busy, but perhaps more public interaction with various departments.

In the Geoffroy administration, I would give the Provost office top marks. They succeeded in keeping state, local, and university politics out of academic decisions. The policies of placing academics first need to be continued.

IF the university had millions of dollars available this year for "special initiatives" perhaps one could have been salary increases for faculty. Where did that money go? How did it improve the university?

no comment

Resources to support serious academic scholarship

Reviews of college/department leadership.

N/A
have not been here long enough to make too many broad judgements about ISU; at least I'm trying hard to not make broad judgements yet.

communication.

Pre-award grant submission could be better. If a budget needs to be changed by $100 they send an email and have the PI take that step, when it could readily be done and then the PI informed...probably up to $1000 would be OK with most, I suspect.

Better communication with new faculty on what the Provost actually does, and how their decisions impacts departments.

I think there needs to be more consistency in knowledge of staff members in the office as to the role of the Faculty Senate in cultivating shared governance. Senate committees really go a great deal to assist the Provost Office in issues that relate to the faculty and academic side of the institution yet I feel some of the personnel that senate committees work with are not in concert with the senate, provost, and assoc provosts.

Everything.

It often feels like the institution is too rigid. There are also places where the provost's office might support those efforts with infrastructure more effectively.

I am not in a position to judge or make suggestions.

Not sure

None

the value of teaching needs to be elevated, from an activity that is required but considered a waste of research time, to one that is a respected and valued activity.

I do not have any recommendations.

NA

Because of limited contact this is difficult to answer - we need continued strong support for teaching undergraduates and for limiting class sizes rather than focusing only on student contact hours. Students learn by being directly engaged with instructors and fellow students which is difficult to do with very large class sizes. There should also be continued support for experiential laboratory courses that require significant faculty time but again provide a rich learning experience for students.

get rid of current budget model that forces competition rather than collaboration

The new 7-year faculty review model is a disaster. The idea that a faculty member could be or should be superior in all categories, research, teaching, and service, is ludicrous. Faculty review committees do
not want such heavy responsibility in evaluating our peers. We only want to advise the department chair. Also, trash in faculty offices should be removed more frequently than once every 2 weeks.

Nothing.

The transition to the RMM model at a time of austerity has been difficult. I'm not sure that this is a criticism of the Provost Office, as much as a general observation and a puzzle to be solved.

More connection with faculty.

na

Keeping the advance grant in perspective. Should not tenure and promote women just because of the advance grant. It is a stigma to be advanced in your career, especially promotion because of the advance grant.

better communication and connection with faculty

Communication and transparency regarding NSF MRI pre-proposal competitions and such calls as last year’s strategic funding initiative.

Communication and visibility

Very little. The Provost does not seem to interfere with the academic activities of the campus.

I'm doing great, my students are doing great so I guess that what the Provost is doing is effective... it is just that I'm not sure how that is connected to my teaching, etc.

?

na

Funding of classrooms - maintenance and technology, esp. with burgeoning enrollments.

I believe the RMM needs to be applied more as designed rather than constantly manipulated, I believe there needs to be better strategic recognition of the rising importance of student numbers and tuition in revenue stream and that requires personnel and resources devoted to teaching

I think Provosts are historically leaders of the faculty. However, the dual roles of executive and provost means that this Provost's office swings more towards management of revenue streams than caring for intellectual endeavors.

The university is way behind in technology. We should have built-in computers in every classroom so we don't have to haul our laptops across campus to show PowerPoints. Last year I taught in a classroom without a projection system, so I had to haul my own projector and laptop across campus each class period. When I give presentations at other universities, I am told just to bring a flash drive because
there will be built-in computers. For a university which calls itself a technology university, we can make many more improvements.

We will be challenged by the external demands for cost containment

More opportunities to attract faculty of color to be in academic leadership positions.

It's probably not possible, but giving teaching and research faculty more time and resource to teach and conduct research, so we spend less time doing never-ending re-assessments of what we do.

I am not aware of anything that needs improvement.

Not sure.

Budget model when it comes to interdisciplinary programs and research initiatives

Sporadic up and downs of state financing made it difficult to understand implementation of new initiatives. I'm not certain budget model will work in this environment.

The new budget model has created some unintended consequences to researchers. The cost of graduate students and animal care use charges have increased dramatically in the last three years. These issues have caused negative consequences in the ability of researchers to conduct research. It is a very serious problem and has to be addressed immediately

Might need to seek input from more diverse channels than only deans, although that probably does occur through the various councils (dept. chairs, P&S, etc).

Actively promotes an environment for excellence in scholarship.

I can't think of anything that needs to be improved. Although many of us do not like the new budget model for resource allocations for teaching, I don't think that started with the Provost's office.

I would like to see more work and support for teaching and student learning.

should be more effective at pushing back against fads foisted on the faculty by the Board of Regents and the President.

Sometimes I think the office could use more senior staff to help in making really difficult financial decisions and/or more thoughtful reflection in making such decisions. There are some squeaky wheels that should just not be given any oil.

Oversight at satellite research centers. Lots of money is going to a black hole.

more communication; clarity about what is available to faculty
As a faculty member in the Department of Kinesiology, I know administration and other faculty members are frustrated by budgetary constraints as our student numbers continue to rise. We need a suitable amount of instructors/professors and class space to fulfill our department's mission.

Better understanding of different situations in different departments, financial support for interdisciplinary initiatives and grad programs

Nothing at this point.

More emphasis on the humanities

Perhaps more interaction with staff mainly involved in teaching.

Honestly, not much. I think perhaps some faculty are confused about the Provost's role, and tend, in that vacuum, to assume inaccurate information. So perhaps an area for improvement might be to do a better job of letting the faculty in general know the full extent of the Provost's mission and accomplishments.

N/A

Don't know

More understanding of differences in departments/colleges that can influence expectations for promotion and tenure

wasn't aware of many of the other functions, so I suppose better communication about them (improving teaching, international work, etc.)

There was a stated leadership philosophy by the former President about "getting the right people on the [leadership] bus and getting the wrong people off the bus quickly." This philosophy has not been applied to my department's leadership structure, which has been ineffective and inefficient for many years.

The university could use more emphasis on the importance of teaching and teaching scholarship. Faculty need a sense of security and appreciation in these changing times. We could benefit from the development of a university climate that values the humanities along with the sciences, fostering creativity and builds community among faculty and administrators.

Creating and understanding that a one size fits all model cannot work. Large departments and small departments cannot function the same way.

Better approach to personnel management

The concept of the Provost as both academic leader and business leader needs to be examined. The key role of the Provost is to maintain the emphasis of the university on academic excellence but right now it appears to be consumed with the mundane activities of day to day administration and business management. It would be difficult for even an informed faculty member to say what the top priorities of the provost are, or what the top goals for improvement / advancement of the university are.
I'm not in a position to know.

Communication about what the Provost's Office roles and goals are.

My first-hand administrative interactions include five other Provosts (including three who went on to become Presidents) and by far our Provost is at the top of this list in terms of overall skills and political savvy. She has done well with hiring supporting team members, but then again she inherited some folks whose replacement would appear to be warranted.

See #7. The Provost needs to be more receptive to general faculty input, not just the hand-selected few who are strongly disposed to agree. The Provost (as chief academic officer) needs to be a stronger advocate for the will of the faculty. She undercuts this by pushing for strong policies that create new ways to fire faculty.

Some retention packages have been offered to faculty in my department which are fair. However, multiple retention packages have been provided to at least two individuals in a very short time period. Other well deserving faculty are not being recognized and these retention packages should be balanced with the performance of other faculty. This could create an environment where faculty realize that they need to go get offers from other institutions to obtain salary parity with their departmental colleagues.

Nothing at this time.

10. Please add any additional comments that might assist the committee that is conducting this evaluation.

start a search

Too often the provost has acted in the capacity as a president. I admire many of her qualities. I'm not sure she admires mine.

Our university has been extremely fortunate to have Provost Hoffman and I dread the day that she retires or leaves for another opportunity. She has set up an extremely positive environment for new faculty; one that is heads and shoulders more collegial and functional than other institutions. That doesn't just happen by accident.

I believe that Betsy Hoffman is doing a fantastic job.

They need to keep Betsy Hoffman as provost, especially with a new president of the university.

Of all the Provost at ISU within the past 20 years, I believe that Dr. Elizabeth Hoffman is the best. There seems to be advancements, positive growth, improved morale, and better accessibility.
has provided important leadership

Due to verbal comments made while in Colorado, I have no, (0), zero, zip respect for the provost.....My only question is why was she ever brought to Ames. She is an embarrassment to our fine University.

It is interesting that this survey was sent only to faculty. Professional and merit administrative staff interacts with the Provost's Office more frequently than most faculty.

Iowa State brags that it serves more people of Iowa that the other regents' institutions. But undergraduates know something is wrong and as they see their classes get larger and the quality of instruction slide, they are increasingly they are unhappy with their educational experience. If the misappropriation of funding continues, ISU's designation for the top destination for Iowans may not continue.

A vision for the academic programs is sorely lacking in the provost's office.

The two most impactful faculty activities in terms of student satisfaction and success (teaching and advising) have virtually no value in P&T or salary adjustments. This truly needs to change if we want faculty to have the same dedication to students that they have to generating grant dollars and publishing papers. All of these activities are important to the sustainability of the university, but only some are rewarded.

I believe the Provost carries out the responsibilities of the position well, but that much of the work is done behind the scenes so that faculty perception of the work is unclear because we do not have a connection to the work being done.

I have always thought it a bad idea to combine the positions of EVP with Provost. I've gotten the feeling that this Provost has spent more time on the EVP part of her job than the Provost job. I hope President Leath does not continue this.

I have found it very easy to like Betsy Hoffman. She is competent, friendly, and inspires confidence.

Provost Hoffman has done an excellent job of handling herself through these difficult economic times. She made decisions that were difficult to make and was transparent in the process which made it easier to understand and accept.

It is always hoped that those who contribute to the survey will get a summary of the findings.

I think the Provost should be much more visible around campus.

Has consistently started and said the right things but has not followed through on them.

The Provost has been very cautious and as result this timidity was contagious among the staff, resulting in long delays on decisions that should be routine, such as hiring decisions. Rather than providing oversight the Provost office appears to reflect that they are the only ones capable of making good decisions.
The University has over the past 20 years moved from a decentralized, humane organization to a highly autocratic, politicized and demoralizing organization. It is a regrettable shift. The losses are huge. The creation of the provost office appears to have been a major factor in this shift.

The Provost position is extremely demanding. It appears to have wearied our current Provost.

Make sure that the Provost's Office accepts the suggestions and makes improvements.

Reduce the number of people in the management levels; add resources to the operating levels spa, ospa.

Do a reality check on policies before putting them in place.

I have been pleased, and inspired, each time I have encountered the Provost. She commands the floor, but is not intrusive. It is a good feeling that our new president has a stellar Provost to work with. I hope he feels that way. I also hope she stays with us here at ISU!

your organizational chart is not up to date

Perhaps more communication of strategy for future planning, continued emphasis on scholarship of teaching, distance ed,

ISU is a land-grant, public university, and currently we are losing the grounds to call ourselves either. Budget cuts resulted in chasing external money. This further reduced student programs, faculty satisfaction, and overall ISU experience. Provost Hofmann was not up to the task of facing these times with vision and proper decision making. The entire Provost office leadership in the past several years behaved according to "gold parachute" standards, and the results are poorer education quality, less motivated faculty and numerous wrong decisions that were not in accordance with a university mission.

My overall assessment is Dr. Hoffman and her Office are and have outstanding. I trust her leadership.

I have had no contact with this office, so these questions do not apply to me at all. Sorry that I couldn't be of more help!

making budgets fair is really hard, especially when there is so much history of doing things a certain way without thinking about it--we are moving at least somewhat in the right direction

The Provost's Office should remove Dean Wintersteen before the scandals hit the news media and shame this university.

none

Overall, Betsy has done a great job. She can engage herself more and understand the units and programs better.
Our Provost, Betsy Hoffman, has done a very good job overall, and I am glad she is not leaving to become president at New Mexico. I hope we can keep her with us.

Keep Provost Hoffman at ISU.

I would like to see the Provost’s office put pressure on HR to develop some wellness facilities on campus for faculty. Nothing fancy, just a small room of aerobic equipment and perhaps a few weights. I know of no faculty member who wants to encounter students while exercising. I am aware of several other schools that offer this fairly inexpensive benefit to their faculty. This is definitely a quality-of-life issue, and would likely save on health care costs over the long run. It might even pay for itself.

The Provost seems well-intentioned, but tentative. Many people are saying she was too damaged by her experience as a President to function as more than a "caretaker" Provost.

Dr. Hoffman is a true human being and she really understand the concerns of faculty.

The faculty should not sit by while other departments are decimated. Realize that the same thing could happen to your department for equally invalid reasons.

Overall I think OSPA and other offices have gotten much better about meeting researchers needs.

Betsy Hoffman is a good role model for ISU.

The committee may consider siggetions to the provost office of developing visible discussion with faculty as lesning sessions

I'm really not sure what exactly the office is responsible for fully.

It is frankly difficult for me to see the impact of the Provost's Office since whatever it does normally is filtered through college and departmental administrative levels before it gets to me.

The next questions asks me to respond to a website. How does one respond to a web site? What "confidential web site?"

Betsy Hoffman has been an extraordinary EVP/Provost for our land-grand university. Wow! We are lucky to have had her calm, stable leadership through a remarkably turbulent period (budget cuts.) Onward!!

There are certainly areas that need improvement and some areas of frustration (graduate programs, budget authority and personnel actions by staff that seems out of proportion with their purpose), but overall the provost and her office have done an excellent job over the last five year of supporting faculty and moving the academic side of campus forward according to the universities strategic plan.

You should come into the trenches with us to see how standards have dramatically declined over the past decade. Our students are drastically unprepared for university level work. I have graduating
seniors who have never written research papers, who can barely structure sentences that are grammatically correct, and who, no matter how hard I try are unable to offer critical thinking analysis, written or oral. Many of my colleagues are turning to online teaching [even 400 level core courses are going online] to rid themselves of face to face opportunities to educate our students and think of little other than building their CVs. Those courses do not contain rigor and in some departments there are no courses dedicated to majors. This means students are no longer being educated to find positions in this global economy. For far too many the degree they will be given [not earned] will not be worth the paper on which it is written. I remember when ISU was a first rate institution in the social sciences.

I'm sorry I'm of little assistance.

Less meetings and more action by this unit would be helpful. Seems things are overly discussed and that process is valued over product.

Concern about faculty moral. Some faculty have not had raises for five years. Young families are hurting and ISU leadership is not doing enough to keep tenured faculty from being scooped up by other schools. Huge investment loss. Faculty needs to be a priority. Provost relationship with faculty is key to ISU success. Need to make faculty a priority and give them back the fur-low funds. They need a financial gesture. Cut other waste. Faculty are working harder have larger classes and more responsibilities due to attrition and hiring hold. They have not seen administrators being downsized or taking on extra burdens. Appears as if administration is "above" the recession realities.

n/a

I have found Provost Hoffman in particular to be very encouraging and supportive of faculty growth, particularly for younger faculty. The strategic initiative program is also very important - it has made possible activities that I have been trying to pursue for several years and gives them legitimacy within my department and college.

There is no trust with the evaluating committee. It can be Provosts friends and it will be hard to imagine a change in Provosts office activities.

Take care of the faculty especially those that are the bread and butter of the University that do not look for another job every year as a means to get their salary increased. These faculty members produce the quality educational programs that really mark the university what it is today.

None

For a university the size of ISU I believe the Provost office works quite well.

RMM has a disaster for the university
Clear commitment to academic values have characterized the functioning of the Provost's Office. Fairness and clear communication have been very much in evidence.

P and T appeals

Greater transparency about budgetary priorities, and in particular the ways in which and grounds whereby the Office of the Provost makes strategic investments in high-priority programs would be desirable.

I think Dr. H does a great job and my impression is that her staff is efficient and helpful as well.

The Provost is a stubborn person who thinks she has all the answers. She does not like to listen to others’ opinions. She actively discriminates against faculty who hold differing viewpoints. She does not believe in meritocracy. She might appear to care about scholarships but her actions indicate otherwise. She is overbearing when speaking in public and inevitably ends up talking about herself.

I am grateful for all the "behind the scenes" work the Provost's Office does to keep the university running as well as it does.

provost office is not helpful for faculty issues; "pass the buck" mentality.

I hope the provist will help the COB dean's search committee find someone who can build us into a real business college.

I have found the Provost to be excellent in dealing with difficult issues. In my experience this included a previous Dean of Engineering and the HR department

Overall, this office is doing a good job, but I'm not sure it's reaching everyone. The good news is that the right people are in place (like Provost Hoffmann), the next goal is how to spread her passion and support to those departments that need it.

None

Betsy has a broad range of experience - including some very difficult situations - and this stands her and ISU in great stead. She is a great asset for us and has very well-honed instincts about how to "do the right thing" when things get complicated.

ISU has been very fortunate to have such a highly committed individual be willing to serve in such a difficult financial environment. We owe her many thanks.

No

none

We are lucky to have this individual as Provost and she does an outstanding job!

Betsy, please do not step down yet. We need you!
Overall things are OK, but I wish the Provost office was more involved in helping fix the chaos at the College of Design.

We need a survey like this NOW for the college leadership.

I have not had any direct interaction with the provost Office. I will guess that that means things are going well.

We're lucky to have this provost here with us. The administration should do all that it can to keep her at ISU.

When things don't get done, or don't get done on time, I don't think the answer is to ask for MORE work out of the people there. While there may be minors gains to be made in efficiency, I think that the Provost office needs MORE people doing the important work that needs to get done.

Why were only 2 of the land grant university's 3 missions covered in the survey? Why were there no questions about Extension and Outreach?

The previous question to rate the different duties of the provost did not have an option to mark N/A as there are some duties we have not had experience to evaluate. I marked those as Not Sure.

Betsy +++

Dave H ++

Dawn +

none

interaction directly with faculty

not yet ready to rate

I believe that change would be good in that office.

none

I am happy with our current provost's performance.

I work with multi-disciplinary teams of scholars on campus to develop grant proposals and conduct research. Consistency of leadership at the upper levels of administration is always helpful in making the proposal submission process smooth (e.g., obtaining letters of support from administrators and maintaining an infrastructure for coordinating efforts across colleges). But I would not give the Provost's office such high rankings if these university leaders weren't doing a great job. The truth is that they are extremely competent and skilled, and have done a great job despite huge economic hurdles.
Top marks for Provost Hoffman. A tireless, dedicated, fair, responsible, and creative administrator!

Morale is at an all time low among faculty. No raises for years and still we hire new people and grow the university. Doing more with less can only go so far. It is time for the leadership to stand up and say "enough" and either limit enrollment or find funding to pay employees.

Provost needs to engage faculty -- not use forums to discuss her record of excellence

My title or rank, as specified on my contract, is lecturer, not instructor. That should be updated for future surveys. It could be confusing, if in fact, there are separate titles of lecturer and instructor.

I am very new to ISU

budget process in particular seems to lack clarity and transparency.

Please bring a provost that has significant research record.

She is a strong, stable, and effective Provost.

As a faculty member, I am pleased to have the opportunity to work with the Provost.

Provost Hoffman is an excellent administrator, she is a great asset to ISU.

She is an insightful person with the larger vision of building excellence for faculty at this university.

NA

Provost provides excellent leadership and is an excellent representative of this university.

Overall, the University has been very well administered in recent years. Thank you President Geoffroy and Provost Hoffman!

Provost Hoffman is an excellent administrator.

Provost Hoffman is a remarkably capable person, and ISU has benefited from her knowledgeable leadership. I am appreciative of Dawn Bratsch-Prince’s efforts as well

I have only been at the university for four months, thus I don’t have much information to base my opinions.

Provost Hoffman is an excellent provost and the office is effective

Personally, Dr. Hoffman is friendly and

greets faculty on campus with a sense of familiarity. I’m not sure she remembers me, but she acts as though she does when I see her on campus.

Sorry, I have had almost no interaction with the Provost and can’t help you out with this survey.
thank you

na

She is an excellent scholar and role model for women in academia --

Even when I disagree with her policy prescriptions, I have never doubted that she made an informed and defensible position. I also never doubted that she made decisions that she felt would best improve the reputation and functioning of the institution and not to benefit any individual agenda.

I have a feeling that faculty at other institutions wish they had a provost as good at Dr. Hoffman.

The Provost Office encourages diversity, and we are slowly improving in having more female faculty receive faculty awards, but the number of male recipients, the number of male award presenters, and especially the number of male endowed chairs is far, far higher than the number of females receiving these honors.

She has been a very good Provost.

Our Provost is doing a wonderful job!

Hopefully there will not be major changes in the Provost's office with the change in President.

none to add.

Dr. Hoffman has been excellent provost and encourage the committee to reappoint her for another term.

The Provost has been a strong and effective leader, although it seems clear that either she is looking for other opportunities or she believes the new administration will be asking her to.

From what I hear from my colleagues, etc. I think Dr. Hoffman represents us well and is working hard to improve our university.

Understand that my comments and survey are limited by my lack of first-person interaction with the Office of the Provost.

Overall, this Provost has done well. Unclear if she fits in with Leath's plans.

none

That's about it. In my view, we're quite lucky to have Provost Hoffman in the position.

N/A
In person, Dr. Hoffmann does an excellent job explaining policies that are not as clear when they come as dictates from the Provost's Office.

I think budget woes have diverted the provost's attention from the other functions of the university. Blame the Iowa legislature for not being more supportive of higher education.

It is a good idea for the Provost's office to seek faculty input for many issues from the right people.

I appreciate the magnitude of the responsibilities of the administration. All of the university leaders deserve our thanks for all that they do. It could be helpful for faculty to feel the Provost's office is more accessible as a source of support, information and faculty advocacy.

Provosts role in eliminating faculty status for academic librarians.

I think it would be very worthwhile to do a top to bottom analysis of the organization of the Provost office to ask whether the current structure is effective in carrying out the "strong Provost" model that was developed by President Geoffroy. Has responsibility for new and complex tasks simply been dumped on the office? Have the job descriptions of the Associate Provosts and their areas of responsibility and lines of authority been examined since the provost took on the additional responsibility of being the Executive Vice President?

I have always felt our Provost works extremely hard at her job, and that she is well attuned to the chemistry and politics that swirl around Beardshear. I have no serious, let alone even minor, complaints that would warrant any suggestion that it is time to look for a replacement.

Having said as much, it is highly likely that this sort of blind evaluation process will attract a far higher percentage of responses from faculty with an axe to grind versus those who have little or no concern...and even then that many of the former sort will write negative accounts that are highly critical and likely to be on the fringe of being anywhere near truthful and honest. Personally, this sort of process strikes me as moreso intended to drum up negatives...so my closing comment would be to adamantly filter these findings with a jaundiced eye regarding the extreme negative end of the spectrum.

Overall, Provost Hoffman has done an excellent job. President Leath would do well to have Provost Hoffman continue in her position until retirement or a time of her choosing.