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2016 UNIVERSITY SENATE SURVEY RESULTS
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The University Senate Administrative Review Committee (ARC) has assembled and analyzed the results of the 2016 Survey of Faculty and Professional Staff regarding Stony Brook Administrators and Services. This document contains a discussion of the results.

The Senate conducted the survey at the beginning of the Fall 2016 semester, using a Web-based survey instrument. The Senate announced the survey in various University settings, notably via the weekly e-mail Campus Events notice and at full Senate meetings. The Senate Administrative Review Committee (ARC) administered the survey using the Qualtrics system licensed to Stony Brook. DoIT supports the Qualtrics system, and also provided technical support to the ARC during the preparation of the survey. The survey was open to all faculty and staff, as defined by the DoIT message system. This included full and part-time faculty and staff, which is a more expansive target audience than that which was used for the 2013 full survey and the 2014 mini-survey. For example, the target audience for the 2016 survey included emeritus faculty members, part-time faculty, and staff not represented by UUP. We included filtering questions at the start of the survey to allow us to identify the effects of the expanded survey audience.

The overriding concerns of the committee were in preserving the anonymity of the respondents and encouraging a representative set of responses. The survey was anonymous. There was no request for identifying information and comments were carefully screened to eliminate information that could identify the respondent.

Each question in the 2016 survey had response categories appropriate to the question. We generally categorized the responses into a positive response (e.g., good or excellent) and negative (fair or poor). This was a change from the 2013 survey in which we had three positive categories (e.g., excellent, very good, and good) along with the two negative categories. This has made comparisons with the 2013 survey results slightly more difficult, but provides a more accurate assessment of faculty and staff attitudes.

The table below summarizes the responses. The table only considers positive and negative responses, ignoring “no basis for opinion,” “don’t know,” and no selection. In the 2013 survey, we used the ratio of the positive score percentage to the negative score percentage to compare responses. Our experience with that survey led us to look for a better measure. For this survey, we sometimes show the ratio, but more often cite the percentage of positive responses, defined as the ratio of the number of positive responses to a question with the total number of responses, ignoring responses that did not state an opinion. As with the 2013 survey report, the table below includes a column for notable results, denoting a notable positive result with a check mark and a recommended area of attention with a pointing finger symbol. The notable results column and the detailed question summary are only provided when the number of responses to a given question is 30 or greater.
The 2013 survey requested comments from respondents for each of the survey questions. We found that there was a tendency to repeat comments, and consequently the 2016 survey grouped related questions into groups, and included only one comment request for the group. As with most surveys in the past, the comments as a whole were more negative than the scores, indicating that respondents with mainly positive scores tended to not provide comments. The ARC compensated somewhat for this by selecting comments to publish that appeared consistent with the numerical scores. These selected comments are included in each of the detail sections later in this report.

The table below summarizes the results of the responses to questions, but omits questions that served as filters or categorization. For example, responses to question group 7 and parts of group 3 are not included in the table since those questions did not lend themselves to a numerical evaluation. We summarize the responses to those questions following the table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Notable</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Total Responses</th>
<th>Positive Response</th>
<th>Negative Response</th>
<th>Positive (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☛</td>
<td>Q2.1 - How would you rate the quality of the maintenance of the buildings, elevators, air conditioning, bathrooms, and heating on campus?</td>
<td>1,479</td>
<td>540</td>
<td>939</td>
<td>36.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☑</td>
<td>Q2.2 - How would you rate the quality of the maintenance of the campus grounds?</td>
<td>1,458</td>
<td>1,095</td>
<td>363</td>
<td>75.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Q2.3 - How would you rate the quality of the maintenance of classrooms?</td>
<td>1,087</td>
<td>537</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>49.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Q2.4 - How would you rate the speed and quality of response to building and office repair and rehabilitation orders?</td>
<td>1,291</td>
<td>557</td>
<td>734</td>
<td>43.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☛</td>
<td>Q3.1 - How would you rate the availability of free parking on campus?</td>
<td>1,288</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>1,333</td>
<td>16.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notable</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Total Responses</td>
<td>Positive Response</td>
<td>Negative Response</td>
<td>Positive (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Q3.2 - How would you rate the availability of paid parking on campus?</td>
<td>1,210</td>
<td>573</td>
<td>637</td>
<td>47.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Q3.3 - How would you rate the cost of campus parking facilities?</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>426</td>
<td>774</td>
<td>35.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Q3.4 - How would you rate the maintenance of campus parking facilities?</td>
<td>1,341</td>
<td>689</td>
<td>652</td>
<td>51.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>Q4.2 – How would you rate the quality of Campus Child Care Services?</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>91.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Q5.2 – How would you rate the services offered by the Procurement Office?</td>
<td>542</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>55.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Q5.3 – How would you rate the relocation of Procurement Office to Research &amp; Development Park?</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>47.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Q5.4 – How would you rate Wolfmart?</td>
<td>467</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>43.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Q5.5 - How would you rate Central Receiving?</td>
<td>430</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>62.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Q6.1 – How would you rate the Office of Conference and Special Event Planning?</td>
<td>584</td>
<td>423</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>72.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Q6.2 – How would you rate the Environmental Health and Safety Office?</td>
<td>690</td>
<td>494</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>71.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notable</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Total Responses</td>
<td>Positive Response</td>
<td>Negative Response</td>
<td>Positive (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>Q6.3 – How would you rate the University Police services?</td>
<td>1,092</td>
<td>914</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>83.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Q6.4 – How would you rate Human Resource services (e.g., Payroll, Benefits, classification &amp; compensation)?</td>
<td>1,345</td>
<td>791</td>
<td>554</td>
<td>58.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Q6.5 - How effective are the University's diversity procedures in hiring, retention, and promotion?</td>
<td>1,348</td>
<td>881</td>
<td>467</td>
<td>65.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Q8.2 – How would you rate the physical collection of books and periodicals in the Stony Brook Library System?</td>
<td>596</td>
<td>369</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>61.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>Q8.3 – How would you rate the collection of electronic databases and e-journals in the Stony Brook Library System?</td>
<td>708</td>
<td>533</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>75.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>Q8.4 – How would you rate the services and facilities of the West Campus library?</td>
<td>522</td>
<td>388</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>74.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>Q8.5 – How would you rate the services and facilities of the HSC Library?</td>
<td>379</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>79.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>Q9.1 – How would you rate the Office of the Division of Undergraduate Education, which includes the Honors College, URECA, and Academic Judiciary?</td>
<td>439</td>
<td>368</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>83.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>Q9.2 – How would you rate the Office of the Provost on the administration of the Undergraduate Colleges?</td>
<td>475</td>
<td>282</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>59.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notable</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Total Responses</td>
<td>Positive Response</td>
<td>Negative Response</td>
<td>Positive (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Q9.3 – How would you rate the services of the Office of Academic and Transfer Advising Services?</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>69.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Q9.4 – How would you rate the services of the Disability Support Services Office?</td>
<td>580</td>
<td>432</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>74.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Q10.1 - Are you satisfied with the quality and quantity of recreational facilities available to faculty and staff?</td>
<td>673</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>369</td>
<td>45.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Q10.2 – How would you rate Audio-Visual Support on campus?</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>649</td>
<td>351</td>
<td>64.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✔</td>
<td>Q10.3 – How would you rate the services of the Career Center?</td>
<td>469</td>
<td>374</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>79.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Q11.1 - To what extent are faculty permitted to be involved in making decisions within your department?</td>
<td>1,060</td>
<td>758</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>71.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Q11.2 - To what extent do professional staff participate in decisions within your department?</td>
<td>1,210</td>
<td>793</td>
<td>417</td>
<td>65.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Q11.3 - To what extent do you participate in decisions within your department?</td>
<td>1,306</td>
<td>830</td>
<td>476</td>
<td>63.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Q11.4 - To what extent are you satisfied with the frequency of external reviews (regular reviews of an academic department by an external evaluator)?</td>
<td>664</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>55.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notable</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Total Responses</td>
<td>Positive Response</td>
<td>Negative Response</td>
<td>Positive (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Q11.5 - How effective are periodic reviews of academic departments and administrative offices in assessing their strengths and weaknesses?</td>
<td>767</td>
<td>403</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>52.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Q12.1 - How effective is the University Senate in addressing [faculty / staff] concerns?</td>
<td>552</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>48.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Q12.3 - How effective is your college academic governance in addressing faculty and staff concerns?</td>
<td>596</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>45.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Q12.4 - How would you rate the effectiveness of your representative to report back to your department the activities of the University Senate?</td>
<td>741</td>
<td>373</td>
<td>368</td>
<td>50.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Q12.5 - How effective is the Professional Employees Governance (PEG) Board?</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>32.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Q13.1 - How would you rate Blackboard?</td>
<td>796</td>
<td>564</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>70.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Q13.2 – How would you rate Solar?</td>
<td>1,276</td>
<td>868</td>
<td>408</td>
<td>68.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Q13.3 - How would you rate the West Campus Electronic Mail System (Google Apps)?</td>
<td>999</td>
<td>770</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>77.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Q13.4 - How would you rate the HSC Electronic Mail System (Outlook)?</td>
<td>403</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>64.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notable</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Total Responses</td>
<td>Positive Response</td>
<td>Negative Response</td>
<td>Positive (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Q13.5 - How would you rate the Services of DoIT, such as Softweb, teaching workshops, client support, software training, 4-HELP on East Campus, and assistance to faculty and students?</td>
<td>1,114</td>
<td>785</td>
<td>329</td>
<td>70.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Q13.6 - How would you rate the quality of University wireless service in the part of the University where you work?</td>
<td>1,194</td>
<td>776</td>
<td>418</td>
<td>65.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Q14.1 - How would you rate West Campus University communications, including print, e-mail alerts, and the University Web site (<a href="http://www.stonybrook.edu">http://www.stonybrook.edu</a>) (Not your department Web site)?</td>
<td>1,043</td>
<td>751</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>72.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Q14.2 - How would you rate East Campus University communications, including print, e-mail alerts, and the Stony Brook Medicine Web site (<a href="http://www.stonybrookmedicine.edu">http://www.stonybrookmedicine.edu</a>) (Not your department Web site)?</td>
<td>544</td>
<td>361</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>66.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Q15.1 - How would you rate the University President (Samuel Stanley) on his vision for the future of Stony Brook?</td>
<td>1,142</td>
<td>637</td>
<td>505</td>
<td>55.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Q15.2 - How would you rate the University President (Samuel Stanley) on leadership?</td>
<td>1,109</td>
<td>549</td>
<td>560</td>
<td>49.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notable</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Total Responses</td>
<td>Positive Response</td>
<td>Negative Response</td>
<td>Positive (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Q15.3 - How would you rate the University President (Samuel Stanley) on the quality of administrative appointments?</td>
<td>915</td>
<td>361</td>
<td>554</td>
<td>39.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Q15.4 - How would you rate the Office of the University President on administrative management, including accessibility, responsiveness, and budgetary decisions?</td>
<td>819</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>552</td>
<td>32.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Q15.5 - How would you rate the University President (Samuel Stanley) on his representation of Stony Brook's needs to Albany and the outside community?</td>
<td>780</td>
<td>459</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>58.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Q15.6 - To what extent does the University President (Samuel Stanley) involve faculty and staff through the governance structure in decisions that affect policy?</td>
<td>638</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>456</td>
<td>28.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Q16.1 - How would you rate the Provost (Dennis Assanis) on his vision concerning the academic future of Stony Brook?</td>
<td>627</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>379</td>
<td>39.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Q16.2 - How would you rate the Provost (Dennis Assanis) on leadership?</td>
<td>625</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>397</td>
<td>36.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Q16.3 - How would you rate the Provost (Dennis Assanis) on the quality of administrative appointments?</td>
<td>538</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>347</td>
<td>35.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notable</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Total Responses</td>
<td>Positive Response</td>
<td>Negative Response</td>
<td>Positive (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Q16.4 - To what extent does the Provost (Dennis Assanis) involve faculty and staff through the governance structure in decisions that affect policy?</td>
<td>433</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>32.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Q16.5 - How would you rate the Office of the Provost on administrative management, including accessibility, responsiveness, and budgetary decisions?</td>
<td>514</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>28.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Q17.1 - How would you rate the Senior Vice President for the Health Sciences (Kenneth Kaushansky) on his vision concerning the academic future of HSC Schools?</td>
<td>534</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>48.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Q17.2 - How would you rate the Senior Vice President for the Health Sciences (Kenneth Kaushansky) on leadership?</td>
<td>535</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>46.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Q17.3 - How would you rate the Office of the Senior Vice President for the Health Sciences on administrative management, including accessibility, responsiveness, and budgetary decisions?</td>
<td>446</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>35.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Q17.4 - How would you rate the Senior Vice President for the Health Sciences (Kenneth Kaushansky) on the quality of administrative appointments?</td>
<td>427</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notable</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Total Responses</td>
<td>Positive Response</td>
<td>Negative Response</td>
<td>Positive (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☛</td>
<td>Q17.5 - To what extent does the Senior Vice President for the Health Sciences (Kenneth Kaushansky), involve faculty and staff through the governance structure in decisions that affect policy?</td>
<td>363</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>29.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☛</td>
<td>Q18.2 - How would you rate the Vice President for Economic Development (Yacov Shamash) on the quality of administrative appointments?</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>72.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✅</td>
<td>Q18.3 - To what extent does the Vice President for Economic Development (Yacov Shamash) involve faculty and staff in decisions that affect policy?</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>79.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✅</td>
<td>Q18.4 - How would you rate the Vice President for Economic Development (Yacov Shamash) on its effectiveness in gaining financial support for Stony Brook?</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>78.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✅</td>
<td>Q19.2 - How would you rate the Office of the Vice President for Finance (Lyle Gomes) on the quality of his administrative appointments?</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>82.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✅</td>
<td>Q19.3 - To what extent does the Office of the Vice President for Finance (Lyle Gomes) involve faculty and staff through the governance structure in decisions that affect policy?</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>69.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notable</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Total Responses</td>
<td>Positive Response</td>
<td>Negative Response</td>
<td>Positive (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Q19.4 - How would you rate the Office of the Vice President for Finance (Lyle Gomes) on its effectiveness in developing financial plans for Stony Brook?</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>71.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Q20.2 - How would you rate the Office of the Executive Director of the Stony Brook Foundation on administrative management, including accessibility, responsiveness, and budgetary decisions?</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>63.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Q21.2 - How effective is the Office of the Vice President for Advancement in raising funds for the University?</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>88.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Q21.3 - How would you rate the Office for Advancement on administrative management, including accessibility, responsiveness, and budgetary decisions?</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>66.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Q22.2 - How would you rate the Office of the Vice President for Student Affairs on leadership in improving the quality of student life?</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>70.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Q22.3 - How satisfied are you with the degree to which the Office of the Vice President for Student Affairs involves faculty, staff, and students in policy decisions?</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>73.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notable</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Total Responses</td>
<td>Positive Response</td>
<td>Negative Response</td>
<td>Positive (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☛</td>
<td>Q22.4 - How would you rate the Office of the Vice President for Student Affairs on its overall effectiveness in support of the university’s academic mission?</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>73.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☛</td>
<td>Q23.2 - How would you rate the Office of the Vice President for Research on administrative management, including accessibility, responsiveness, and budgetary decisions?</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>60.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☛</td>
<td>Q23.3 - How would you rate the Office of the Vice President for Research on development of new research initiatives?</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>53.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☛</td>
<td>Q23.4 - To what extent does the Vice President for Research (David Conover) involve faculty, staff, and students through the governance structure in decisions that affect policy?</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>50.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☛</td>
<td>Q23.5 - How would you rate the services of iLab?</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>28.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☛</td>
<td>Q24.2 - How effective is the Office of Sponsored Programs in terms of the speed and quality with which they process grant proposals?</td>
<td>314</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>87.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☛</td>
<td>Q24.3 - Are the services received commensurate with the overhead charged for grants?</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>27.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notable</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Total Responses</td>
<td>Positive Response</td>
<td>Negative Response</td>
<td>Positive (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☛</td>
<td>Q24.4 - How satisfied are you with the distribution of the indirect cost allocation?</td>
<td>282</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>29.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Q24.5 - How effective is the Office of the Vice President for Research in the management of grants once they have been awarded?</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>79.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Q24.6 - How effective is the Office of the Vice President for Research in keeping you informed about funding opportunities, target dates, and application deadlines for external funding?</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>73.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Q24.7 - How would you rate the Office of Research Compliance?</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>75.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Q25.2 - How would you rate the Office of the Chief Information Officer on development of new IT initiatives?</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>67.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Q25.3 - To what extent does the Office of the Chief Information Officer involve faculty and staff through the governance structure in decisions that affect policy?</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>62.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Q26.2 - How would you rate the Dean of the Graduate School (Charles Taber) on administrative management, including accessibility, responsiveness, and budgetary decisions?</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>86.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notable</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Total Responses</td>
<td>Positive Response</td>
<td>Negative Response</td>
<td>Positive (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>Q26.3 - How would you rate the Dean of the Graduate School (Charles Taber) on leadership in improving the quality of graduate student life?</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>87.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>Q26.4 - To what extent does the Graduate School facilitate the quality of graduate education?</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>85.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Q26.5 - To what extent does the Graduate School facilitate the recruitment of quality graduate students?</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>74.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✔️</td>
<td>Q26.6 - To what extent does the Dean of the Graduate School (Charles Taber) involve faculty, staff, and students through the governance structure in decisions that affect policy?</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>81.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Summary of Results for Deans**

Question group 27 includes seven questions concerning the head of various units within the University. The survey included a question in which the respondents were asked to self-identify the unit in which they work. The unit options included in that question are:

- College of Arts and Sciences
- College of Business
- College of Engineering and Applied Sciences
- Graduate School
- Office of Student Affairs
- School of Dental Medicine
- School of Health Technology & Management
- School of Journalism
- School of Marine & Atmospheric Sciences
- School of Medicine
- School of Nursing
- School of Professional Development
- School of Social Welfare
- Undergraduate Colleges
- University Administration Offices
- University Libraries
- Other

The question group for unit heads include seven distinct questions fully identified in the unit head section, later in this report. For the purposes of this summary, we use the following descriptions of the questions:

- Academic leadership
- Administrative management
- Administrative appointments
- Use of governance structure
- Support for research
- Recruit researchers
- Retain researchers

The table below includes the number of responses for each unit, along with a summary of the positive and negative categories when the ratio of positive responses exceeded either the positive or the negative threshold. We also include a column for any responses worthy of attention.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Note</th>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Positive</th>
<th>Negative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>College of Arts &amp; Sciences</td>
<td></td>
<td>331</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Academic leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean Sacha Kopp</td>
<td>☛</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Administrative management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Administrative appointments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Use of governance structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Support for research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Recruit researchers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Retain researchers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Note</th>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Positive</th>
<th>Negative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>College of Business</td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>The quantity of responses was not sufficient to publish the results, but the responses to questions and comments were generally positive.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean Manuel London</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Engineering &amp; Applied Sciences</td>
<td></td>
<td>107</td>
<td>▪ Academic leadership &lt;br&gt;▪ Administrative appointments &lt;br&gt;▪ Retain researchers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean Fotis Sotiropoulos</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate School</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>The quantity of responses was not sufficient to publish the results, but the responses to questions and comments were generally positive.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean Charles Taber</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of Student Affairs</td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>The quantity of responses was not sufficient to publish the results, but the responses to questions and comments were generally positive.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter Baigent, VP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Dental Medicine</td>
<td></td>
<td>82</td>
<td>▪ Academic leadership &lt;br&gt;▪ Administrative management &lt;br&gt;▪ Administrative appointments &lt;br&gt;▪ Use of governance structure &lt;br&gt;▪ Support for research &lt;br&gt;▪ Recruit researchers &lt;br&gt;▪ Retain researchers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean Mary Truhlar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Health Technology &amp; Management</td>
<td></td>
<td>88</td>
<td>▪ Academic leadership &lt;br&gt;▪ Administrative management &lt;br&gt;▪ Administrative appointments &lt;br&gt;▪ Use of governance structure &lt;br&gt;▪ Support for research &lt;br&gt;▪ Recruit researchers &lt;br&gt;▪ Retain researchers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean Craig Lehmann</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit</td>
<td>Note</td>
<td>Responses</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>Negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Journalism</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>The quantity of responses was not sufficient to publish the results. The responses to questions and comments were mixed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean Howard Schneider</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Marine &amp; Atmospheric Sciences</td>
<td></td>
<td>31</td>
<td>While the total number of responses was 31, the number of responses with a basis for opinion was only 14. Therefore, we did not consider the quantity of responses to be sufficient to publish the results. However, the responses to questions and comments was generally positive.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interim Dean Larry Swanson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Medicine</td>
<td>☛</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>★ Administrative management</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean Kenneth Kaushansky</td>
<td>☛</td>
<td></td>
<td>★ Administrative appointments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>★ Use of governance structure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Nursing</td>
<td>☛</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>★ Administrative management</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean Lee Anne Xippolitos</td>
<td>☛</td>
<td></td>
<td>★ Use of governance structure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Professional Development</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>The quantity of responses was not sufficient to publish the results, but the responses to questions and comments were generally positive.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice Provost Charles Taber</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Social Welfare</td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>The quantity of responses was not sufficient to publish the results, but the responses to questions and comments were generally positive.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean Jacqueline B. Mondros</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate Colleges</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>The quantity of responses was not sufficient to publish the results, but the responses to questions and comments were generally positive.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice Provost Charles Robbins</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Administration Offices</td>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>The quantity of responses was not sufficient to publish the results, but the responses to questions and comments were generally positive.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Overall Themes

We gleaned the following themes from the survey results:

- Overall satisfaction with general campus services. For example, the responses were very positive for the Career Center, the Child Care Center, DSS, the campus police, and many of the services provided by the Office of the CIO.

- Significant improvement in the scores within the School of Social Welfare. This school had scored very negative scores and comments in past surveys, all under the leadership of the former Dean. The responses to questions along with the comments indicate a substantial improvement under the leadership of Dean Jacqueline Mondros.

- Widespread dissatisfaction with academic management, as reflected in overall negative responses for five academic units: College of Arts & Sciences, University Libraries, School of Medicine, School of Dental Medicine, and School of Nursing. The most notable of these is the precipitous decline in scores for the College of Arts & Sciences, especially notable since there was a change in Deans since the 2013 survey. A point noted in the detailed section of this report is a possible relationship between negative scores in these units and the negative scores in administrative management for the Office of the Provost and the Office of the President. In one sample analysis, we compared the total scores for the President with the scores among respondents from the College of Arts & Sciences (CAS). The scores among CAS respondents were lower than those from the overall University.

- Extraordinary quantity of negative scores and comments concerning the state of many buildings on campus. The comments provided details of serious infrastructure issues in a wide range of buildings.
SURVEY RESPONSE DETAILS

RESPONDENT CLASSIFICATION

Q1.1: WHAT IS YOUR PRIMARY ROLE AT STONY BROOK?

Respondents reported the following roles at Stony Brook:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th># Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tenured Faculty</td>
<td>21.24%</td>
<td>336</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure-Track Faculty</td>
<td>6.70%</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Tenured Faculty</td>
<td>9.73%</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinical Faculty</td>
<td>7.77%</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff-UUP</td>
<td>35.21%</td>
<td>557</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff-Classified</td>
<td>6.51%</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>5.75%</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None of the above</td>
<td>7.08%</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,582</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q1.2: WHAT IS YOUR CURRENT EMPLOYMENT STATUS?

The overwhelming majority of the respondents (90.2%) reported full-time status. 4.9% reported part-time, greater than 50% and 3.2% reported part-time less than 50%. Of the remainder, 3 were on sabbatical and 24 reported none of the above.
### Q1.3: RELATIONSHIP TO SENATE

Approximately one third of the respondents reported some interaction with the University Senate, with the details shown in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Senate Involvement</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>#Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Served as a Senator</td>
<td>30.54%</td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Served on one of the standing committees of the University Senate</td>
<td>36.93%</td>
<td>185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Served as a Senator in the Senate of your School (e.g., Arts &amp; Sciences, Medicine, and Engineering)</td>
<td>24.75%</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attended a Senate meeting within the past 2 years</td>
<td>46.31%</td>
<td>232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attended a Senate meeting since you started at Stony Brook</td>
<td>62.48%</td>
<td>313</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attended a Senate Committee meeting</td>
<td>41.52%</td>
<td>208</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Q4: At what location do you work?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>%</th>
<th># Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>West Campus</td>
<td>65.30%</td>
<td>1,033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Campus</td>
<td>30.59%</td>
<td>484</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manhattan</td>
<td>0.63%</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southampton</td>
<td>1.64%</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUNY-Korea</td>
<td>0.51%</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other campus location</td>
<td>6.51%</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Q5: In which unit do you work?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>#Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>College of Arts and Sciences</td>
<td>21.24%</td>
<td>336</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Business</td>
<td>1.07%</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Engineering and Applied Sciences</td>
<td>6.83%</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate School</td>
<td>0.51%</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of Student Affairs</td>
<td>3.54%</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Dental Medicine</td>
<td>5.18%</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Health Technology &amp; Management</td>
<td>5.56%</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Journalism</td>
<td>0.63%</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Marine &amp; Atmospheric Sciences</td>
<td>1.96%</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Medicine</td>
<td>15.36%</td>
<td>243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Nursing</td>
<td>2.47%</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. MAINTENANCE

Q2.1: HOW WOULD YOU RATE THE QUALITY OF THE MAINTENANCE OF THE BUILDINGS, ELEVATORS, AIR CONDITIONING, BATHROOMS, AND HEATING ON CAMPUS?

1,479 respondents provided responses to this question. 36.5% of those responses rate the maintenance of buildings as excellent or good, while 39.8% rated it as fair and 23.7% rated it as poor.

Q2.2: HOW WOULD YOU RATE THE QUALITY OF THE MAINTENANCE OF THE CAMPUS GROUNDS?

1,458 respondents provided responses to this question. 21.7% rated the maintenance of the grounds as excellent, while 53.4% rated it as good. 20.5% rated the maintenance of the grounds as fair, while only 4.4% rated it as poor.

Q2.3: HOW WOULD YOU RATE THE QUALITY OF THE MAINTENANCE OF CLASSROOMS?

1,087 respondents provided responses to this question. 7.3% rated classroom maintenance as excellent, while 42.1% rated it as good. 39.2% rated classroom maintenance as fair, while 11.4% rated it as poor.

Q2.4: HOW WOULD YOU RATE THE SPEED AND QUALITY OF RESPONSE TO BUILDING AND OFFICE REPAIR AND REHABILITATION ORDERS?

1,291 respondents provided responses to this question. 8.5% rated the speed and quality of response to repair orders as excellent, while 34.6% rated it as good. 38.0% of respondents rated it as fair, while 18.8% rated it as poor.
Representative Comments

674 respondents provided comments, almost all expressing significant displeasure with various aspects of building maintenance. The sheer scope of these comments is overwhelming. If we had published all the comments, it would take well over 50 pages in this report. The comments covered the spectrum of building features (e.g., elevators, AC, structure, etc.) and included specific mention of many of the older and larger buildings on campus. In addition, many of the respondents commented that a once a day bathroom maintenance policy in the busy buildings is insufficient.

The University has cash-starved the departments charged with building maintenance -- so of course the buildings are not well-maintained. The entire emphasis of the University seems to be the construction of "New" buildings -- while everything else is left to rot.

A consistent problem I have noticed over 25 years at Stony Brook is that very nice renovations (both buildings and grounds) are completed but there is no preventative maintenance so it eventually becomes an eyesore/problem that could have been prevented by routine upkeep.

AC and heating - it is always freezing in my office. My requests to look into it resulted in a thermometer being placed into my office "for a few weeks". It has been there for about 3 months now and no one cares. Server room ACs fail routinely and the temperature spirals out of control (this happens both in the winter and in the summer).

AC and heating systems are rarely optimal for the season. Bathrooms are filthy for the amount of people that use them.

AC system does stay at the same temperature, it changes during day and usually it is very cold and it causes problems with performing experiments and well-being of the people in the lab, bathrooms are not very well taking care of, some stalls have water on the floor and it is not fixed at all, Water in the bathrooms is cold - rather inconvenient.

AC/Heating issues in old buildings need to be updated. We have mold issues, water leaks, inconsistent temperatures in rooms because units are old and do not function properly. Maintenance workers are constantly being called upon to fix broken parts of old and outdated units. They are also called upon to adjust temperature issues when they can be doing more important work on campus.

Although the new buildings e.g. Frey Hall are in great shape - the older buildings - for instance the Staller Center are in desperate need of repairs. The HVAC system is constantly failing and needs a complete overhaul - instead of fixing the root of the problem the university keeps paying astronomical amounts of money to fix the damages in the aftermath of floods, etc - they should be investing the money to fix what's wrong and save money in the long run.

Attempts are made to keep up as well as possible, but over the years, funding has been continually cut for maintenance staff and equipment, and it is apparent. Many of the old buildings need attention, especially the ductwork, plumbing, brickwork, doors and windows.
"Bathroom on the 2nd floor of the Engineering Building is in severe need of updates. One of the sinks does not work correctly. Soap dispensers are broken. Extremely hateful and racist comments permanently etched into the bathroom stalls. Also, the building is old and has asbestos floor and ceiling tiling, this needs to be removed for the health and safety of the students and employees. Elevator in Engineering breaks down often and does not have appropriate up and down buttons.

Most classrooms are out of date. Many labs do not have the proper chemical ventilation—chemicals are released without proper filtration to the environment.

Bathrooms at HSC are deplorable at times compared to other parts of campus. Heating and AC sometimes have issues. We just seem to look very old and tired compared to other areas. Carpeting in the HSC offices is absolutely disgusting, in spite of repeated requests to clean it.

Campus is slow to adopt new, helpful technologies. Building and technology are behind times in many areas of campus. Even NYC public schools now have art boards. Heating & AC very old, hard to control and either on full blast or not functioning

Classrooms outdated with technology that works part of the time. Lecture halls outdated and not up to par with a University of our stature. Classrooms on par with those in inner city schools.

Cockroaches in buildings are disgusting. We do not live in a third world country and should not have to work in these conditions

The annual AC shutdown is deplorable. It often occurs during the hottest time of the year and employees are unable to work because it is so hot. Other times of the year, we are unable to control the AC because of an adjacent office that has controls that supersedes ours.

Blinds in Melville library are missing. We are told the budget does not allow their replacement."

Everyone knows that the School of Dental Medicine was built as a temporary building back in the 1970s. The building is showing its age with AC and heating. There is no happy medium in the department offices or in between buildings. Some offices are extremely cold and others are too hot to sit in. None of the windows open in Rockland Hall to allow air flow and those who have windows that can open in Westchester have to deal with bugs and other such critters, even in the winter. I had blowing hot air in the middle of the summer this year and it took 3-4 phone calls to Facilities before anyone came to look into the issue.

Grounds are the best maintained. Bathrooms the least. AC is lacking in classrooms, especially for summer courses.

Harriman Hall is horrible. The classrooms smell badly, are poorly ventilated, and are often either very hot or very cold. My office is also either very hot or very cold. This building is in desperate need of a complete remake.
HVAC issues in the Staller Building (particularly the Music wing) have been noted as critical, but there has been little institutional discussion of moving forward with major repairs (that could sustain the building for another 10+ years) or consideration of constructing new facilities for departments housed within Staller.

I am located in the SBS building that is starting to show its age. Building exterior maintenance, including grounds immediately adjacent to the building is less than spectacular. When walking around campus, some of the older buildings are starting to show their age and need extensive external and internal renovation.

I am located in the Social and Behavioral Sciences Building and the heat/air conditioning is very difficult to control (probably because it’s an old building).

I find the quality to be very uneven...some buildings are in excellent condition and others are in poor condition; but the problem seems less about the maintenance and more about the need for renovations.

I gave fair and good ratings because as a whole the campus is fair to good. However, it should be noted that some buildings (Admin and Wang) are maintained beautifully while others (Harriman) are maintained horribly.

I have worked at and attended several top public research universities throughout the country. Unfortunately, Stony Brook’s maintenance of buildings and grounds ranks FAR below maintenance at the others. It has been the one thing I have always been ashamed of.

Maintenance of the grounds is good, the plantings are welcome, and the operation of the water features is impressive to visitors.

I teach in Javits 100, perhaps the largest lecture hall on campus. While the technology in that room is great, the room itself is a nightmare. Desks broken, the ceiling has stuff hanging, and it is often dirty. Constructing another large lecture hall should be a very high priority if Javits 100 can ever get the renovation it sorely needs.

In the twenty-first century, a major institution of higher learning should have toilets that flush, running warm water, and regulated temperatures that do not necessitate indoor wearing of fleece to stay warm.

"It is a routine occurrence to have nearly 100% humidity in our building, causing rust and component failure in electronic equipment (mostly computers). Repeated calls to maintenance have failed to address the problem. Rooms are often over cooled or over heated all through the year.

The construction in the various School of Medicine department labs in the HSC has resulted in old equipment and Chemical and Biohazard materials, from cleaned out labs, accumulating in the common walking areas (hallways, elevator cores). Some of this actually poses a fire hazard as the smoke doors and fire extinguishers have been blocked off. These items are left for many months and are really an embarrassment for visitors to see."
The grounds of SBU are beautifully maintained. Shirley Kenny, President emeritus, did a wonderful job of landscaping, building ‘the brook’ and fountain and making SBU a people friendly campus.

The ground on West Campus are beautiful. Unfortunately, not much attention has been given to the grounds on East Campus.

3. PARKING

Q3.1: HOW WOULD YOU RATE THE AVAILABILITY FREE OF PARKING ON CAMPUS?

1,288 respondents provided responses. Only 19.8% of respondents rate the availability of free parking on campus as excellent or good, 26.2% as fair and 54.0% rate as poor. The positive/negative ratio was 19.8/80.2.

Q3.2: HOW WOULD YOU RATE THE AVAILABILITY OF PAID PARKING ON CAMPUS?

1,210 respondents provided responses. Overall, the responses were negative, with 47.4% of the respondents rating the availability of paid parking on campus as excellent (8.2%) or good (39.2%). There were 417 respondents rating as fair, 34.5%. Only 18.2% rated the availability of paid parking as poor. The positive/negative ratio was 47.4/52.6.

Q3.3: HOW WOULD YOU RATE THE COST OF CAMPUS PARKING FACILITIES?

1,200 respondents provided responses. Overall, the responses were negative, with 427 respondents rating as fair 35.6%, and 347 respondents rating as poor, 28.9%. There were 129 respondents rating excellent, 10.8% & 297 as good, 24.8%. The positive/negative ratio was 35.5/64.5.

Q3.4: HOW WOULD YOU RATE THE MAINTENANCE OF CAMPUS PARKING FACILITIES?

There were 1,341 respondents that provided responses. The responses were nearly split, with slightly higher positive responses. 689 rated excellent (7.2%) or good (44.2%). A total of 652 respondents rated as fair (44.2%) or poor (14.0%). The positive/negative ratio was 51.4/48.6.

Q3.5: DO YOU THINK THAT ADEQUATE CONSIDERATION HAS BEEN GIVEN TO HANDICAPPED PARKING, ESPECIALLY IN NEW PARKING LOTS AND NEAR NEW UNIVERSITY BUILDINGS?

752 responses were provided. 553 responses were yes, a total of 73.5%. 199 responses were no, 26.5%. The positive/negative ratio was 73.5/26.5.
Q3.6: DO YOU THINK THAT THE ENFORCEMENT OF HANDICAPPED PARKING SPACES, SPECIFICALLY INAPPROPRIATE USE OF HANDICAPPED PARKING, IS TOO STRICT OR NOT STRICT ENOUGH?

665 respondents provided an opinion. 34 (5.1%) responses were that enforcement is too strict. 388 (58.4%) responses were that enforcement is about right. 243 (36.5%) responses were that enforcement is not strict enough.

Representative Comments

There were a total of 452 comments. A total of 3 comments were positive.

Always a challenge to invite people to campus.

As a person with a handicap sticker there are no handicap spaces in any of the lots by the Wang Center. I chose not to use the garage because it is not affordable for me […] nothing is done for people that have a handicap parking decal and they [disabled persons] actually have to park a distance away.

Parking for ADA is NOT being addressed as the University has added many parking lots all over and exclude accessible pathways and parking within the ADAAG minimum distances to an accessible entrance. For instance, once example is a parking lot behind Life Sciences and Laufer Center was added and not one ADA spot was considered but excluded. The ADA entrance is automated but the ADA parking lot is far beyond remote to make it truly compliant and accessible for students, faculty and staff. […] Accessibility is being ignored and not inclusive to all who visit the campus.

Snowplow drivers seem to take great pride in dumping mountains of snow in the handicap spots. On the rare occasions that they clear a handicap spot, the snow is piled up so high there is no path to a sidewalk.

Parking enforcement is nonexistent after 4pm.

It’s incredibly hard to find parking after 10am. I have to give myself 40 minutes to ensure I’m not late.

Free parking for faculty and staff is woefully inadequate. We never leave campus for lunch because it’s not uncommon to spend an hour looking for a free space when we return. It seems all new lots are pay lots.

The parking garages are dark, dank, and decrepit. Pedestrians need walkways, stairs, doors that are better prepared and lit.

Lighting in parking garage is often not working (in full rows of lights, not just individual lights) creating an unsafe environment.

HSC parking garage can be very difficult during certain times of the day. We pay for parking and can spend 30 minutes driving through the garage looking for a legal spot.
Hospital parking is inadequate.
I can always find a space to park in the garage so I am a happy camper.
Admin garage is a good deal.

4. CAMPUS CHILD CARE SERVICES

157 respondents have had experiences with Campus Child Care Services. Almost all of them responded with specific answers to the two questions in this group.

Q4.2: HOW WOULD YOU RATE THE QUALITY OF CAMPUS CHILD CARE SERVICES?

Among the 149 responders who answered this question, 69.1% rated the quality as Excellent, 22.8% Good, 4.7% Fair and 3.4% Poor. The remainder declined to rate the service.

Q4.3: DOES THE FULL-TIME COST OR LACK OF A (CHEAPER) PART-TIME OPTION DETER YOU FROM USING THE CAMPUS CHILD CARE SERVICES?

Of the respondents with experience with this service, 26% indicated that the full-time cost, or lack of a cheaper part-time option, deterred them from using the Campus Child Care Services. An additional 2 respondents did not say whether they had experiences with Campus Child Care Services, but indicated that cost was a deterrent.

Representative Comments

This is an excellent childcare center, probably the best in the area. However, costs keep increasing so I would like to see Stony Brook subsidize it more so that students and other faculty can take advantage of it. It would be great even to see it grow and take in more children from a broader community and socioeconomic background. The teachers should also be paid more.

SBCCSI is MAGICAL!!! Their rates are competitive with other facilities in the geographical area. Their staff is compassionate and caring and offer a wide variety of hand-on learning activities. (I moved my child from another facility to SBCCSI. The structure of the program cannot be compared.)

This is an excellent facility, but our tuition goes up 2-3% every year so that the teachers there get a raise, despite the fact that faculty have not gotten the same raise in every year. I am ok with it since these wonderful teachers should be paid more. It is troubling to me though, that our daycare teachers do not make enough to send their own children to the daycare facility in which they work because they do not make enough. I would ask for more subsidy to this childcare facility. As the number of female faculty increase and the number of male faculty with working spouses, subsidizing childcare is one way to support and retain faculty. I also
wish I did not have to send my kids to childcare at such an early age even with how wonderful this daycare is. Faculty and staff need PAID paternity/maternity leave!!!

FABULOUS resource -- but the University should provide subsidies to help the childcare center and to enable them to reduce cost to families and to expand. This is vital to our ability to recruit and retain faculty, staff, and students.

What is the University doing about the wait list? What is the University doing about assessing for priority need for students with parents?

Very helpful Tuition Assistance for those in low-income brackets. Need more slots on sliding fee scale.

There is no distinction between how many children you are paying for to attend childcare. The only consideration is your salary. The discounted rates apply nicely to those families that have only one child, however if you have two children (which we do) then the lack of any consideration for paying double the amount really hurts, and it becomes significant burden, especially if you are just above the salary level to receive any discount (which we are). I would recommend considering a second type of discount if you have two or more children enrolled in the daycare services. Overall, the childcare is fantastic at Stony Brook.

They have a long waiting list. It took over 6 months for my child to be admitted. It is expensive, lacks support from the University, which is shameful. Consequently, they cannot offer any flexibility especially in summer time when faculty are not necessarily teaching.

5. PROCUREMENT OFFICE

QUESTION 5.1: DO YOU HAVE REGULAR CONTACT WITH THE PROCUREMENT OFFICE?

899 responded that they did not have contact with the procurement office while 553 respondents that they did.

QUESTION 5.2: HOW WOULD YOU RATE THE SERVICES OFFERED BY THE PROCUREMENT OFFICE?

542 respondents provided responses. The overall response was mixed, with 12.2% rating the services as excellent, 42.8% as good, 30.4% as fair, and 14.6% as poor. The positive/negative ratio was 55/45.
QUESTION 5.3: HOW WOULD YOU RATE THE RELOCATION OF PROCUREMENT OFFICE TO RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT PARK?

286 respondents provided responses. The overall response was mixed, with 10.8% rating the services as excellent, 36.4% as good, 25.5% as fair, and 27.3% as poor. The positive/negative ratio was 47.2/52.8.

QUESTION 5.4: HOW WOULD YOU RATE WOLFMART?

467 respondents provided responses. The overall response was mixed, with 6.6% rating the services as excellent, 37.3% as good, 37% as fair, and 19.1% as poor. The positive/negative ratio was 43.9/56.1.

QUESTION 5.5: HOW WOULD YOU RATE CENTRAL RECEIVING?

430 respondents provided responses. The overall response was generally positive, with 12.8% rating the services as excellent, 49.5% as good, 30.2% as fair, and 7.4% as poor. The positive/negative ratio was 62.3/37.7.

Representative Comments

*Being off the main campus is a handicap. Although I am only here one month it does not feel like I work for Stony Brook University and being off campus restricts the events that one can attend.*

*I ALWAYS say the hardest thing to do at Stony Brook is to spend money- it almost makes getting grants not worth it. The system is cumbersome and has way too many restrictions. It would be much better to have a spending card linked directly to the grant, and then just have us audit the charges each month.*

*I am pretty biased because I work in Procurement. I think we do the best we can with the staff we have. NYS procurement laws are always changing, so it’s a constant issue of keeping up. I do think that we can do more for end users, and I look forward to improving services for them as best as I can. However, I think a lot of end users feel like Procurement doesn’t care about their opinions or is generally hard to work with. We are so far away from main campus, that they lose touch with our staff. Face to face meetings for larger procurements are essential, and it is a hassle for some end users to get to our office during regular business hours. I wish we could do more outreach events on campus so that new people can be caught up on how to do business at Stony Brook, and veteran administrative staff can get frequent refreshers. While procurement staff may be on Wolfmart every day, we have to understand that a lot of end users login infrequently, and only when they need to order something. A lot of time end users will end up doing things on their own because they feel intimidated to call us, but I’d like for them to treat us as a resource in guiding them through the proper process in purchasing/paying.*
I don’t have sufficient foul language to express my opinion of the stupid nitpicking imposed on the process of obtaining reimbursement for the travel that as a research faculty we are expected to do. The hours wasted over claims should be billed to the state. I understand that the Procurement folks are doing what the state requires, but the cumulative effect is repeatedly to tell us “we don’t trust you” and the damage that does to morale and engagement with the University goes far beyond the sums involved. It was bad enough to know we are functionally identical to the DMV but to learn that the same policies govern the University and the Department of Corrections is yet more evidence of the bureaucratic rigidity and inefficiency of the state.

I have a laboratory funded by NIH. Wolfmart is a disaster. It is difficult to use, and we have had orders disappear, or get hung up without explanation. Some of the people in Procurement are terrific, others not so much.

I have had nothing but good experiences when I have had to contact procurement either by email or by phone. The people there are helpful and knowledgeable. They go out of their way to help and resolve any issues you may contact them about. I have even had someone who has an "away message" on their email contact me about issues because they checked their email while on leave and could answer my questions. This is a great bunch of people who, I’m sure, do not receive enough praise for the work they do.

It takes a long time for faculty to be reimbursed for travel.

Non-Wolfmart items from vendors other than VWR/Fisher/etc. take far too long to order and process. Many items are much more easily ordered from Amazon.com, but procurement cards are not issued for use on Federal grant funds. Other universities where I have experience routinely authorize the use of a credit card for every grant account and every department account.

Occasionally disorganized. Tendency to push work back onto department instead of problem solving to serve department

Overall, the Procurement and Wolfmart do the job. However, we have had numerous experiences of delayed orders and lack of follow up, or various other forms of complications with Procurement. Mis-deliveries have also happened several times

6. ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICES

QUESTION 6.1: HOW WOULD YOU RATE THE OFFICE OF CONFERENCE AND SPECIAL EVENT PLANNING?

584 people provided a response to this question. The overall response was positive with 18.3% rating the unit as excellent, 54.1% as good, 21.6% as fair, and 6.0% as poor. The positive/negative ratio was 72.4/27.6.
QUESTION 6.2: HOW WOULD YOU RATE THE ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH AND SAFETY OFFICE?

690 people provided a response to this question. The overall response was positive with 16.5% rating the unit as excellent, 55.1% as good, 22.5% as fair, and 5.9% as poor. The positive/negative ratio was 71.6/28.4.

QUESTION 6.3: HOW WOULD YOU RATE THE UNIVERSITY POLICE SERVICES?

1,092 people provided a response to this question. The overall response was positive with 30.5% rating the unit as excellent, 53.2% as good, 13.6% as fair, and 2.7% as poor. The positive/negative ratio was 83.7/16.3.

QUESTION 6.4: HOW WOULD YOU RATE HUMAN RESOURCE SERVICES (E.G., PAYROLL, BENEFITS, CLASSIFICATION & COMPENSATION)?

1,345 people provided a response to this question. The overall response was positive with 12.5% rating the unit as excellent, 46.3% as good, 28.1% as fair, and 13.1% as poor. The positive/negative ratio was 58.8/41.2.

QUESTION 6.5: HOW WOULD YOU RATE THE UNIVERSITIES DIVERSITY PROCEDURES IN HIRING, RETENTION, AND PROMOTION?

1,284 people provided a response to this question. This question retained the five response categories found in the 2003 survey. For the positive calculation, we used extremely, very, and moderately effective as the positive group, with slightly effective and not at all effective in the negative group. The overall response was 4.8% rating the unit extremely effective, 19.1% as very effective, 41.5% as moderately effective, 18.7% as slightly effective, and 15.9% as not effective at all. The positive/negative ratio was 65.4/34.6.

Representative Comments

328 respondents provided comments about this group of questions. A number of comments were questioning the universities commitment to diversity in the faculty and staff.

Conferences & Special events need to train new employees of University policies and procedures which were not evident in recent interactions with their office.

Environmental Health and Safety personnel are helpful, but they need additional resources to update their website. In the case of emergency need for information, many links are dead or obsolete.
Regarding campus police, they do excellent work and have a quick response time to emergency. However, with non-emergency issues they are rather lax. I once needed a police report and went to the campus police office. I was told I had to wait for the "next shift" to come on. I waited two and a half hours to get a police report.

Hiring people and providing raises is a difficult procedure, with many administrative hurdles. Hiring practices are too lengthy.

Concerning diversity hiring, there are 31 members of the Hospital's Executive Staff, and there is not one person of color in that group.

As a faculty member of color, I find SBU's rhetoric on diversity laughable and placating. They need to hire more faculty of color, provide more resources to departments who serve those constituencies (Africana Studies, Hispanic Languages, Asian and Asian American, Women's Gender and Sexuality Studies, etc.) if they are actually going to claim that they support "diversity".

The new TMS system did away with the EEO committees that had actual humans looking out for equal employment opportunities for protected classes. This was a shame. At a time when our students are telling us they would like to see people who look like them as their faculty and staff, we should be listening. I'm heartened that the Diversity Plan has made this a priority.

7. TEMPERATURE COVERAGE

Q7.1. – HAVE YOU BEEN ASKED TO PROVIDE SIGNIFICANT TEMPORARY COVERAGE FOR SOMEONE WHO HAS VACATED A POSITION OR WAS OUT ON EXTENDED LEAVE?

1,406 respondents replied to this question, 543 of whom replied Yes and 863 replied No. The number appears to be a bit skewed since the other parts of the section reflect respondent numbers that are significantly different. This discrepancy might be due to reporting from the East and West campuses as well as from the job descriptions of the respondents. Using the reported numbers above, 38.6% were requested to provide coverage for someone else while 61.4% were not.

Q7.2 – WERE YOU COMPENSATED FOR THESE ADDITIONAL DUTIES?

There were 1,050 responses to this question. 89 respondents replied Yes (they were compensated), 658 replied that they were not compensated (No), and 303 replied that they did not know if they had been compensated or not (Don’t Know). If one eliminates the Don’t Know responses, the percentage of Yes answers is 11.9% to 88% of No answers. If Don’t Know responses are included, the percentages change to: 8% Yes, 63% No, 29% Don’t Know.
Q7.3. – HOW LONG DID THESE ADDITIONAL DUTIES LAST?

A total of 596 responses were recorded to this question. 163 (27%) responded that the coverage lasted from 1-3 months; 160 (27%) responded that the coverage lasted for 4-6 months; 70 (12%) responded that the coverage lasted for 10-12 months; and 203 (34%) responded that the coverage lasted more than 12 months. There was some indication in the comments that these “temporary” coverage positions had lasted considerably more than 12 months, had been permanently assigned, and/or that the positions being covered were permanently eliminated.

REPRESENTATIVE COMMENTS:

There were 221 comments provided by respondents in this question group.

More effort needs to be made on the part of administration to fill vacancies in a timely manner. Pushing the work on already overworked staff members creates a great deal of stress for the employee and leads to poor service being provided to our students and faculty. Holding back on hiring replacement staff is not the way to solve a budget crisis.

Several positions in our department were vacated and not refilled. Duties of those individuals have fallen on the rest of the team, while very large salaries have been committed to individuals hired at top executive levels. Those individuals do not contribute to the work demanded of our team, and have proven to be "workplace bullies" as defined by SUNY in a recent newsletter.

Many of my colleagues have been asked to fill in and have gladly done so, however they generally have to go through great efforts to receive remuneration for added responsibilities, which shouldn’t be. They are also supposed to continue with their current primary position roles, while filling in for the spots they’ve been asked to cover.

Hiring is slow. Promotions and salary increases extremely slow. Money would be the best compensation for the extra workload, but I know of no department that compensates. Sad, no? Abusive, no? Thank goodness, the staff is terrific and willing to keep departments moving along at the usual SBU quick pace.

The University does not compensate enough for this. There is still an expectation that you will cover your original position, plus do the additional work. Anyone who thinks this is all being done in a 40- hour workweek, or even just an additional 8 hours per week, is delusional. It’s more likely that people are getting the work done by answering emails while eating meals, from breakfast right through bedtime, and all weekend long. Capping the compensation at 20% (and it’s rare that they will allow 20%) is shameful.

Three people chipped in to cover an employee who retired. Her position could not even begin to be replaced until the day she retired. Then there was the permission for the search, the search, the interviews, etc. All three of us are doing the best we can, but speaking for myself, I had to take time away from my teaching prep to attend to some of the retired person duties. Trying to find time to write and publish was out of the question. I was lucky I had time to eat
and sleep. I cannot speak for my other two colleagues (staff member, not faculty), but I know they were doing work well after 6:00PM. This situation is very bad for morale, and it is not good for all the students we serve in our regular jobs.

It took almost 2 years to get a replacement to department office staff causing serious loss of work motivation decreased quality of work performed and increased load on faculty without required administrative services,

[...] If there are to be cuts to staff, it should be felt and participated on by ALL departments.

8. LIBRARY SERVICES

Q8.1: DO YOU USE LIBRARY SERVICES?

Of the 1,402 respondents, 742 responded that yes, they use Library Services, 52.9%. The remaining 660 responded no, 47.1%.

Q8.2: HOW WOULD YOU RATE THE PHYSICAL COLLECTION OF BOOKS AND PERIODICALS IN THE STONY BROOK LIBRARY SYSTEM?

596 respondents provided responses. Overall, the responses were positive, with 369 or 61.9% of the respondents rating the conditions of books and periodicals excellent (12.9%) or good (49.0%). There were 158 respondents rating as fair, 26.5% and 11.6% rating as poor. The positive/negative ratio was 61.9/38.1.

Q8.3 HOW WOULD YOU RATE THE COLLECTION OF ELECTRONIC DATABASES AND E-JOURNALS IN THE STONY BROOK LIBRARY SYSTEM?

708 respondents provided responses. There were 533 positive responses were, with 75.3% of the respondents rating the conditions of electronic databases and e-journals excellent (28.1%) or good (47.2%). There were 175 respondents rating as fair, 19.4% or poor 5.37. The positive/negative ratio was 75.3/24.7.

Q8.4: HOW WOULD YOU RATE THE SERVICES AND FACILITIES OF THE WEST CAMPUS LIBRARY?

Only 522 respondents provided responses. Overall, the responses were positive, with 388 or 74.3% of the respondents rating the services and facilities of the West Campus Library excellent (23.8%) or good (50.6%). There were 134 respondents rating as fair, 21.8% and 3.8% rating as poor. The positive/negative ratio was 74.3/25.7.
Q8.5: HOW WOULD YOU RATE THE SERVICES AND FACILITIES OF THE HSC LIBRARY?

There were 379 respondents to this question. 303 rated excellent (26.91) or good (53.0%). A total of 76 respondents rated as fair (16.4%) or poor (3.7%). The positive/negative ratio was 79.9/20.1.

Representative Comments

There were a total of 173 comments. The respondents were less positive and more negative in the comments.

*Interlibrary Loan Office is remarkably fast and efficient. I've found this to be consistently the case for many years now.*

*The librarians are very knowledgeable, helpful and professional.*

*We have a bare bones collection of books on contemporary Asian studies, for a University that claims to have a global curriculum. There needs to be more books purchased on contemporary Asian studies. That aside, the library staff are wonderful and helpful. I enjoy dealing with the staff, who are always very quick to assist faculty with their research.*

*There seems to be a negative change over the past few years. Staff are helpful, but no longer as warm and welcoming. [...] it almost seems as if the staff members are afraid to be seen speaking with patrons.*

*Highly knowledgeable and effective staff - they just need an adequate budget to offer standard University level Library Services.*

*Though the facilities are improved aesthetically, the library seems to be a colder place full of very unhappy workers.*

*Handicapped access to stacks a problem.*

*Major science journals are not available from the library's e-journal collection. This can be a barrier to productive research.*

*It is overly difficult to get access to online journal articles when off campus. Other universities provide proxy server settings that make it just as easy to read journals off campus as it is to read them on campus.*

9. EDUCATION SUPPORT

Q9.1. - HOW WOULD YOU RATE THE OFFICE OF THE DIVISION OF UNDERGRADUATE EDUCATION WHICH INCLUDES THE HONORS COLLEGE, URECA, AND ACADEMIC JUDICIARY?

A total of 439 responses were recorded to this question. 119 (27%) responded Excellent, 240 (56.7%) responded Good, 55 (12.5%) responded Fair, and 16 (3.6%) responded Poor. The ratio of positive to negative is 83.7% to 16.1% or 5.1. Part of the difficulty reported in answering this question is the multiple nature of the included programs (the Honors College, URECA, and the Academic Judiciary). It
was suggested that these be separated from the Division of Undergraduate Education in the future for a more specific reading.

Q9.2. - HOW WOULD YOU RATE THE OFFICE OF THE PROVOST ON THE ADMINISTRATION OF THE UNDERGRADUATE COLLEGES?

There were a total of 475 responses to this question, more than to the previous question, which might indicate the fact that respondents factored out the multifaceted nature of Question 9.1. 81 (17%) responded Excellent; 201 (42.3%) responded Good; 133 (28%) responded Fair; and 60 (12.6%) responded Poor. The ratio of positive to negative responses is 59.3% to 40.6%.

Q9.3. - HOW WOULD YOU RATE THE SERVICES OF THE OFFICE OF ACADEMIC AND TRANSFER ADVISING SERVICES?

Of the 360 total responses, 90 (25%) rated this office Excellent; 161 (44.7%) rated it as Good; 88 (24.4%) rated it as Fair; and 21 (5.8%) rated it as Poor. The ratio of positive to negative responses is 69.7% to 30.2% or 2.3.

Q9.4. - HOW WOULD YOU RATE THE SERVICES OF THE DISABILITY SUPPORT SERVICES OFFICE?

There were a total of 580 responses to this question. 142 (24.4%) rated the office as Excellent; 290 (50%) rated it as Good; 121 (20.8%) rated it as Fair; and 27 (4.6%) rated it as Poor. There were a wide variety of comments concerning this office, some of which did not fall under its purview (e.g. the availability of handicapped parking spots, provisions for those with temporary handicapping conditions, and the cleanliness and clearing of handicapped parking spaces during inclement weather). It is possible that those issues affected the overall ratings above even though the office does not have control over the aforementioned situations.

REPRESENTATIVE COMMENTS:

Since there were comments on the individual services and offices in this section, comments have been selected for as many as applicable.

I frequently interact with Disability Support Services and the support they provide with their small staff is remarkable. They are incredibly student centered while upholding academic integrity. Similarly, the advisors at ATAS are outstanding.

The office of Academic Judiciary operates according to a set of policies that, unlike those at many other universities, create extremely adversarial relationships between faculty and students. Faculty are given the choice, if they want to address issues of apparent student academic misconduct and believe that if actual misconduct is found to have occurred there
should be some consequence for it, of either reporting it to the Academic Judiciary immediately without even having the chance to talk with the student about it first (resulting in a procedure in which the student is told that the faculty member has made an "accusation" against them, and in which the student gets the impression that the faculty member doesn’t even care enough about the student to have had a conversation with him or her first), or, if the faculty member feels uncomfortable with the above harsh process, being forced to act as if nothing whatsoever has happened, i.e. not being allowed to penalize the student in even the most minor way whatsoever (for example, through a minor grade reduction). Furthermore, in cases where hearings are held, they are held in an extremely adversarial fashion, as if in a court of law, leading to students feeling extremely angry with faculty for subjecting them to this process. While staff are doubtless extremely competent and are clearly acting in what they genuinely believe to be in the best interests of students, these policies have led many faculty members whom I know (the ones with prior experience with the Academic Judiciary, that is), including myself, to avoid reporting issues to the Academic Judiciary in cases where there is any doubt whatsoever. This is a real shame, because I think there is a very good argument to be made that cases of academic dishonesty should indeed be reported to the University.

The undergraduate colleges are a device for segregating students according to interest and very counterproductive to good curriculum.

The Honors College is no longer run out of CAS with a real chair. It is run by NTPs who do not have the appropriate academic qualifications.

We act as if the transfers don’t exist: just look at the SBC which assumes everyone is here for four years. In short, the undergraduate program at SB has never been shallower. All dean of CAS cares about is revenue. He knows nothing about curriculum, nor does he care about it.

In HSC, in my department, students do not register until the summer for the fall and late fall for spring. Many of our DSS students are unable to attain exam appointments that coincide or are close to their regularly scheduled exam. There is no DSS office on East campus to accommodate these students. Many classes will hold lecture after an exam or quiz. Having the students go to west campus to take their exam and then come back to east campus is very inconvenient.

DSS does not have the capacity to accommodate the number of students who require accommodations. Oftentimes we have to find a place for students to take an exam if they need additional time or decreased distractions.

I feel my students often need more support than they can find; they tell me that advising is impersonal and unhelpful in their experience.

My experience with the Division of Undergraduate Education, under the leadership of the Vice Provost, is that they provide an amazing service, support, and advocacy for undergraduate students and academic success. However, they are seriously (almost embarrassingly) under-resourced, which is immensely limiting. I would think given the University’s retention and graduation goals that this division and its services would be more of a priority. The Undergraduate
Colleges, in my experience, is an exceptional first-year academic program for students and provides great opportunities for collaboration across academic affairs and student affairs, but again, where are the resources? With the most first-year students enrolled ever at the University, they have the least number of advisors in the history of the implementation of the program, due to the inability to rehire vacancies (i.e. budget, etc.). Moreover, the 102-seminar program, which is a faculty-taught seminar, constantly has to struggle to get buy-in from faculty. If the University cares about connecting first-year students and faculty, they need to rethink the way this is communicated to faculty and/or create incentives for faculty to teach (credit banking toward course release, etc.).

Disability Support Services often times appears to be understaffed, and this can cause considerable burden on students who need accommodations. Acquiring accommodations seems to require a lot of time and effort on the part of the student, and many of these students have trouble with handling the many responsibilities of their college careers already. It would be great if more support for students could be provided through this office to allow easier access to mandated accommodations.

Transfer office needs to provide better support for transfer students, especially international transfer students. I have encounter transfer students who were not sure about what they needed to graduate, and some could not graduate on time because they were not properly advised on fulfilling their SBC requirements. International transfer students need more attention and guidance. When it comes to transferring credits, it is irresponsible to tell students to go look for individual department and sort out the credit transfer themselves. Better training for advisors on their duties and responsibilities might be needed.

These offices seem to be helpful overall. However, something is still wrong because 4-year and 6-year graduation rates are not moving up the way the University needs them to. This means that something is wrong, and whether we are appropriately and effectively advising undergraduates is well open to question. Better academic program and course assessment practices need to be put in place. Graduation requirements need to be better vetted. Transfer students should be given the absolute truth about what credits can carry in. Advisors need to work out full academic plans covering the courses needed to graduate and when they need to take them to graduate. Availability of core courses needs to be guaranteed.

Money needs to be set aside for more and more qualified advisors and to help students financially who trip on their way toward graduation. Advisors need to understand how financial aid will be affected if they stumble or fail to proceed.

Finally, there is a mishmash of tools used by academic advising. Some visible to students and some not. Whatever tool they use should be visible to the students.

The first question is a loaded one as you are asking us to compare three distinctly different units. The judiciary does a reasonable job. URECA is brilliantly run by Mrs. Kernan and should receive much more support than it does. The Honors College has serious issues with a lack of
diversity. In fairness, I do not know what efforts have been made to diversify the Honors College, but I am disappointed that every time I see a photo of students in the Honors College, there is a noticeable lack of students of color.

On transfers. We have articulation agreements that allow students beginning at community college to gain admission to SB on minimal credentials. We worked hard on the SB Curriculum to strengthen Gen Ed, but the advisers have more or less been told not to delay anyone’s graduation for a Gen Ed requirement, so a proportion of our students simply make an end run on what we thought was educationally advisable. International students register last and often end up placed in classes for which they do not have the language capabilities. It is hard on the instructors and much harder on the students, some of whom return home out of pocket and ashamed.

10. CAMPUS SERVICES

**Q10.1. - ARE YOU SATISFIED WITH THE QUALITY AND QUANTITY OF RECREATIONAL FACILITIES AVAILABLE TO FACULTY AND STAFF?**

This question had five response options: very satisfied, somewhat satisfied, neither satisfied nor dissatisfied, not very satisfied, and not at all satisfied. 911 respondents had experience with recreational facilities, and selected one of the above five choices. For the positive/negative calculation, we ignored the 238 responses for which the option selected was “neither satisfied nor dissatisfied.” Among the four remaining options, these, 120 were very satisfied, 184 somewhat satisfied, 212 not very satisfied, and 157 not at all satisfied. In computing the positive score, we omitted the “neither satisfied nor unsatisfied” total, leaving us with 673 responses, of which 304 were positive and 369 negative, for a positive response rating of 45.2%. Notably, West and East campus school respondents were very similar in their (overall negative) rating, but employees from administrative offices were much more positive (ratio of 1.8).

**Q10.2. – HOW WOULD YOU RATE AUDIO-VISUAL SUPPORT ON CAMPUS?**

1,000 respondents provided responses. The overall response was positive with 18.6% excellent, 46.3% good, 29.0% fair, and 6.1% poor. The ratio was 64.9% positive to 35.1% negative or 1.85.

**Q10.3. – HOW WOULD YOU RATE THE SERVICES OF THE CAREER CENTER?**

469 respondents rated the career center with an overwhelmingly positive response. Of these, 33.5% were excellent, 46.3% good, 15.8% fair, and 4.5% poor. The ratio was 79.7% positive to 20.3% negative or 3.94.
Representative Comments

220 comments were submitted. The majority centered on the lack of services (recreational facilities) or its uneven distribution across campus (audiovisual service).

At this major state University, it's unacceptable not to have a working swimming pool. There are only day-use lockers for faculty or staff, which makes it difficult to use the gym conveniently on a daily basis. Even in the previous, gulag-like locker rooms (before the renovations), there was a dedicated faculty-staff locker room, which was appreciated.

We need recreational facilities on East campus, and recreational, health and wellness programs that accommodate the vast range of work hours by employees in the healthcare professions.

The fact that faculty and staff are required to pay a fee to use recreational facility such as the gym is hard to believe. Should not the University be more willing to invest in the health of its faculty and staff?

There should be a faculty/staff lounge where faculty and staff can eat their lunch (or take a break) without having to spend 20 minutes looking for a place to eat.

The AV people who have responded to problems have been terrific. The problem is not with the people, but with the equipment that is in need of upgrade. We need smart classrooms; we need regular upgrades of computer equipment, especially in the SINC Sites; we need regular upgrades of software, including Adobe Creative licenses.

The AV support groups in Frey and Javits are excellent. However, beyond these two facilities, classrooms contain low-grade technology that is not well maintained.

The career center is very effective reaching out to students and coming into the classroom to teach students about what they have to offer. They also work with faculty in inviting companies to their job fairs.

11. DEPARTMENTAL REVIEWS AND GOVERNANCE

Q11.1. TO WHAT EXTENT ARE FACULTY PERMITTED TO BE INVOLVED IN MAKING DECISIONS WITHIN YOUR DEPARTMENT?

1,060 respondents provided responses. The overall response was positive with 40.5% very involved, 31.0% somewhat involved, 17.6% not very involved, and 10.9% not at all involved. The ratio was 71.5% positive to 28.5% negative or 2.51. Across units the ratio varied from highly positive to slightly negative/mixed. West campus respondents were more positive than east campus respondents. Members of administrative offices were the least positive.
Q11.2. TO WHAT EXTENT DO PROFESSIONAL STAFF PARTICIPATE IN DECISIONS WITHIN YOUR DEPARTMENT?

1,210 respondents rated the participation of staff in decisions within their department. Of these, 31.2% were great deal, 34.4% some, 21.1% a little and 13.4% not at all. The ratio was 65.5% positive to 34.5% negative or 1.90. Across units, the ratio varied from highly positive to mixed. Two units with negative ratings are worthy of note: University Libraries (0.58) and the School of Nursing (0.42).

Q11.3. TO WHAT EXTENT DO YOU PARTICIPATE IN DECISIONS WITHIN YOUR DEPARTMENT?

1,306 respondents provided responses. The overall response was positive with 31.6% were great deal, 32.0% some, 19.6% little, and 16.9% not at all. The ratio was 63.6% positive to 36.5% negative or 1.74.

Q11.4. TO WHAT EXTENT ARE YOU SATISFIED WITH THE FREQUENCY OF EXTERNAL REVIEWS (REGULAR REVIEWS OF AN ACADEMIC DEPARTMENT BY AN EXTERNAL EVALUATOR)?

664 respondents had experience with external reviews. Of these, 21.8% were very satisfied, 33.9% somewhat satisfied, 19.1% not very satisfied, and 25.2% not at all satisfied. The overall response was mixed with 55.7% positive and 44.3% negative and a ratio of 1.26.

Q11.5. HOW EFFECTIVE ARE PERIODIC REVIEWS OF ACADEMIC DEPARTMENTS AND ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICES IN ASSESSING THEIR STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES?

767 respondents provided responses. The overall response was mixed with 15.9% very effective, 36.6% somewhat effective, 24.3% not very effective, and 23.2% not at all effective. The ratio was 52.5% positive to 47.5% negative or 1.11.

Representative Comments

203 comments were submitted. While some praised a generally positive experience, consistent with the overall positive rating, the majority of the comments were negative, stressing especially the lack of consultation in decision making, along with dissatisfaction with external reviews, both the frequency of reviews and the response to a review.

Our department has a long democratic tradition and by-laws that make participation available to everyone who wishes to participate. Staff members participate in all general meetings: we could not do without them. But we have a Dean who doesn’t consult, and there are many things that are handed down from above in which we have little say.
My department is completely lacking in transparency and almost all decisions are made by a small number of administrators and very little input from faculty and staff. Outside of the department administration, just a few, select faculty seem to have any say in decisions that are made. I cannot see evidence of any real review of administrators at all.

Unfortunately, we have seen that decisions are made at the managerial level without consulting the professional opinion of team members who work in a specific area on a daily basis. If there were more collaboration and involvement in decisions before making a call we would be saving time, energy and resources not to mention, improving morale and empowering team members to excel in their areas of expertise.

When I first came to Stony Brook, we had five-year reviews. I can’t recall the last one. Our department used to be one of the best in our field in the world. It is no longer the case because of outright hostility by one provost and negligence by the others. It is relatively easy to maintain excellence by using the current faculty as bait for young rising stars. It is much harder to build excellence from mediocrity.

If we did have such a review, it would only be useful if it was completely confidential, and there was absolutely no danger of repercussions. That would not likely be possible. In my experience, consultants say what the person that hired them wants to hear. If the administration wanted to hear it, we wouldn’t need a review.

There needs to be screening of review committees to check for their relationships to the people in power in the department and potential, strong and mutually beneficial relationships with the chair. My department has had serious problems due to lack of governance, no bylaws, no faculty council, and disregard of tenured faculty.

The Administration has consistently and totally ignored the external reviews.

External reviews are very helpful, but only if the chair is separated from the process, and if all opinions, majority and minority are accurately and completely reported. If significant omissions are permitted or if the chair is an active participant in the construction of the final report, then external reviews are not helpful. A frank, dispassionate, objective, and complete review is needed to assist a dialog between a chair and the dean.

12. UNIVERSITY AND SCHOOL GOVERNANCE

QUESTION 12.1: HOW EFFECTIVE IS THE UNIVERSITY SENATE IN ADDRESSING (FACULTY/STAFF) CONCERNS?

552 people provided a response to this question. The overall response was neutral with 5.4% rating the University Senate as very effective, 43.1% as somewhat effective, 30.6% as not very effective, and 20.8% as not at all effective. The positive/negative ratio was 48.6/51.4.
QUESTION 12.3: HOW EFFECTIVE IS YOUR COLLEGE ACADEMIC GOVERNANCE IN ADDRESSING FACULTY AND STAFF CONCERNS?

596 people provided a response to this question. The overall response was negative with 8.6% rating their college academic governance as very effective, 37.1% as somewhat effective, 31.5% as not very effective, and 22.8% as not at all effective. The positive/negative ratio was 45.7/54.3.

QUESTION 12.4: HOW WOULD YOU RATE THE EFFECTIVENESS OF YOUR REPRESENTATIVE IN REPORTING BACK TO YOUR DEPARTMENT THE ACTIVITIES OF THE UNIVERSITY SENATE?

741 people provided a response to this question. The overall response was neutral with 19.4% rating their representatives to University Senate reporting to their department as very effective, 30.9% as somewhat effective, 24.0% as not very effective, and 25.6% as not at all effective. The positive/negative ratio was 50.3/49.6.

QUESTION 12.5: HOW EFFECTIVE IS THE PROFESSIONAL EMPLOYEES GOVERNANCE (PEG) BOARD?

173 people provided a response to this question. The overall response was negative with 8.1% rating the Professional Employees Governance Board as very effective, 24.3% as somewhat effective, 27.2% as not very effective, and 40.4% as not at all effective. The positive/negative ratio was 32.4/67.6.

Representative Comments

140 respondents provided comments to this question group. Many comments indicated that the University Senate is irreverent since the current University Administration does not believe in any form of shared governance and is hostile towards the University Senate.

What I have seen is an unwillingness on the part of the President and the Dean of the School of Medicine to involve the faculty in governance.

The current administration does not work with the faculty well.

The upper administration ignores it - so what is the point?

The PEG board is a sop to Professionals -- just to make us think we have a seat at-the-table.

Never even heard about the Professional Employees Governance Board. Wish we are more informed!

Because both West and East campus administrations run without any faculty checks and balances, I see the University Senate primarily as a debating society for the faculty.
Faculty have little to no influence on campus. Unfortunately, the role of the university senate appears more symbolic than effective in mitigating the delusions of grandeur of our ruthless university leaders/rulers/masters.

Great intentions. Not enough involvement.

I wasn't aware there is a University Senate.

Very few faculty get involved in our senate because they believe it is powerless to do anything. I think many people are aware that this is self-defeating, but no one knows how to change this situation.

13. INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY

Q13.1: HOW WOULD YOU RATE BLACKBOARD?
Of 796 respondents who chose to rate Blackboard, 71% rated it as Excellent or Good, and 29% rated it as Fair or Poor.

Q13.2: HOW WOULD YOU RATE SOLAR?
Of 1,276 respondents who chose to rate Solar, 13.2% rated it as Excellent, 54.8% rated it as Good, 26.2% rated it as Fair, and 5.8% rated it as Poor.

Q13.3: HOW WOULD YOU RATE THE WEST CAMPUS ELECTRONIC MAIL SYSTEM (GOOGLE APPS)?
Of 999 respondents who chose to rate the West campus electronic mail system (Google Apps), 77.1% rated it as Excellent or Good, and 22.9% rated it as Fair or Poor.

Q13.4: HOW WOULD YOU RATE THE HSC ELECTRONIC MAIL SYSTEM (OUTLOOK)?
Of 403 respondents who chose to rate HSC electronic mail system (Outlook), 64.0% rated it as Excellent or Good, and 36.0% rated it as Fair or Poor.

Q13.5: HOW WOULD YOU RATE THE SERVICES OF DOIT, SUCH AS SOFTWEB, TEACHING WORKSHOPS, CLIENT SUPPORT, SOFTWARE TRAINING, 4-HELP ON EAST CAMPUS, AND ASSISTANCE TO FACULTY AND STUDENTS?
Of 1,114 respondents who chose to rate DoIT, 70.5% rated it as Excellent or Good, and 29.5% rated it as Fair or Poor.
Q13.6: HOW WOULD YOU RATE THE QUALITY OF UNIVERSITY WIRELESS SERVICE IN THE PART OF THE UNIVERSITY WHERE YOU WORK?

Of 1,194 respondents who chose to rate the University wireless service, 65.0% rated it as Excellent or Good, and 35.0% rated it as Fair or Poor.

Representative Comments

No complaints. Great improvement within the last two years.

I think the IT department in the Dental School is excellent. They made a great way to submit tickets to fix problems and are always around to help with any computer problems that arise!

DoIT/TLT support is amazing! Wi-Fi has been unreliable often enough that I worry that I may not be able to connect and carry an Ethernet cable with USB adapter with me everywhere on campus as a backup. This level of failure in technological infrastructure is disappointing.

Blackboard is not very intuitive but I've gotten better using, especially after teaching an online class. Solar is the pits! Terrible interface and cumbersome. I've found DoIT folks kind and efficient in responding to requests.

Solar should have mobile format for all of its functions not just the student functions. For example, viewing paystubs or approving student timesheets is a struggle on a mobile device.

Outlook is great when it works properly. Unfortunately, I've had many instances of losing emails and folders only for them to reappear at another time. Strange!

I did not interact heavily with DoIT, but the times I did, I was quite disappointed. It took a long time to look into my problems, and in the end, they could not solve the problems. The solutions they provided me were quite limited and cumbersome. I also had to purchase software from a third party because the one provided by DoIT was not up to the task. All very disappointing for a University like Stony Brook.

There are often issues with wireless on West campus, particularly in areas like the SAC or where many people are using the wireless system. I would also like to see an easier way to get onto things like PeopleSoft remotely.

Email communication between the East and West Campus is difficult. Google Apps sends email messages from Outlook to trash. Help has been totally unhelpful in resolving this issue.

They need to hire more people; they are clearly overworked and understaffed. They cannot meet the needs of a growing campus or Hospital with their current staffing levels.

DoIT spent a lot of money recently to implement many new/different things. However, seems like we are still behind as a University. Now with a new CIO, seems like she wants to change things again which all cost a ton of money. Just hope we keep moving forward and use money as efficiently and effectively as possible.
14. COMMUNICATIONS SERVICES

Q14.1: HOW WOULD YOU RATE WEST CAMPUS UNIVERSITY COMMUNICATIONS, INCLUDING PRINT, E-MAIL ALERTS, AND THE UNIVERSITY WEB SITE (HTTP://WWW.STONYBROOK.EDU) (NOT YOUR DEPARTMENT WEB SITE)?

1,043 respondents provided answers to this question. There were 751 positive responses, with 168 rating as excellent and 583 rating as good. 247 respondents rated this question as fair and only 45 as poor. Overall, the respondents provided a positive rating at 72.2%.

Q14.2: HOW WOULD YOU RATE EAST CAMPUS UNIVERSITY COMMUNICATIONS, INCLUDING PRINT, E-MAIL ALERTS, AND THE STONY BROOK MEDICINE WEB SITE (HTTP://WWW.STONYBROOKMEDICINE.EDU) (NOT YOUR DEPARTMENT WEB SITE)?

544 respondents provided answers to this question. There were 361 positive responses, with 68 rating their response as excellent and 293 rating as good. 147 respondents rated this question as fair and 36 rated it as poor.

Representative Comments

95 respondents provided comments to this question group. Many of the comments concerned the University Web site, with many comments offering specific suggestions for improvement. There were also a handful of comments concerning the University message:

The HSC website should look like the University website! We are all the same University! The main campus website is constantly being updated and has a new look to keep it fresh! The HSC/SoM websites look outdated and do not hold the same focus of attention and whenever they make changes, they reroute websites that are used frequently. I should not have to store favorites for each website link within a website. When I use the main campus website, it is easy to access and find all the quick links I use frequently. Not so much with the HSC one.

The University website is very nice. It is easy to navigate! The SOM/hospital website could take some pointers from main campus to stay current and become more user friendly.

Communications are often disjointed; it is clear that each unit on campus is not communicating with the others. Though autonomy is great, it does not provide a united front and can cause confusion.

The new design of the SBU website is difficult to obtain information due to the size of the pictures. Oftentimes, I go to Google so that I can get to the appropriate page, as it is much more effective than parceling through the SBU website. Additionally, there is a lot of outdated information on the website despite the appropriate people being notified regarding the mistakes. For instance, please see the Social Media page.
15. OFFICE OF THE UNIVERSITY PRESIDENT

Q15.1: IT IS IMPORTANT FOR THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNIVERSITY TO COMMUNICATE HIS/HER VISION FOR THE UNIVERSITY. HOW WOULD YOU RATE THE UNIVERSITY PRESIDENT (SAMUEL STANLEY) ON HIS VISION FOR THE FUTURE OF STONY BROOK?

1,142 respondents provided responses. There were 637 positive responses for the President’s vision, with 17.6% of the respondents rated excellent and 38.2% good. 29.2% rated his vision for the future of Stony Brook as fair and 15.1% as poor. The positive/negative ratio was 55.8/44.2.

Q15.2: HOW WOULD YOU RATE THE UNIVERSITY PRESIDENT (SAMUEL STANLEY) ON LEADERSHIP?

1,109 respondents provided responses. The respondents for the University President’s leadership were split, with a slightly negative response rate. 549 responses or 49.5% were positive, where 16.1% rated the President’s leadership excellent and 33.4% good. A total of 29.3% rated fair and 21.2% poor. The positive/negative ratio was 49.5/50.5.

Q15.3: HOW WOULD YOU RATE THE UNIVERSITY PRESIDENT (SAMUEL STANLEY) ON THE QUALITY OF ADMINISTRATIVE APPOINTMENTS?

Of the 915 respondents, 554 were negative responses concerning the University President’s quality of administrative appointments. 105 respondents rated excellent (11.5%) and 256 rated good (28.0%). A total of 305 respondents rated fair (33.3%) and 249 rated poor (27.2%). The positive/negative ratio was 39.5/60.5.

Q15.4: HOW WOULD YOU RATE THE OFFICE OF THE UNIVERSITY PRESIDENT ON ADMINISTRATIVE MANAGEMENT, INCLUDING ACCESSIBILITY, RESPONSIVENESS, AND BUDGETARY DECISIONS?

Of the 819 respondents, 552 were negative responses concerning the University President’s administrative management. 78 respondents rated excellent (9.5%) and 189 rated good (23.1%). A total of 270 respondents rated fair (33.0%) and 282 rated poor (34.4%). The positive/negative ratio was 32.6/67.4.

Q15.5: HOW WOULD YOU RATE THE UNIVERSITY PRESIDENT (SAMUEL STANLEY) ON HIS REPRESENTATION OF STONY BROOK’S NEEDS TO ALBANY AND THE OUTSIDE COMMUNITY?

780 respondents provided responses. The respondents for the University President’s representation on Stony Brook’s needs has a more positive response rate. 459 responses were positive, with 160
rated as excellent (20.5%) and 299 a good (38.3%). There were 194 responses as fair (24.9%) and 127 as poor (16.3%). The positive/negative ratio was 58.9/41.1.

Q15.6: TO WHAT EXTENT DOES THE UNIVERSITY PRESIDENT (SAMUEL STANLEY) INVOLVE FACULTY AND STAFF THROUGH THE GOVERNANCE STRUCTURE IN DECISIONS THAT AFFECT POLICY?

A total of 638 respondents provided an opinion. 60 respondents selected “a great deal” (9.4%), 122 selected “some’ (19.1%). There were 208 respondents that selected “a little” (32.6%) and 248 that selected “not at all” (38.9%). The positive/negative ratio was 28.5/71.5.

Analysis

We compared the results in this category to the results obtained in the 2013 Senate Survey. The six questions in this category were also present in the 2013 survey, although in some cases the wording was slightly different. In addition, the set of respondents was larger in the 2016 survey. However, the greatest difference between the 2016 and 2013 surveys is the set of response options. The 2013 survey typically had five response options (excellent, very good, good, fair, and poor) as compared with those in the 2016 survey (excellent, good, fair, and poor). As mentioned previously, we sought to delineate the 2016 survey options into two equally sized groups of positive and negative options. This change in the number of options makes a direct comparison with the 2013 survey results problematic. For example, the 2016 scores in Question 15.2 were 49.5 positive and 50.5% negative. If we omit the middle category (good) of the 2013 survey results to make the two categories equal in size, the results were 47.2% positive and 52.8% negative. If we include the middle category in the positive category, the results for 2013 are 61.0% positive and 39.0% negative.

A more direct comparison with the results of the 2013 survey can be done with the responses to Question 15.6. For this question, both the 2013 and 2016 surveys had two positive responses (a great deal, some) and two negative responses (a little, not at all). The 2013 survey responses to this question were 25.5% positive and 74.5% negative. That compares with the corresponding 2016 responses of 28.5% positive and 71.5% negative.

Another area of analysis for this category is a comparison of the scores of the total survey population with the scores from only the CAS respondents. The question here is whether the low scores from the CAS population when evaluating their dean was consistent with lower scores from this same group for upper levels of academic administration. The results of that comparison are shown in the Table below.
Table 1 – Comparison of CAS and Total Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question Number</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Poor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q15.1</td>
<td>How would you rate the University President (Samuel Stanley) on his vision for the future of Stony Brook?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>201 (17.6%)</td>
<td>436 (38.2%)</td>
<td>333 (29.2%)</td>
<td>172 (15.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAS</td>
<td>34 (12.6%)</td>
<td>76 (28.0%)</td>
<td>103 (38.0%)</td>
<td>58 (21.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q15.2</td>
<td>How would you rate the University President (Samuel Stanley) on leadership?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>179 (16.1%)</td>
<td>370 (33.3%)</td>
<td>325 (29.3%)</td>
<td>235 (27.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAS</td>
<td>21 (7.9%)</td>
<td>82 (30.7%)</td>
<td>92 (34.5%)</td>
<td>72 (27.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q15.3</td>
<td>How would you rate the University President (Samuel Stanley) on the quality of administrative appointments?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>105 (11.5%)</td>
<td>256 (28.0%)</td>
<td>305 (33.3%)</td>
<td>249 (27.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAS</td>
<td>14 (6.3%)</td>
<td>37 (16.5%)</td>
<td>89 (39.7%)</td>
<td>84 (37.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q15.4</td>
<td>How would you rate the Office of the University President on administrative management, including accessibility, responsiveness, and budgetary decisions?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>78 (9.5%)</td>
<td>189 (23.1%)</td>
<td>270 (33.0%)</td>
<td>282 (34.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAS</td>
<td>10 (5.0%)</td>
<td>26 (12.9%)</td>
<td>70 (34.8%)</td>
<td>95 (47.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q15.5</td>
<td>How would you rate the University President (Samuel Stanley) on his representation of Stony Brook’s needs to Albany and the outside community?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>160 (20.5%)</td>
<td>299 (38.3%)</td>
<td>194 (24.9%)</td>
<td>127 (16.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAS</td>
<td>28 (15.5%)</td>
<td>68 (37.6%)</td>
<td>55 (30.4%)</td>
<td>30 (16.6%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results for Question 15.6 display a similar pattern, with 15.1% positive scores among CAS respondents compared with 28.5% positive scores among all the respondents. These scores are not shown in the table above since the response categories are different.

Representative Comments

There were a total of 205 comments.

I think that Dr. Stanley has done an excellent job by the standards of what University Presidents are supposed to do—PR and fundraising. I also see him at a lot of campus and student
events. He's a good public speaker. But I will say that SBU still has a dysfunctional and inefficient administrative culture, that SBU will never win any awards for best workplace and that there is not the slightest evidence that Admin cares about faculty/staff compensation or employee satisfaction. It's like Admin lives in a parallel fantasy world bubble seduced by Far Beyond branding imagery and a lot of what they do is for show, including sustainability (energy, food, resource and water waste on campus are amazing), Tobacco Free campus (not enforced so many people still smoke here), HeFor She (hypocritical given the low representation of women in high administrative roles at the University) and so on. I actually do like, respect and admire Dr. Stanley despite these reservations.

I agree with his progressive vision for our students and the SBU community.

President Stanley is doing a solid job. His last State of the University address was wonderful. He seems in command of the issues and confident in tackling them.

Big shout out to President Stanley. SBU is lucky to have his leadership.

President Stanley needs to go "far beyond" his current communications strategy with faculty. He says we are not a corporate entity, but why does he behave like a CEO?

Far Beyond cost a lot of money and looks more akin to propaganda out of George Orwell's 1984 than a top ranked University.

President Stanley is a nice man, but his focus is primarily on medicine. This leaves many areas of the University by the wayside. Understandably, STEM fields and medicine generate more revenue from the college. However, Stony Brook prides itself as a full-fledged University with a variety of fields of study. This should be reflected by a balanced budget supporting more areas with crucial funds to improve facilities and infrastructure campus-wide. President Stanley has made several VP appointments resulting in poor workplace environments. These decisions should be analyzed by an external auditor and action should be taken.

I would encourage more Presidential involvement in campus concerns, maybe a quarterly walk around different departments to get to know employees. I believe it would motivate employees to know that the president is supporting us and will give us some encouragement now and then.

I believe President Stanley focus a little too much on the East campus and can do a better job at promoting the arts and humanities.
16. OFFICE OF THE PROVOST

Q16.1: HOW WOULD YOU RATE THE PROVOST (DENNIS ASSANIS) ON HIS VISION CONCERNING THE ACADEMIC FUTURE OF STONY BROOK?

627 respondents provided responses to this question. 10.0% of the respondents rated the Provost vision excellent, while 29.5% rated it as good. 27.0% rated the Provost vision as fair and 33.5% rated it as poor.

Q16.2: HOW WOULD YOU RATE THE PROVOST (DENNIS ASSANIS) ON LEADERSHIP?

625 respondents provided responses to this question. 9.3% rated the Provost’s leadership as excellent, while 27.2% rated it as good. 24.6% rated the Provost’s leadership as fair and 38.9% rated it as poor.

Q16.3: HOW WOULD YOU RATE THE PROVOST (DENNIS ASSANIS) ON THE QUALITY OF ADMINISTRATIVE APPOINTMENTS?

538 respondents provided responses to this question. 8.0% rated the quality of the Provost’s appointments as excellent, while 27.5% rated it as good. 30.1% rated the Provost’s appointments as fair and 34.4% rated it as poor.

Q16.4: TO WHAT EXTENT DOES THE PROVOST (DENNIS ASSANIS) INVOLVE FACULTY AND STAFF THROUGH THE GOVERNANCE STRUCTURE IN DECISIONS THAT AFFECT POLICY?

433 respondents provided responses to this question. 9.7% respondents answered excellent, while 23.1% answered good. 31.4% of respondents reported the Provost’s involvement of faculty and staff as fair and 35.8 reported poor.

Q16.5: HOW WOULD YOU RATE THE OFFICE OF THE PROVOST ON ADMINISTRATIVE MANAGEMENT, INCLUDING ACCESSIBILITY, RESPONSIVENESS, AND BUDGETARY DECISIONS?

514 respondents provided responses to this question. 7.6% rated the Provost’s administrative management as excellent, while 20.4% reported it as good. 31.5% of respondents reported the Provost’s administrative management as fair and 40.5% reported it as poor.
Analysis

The intent of the Provost questions in the survey was to determine opinions of the faculty and staff concerning the performance of the Office of the Provost under the leadership of Dennis Assanis. We expect that this information would be helpful to Michael Bernstein, the new Provost at Stony Brook. We included words to this effect in the cover message sent to faculty and staff with the request for survey participation. Despite this, there were messages and comments from some respondents that indicated they were not aware of this goal. While the number of such messages was not great, it is possible that this misunderstanding had some influence on the survey results.

We compared the results in this category to the results obtained in the 2013 Senate Survey. The five questions in this category were also present in the 2013 survey, although in some cases the wording was slightly different. In addition, the set of respondents was larger in the 2016 survey. However, the greatest difference between the 2016 and 2013 surveys is the set of response options. The 2013 survey typically had five response options (excellent, very good, good, fair, and poor) as compared with those in the 2016 survey (excellent, good, fair, and poor). As mentioned previously, we sought to delineate the 2016 survey options into two equally sized groups of positive and negative options. This change in the number of options makes a direct comparison with the 2013 survey results problematic.

While the above differences make a summary comparison difficult, we did examine the raw data, as shown for representative questions in the table below

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question Number</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Very Good</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Poor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q16.3</td>
<td>How would you rate the Provost (Dennis Assanis) on the quality of administrative appointments?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>28 (8.3%)</td>
<td>66 (19.5%)</td>
<td>85 (25.1%)</td>
<td>97 (28.7%)</td>
<td>62 (18.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>43 (8.0%)</td>
<td>148 (27.5%)</td>
<td>162 (30.1%)</td>
<td>185 (34.4%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q16.5</td>
<td>How would you rate the Office of the Provost on administrative management, including accessibility, responsiveness, and budgetary decisions?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>33 (8.2%)</td>
<td>61 (15.2%)</td>
<td>91 (22.7%)</td>
<td>112 (27.9%)</td>
<td>104 (25.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>39 (7.6%)</td>
<td>105 (20.4%)</td>
<td>162 (31.5%)</td>
<td>208 (40.5%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Representative Comments

138 respondents provided comments concerning the Provost. Many of the respondents only commented that they would not comment since Dennis Assanis had left Stony Brook. Consequently, the number of substantive comments is fewer than 138. The survey had asked respondents to respond to the questions concerning administrators who left as a guide to their replacements, but in this case, this request was not successful. Many of the comments concerning the Provost were negative, but interestingly, there were a number of positive comments concerning members of his staff. A representative sample of these comments is included in the comment set below.

As a Student Affairs staff member, my sense was that Provost Assanis made no attempt to collaborate or build bridges to support students in their academic pursuits. I am thrilled that our incoming provost apparently has this approach.

Dennis Assanis took forever to take care of issues brought to his attention. I hope the new interim provost will do better.

Dennis Assanis was willing to work with the Senate and had a good vision with good intentions. Some of his policies and decisions were not on target.

Did not provide clear answers to simple questions regarding budgets and accounts.

Don’t know him.

From what I could tell, he was not as interested in the university or healthy responsible growth as much as he was in distributing money. I loved the cluster hires vision and came to SBU thinking that this was an actually going to be the direction it was going. What happened? In addition, I did not get the sense that he cared about anything non-STEM. Hires happened that were aspirational but that were not sustainable. People’s lives were impacted.

Funds should not be mysteriously withheld from new faculty start up packages to make up for budgetary shortfalls. The financial cup game needs to stop.

Having a provost that understand long-term leadership is a must.

He chose a number of very poor deans and has consolidated all power from schools/colleges and placed the power in the Provost’s office.

He couldn’t make decisions or get anything done - to the detriment of University

He is an intelligent and likable man. He grew into the position and became a much better leader as time went on.

His poor judgment on hiring Deans and filling other administrative positions in departments have hurt the departments instead of making a positive impact

I, personally, found Provost Assanis accessible and quite willing to involve faculty and staff in policy decisions.
Increasing enrollment of more undergraduates than we have classes available to just to make extra revenue. The students suffer as well as the staff and faculty.

It is obvious that the Provost did not have the budget to accomplish everything he planned. Either this was poor management or resources were diverted to other units on campus (e.g. SoM).

Not sure what kind of impact Dennis had on Stony Brook but he is gone now so not really worth evaluating. I do however think very highly of the work that Charlie Robbins, Chuck Taber and Rick Gatteau all do on behalf of students and faculty in their roles. They make Stony Brook better.

Provost Assanis did a poor job in his management of CAS

Provost Assanis is a very nice person but was not good at saying ‘No’. Centers and Institutes report to the Provost. In some cases these units are very well funded but it is not clear that faculty in them contribute to the educational mission of the university. This creates a two tier system.

Provost Assanis’ poor hiring will be his legacy and this campus’ torment for years to come. Regardless of his good work in some areas, his support of those bad actors within his cabinet such as the Dean of Libraries, ruins any good he may have done while at Stony Brook and creates the negative perception at the divisional level.

Provost Assanis was an excellent provost. I know personally of his efforts to assist in cost sharing issues with a large center proposal, which ultimately was funded. Large center grants are critical to the success and positive perception of SBU, and Dennis Assanis accurately recognizes where to devote the university resources.

Provost Assanis was unpopular among faculty in some quarters. I myself found him energetic and at least trying to achieve something positive. These discussions are moot now given his departure to UDEL.

Resources for departments have been restricted during his tenure here. Provost’s area constricts the effectiveness of CAS.

The only reason that the Provost’s office is functional is Stella Tsirkas. She has been the lifeline for all the CAS chairs.

The Provost did not provide any oversight of the CAS Dean (Sacha Kopp) and this created a terrible situation for the Humanities.

The Provost has not prevented the School of Medicine from dismantling the Department of Anatomical Sciences, one of the most scholarly units on the campus. The Provost’s Office is also attempting to remove the University’s relationship with the Quarterly Review of Biology, one of the premier journals in the field of Biology. Why is the administration of the university acting to harm our scholarly reputation?

The Provost was an authoritarian figure with seemingly little understanding of how anything really worked or the consequences of his decisions.
The provost was indecisive, unreliable, and lacking a coherent vision.

There are many high quality people in the Provost’s office, including Vice Provosts Charles Robbins and Charles Taber. In particular, Charles Robbins is a dedicated advocate for students and has done a great deal to move student success forward. However, I do not believe that undergraduate education was a priority for the former Provost, neither in terms of responsiveness or budgetary decisions. I hope that this is something that can change with a new Provost and that Charles Robbins can move student success even further.

[...] Provost Assanis proposed some ideas for the future but hardly deliver them. He is no longer at the University. Interim Provost Chuck Taber, though standing in until our new provost arrives, has been a very fair and approachable Provost. He has given some sense of stability for the Provost office for the past few months.

When he took the position, he was open and available. His lack of leadership skills and bad decision-making caused him to retreat and create a buffer between himself and the faculty. He was prejudiced towards engineering - his area of expertise - to the cost of CAS, which carries the burden of educating our students. He lacked a vision for education and seemed ineffective in dealing with the President. Continually appointed a coterie of faculty in decision-making positions, most of who were from privileged departments.

17. SENIOR VICE PRESIDENT FOR HEALTH SCIENCES

QUESTION 17.1: HOW WOULD YOU RATE THE SENIOR VICE PRESIDENT FOR THE HEALTH SCIENCES (KENNETH KAUSHANSKY) ON HIS VISION CONCERNING THE ACADEMIC FUTURE OF HSC SCHOOLS?

534 respondents provided responses. The overall response was mixed, with 16.5% rating the vice president’s vision as excellent, 31.6% as good, 24.3% as fair, and 27.5% as poor. The positive/negative ratio was 48.1/51.9.

QUESTION 17.2: HOW WOULD YOU RATE THE SENIOR VICE PRESIDENT FOR THE HEALTH SCIENCES (KENNETH KAUSHANSKY) ON LEADERSHIP?

535 respondents provided responses. The overall response was mixed, with 17.6% rating the vice president’s leadership as excellent, 29% as good, 24.3% as fair, and 29.2% as poor. The positive/negative ratio was 46.6/53.4.
QUESTION 17.3: HOW WOULD YOU RATE THE OFFICE OF THE SENIOR VICE PRESIDENT FOR THE HEALTH SCIENCES ON ADMINISTRATIVE MANAGEMENT, INCLUDING ACCESSIBILITY, RESPONSIVENESS, AND BUDGETARY DECISIONS?

446 respondents provided responses. The overall response was generally negative, with 13% rating the office of the senior vice president as excellent, 22% as good, 29.1% as fair, and 35.9% as poor. The positive/negative ratio was 35/65.

QUESTION 17.4: HOW WOULD YOU RATE THE SENIOR VICE PRESIDENT FOR THE HEALTH SCIENCES (KENNETH KAUSHANSKY) ON THE QUALITY OF ADMINISTRATIVE APPOINTMENTS?

427 respondents provided responses. The overall response was slightly negative, with 13.3% rating the administrative appointments as excellent, 26.7% as good, 26.7% as fair, and 33.3% as poor. The positive/negative ratio was 40/60.

QUESTION 17.5: TO WHAT EXTENT DOES THE SENIOR VICE PRESIDENT FOR THE HEALTH SCIENCES (KENNETH KAUSHANSKY) INVOLVE FACULTY AND STAFF THROUGH THE GOVERNANCE STRUCTURE IN DECISIONS THAT AFFECT POLICY?

363 respondents provided responses. The overall response was negative, with 9.9% rating that faculty and staff are involved a great deal, 19.8% as some, 24.8% a little, and 45.5% not at all. The positive/negative ratio was 29.7/70.3.

Representative Comments

"As part of SHTM, and in my opinion, the SOM is heavily favored when it comes to decisions (including classroom reservations). In regards to the classrooms: MANY SOM classes are held in lecture halls and no students attend, therefore a lecture hall that could have been used by another program is not available. Space should be determined by actual need, not by program priority. Classes are now being held in the galleria which is not a conducive learning environment."

Does not appear that the Senior Vice President for Health Sciences considers any other entity other than the Medicine, although the other Schools contribute greatly in reputation, research, and accomplished alums to Stony Brook.

Dr K has some good ideas and exhibits some good leadership traits, but he has created a bubble and echo chamber around himself by replacing any chair that disagrees with him. I don’t think anyone ever tells him when he is wrong. At least no one below his pay grade.

Dr. Kaushansky has a very clear vision and has made a major improvement in the quality of many activities in the health sciences/hospital. In terms of research, his primary focus is on clinical departments leading to the demise of anatomy and Physiology/Biophysics.
He makes decisions that affect patient care when he forces faculty out and doesn’t replace them. He makes admin decisions based on how he can control them rather than choosing the best candidate for the job and that is why the SDM is going through turmoil that he appears to not care about. I've worked for 1 other state institution and a private college and I have never seen the hostility that I have seen here due to the decisions of upper administration.

Hiring people, Researcher, with only a three-year salary commitment and then making them bring in 50% of their salary through grants is not a smart policy in the current funding environment. Funding is MUCH harder to get these days by no fault of the researcher. By making them bring in 50% of their salary causes undue stress or creates an environment where people leave.

I have had two colleagues I collaborated with leave SBU Medicine. They found the senior leadership insular, uninformed about the actual working of the school. Both left for schools that we should not be thinking of as competition.

I think employees are increasingly dissatisfied working at Stony Brook since his arrival. Disappointing that as people I know retire they are glad to leave and say they "will not miss this place". I personally think that is a sad statement for the work environment from employees that have put 20, 25, and 30 years of service to leave feeling de-moralized.

Need more investment in clinical research especially for junior faculty. Need more aggressive hiring of research faculty in various departments.

Senior Vice President Kenneth Kaushansky is an excellent administrator. Although my appointment is not in Medicine, I have noticed the quality of administrators and senior hires within Health Sciences, and I attribute them to Kenneth Kaushansky. He directs his resources well, and he is strategic in his senior hires.

When Dr. Kaushansky arrived at Stony Brook, I was very enthusiastic about his vision and potential to change the institution for the better. I now believe that he has had a number of visible successes (e.g. Buildings) but has had an increasingly negative impact on the school as a whole in terms of creating a negative, divisive and demoralizing environment and selecting leaders who are equally problematic. The culture has switched to one where people are reluctant to speak up for fear of reprisals.

18. OFFICE OF VICE PRESIDENT FOR ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

Q18.1. DO YOU HAVE REGULAR CONTACT WITH THE OFFICE OF THE VICE PRESIDENT FOR ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT?

59 respondents had regular contact with the office of the Vice President of Economic Development.
Q18.2. **HOW WOULD YOU RATE THE VICE PRESIDENT FOR ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT (YACOV SHAMASH) ON THE QUALITY OF ADMINISTRATIVE APPOINTMENTS?**

50 respondents provided responses. The overall response was positive with 35.0% excellent, 34.0% good, 14% fair, and 14.0% poor. The ratio was 72.0% positive to 28.0% negative or 2.57. However, among the three main groups of respondents, administrative offices were less positive than CEAS or Other.

Q18.3. **TO WHAT EXTENT DOES THE VICE PRESIDENT FOR ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT (YACOV SHAMASH) INVOLVE FACULTY AND STAFF IN DECISIONS THAT AFFECT POLICY?**

43 respondents provided responses. The overall response was positive with 41.9% were great deal, 37.2% some, 7.0% little, and 14.0% not at all. The ratio was 79.1% positive to 20.9% negative or 3.78.

Q18.4. **HOW WOULD YOU RATE THE VICE PRESIDENT FOR ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT (YACOV SHAMASH) ON ITS EFFECTIVENESS IN GAINING FINANCIAL SUPPORT FOR STONY BROOK?**

52 respondents provided responses. The overall response was positive with 48.1% excellent, 30.8% good, 15.4% fair, and 5.8% poor. The ratio was 78.8% positive to 21.2% negative or 3.73.

**Representative Comments**

12 respondents provided comments, among those the following:

- The VP for Economic Development has done an excellent job in attracting funds for the University. He has a long history of involving faculty and staff in his decisions.

- VPED's overall mission is an integral part of not only the Long Island/NYS economy, but USA's economy as well. So long as they maintain an overall global, environmental thoughtfulness in all they support and do, VPED will be a crown jewel for Long Island.

- SHOUT OUT to Pat Malone and her staff in the Center for Corporate Education and Training for their amazing work!

- The VP for Eco Development has certainly been instrumental in gaining some support for Stony Brook; however, in the areas that count (facilities that are directly for students, staff that deal directly with students) he has not.

- This office only benefits people in the inner circle. There is no faculty or departmental involvement. Appointments are offered to preferred people. Decisions are made top down and benefits few. There is no accountability. Lot of hyperbolae, devil is in the details. One needs to critically assess the investments and returns. Lastly, the same people have been in these jobs for a long time. There should be rotations.

- The office is unresponsive. They just don't answer emails, which is a big problem.

-60-
Q19.1: DO YOU HAVE REGULAR CONTACT WITH THE OFFICE OF THE VICE PRESIDENT FOR FINANCE (LYLE GOMES)?

Of the 1,202 respondents, 91 said yes, they have regular contact with the Office of the Vice President for Finance, 7.57%. The remaining 1,111 or 92.43% of the respondents said no.

Q19.2: HOW WOULD YOU RATE THE OFFICE OF THE VICE PRESIDENT FOR FINANCE (LYLE GOMES) ON THE QUALITY OF HIS ADMINISTRATIVE APPOINTMENTS?

82 respondents provided responses. Overall, the responses were positive, with 68 or 82.9% of the respondents rating the Office of the Vice President for Finance excellent (48.8%) or good (34.2%). There were 14 respondents rating as fair, 12.2% and 4.9% rating as poor. The positive/negative ratio was 82.9/17.1.

Q19.3: TO WHAT EXTENT DOES THE OFFICE OF THE VICE PRESIDENT FOR FINANCE (LYLE GOMES) INVOLVE FACULTY AND STAFF THROUGH THE GOVERNANCE STRUCTURE IN DECISIONS THAT AFFECT POLICY?

A total of 72 respondents provided an opinion. 32 respondents selected “a great deal” (44.4%), 18 selected “some’ (25.0%). There were 14 respondents that selected “a little” (19.4%) and 8 that selected “not at all” (11.1%).

Q19.4: HOW WOULD YOU RATE THE OFFICE OF THE VICE PRESIDENT FOR FINANCE (LYLE GOMES) ON ITS EFFECTIVENESS IN DEVELOPING FINANCIAL PLANS FOR STONY BROOK?

83 respondents provided responses. The respondents for the Office of the Vice President for Finance on its effectiveness in developing financial plans for Stony Brook has a more positive response rate. 59 responses were positive, with 38 rated as excellent (45.8%) and 21 a good (25.3%). There were 19 responses as fair (22.9%) and 5 as poor (6.1%). The positive/negative ratio was 71.1/28.9.

Representative Comments

There were a total of 7 comments.

*Lyle Gomes always demonstrates receptiveness to ideas and SOLUTIONS that would work for SBU. When problems arise from new policies and procedures of SBU, he has shown a willingness to be reasonable and work through the issues to find common ground and solutions.*
I worked with the VP for Finance on issues regarding Stony Brook accounts for student organizations. He assisted in the initial navigation of an issue that arose, but did not stay involved to make sure that the transition was smooth.

It is difficult to answer this question as the line between state constraints and permitted effectiveness is not clear. However, determining the budget for each department seems to be left to deans. [...] A better system needs to address determining true cost versus revenue generated. [...] The true cost of the department versus the revenue brought in does not line up to start with and thus successful departments are penalized for their innovation. [...] This model does not work. Period.

I do have regular contact. However, I don’t have anything specific to report.

Professional and a pleasure to work with.

Our dealings with Lyle and his office have always been very very positive. His role seems to have changed a bit recently and there seem to be more policies and regulation changes that have impacted how things are done across campus. Much more red tape and much more scrutiny which have slowed progress considerably.

Its work product speaks for itself.

20. OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT OF THE STONY BROOK FOUNDATION

Q20.2: HOW WOULD YOU RATE THE OFFICE OF THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR OF THE STONY BROOK FOUNDATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE MANAGEMENT, INCLUDING ACCESSIBILITY, RESPONSIVENESS, AND BUDGETARY DECISIONS?

1,225 respondents provided responses, and among those, 237 respondents stated involvement with this office. Among those who chose to respond among this smaller group, 28.2% stated that the office was excellent, 35.2% stated the office was good, 24.1% stated the office was fair and 12.50% stated the office was poor. The overall response was more positive than negative.

Representative Comments

I am very pleased with Dexter’s strategy and the great work he has done on behalf of the University.

Dexter has been nothing short of exemplary since he has been here. Positive, professional, enthusiastic, hard working.

Dexter Bailey is a very good administrator. I know personally that he works hard to bring resources to SBU, and he tethers individual faculty to potential resources in order to be more effective at attracting resources. He also brings publicity to individual faculty, which is the first step in bring resources to SBU. This strategy is labor intensive and time consuming, but it is a good strategy.
In my opinion, Dexter is a great leader exhibiting a true interest and care in his staff, the overall health of team, and is a visionary for progressing Stony Brook.

They're easy to work with. The staff is friendly and helpful.

Dexter Bailey is a rare gem in the administration. He's wonderful. He's done a lot of good for the University and is accessible and open.

Donors are misled about the gravity of problems in the School of Dental Medicine. It is no surprise that most alumni refuse to donate to a school that adversely affected their ability to learn effectively. […]

Actively involved in private funding for Stony Brook and communicates effectively with administration and faculty.

Dexter fakes openness and candor very well. Budgetary decision are still a hidden swamp filled with special interest alligators.

The leader of this office has made no effort to understand the specificities of the academic environment. He is totally ignorant of academic values and needs. His offices behaves in an imperial way, without showing any interest in learning about what actually goes on at SB. I’m sure he will fail like his predecessors, who were similarly clueless about our mission. Someday, SB will wake up and find someone who actually understands the mission and can connect positively with student and faculty.

21. OFFICE FOR THE VICE PRESIDENT FOR ADVANCEMENT

1,217 respondents provided responses. 217 respondents state involvement with this office.

Q21.2: HOW EFFECTIVE IS THE OFFICE OF THE VICE PRESIDENT FOR ADVANCEMENT IN RAISING FUNDS FOR THE UNIVERSITY?

Among the 193 respondents with a response to this question, 51.3% reported that the office is very effective, 36.8% reported the office as somewhat effective, 8.3% reported that the office is not very effective, and 3.6% reported that the office is not at all effective.

Q21.3: HOW WOULD YOU RATE THE OFFICE FOR ADVANCEMENT ON ADMINISTRATIVE MANAGEMENT, INCLUDING ACCESSIBILITY, RESPONSIVENESS, AND BUDGETARY DECISIONS?

Among those respondents with involvement with the office and who chose to respond to the question, 35.3% rated the office as excellent, 31.5 rated the office as good, 18.5% rated is as fair, and 14.7% rated is as poor. The overall responses was more positive than negative.
Representative Comments

Again, I have had nothing but good experiences with Dexter and the staff in his office.

A more interactive web site would be appreciated.

The level of justification (multi-pages) for using funds that come with 1 - 3 sentence donor requests has become burdensome and excessive. The funds management staff should become more familiar with how graduate programs operate and determine excellence, i.e., not based on transcripts, but based on research excellence.

Baily is outstanding - arguably the most effective and straightforward administrator on this campus.

I think that Dexter Bailey is doing an excellent job.

He's great. Clone him.

See previous comments for the director, with whom I have no contact. Dexter is an effective leader dealing as best he can with excessive red tape, audits, etc.

More Advancement support is needed to further initiatives at the SBMedicine. Cardiology, Endocrinology, GI, Women's health, Community health and education, these are all areas that could make profound impact on the health of the community but have no one to further their initiatives.

Systems should be streamlined throughout University. Clear guidelines should be provided. Staff resources and response time should be improved.

Not much information is shared about the success of campus fundraising initiatives and the effectiveness of fundraising relative to staff assigned and budget expenditures.

He helped move along a project I was coordinating.

For a new institution, birthed in 1957 SBU is doing sort of ok in advancement, but it never acknowledges that it a very young creature. In a neighborhood with older institution and those who, like NYU have remarkably pulled themselves up by their own bootstraps through effective leaders and fund raising, SBU remains a fourth rate entity. First: Columbia, Princeton, Yale Second: NYU; Third: Fordham Fourth...but a great bargain for undergrads, SBU

Actively involved in private funding for Stony Brook and communicates effectively with administration and faculty.

He has a very tough job as far as the SDM is concerned because so many of our faculty and alumni are no longer willing to give to the school.
22. OFFICE FOR THE VICE PRESIDENT FOR STUDENT AFFAIRS

Q.22.1 DO YOU HAVE REGULAR CONTACT WITH THE OFFICE OF THE VICE PRESIDENT FOR STUDENT AFFAIRS (PETER BAIGENT)?

211 respondents reported having had regular contact with the Office of the Vice President for Student Affairs. Of these, 16 work on East Campus, 184 work on West Campus, 4 work on both East and West Campus, and the remaining respondents work at other locations.

Q.22.2 HOW WOULD YOU RATE THE OFFICE OF THE VICE PRESIDENT FOR STUDENT AFFAIRS ON LEADERSHIP IN IMPROVING THE QUALITY OF STUDENT LIFE?

205 respondents provided responses. The overall response was positive, with 22.9% reporting excellent, 47.8% reporting good, 21.5% reporting fair, and 7.8% reporting poor. The positive/negative ratio was 70.7/29.3.

Q.22.3 HOW SATISFIED ARE YOU WITH THE DEGREE TO WHICH THE OFFICE OF THE VICE PRESIDENT FOR STUDENT AFFAIRS INVOLVES FACULTY, STAFF, AND STUDENTS IN POLICY DECISIONS?

182 respondents provided responses. 20.3% of respondents were very satisfied, 50.0% were somewhat satisfied, 17.6% were not very satisfied, and 12.1% were not at all satisfied.

Q.22.4 HOW WOULD YOU RATE THE OFFICE OF THE VICE PRESIDENT FOR STUDENT AFFAIRS ON ITS OVERALL EFFECTIVENESS IN SUPPORT OF THE UNIVERSITY’S ACADEMIC MISSION?

198 respondents provided responses. The overall response was positive, with 27.3% rating the office as excellent, 46.5% as good, 18.7% as fair, and 7.6% as poor.

Representative Comments

I really do like Peter Baigent, but I think he should have retired a while ago, and I’m always surprised that Admin hasn’t fired him. He should not be allowed to speak at any public University events. But the areas he supervises--Dean of Students office, Career Center, CPO--are all doing an excellent job with the resources they have.

Peter Baigent was always a source of good advice and imaginative suggestions.

Peter has done an excellent job. Peter’s office continues to perform at a very high level. Peter is a great individual to have in our midst. I can confidently say that our VP is looking out for students every day.
Student clubs and organizations are very poorly supported, and have to fight tooth and nail to receive funding or find space for meetings and events. This is highly problematic and reflective once again of a privatizing SUNY interested solely in profit making ventures such as athletic programs, not serving their students.

Dr. Baigent is a welcoming and fair Vice President for Student Affairs. He is smart and experienced. Dr. Baigent is the one person on campus who will listen to anyone and appears to value what students and staff say. Much appreciated.

Veterans need more support on campus. Around half of them drop out of SBU. Vice President has not provided the necessary funding to hire support staff to help our veteran students.

In recent years, it seems that the office of student affairs has gotten less and less truly connected the students. Dr. Baigent shows up at events but looks disinterested and leaves early. He does not show the students that he really cares. He seems to prefer what statistics show rather than dealing with the real students in front of him. The management of the office of community standards is awful. That staff is not very capable of doing their jobs well and the students suffer. I am so sorry to say that I, and many others with whom I have talked, have very little good to share about the workings of that office. The staff is truly not equipped or talented enough to run that very important office. More importantly, they ironically do not consider the most important part of the process...the students. They make mistakes in procedure and protocol, talk about students and their private issues in open spaces, are not open to feedback about their mistakes and simply do not consider the best learning opportunities for students as they go through the judicial process. That reflects poorly on the Vice President for Student Affairs as well.

FSA operates like a front organization or a hidden offshore tax avoiding playground. They don’t tell the truth unless forced to do so. The decision to eliminate the bookstore came without advising and consultations with the Senate. Their books are not open to scrutiny. Their actions further student unhappiness.

Baigent is a good guy, but he is working for an administration that does not understand the needs of CAS/University curriculum. Good curriculum is being sacrificed to concerns about revenue.

Charlie Robbins is a social worker who has no qualifications for his current position. Too often in conflict with academic programs and goals. Overly concerned with liability issues.

OSA staff is extremely responsive and positive in situations involving student actions.

The President does not support student well-being, but Peter Baigent seems to have tried to do the best possible. The President does not seem to recognize that the University is a place designed for students to learn. The treatment of undergrads is poor, the treatment of grad students atrocious and abysmal.

Over the last few years, the Office of Student Activities has lost nearly all their full-time staff members. They have either been unable to replace them, or they have decided it would be...
cheaper to have graduate and undergraduate student staff doing the same work. Ever since, it has been extremely difficult for students to work with this office. It is hard to get in touch with them; response time to inquiries is very poor.

### 23. OFFICE OF THE VICE PRESIDENT FOR RESEARCH

#### Q23.1. DO YOU HAVE REGULAR CONTACT WITH THE OFFICE OF THE VICE PRESIDENT FOR RESEARCH (DAVID CONOVER)?

181 respondents had regular contact with the Office of the Vice President for Research.

#### Q23.2. HOW WOULD YOU RATE THE OFFICE OF THE VICE PRESIDENT FOR RESEARCH ON ADMINISTRATIVE MANAGEMENT, INCLUDING ACCESSIBILITY, RESPONSIVENESS, AND BUDGETARY DECISIONS?

174 respondents provided responses. The overall response was slightly positive with 21.3% excellent, 39.1% good, 27.6% fair, and 12.1% poor. The ratio was 60.3% positive to 39.7% negative or 1.52.

Notably, members of the School of Medicine were the only unit that responded negatively to this question (ratio of 0.69).

#### Q23.3. HOW WOULD YOU RATE THE OFFICE OF THE VICE PRESIDENT FOR RESEARCH ON DEVELOPMENT OF NEW RESEARCH INITIATIVES?

163 respondents provided responses. The overall response was mixed with 18.4% excellent, 35.0% good, 25.8% fair, and 20.9% poor. The ratio was 53.4% positive to 46.6% negative or 1.14.

#### Q23.4. TO WHAT EXTENT DOES THE VICE PRESIDENT FOR RESEARCH (DAVID CONOVER) INVOLVE FACULTY, STAFF, AND STUDENTS THROUGH THE GOVERNANCE STRUCTURE IN DECISIONS THAT AFFECT POLICY?

131 respondents provided responses. The overall response was mixed with 22.1% were great deal, 28.2% some, 31.3% little, and 18.3% not at all. The ratio was 50.4% positive to 49.6% negative or 1.02.

#### Q23.5. HOW WOULD YOU RATE THE SERVICES OF ILAB?

64 respondents provided responses. The overall response was negative with 10.9% excellent, 17.2% good, 26.6% fair, and 45.3% poor. The ratio was 28.1% positive to 71.9% negative or 0.39.

**Representative Comments**

47 comments were submitted.
On most campus’s the VPR is one of the most powerful and influential administrators. However, our VPR is massively underfunded. The VPR should help boost and support research at SBU but cannot because they have no funds. In addition, the VPR should be responsible for all facilities on campus. This is also a serious problem. Many facilities are too expensive to use because they are trying to recover costs (e.g. salary costs). However, facilities should be in a position to properly support the research mission of the University. There are facilities in SOM under OSA and facilities on west campus. These should all be centralized under the VPR and properly resourced. This is probably the most important barrier to elevating the research ranking of the University.

I wish the Vice president for research had more power to implement what needs to be done to improve research activities at Stony Brook. It seems that the Office for Research is doing a lot of efforts but the results are limited by lack of support.

The grant administration was and is exceptional. The service provided on that end of the enterprise is superb. However, on the development of new initiatives, the office seemed to be reactive rather than proactive. The timetables for internal competitions for submitting restricted grants were late and made it unnecessary hard on the PIs. The office failed on the proactive role in grant development for large initiatives. Rather than competitions, the office could have facilitated team building. Furthermore, it seemed that other Universities OVPR offices knew of new grant initiatives by federal agencies before SBU's OVPR or communicated them more timely.

I-lab does not accommodate the faculty with SUNY 2020 start-up funds (state funding). Many of the I-lab service centers are set up ONLY for those with Research Foundation funding, and this was shortsighted and is causing problems that nobody seems to be addressing.

Never heard of iLab. No support, in fact, obstruction characterizes the Administration’s approach to research and researchers. Research Foundation people responsible for grant submission, and grants management people are good and helpful, although the general institutional support to manage grants is very poor.

The VPR should be in the business of assisting faculty find support for all kinds of research, not just applied research that will profit the University monetarily through patents and licensing fees. What happened to the ideal of the University as a bastion of unfettered basic research?

24. OFFICE OF THE VICE PRESIDENT FOR RESEARCH

Q24.1: ARE YOU INVOLVED IN EXTERNALLY FUNDED RESEARCH OR HAVE REGULAR CONTACT WITH THE OFFICE OF THE VICE PRESIDENT FOR RESEARCH?

341 respondents were involved in externally funded research or had regular contact with the Office of the Vice President for Research.
Q24.2: HOW EFFECTIVE IS THE OFFICE OF SPONSORED PROGRAMS IN TERMS OF THE SPEED AND QUALITY WITH WHICH THEY PROCESS GRANT PROPOSALS?

314 respondents provided responses. The overall response was very positive with 41.7% very effective, 45.9% somewhat effective, 7.6% not very effective, and 4.8% not at all effective. The ratio was 87.6% positive to 12.4% negative or 7.05.

Q24.3: ARE THE SERVICES RECEIVED COMMENSURATE WITH THE OVERHEAD CHARGED FOR GRANTS?

295 respondents provided responses. The overall response was very negative with 3.1% rating the services as more than expected, 24.8% as commensurate with charges, and 72.2% as less than expected. The ratio was 27.8% positive to 72.2% negative.

Q24.4: HOW SATISFIED ARE YOU WITH THE DISTRIBUTION OF THE INDIRECT COST ALLOCATION?

282 respondents provided responses. Of these, 5.7% were very satisfied, 24.1% somewhat satisfied, 33.3% not very satisfied, and 36.9% not at all satisfied. The overall response was negative with 29.8% positive and 70.2% negative and a ratio of 0.42.

Q24.5: HOW EFFECTIVE IS THE OFFICE OF THE VICE PRESIDENT FOR RESEARCH IN THE MANAGEMENT OF GRANTS ONCE THEY HAVE BEEN AWARDED?

296 respondents provided responses. The overall response was positive with 26.7% very effective, 52.4% somewhat effective, 12.8% not very effective, and 8.1% not at all effective. The ratio was 79.1% positive to 21.0% negative or 3.77.

Q24.6: HOW EFFECTIVE IS THE OFFICE OF THE VICE PRESIDENT FOR RESEARCH IN KEEPING YOU INFORMED ABOUT FUNDING OPPORTUNITIES, TARGET DATES, AND APPLICATION DEADLINES FOR EXTERNAL FUNDING?

298 respondents provided responses. The overall response was positive with 26.5% very effective, 46.6% somewhat effective, 15.1% not very effective, and 11.7% not at all effective. The ratio was 73.2% positive to 26.9% negative or 2.73.

Q24.7: HOW WOULD YOU RATE THE OFFICE OF RESEARCH COMPLIANCE?

269 respondents provided responses. The overall response was positive with 23.4% very effective, 52.4% somewhat effective, 14.9% not very effective, and 9.3% not at all effective. The ratio was 75.8% positive to 24.2% negative or 3.14.
Representative Comments

65 comments were submitted.

For the staff they have and management that they have to deal with, AVP learning on the job and not doing it very well, this office rocks. They have also needed to deal with a new VP almost every 18 months which causes the direction to shift.

Impossible to find out and keep track of grants for PIs in departments without dedicated staff for it. It is so horrible to figure out if your grant is being billed properly (and often it is not) or what money you have left, etc. And time delays in getting reimbursed for out of pocket expenses (which are huge because Wolfmart is so horrible) are terrible. Vendors do not want to work with us because Stony Brook is known for not paying its bills on time. Sponsored programs is too short handed! The people are great, but their workload is too huge.

Other than taking care of the submission of proposals, setting up new accounts, and submitting final financial reports, I really don’t see what the office of sponsored programs does for us. Their accounting system is extremely difficult to use. We have to make our own purchases and handle personnel appointments. I must depend heavily on the single administrative assistant that serves my entire department. The people who work in the Research foundation seem intent on telling you what you can’t do rather than trying to help you find a way to get some things done.

Overhead is high. If they get 59% of my research money, then I expect a lot of service. To be honest, there’s probably not any level of service that they could provide that I would think it’s justified 59%. Overhead completely eats away at my research abilities.

At many universities Principal Investigators receive a small fraction of the ICR for incidental expenses that the sponsors will not cover, such as laptops, or office furniture, or some travel. This can serve as an inducement to faculty to write more proposals and seek more grants. That SBU does not do this is indicative of the attitude that the administration knows better than the faculty how to pursue research.

Compliance office is understaffed. Delays in approval often result from administrative errors which could be caught ahead of time if Compliance staff had time to pre-review (sometimes works for IACUC, but not for IBC or IRB). Compliance office also should have liaisons to assist faculty with applications.

Ms. Judy Matuk and her team are one of the unsung heroes on campus. They work hard to support investigator-based research, as well as participate in training programs. They are to be commended for doing an excellent job!

Research Compliance has become exceptionally bureaucratic. Partly due to federal mandates, partly due to implementations.
25. OFFICE OF THE CHIEF INFORMATION OFFICER

143 respondents have had regular contact with the Office of the Chief Information Officer. Of these, 26 work on East Campus, 107 work on West Campus, 5 work on both East and West Campus, and the remaining respondents work at Southampton, or Other.

Q25.2: HOW WOULD YOU RATE THE OFFICE OF THE CHIEF INFORMATION OFFICER ON DEVELOPMENT OF NEW IT INITIATIVES?

For those working solely on East Campus, 58% of respondents rate the development of new IT initiatives as Excellent or Good, and 42% Fair or Poor. For those working solely on West Campus, 64% of respondents rate the development of new IT initiatives as Excellent or Good, and 15% Fair or Poor. The remainder either had no basis for opinion or did not answer the question.

Q25.3: TO WHAT EXTENT DOES THE OFFICE OF THE CHIEF INFORMATION OFFICER INVOLVE FACULTY AND STAFF THROUGH THE GOVERNANCE STRUCTURE IN DECISIONS THAT AFFECT POLICY?

Across all campuses, respondents who gave ratings of Excellent also think that the CIO involves faculty and staff either a great deal or some in decisions that affect policy; 65% of those who gave a rating of Poor felt that faculty and staff are not involved at all.

Representative Comments

While Dr. Woo is new, she seems to bring energy and originality to her position. I am hopeful.

The CIO position has been a revolving door. We hire good candidates; they see how understaffed and underfunded IT is at our University and leave quickly. At this point, the CIO has held no meetings with the campus IT staff and has occasionally sent emails detailing restructuring within the department. She needs to meet with us to discuss campus IT.

Ever since Rich Reeder retired -- we have been subjected to a series of CIOs who have a "short-timer" mentality. They grab some quick publicity, make a few decisions so they look like leaders -- and then run for the exit before any consequences of their decisions become apparent. It’s easy to be the "Decider" when you don’t have to "live with" the consequences of your choices.

It is the fifth or 6th person in this position and no one will stay. Promote from within and eliminate the chaos in IT.

DoIT needs to maintain open communication with the non-DoIT IT technicians to keep us up-to-date on projects and goals of the department. It would be helpful to feel like a part of the conversation rather than an outsider.
26. OFFICE OF THE DEAN OF THE GRADUATE SCHOOL

Q26.2: HOW WOULD YOU RATE THE DEAN OF THE GRADUATE SCHOOL (CHARLES TABER) ON ADMINISTRATIVE MANAGEMENT, INCLUDING ACCESSIBILITY, RESPONSIVENESS, AND BUDGETARY DECISIONS?

210 respondents provided responses to this question. A remarkable 86.2% rated the Dean of the Graduate School positive, with 50.5% rating him excellent and 35.7% rating him as good. 9.5% rated the Dean as fair in administrative management and 4.3% rated him as poor.

Q26.3: HOW WOULD YOU RATE THE DEAN OF THE GRADUATE SCHOOL (CHARLES TABER) ON LEADERSHIP IN IMPROVING THE QUALITY OF GRADUATE STUDENT LIFE?

206 respondents provided responses to this question. A remarkable 87.9% rated him positive in this category, with 48.1% rating him as excellent and 39.8% rating him as good. 7.8% rated him as fair and 4.4% rated him as poor.

Q26.4: TO WHAT EXTENT DOES THE GRADUATE SCHOOL FACILITATE THE QUALITY OF GRADUATE EDUCATION?

207 respondents provided responses to this question, with 48.8% responding that the Graduate School does an excellent job in facilitating the quality of graduate education. 36.2% responded as good, while 11.1% responded as fair and 3.9% responded as poor.

Q26.5: TO WHAT EXTENT DOES THE GRADUATE SCHOOL FACILITATE THE RECRUITMENT OF QUALITY GRADUATE STUDENTS?

195 respondents provided responses to this question, with 30.8% responding that the Graduate School facilitates the recruitment of quality graduate students very well. 44.1% responded as somewhat well, while 14.9% responded as fair, and 10.3% responded not at all.

Q26.6: TO WHAT EXTENT DOES THE DEAN OF THE GRADUATE SCHOOL (CHARLES TABER) INVOLVE FACULTY, STAFF, AND STUDENTS THROUGH THE GOVERNANCE STRUCTURE IN DECISIONS THAT AFFECT POLICY?

171 respondents provided responses to this question, with 47.4% responding that the Dean involves faculty, staff and students very well in decisions. 33.9% responded somewhat well, 11.7% not very well, and 7.0% not at all.
Representative Comments

Both Charles Taber and Interim Grad. Dean Nancy Goroff have been of invaluable help, not to mention extremely responsive, to the graduate program of my department. Wish more administrators were like these two.

Charles is a distinguished educator and a very effective and caring graduate administrator

Charles Taber is a great leader in Graduate Education; he also did a lot for undergraduate education, even in his short time as interim provost. This signals his true leadership qualities, dedication and abilities.

Charles Taber is the best Dean/upper level administrator on the Stony Brook Campus that I have regular communication with. He is smart, has excellent communication skills, has intimate knowledge of how things work at SBU and hence how to get things done, understand what is being done well and what is in need of improvement. […]

Chuck Taber has done an outstanding job as Dean of the Graduate School. It is the most functional office on campus.

He is consults thoroughly and always makes a decision that you can understand, even if you do not agree with it.

Chuck Taber is a treasure. While I wish the Graduate School had the resources to support graduate students at a higher level, thus making us competitive with other area universities, he has done the very best he can with that office.

Chuck Taber is excellent--dedicated to students and works very hard for the betterment of his colleagues and SBU.

Chuck's commitment to graduate education and postdoctoral scholar support is unsurpassed.

Dean Taber does a nice job, but sometimes his hands are tied because of the bureaucracy of Stony Brook.

Dean Taber is wonderful and his staff collaborates to support graduate students in their endeavors.

I believe that Charles Taber is doing the best he can with the staff he has. Upper staff in Records/Admissions can be rude. The lower-level staff in Records/Admissions are pleasant to interact with, but are inconsistent with policy enforcement. In addition, in Spring 2016 the deadline for clearances was moved up (then moved back again, but still earlier than previous years) to help with degrees being awarded faster/earlier. Our department’s May degree review still did not occur until late July/early August (and we submitted clearance paperwork by their deadline). This is not fair to students who have been working hard and paying fees during their tenure as graduate students. I have also received comments from students who have visited the office that it is not a welcoming environment.
I went to Chuck several times on administrative matters or the award of TAships and such-like in the course of business arising from various positions I then held. He listens and is a straight shooter. I couldn’t always get what I hoped, but I always got a hearing, a probing discussion, and an explanation for the decision taken.

In my contacts with Dean Taber he has been professional and is someone that I trust.

Need to increase stipends for graduate students to be competitive.

Not enough effort is made to recruit and compensate quality graduate students, and support those departments with stellar track records of graduate student training (such as Ecology and Evolution).

Recruitment is difficult in the non-STEM disciplines -- graduate stipends are very low compared to our competitors. I realize the Graduate School must operate within a budget, so blame cannot be placed there.

Taber is outstanding. He is very responsive to programmatic needs.

The Dean has done a remarkable job with insufficient resources.

The graduate school needs additional funds to cover recruitment TA lines for all departments. Otherwise, it will be difficult to grow our graduate programs.

The Graduate School needs to be more transparent about the allocation of funds to support Graduate Student TAs. For most units in CAS, the allocation has decreased by 50% or more over the past several years. Several departments can only admit 4 to 6 graduate students per year, a number that is simply not sufficient to maintain a nationally recognized program.

The Office of the Dean of the Graduate School is outstanding
SUMMARY OF SURVEY RESULTS FOR DEAN SPECIFIC SECTIONS

Some units, especially those in the Schools of the Health Science Center, have few full-time faculty and only full-time faculty were permitted to answer the Dean-specific questions on the survey. As a result, in some units, even though a large percentage of eligible faculty responded to the survey there were fewer than 30 individuals who rated several Deans. For example, one school has 9 eligible full-time faculty and 8 responded to the survey (89%) and another school has 38 eligible full-time faculty and 19 responded (50%). Unfortunately, in a smaller school a rating of a specific Dean is based on an insufficiently large sample to draw confident conclusions. For example, in a School with 38 full-time faculty, of which 19 responded to the survey, a 50% approval rating for the Dean generates a margin of error of 16%. We can thus say with 95% confidence that approval of the Dean is between 34% and 66%. However, this is a very wide margin and the estimate is not especially useful. Our confidence in estimates of other Deans, included in the report, who oversee larger schools or colleges, is far greater because they are rated by a larger number of full-time faculty.

The survey response summary in this section is only for the Deans of units with more than 30 respondents.

COLLEGE OF ARTS AND SCIENCES

Q27.1 - HOW WOULD YOU RATE YOUR DEAN ON ACADEMIC LEADERSHIP?

There were 255 responses to this question; 22 (8.6%) rated the Dean as excellent; 61 (23.9%) rated him as good; 52 (20.4%) rated him as fair; and 120 (47.1%) rated him as poor. The ratio of positive to negative responses is 32.5% to 67.5%.

Q27.2 – HOW WOULD YOU RATE YOUR DEAN ON ADMINISTRATIVE MANAGEMENT, INCLUDING ACCESSIBILITY, RESPONSIVENESS, AND BUDGETARY DECISIONS?

Of 246 responses, 18 (7.3%) were excellent; 54 (22.0%) were good; 43 (17.5%) were fair; and 131 (53.3%) were poor. The ratio of positive to negative responses is 29.3% to 70.7%.

Q27.3 – HOW WOULD YOU RATE YOUR DEAN ON THE QUALITY OF ADMINISTRATIVE APPOINTMENTS (INCLUDING ASSOCIATE AND ASSISTANT DEANS AND CHAIRS)?

There were 207 responses to this question. 22 (10.6%) rated the Dean as excellent; 56 (27.1%) rated him as good; 54 (26.1%) rated him as fair; and 75 (36.2%) rated him as poor. The ratio of positive to negative responses is 37.7% to 62.3.
2016 University Senate Survey

Q27.4 - TO WHAT EXTENT DOES YOUR DEAN INVOLVE FACULTY, STAFF, AND STUDENTS THROUGH THE GOVERNANCE STRUCTURE IN DECISIONS THAT AFFECT POLICY?

There were 234 responses to this question. The Dean was rated as involving the above groups a great deal by 23 respondents (9.8%); involving them some by 64 respondents (27.4%); involving them a little by 78 respondents (33.3%); and not involving them at all by 69 respondents (29.5%). The positive to negative ratio in this section is 37.2% to 62.8%.

Q27.5 - TO WHAT EXTENT DOES YOUR DEAN PROVIDE THE INFRASTRUCTURE AND RESOURCES TO SUPPORT ACADEMIC RESEARCH PROGRAMS?

Of the 228 responses to this question, 11 (4.8%) reported that he provides a great deal of support to these programs; 52 (22.8%) reported that he provides some support; 83 (36.4%) responded that he provides a little support; and 82 (36.0%) responded that he gives no support to these programs. The positive to negative ratio in this section is 27.6% to 72.4%.

Q27.6 - TO WHAT EXTENT DOES YOUR DEAN RECRUIT HIGH LEVEL EXPERIENCED RESEARCHERS TO SUPPORT ACADEMIC RESEARCH PROGRAMS?

There were 182 answers to this question. 23 (12.6%) of the respondents replied a great deal; 46 (25.3%) replied some; 47 (25.8%) replied a little; and 66 (36.3%) replied not at all. The positive to negative ratio is 37.9% to 62.1%.

Q27.7 - TO WHAT EXTENT IS YOUR DEAN ABLE TO RETAIN HIGH-LEVEL EXPERIENCED RESEARCHERS TO SUPPORT ACADEMIC RESEARCH PROGRAMS?

This question was answered by 165 people. It was recorded that the Dean is able to achieve this goal a great deal by 17 (10.3%) of the respondents; Some(what) by 37 (22.4%) of the respondents; a little by 39 respondents (23.6%); and not at all by 72 respondents (43.6%). The positive to negative ratio is 32.7% to 67.3%.

Analysis

We compared the 2016 scores for the Dean of Arts & Sciences with the scores in the 2013 survey. The 2013 survey results refer to the performance of Dean Nancy Squires, while the 2016 survey results refer to Dean Sacha Kopp. While the 2016 survey contained more dean-specific questions than the 2013 survey, the first few questions were almost identical to those of the 2013 survey. However, some of the questions in the 2013 survey had an unbalanced (3 positive/2 negative) set of responses, making a direct
comparison problematic. In addition, the 2013 survey only requested Dean-specific responses from faculty (not staff). Despite these differences in the surveys, we see a precipitous decline in the scores as shown in the table below.

Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question Number</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Very Good</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Poor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q27.1</td>
<td>How would you rate your Dean on academic leadership?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>50 (32.5%)</td>
<td>43 (27.9%)</td>
<td>31 (20.1%)</td>
<td>19 (12.3%)</td>
<td>11 (7.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>22 (8.6%)</td>
<td>61 (23.9%)</td>
<td>52 (20.4%)</td>
<td>120 (47.1%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q27.2</td>
<td>How would you rate your dean on administrative management, including accessibility, responsiveness, and budgetary decisions?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>52 (33.8%)</td>
<td>43 (27.9%)</td>
<td>28 (18.2%)</td>
<td>19 (12.3%)</td>
<td>12 (7.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>18 (7.3%)</td>
<td>54 (22.0%)</td>
<td>43 (17.5%)</td>
<td>131 (53.3%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q27.3</td>
<td>How would you rate your dean on the quality of administrative appointments (including Associate and Assistant Deans and Chairs)?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>41 (32.0%)</td>
<td>37 (28.9%)</td>
<td>24 (18.8%)</td>
<td>19 (14.8%)</td>
<td>7 (5.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>22 (10.6%)</td>
<td>56 (27.1%)</td>
<td>54 (26.1%)</td>
<td>75 (36.2%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There were two other questions on the 2013 survey. One of them had a different set of responses, and the other was not repeated on the 2016, so they were not included in the table above. However, the results show the same pattern of responses.

Representative Comments

There were 88 comments about this Dean most of which were extremely lengthy. This would indicate that roughly one out of every 2-3 respondents (depending upon the question) felt strongly enough to take the time necessary to express their feelings. The few positive comments were neutral in nature and have been included here for balance. The overwhelming majority of the comments were negative (in keeping with the ratios reported above). Perception of the Dean’s relative concern for Arts or Sciences might be a function of the respondent’s affiliation with either one or the other of the two general areas.

This is the most serious problem facing the University. The CAS dean has his own agenda (more music! less science) that he is pursuing with only the guise of consultative behavior. He
has made sweeping and college-wide harmful decisions in order to balance his budget. He has bankrupted several departments, been the cause for several top chairs to step down, he is not persuadable as to anything but balancing his budget on the backs of the faculty of CAS. The quality of the education is plummeting, the best people are looking to leave and he is taking money from departments and programs and gaining through attrition. [...] 

Our Dean is very proud to be a physicist and has repeatedly told us that he doesn’t understand how humanities work. He pretends to ask for information but ends up doing what financially works for his office. Large classes in humanities, budget cuts, no hires, low pay for adjuncts (with no stability) do not seem to bother him despite all of our efforts to educate him on some important matters to us.

Although he is Dean of Arts & Sciences, only sciences seem to matter.

The current dean of CAS is an unmitigated, unsustainable disaster. He is not only unqualified for his position, having never been a chair or held a college-wide responsibility, but he is a person of low character who is not an honest partner.

He is incompetent, inexperienced, and grandiose. He does not understand the basic workings of a research University. This person thinks he can renege on startups or on funding for continuing graduate students.

He is incomparable in his ability to waste precious faculty time.

We can only hope that the new Provost will replace him immediately.

Our Dean Sacha Kopp is known in the college as a rude, arrogant, dismissive, and inconsiderate administrator. He does not understand the Humanities, yet refuses to heed the advice from those who have professional knowledge in respective fields. He holds meeting and forum claiming that he wants to "listen and learn." However, these meetings and forum are mere patronizing gestures to show that he has given faculty, staff, and students a chance to voice their concerns and opinions. However, we often come out of these meetings, forum, etc., feeling like he never incorporates our concerns and needs into his decision-making. The very gesture of creating a forum for us to share our concerns is after all a silencing gesture on his faculty and staff. The status of CAS is at stake, and if we want to maintain our status as an R1 University, we need to seriously consider the importance of Humanities and Social Sciences. Sacha Kopp’s attitude of treating Humanities and Social Sciences as service units, his lack of interest in graduate students and their research, and lack of concrete support for research in Humanities and Social Sciences will have negative impact on Stony Brook in the end. He pays lip service to faculty and staff in terms of research support and incentive for service and hard work. However, none of these has concrete outcomes. I do not believe in a Dean who manages his faculty and staff as if he were a Walmart manager. I do not believe in a Dean whose job it is to advocate for his faculty and staff positions himself against their needs and benefits. The majority of us feel helpless and does not feel like we have any advocate we can go to without the fear of retribution. We need our higher administration to look into this matter and rectify an unpleasant working environment that has clouded CAS for the past two and a half years. If necessary, a
vote of confidence should be put forth at the end of the Dean’s three-year term. This will allow
faculty and staff to have a say in building or recuperating a healthy working environment

Dean Kopp has been a disaster. He has created programs and changed departmental pro-
cedures without any clear vision or goals and without departmental involvement in the process.
The hodgepodge methods that he uses in his leadership have created several hardships within
several departments under his administration. Most recently, he moved all the members of
three different departments to new locations in several buildings despite several logical pro-
posals that limited the number of moves necessary - treating lecturers as second-class citizens
and adjuncts as no citizens at all. He is not clear (or honest) in his expression of his vision and
has permitted certain departments to negatively impact the conditions in others without any
discussion of the possible repercussions that might result - all the while ignoring the advice of
experts and senior tenured departmental members. His creation of a "shared services" depart-
ment has resulted in "services" for one and a total lack of services for the other. Since his
arrival, he has relied on the advice of some of his faculty to the exclusion of most, choosing to
listen to those who share his ideas and being very dismissive on anyone who is not on a tenure
track. Collegiality has been virtually eliminated in the Humanities with his approval and
through divisive administrative style.

Dean Kopp has encouraged some important ideas, such as increased attention to recruit-
ing undergraduates to attend SBU and the idea of requiring undergraduates to minor. That
said, his primary concern is budget (i.e. cutting it) with a secondary concern for undergraduate
teaching. He pays lip service to the research mission of the college but in fact has done many
things to harm that mission, including stripping junior faculty of startup monies. In many in-
stances, he will go through the motions of collecting faculty input only to arrive at the same
outcome with which he came in. He has a condescending approach to faculty and departments.
Morale has decreased under his tenure, which is really saying something given that CAS has
always struggled due to a lack of resources.

The Dean started horribly, and has gotten better each semester.

He has an Associate Dean for Research who is ineffective. He closed the Center for Survey
down and brings over the two employees to assist faculty with grants. They have no experi-
ence in this field to my knowledge, and nobody is using them. He has wasted enormous
amounts of money in their salaries and a few of his staff’s promotions.

He has expanded his office so much that there are people literally sitting in the hall. Yet
the CAS departments are cut so lean, they can barely operate.

Dean Kopp talks a good talk about restoring the liberal arts to a place of prominence
within the University. However, he has not carried through. Admittedly, he is constrained by
the Provost and the President, and he has over-committed what limited discretionary funds he
has. The Provost and President must wipe out the structural deficit that CAS has had for dec-
ades, and provide proper funding for the educational mission of the University. That the
professional schools are gaining more majors at the expense of CAS is immaterial - CAS still
 teaches many of their courses. However, Dean Kopp has been ineffective at staunching the
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move towards SBU's becoming a trade school. Dean Kopp has not shown great leadership, and has lost the confidence of many of the faculty.

This is the worst Dean in my time at SBU. He lacks the wisdom and experience to manage a complex organization with varied needs and requirements. He micromanages individual departments, but without doing the necessary work to understand a situation or the history of that department. This leads to some very bad, ill-considered, decisions. He is clearly trying to fashion an administrative career for himself without having the necessary range of skills to be an effective high-level administrator. He is a very bad man-manager (and I use man purposefully—he's even worse when it comes to women); he does not have sufficient knowledge of the social sciences and humanities to know what these departments are doing or supposed to be doing; he doesn't listen. I may not agree with everything Chuck Taber does or says but you trust him. He is a straight shooter. The Dean is not.

According to the Dean's draconian methods of saving money, we lost and are losing students, faculty, and many courses. [...] The Dean's ego to succeed destroys not only the economic support of those who lost their contracts, but destroys as well the morale of the departments involved in these kind of purges. He bestowed upon himself a power to neglect the renewed contracts and fire professors without any reasonable explanation. It [might be] illegal, but he is still doing it!

The Budget of CAS is a mystery. It is not clear how funds are allocated among units, and there seem to be random amounts of debt added to each department each year. Moreover, funds generated from summer tuition and Master's student tuition are not actually available to each department, but are somehow added into the moving target of debt payments.

The CAS-level decisions—from carving out the strategic plan to instituting a new program of creative writing and film—seem to be made top-down, and too often the town hall meetings seem like just a formality and not a place where decisions are being shaped. I was especially disappointed at how the strategic plan was written and finalized without a transparent and collective procedure.

Dean Kopp has learned that he has the ability to reassign employees, making them his chess pieces and moves staff from one department to another. In his 2 years here, he has already moved eight staff members to positions in other departments, seven of whom are UUP professional staff. Each one of them were put into positions they needed to be trained to do for they had no prior experience. He has caused morale to become nearly non-existent. Stony Brook has become just a job to many because of this dean. He has killed any sense of family that once existed.

Dean Kopp is doing a very good job under very trying circumstances.

The stealing from Peter to pay Paul antics of this dean will not work to sustain innovation anywhere whether in the classroom, in administration or on the side of research. This dean does not seem to understand this basic issue. He includes faculty and staff only on a superficial level, but appears to [pass on] blame in the end, not to give credit.
Rather than taking innovations and your best performers and rewarding them, he instead takes from them to give to other areas that are less innovative. This suppresses the entire process that could assist us in attaining financial viability.

**COLLEGE OF ENGINEERING AND APPLIED SCIENCES**

108 respondents indicated that they work in the College of Engineering and Applied Sciences. Of these, 77 answered the questions regarding the Dean. Among the 31 who either did not answer the questions, or claimed they had no basis to judge, 2 indicated that they could not judge because the Dean is so new. In the non-responding group, 87% are full-time employees, and 39% are either tenured or tenure-track.

**Q27.1. HOW WOULD YOUR RATE YOUR DEAN ON ACADEMIC LEADERSHIP?**

Among the 68 responses to this question, 64.7% rated the Dean’s academic leadership as excellent or good, and 35.3% rated it as fair or poor.

**Q27.2. HOW WOULD YOU RATE YOUR DEAN ON ADMINISTRATIVE MANAGEMENT, INCLUDING ACCESSIBILITY, RESPONSIVENESS, AND BUDGETARY DECISIONS?**

Among the 65 responses to this question, 50.8% rated the Dean’s administrative management as excellent or good, and 49.2% as fair or poor.

**Q27.3. HOW WOULD YOU RATE YOUR DEAN ON THE QUALITY OF ADMINISTRATIVE APPOINTMENTS (INCLUDING ASSOCIATE AND ASSISTANT DEANS AND CHAIRS)?**

Among the 67 responses to this question, 65.7% rated the quality of administrative appointments as excellent or good, and 34.3% reported it as fair or poor.

**Q27.4. TO WHAT EXTENT DOES YOUR DEAN INVOLVE FACULTY, STAFF, AND STUDENTS THROUGH THE GOVERNANCE STRUCTURE IN DECISIONS THAT AFFECT POLICY?**

Among the 60 responses to this question, 53.3% said that the Dean involved faculty staff and students either a great deal or some in policy decisions, with 31% of them having been involved in governance at some level. 46.7% said that the Dean involved faculty staff and students either a little or not at all in policy decisions, with 21% of them having been involved in governance at some level.
Q27.5. TO WHAT EXTENT DOES YOUR DEAN PROVIDE THE INFRASTRUCTURE AND RESOURCES TO SUPPORT ACADEMIC RESEARCH PROGRAMS?

Among the 60 responses to this question, 53.3% said that the Dean supports infrastructure and resources either a great deal or some, while 46.7% said it was supported either a little or not at all.

Q27.6. TO WHAT EXTENT DOES YOUR DEAN RECRUIT HIGH LEVEL EXPERIENCED RESEARCHERS TO SUPPORT ACADEMIC RESEARCH PROGRAMS?

Among the 48 responses to this question, 64.6% believed that the Dean recruits high-level experienced researchers either a great deal or some, while 35.4% reports that this recruiting occurs either a little or not at all.

Q27.7. TO WHAT EXTENT IS YOUR DEAN ABLE TO RETAIN HIGH-LEVEL EXPERIENCED RESEARCHERS TO SUPPORT ACADEMIC RESEARCH PROGRAMS?

Among the 46 responses to this question, 63.0% believed that the Dean is able to retain high-level experienced researchers either a great deal or some, while 37.0% claims that this is either a little or not at all.

Representative Comments

Dean Fotis is new and is doing a good job. I hope that CEAS will keep moving up and up.

He is a strong leader.

The dean is new. He is making decisions without really spending time understanding the environment and context.

One needs to strike a balance in the quest for funding. For instance when mechanical engineering recently received some big new grants the lead title in the CEAS web page story was not that it was expected to create new knowledge but that mechanical engineer's funding had gone up significantly (of internal interest but not the best way to put our best foot forward to the world). Also, we now have in CEAS a millionaire's club for researchers with a million or more dollars in grants but where is the club for great teachers?

There are budgetary constraints to keeping and recruiting high level experienced researchers, hardly any support available for startup funding of said faculty.

The only thing I’ve heard coming from the Dean’s direction is that we have no money to do anything. The top junior faculty in the department are leaving; more are lining up to leave.
OFFICE OF STUDENT AFFAIRS

Only 13 respondents reported working in the Office of Student Affairs. That number is below our publication threshold, and consequently we do not publish the results.

SCHOOL OF DENTAL MEDICINE

QUESTION 27.1: HOW WOULD YOU RATE YOUR DEAN ON ACADEMIC LEADERSHIP?

60 people provided a response to this question. The overall response was negative with 20.0% rating the Dean as excellent, 5.0% as good, 21.7% as fair, and 53.3% as poor. The positive/negative ratio was 25.0/75.0.

QUESTION 27.2: HOW WOULD YOU RATE YOUR DEAN ON ADMINISTRATIVE MANAGEMENT, INCLUDING ACCESSIBILITY, RESPONSIVENESS, AND BUDGETARY DECISIONS?

57 people provided a response to this question. The overall response was negative with 21.1% rating the Dean as excellent, 3.5% as good, 19.3% as fair, and 56.1% as poor. The positive/negative ratio was 24.6/75.4.

QUESTION 27.3: HOW WOULD YOU RATE YOUR DEAN ON THE QUALITY OF ADMINISTRATIVE APPOINTMENTS (INCLUDING ASSOCIATE AND ASSISTANT DEANS AND CHAIRS)?

59 people provided a response to this question. The overall response was negative with 18.6% rating the Dean as excellent, 6.8% as good, 20.3% as fair, and 54.2% as poor. The positive/negative ratio was 25.4/74.5.

QUESTION 27.4: TO WHAT EXTENT DOES YOUR DEAN INVOLVE FACULTY, STAFF, AND STUDENTS THROUGH THE GOVERNANCE STRUCTURE IN DECISIONS THAT AFFECT POLICY?

55 people provided a response to this question. The overall response was negative with 16.4% rating the Dean as excellent, 5.5% as good, 18.2% as fair, and 60.0% as poor. The positive/negative ratio was 21.8/78.2.
QUESTION 27.5: TO WHAT EXTENT DOES YOUR DEAN PROVIDE THE INFRASTRUCTURE AND RESOURCES TO SUPPORT ACADEMIC RESEARCH PROGRAMS?

48 people provided a response to this question. The overall response was negative with 18.8% rating the Dean as excellent, 12.5% as good, 31.3% as fair, and 37.5% as poor. The positive/negative ratio was 31.3/68.8.

QUESTION 27.6: TO WHAT EXTENT DOES YOUR DEAN RECRUIT HIGH LEVEL EXPERIENCED RESEARCHERS TO SUPPORT ACADEMIC RESEARCH PROGRAMS?

51 people provided a response to this question. The overall response was negative with 15.7% rating the Dean as excellent, 11.8% as good, 13.7% as fair, and 58.8% as poor. The positive/negative ratio was 27.5/72.5.

QUESTION 27.7: TO WHAT EXTENT IS YOUR DEAN ABLE TO RETAIN HIGH-LEVEL EXPERIENCED RESEARCHERS TO SUPPORT ACADEMIC RESEARCH PROGRAMS?

51 people provided a response to this question. The overall response was negative with 15.7% rating the Dean as excellent, 11.8% as good, 15.7% as fair, and 56.9% as poor. The positive/negative ratio was 27.5/72.5.

Analysis

We compared the 2016 scores for the Dean of Dental Medicine with the scores in the 2013 survey. The 2013 survey results refer to the performance of Dean Ray Williams, while the 2016 survey results refer to Mary Truhlar. The number of responses from the School of Dental Medicine to the 2013 survey request did not reach our threshold for publication, while the 2016 survey response number did. Now, three years after the publication of the 2013 survey results, we chose to provide some 2013 survey summary data in order to show a general trend in attitudes among the faculty and staff of the school. While the 2016 survey contained more dean-specific questions than the 2013 survey, the first few questions were almost identical to those of the 2013 survey. However, some of the questions in the 2013 survey had an unbalanced (3 positive/2 negative) set of responses, making a direct comparison problematic. Despite these differences, we see an increase in the percentage of positive responses, although the percentage of negative responses is still unusually high.
Table 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question Number</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Very Good</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Poor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q27.1</td>
<td>How would you rate your Dean on academic leadership?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013 1 (5.6%)</td>
<td>1 (5.6%)</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>5 (2.8%)</td>
<td>11 (61.1%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016 12 (20.0%)</td>
<td>3 (5.0%)</td>
<td>13 (21.7%)</td>
<td>32 (53.3%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q27.2</td>
<td>How would you rate your dean on administrative management, including accessibility, responsiveness, and budgetary decisions?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013 1 (5.6%)</td>
<td>1 (5.6%)</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>3 (1.7%)</td>
<td>13 (72.2%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016 12 (21.1%)</td>
<td>2 (3.5%)</td>
<td>11 (19.3%)</td>
<td>32 (56.1%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q27.3</td>
<td>How would you rate your dean on the quality of administrative appointments (including Associate and Assistant Deans and Chairs)?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013 1 (5.6%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016 11 (18.6%)</td>
<td>4 (6.8%)</td>
<td>12 (20.3%)</td>
<td>32 (54.2%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There were two other questions on the 2013 survey. One of them had a different set of responses, and the other was not repeated on the 2016, so they were not included in the table above. However, the results show the same pattern of responses.

Representative Comments

Thirty respondents provided comments about Dean of the School of Dental Medicine. Most comments were negative with some making serious negative allegations about her leadership. Three comments were very supportive of the dean and her leadership.

On Kaushansky’s instructions, she has forced out excellent research faculty. She treats faculty and staff with contempt. I think Kaushansky’s goal is to close the dental school; why else would he have chosen this dean? If the dental school does not close - it will just be a "trade school".

A highly compassionate and effective leader whose vision of the needs and future direction of the SDM are right on the mark. A peace maker and strong advocate of the patient care needs of the community, especially those of the elderly and children.

There is poor retention of faculty and staff. The Dean has stated to staff that all staff are replaceable and it’s the SB way to move on away from SDM to get promotions or raises. The dean’s decisions making us poor. She promotes her own cronies and pushes back those who are
well-deserving. She makes undeserving negative comments about faculty and staff. We need leadership and someone who can bring the SDM family back together!

Just recently, she mentioned to a faculty: "You do not align with my administration, therefore you can leave". This is a dictatorial way of leadership. Is this the kind of leader what the State of NY (tax payers) would want and students would deserve?

The current Dean has significantly diminished the standing of what was once one of the top dental schools in the nation. The current Dean has rapidly propelled the school towards trade school status. Her lack of vision and leadership has made it impossible to retain our excellent faculty and recruitment and development is virtually non-existent. There is no indication that there will be any changes in the near future leading to all-time lows in morale of faculty, staff and students as the exodus of our talented and dedicated faculty continue.

The mockery of a legitimate search that defied any adherence to standard AA/EEO practices and the selection of this person over at least two others whose CV’s and experience were vastly more qualified, put all other decisions made at the HSC and the SDM under suspicion. People who served on the search committee that selected Dean Truhlar have received nice promotions within six months and hefty salary increases.

SCHOOL OF HEALTH TECHNOLOGY & MANAGEMENT

**QUESTION 27.1: HOW WOULD YOU RATE YOUR DEAN ON ACADEMIC LEADERSHIP?**

69 people provided a response to this question. The overall response was positive with 52.2% rating the Dean as excellent, 21.7% as good, 20.3% as fair, and 5.8% as poor. The positive/negative ratio was 73.9/26.1.

**QUESTION 27.2: HOW WOULD YOU RATE YOUR DEAN ON ADMINISTRATIVE MANAGEMENT, INCLUDING ACCESSIBILITY, RESPONSIVENESS, AND BUDGETARY DECISIONS?**

71 people provided a response to this question. The overall response was positive with 45.1% rating the Dean as excellent, 25.4% as good, 18.3% as fair, and 11.3% as poor. The positive/negative ratio was 70.5/29.6.

**QUESTION 27.3: HOW WOULD YOU RATE YOUR DEAN ON THE QUALITY OF ADMINISTRATIVE APPOINTMENTS (INCLUDING ASSOCIATE AND ASSISTANT DEANS AND CHAIRS)?**

68 people provided a response to this question. The overall response was positive with 44.1% rating the Dean as excellent, 22.1% as good, 25% as fair, and 8.8% as poor. The positive/negative ratio was 66.2/33.8.
QUESTION 27.4: TO WHAT EXTENT DOES YOUR DEAN INVOLVE FACULTY, STAFF, AND STUDENTS THROUGH THE GOVERNANCE STRUCTURE IN DECISIONS THAT AFFECT POLICY?

62 people provided a response to this question. The overall response was positive with 45.2% rating the Dean as excellent, 16.1% as good, 25.8% as fair, and 12.9% as poor. The positive/negative ratio was 61.3/38.7.

QUESTION 27.5: TO WHAT EXTENT DOES YOUR DEAN PROVIDE THE INFRASTRUCTURE AND RESOURCES TO SUPPORT ACADEMIC RESEARCH PROGRAMS?

56 people provided a response to this question. The overall response was positive with 41.1% rating the Dean as excellent, 26.8% as good, 23.2% as fair, and 8.9% as poor. The positive/negative ratio was 67.9/32.1.

QUESTION 27.6: TO WHAT EXTENT DOES YOUR DEAN RECRUIT HIGH LEVEL EXPERIENCED RESEARCHERS TO SUPPORT ACADEMIC RESEARCH PROGRAMS?

52 people provided a response to this question. The overall response was positive with 46.2% rating the Dean as excellent, 25% as good, 19.2% as fair, and 9.6% as poor. The positive/negative ratio was 71.2/28.8.

QUESTION 27.7: TO WHAT EXTENT IS YOUR DEAN ABLE TO RETAIN HIGH-LEVEL EXPERIENCED RESEARCHERS TO SUPPORT ACADEMIC RESEARCH PROGRAMS?

49 people provided a response to this question. The overall response was positive with 46.9% rating the Dean as excellent, 20.4% as good, 24.5% as fair, and 8.2% as poor. The positive/negative ratio was 67.3/32.7.

Representative Comments

Fourteen respondents provided comments about the Dean of the School of Health Technology and Management. Most of the comments were very positive but indicating that budgetary constraints are problematic for the school.

Dean Lehmann is sincerely committed to the School of Health Technology and Management and Stony Brook University as well. He has given 50+ years of service and continues to do an exemplary job. We are fortunate that he has taken our school to heights it would not have reached without his vision and leadership.

Our Dean is outstanding in every way, despite very little support from Dr. Kaushansky and an unfair budget. He has been able to make our school grow and excel with the creation of innovative new programs at both the HSC and Southampton.
2016 University Senate Survey

Our Dean is not given adequate financial resources from the VP to do any of these things; we are drowning. He has been able to make our school grow and excel with the creation of innovative new programs at both the HSC and Southampton.

Not sure how much of a role the Dean has in this-- We have lost a lot of faculty the past 2 years or so and have been on a hiring freeze I believe.

Honored to work with such an astute, outstanding, and caring Dean!

There is a lack of diversity in our school leadership.

SCHOOL OF MEDICINE

QUESTION 27.1: HOW WOULD YOU RATE YOUR DEAN ON ACADEMIC LEADERSHIP?

134 respondents provided responses. The overall response was somewhat negative, with 15.7% rating the Dean as excellent, 28.4% as good, 29.9% as fair, and 26.1% as poor. The positive/negative ratio was 44.0/56.0.

QUESTION 27.2: HOW WOULD YOU RATE YOUR DEAN ON ADMINISTRATIVE MANAGEMENT, INCLUDING ACCESSIBILITY, RESPONSIVENESS, AND BUDGETARY DECISIONS?

128 respondents provided responses. The overall response was negative, with 10.9% rating the Dean as excellent, 21.9% as good, 33.6% as fair, and 33.6% as poor. The positive/negative ratio was 32.8/67.2.

QUESTION 27.3: HOW WOULD YOU RATE YOUR DEAN ON THE QUALITY OF ADMINISTRATIVE APPOINTMENTS (INCLUDING ASSOCIATE AND ASSISTANT DEANS AND CHAIRS)?

128 respondents provided responses. The overall response was negative, with 12.4% rating the Dean as excellent, 20.7% as good, 34.7% as fair, and 32.2% as poor. The positive/negative ratio was 33.1/66.9.

QUESTION 27.4: TO WHAT EXTENT DOES YOUR DEAN INVOLVE FACULTY, STAFF, AND STUDENTS THROUGH THE GOVERNANCE STRUCTURE IN DECISIONS THAT AFFECT POLICY?

113 respondents provided responses. The overall response was negative, with 11.5% rating that faculty, staff, and students are involved a great deal, 21.2% as some, 31.9% as little, and 35.4% as not at all. The positive/negative ratio was 32.7/67.3.
QUESTION 27.5: TO WHAT EXTENT DOES YOUR DEAN PROVIDE THE INFRASTRUCTURE AND RESOURCES TO SUPPORT ACADEMIC RESEARCH PROGRAMS?

117 respondents provided responses. The overall response was slightly negative, with 11.1% rating that the Dean provides a great deal of infrastructure and resources, 31.6% as some, 31.6% as little, and 25.6% as not at all. The positive/negative ratio was 42.7/57.3.

QUESTION 27.6: TO WHAT EXTENT DOES YOUR DEAN RECRUIT HIGH LEVEL EXPERIENCED RESEARCHERS TO SUPPORT ACADEMIC RESEARCH PROGRAMS?

119 respondents provided responses. The overall response was positive, with 25.2% rating that the Dean recruits high-level researchers to a great deal, 37.8% as some, 16.0% as little, and 21.0% as not at all. The positive/negative ratio was 63.0/37.0.

QUESTION 27.7: TO WHAT EXTENT IS YOUR DEAN ABLE TO RETAIN HIGH-LEVEL EXPERIENCED RESEARCHERS TO SUPPORT ACADEMIC RESEARCH PROGRAMS?

118 respondents provided responses. The overall response was mixed, with 10.2% rating that the Dean is able to retain researchers to a great deal, 33.1% as some, 28.8% as little, and 28.0% as not at all. The positive/negative ratio was 43.2/56.8.

Analysis

We compared the 2016 scores for the Dean of Medicine with the scores in the 2013 survey. Both the 2013 and 2016 survey results refer to the performance of Dean Ken Kaushansky. While the 2016 survey contained more dean-specific questions than the 2013 survey, the first few questions were almost identical to those of the 2013 survey. However, some of the questions in the 2013 survey had an unbalanced (3 positive/2 negative) set of responses, making a direct comparison problematic. Despite these differences, we see a similar pattern of responses, although there is an appearance of an increase in the percentage of negative responses. However, with a large increase in the number of responses, the demographic pattern of respondents might have changed, and therefore caused the differences.

Table 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question Number</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Very Good</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Poor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q27.1</td>
<td>How would you rate your Dean on academic leadership?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>10 (18.5%)</td>
<td>12 (22.2%)</td>
<td>13 (24.1%)</td>
<td>8 (14.8%)</td>
<td>11 (20.4%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2016 University Senate Survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question Number</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Very Good</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Poor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>21 (15.7%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>38 (28.4%)</td>
<td>40 (29.9%)</td>
<td>35 (26.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q27.2</td>
<td>How would you rate your dean on administrative management, including accessibility, responsiveness, and budgetary decisions?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>5 (9.8%)</td>
<td>11 (21.6%)</td>
<td>9 (17.6%)</td>
<td>11 (21.6%)</td>
<td>15 (29.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>14 (10.9%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>28 (21.9%)</td>
<td>43 (33.6%)</td>
<td>43 (33.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q27.3</td>
<td>How would you rate your dean on the quality of administrative appointments (including Associate and Assistant Deans and Chairs)?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>6 (11.5%)</td>
<td>12 (23.1%)</td>
<td>12 (23.1%)</td>
<td>14 (26.9%)</td>
<td>8 (15.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>15 (12.4%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>25 (20.7%)</td>
<td>42 (34.7%)</td>
<td>39 (32.2%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There were two other questions on the 2013 survey. One of them had a different set of responses, and the other was not repeated on the 2016, so they were not included in the table above. However, the results show the same pattern of positive responses.

**Representative Comments**

*They recruit people but have trouble retaining them. Both in research and the clinical faculty. Recently, they have hired new surgeons, but we don’t have OR space and they don’t have dedicated OR days. This is not a good plan. It is likely solvable, but it will require new thinking and a level of operational sophistication that we haven’t seen here at SBU.*

*The medical school dean has focused on buildings rather than the academic, teaching or clinical mission of the medical school. This is evidenced by declining funding, terrible ratings for clinical care, and a total lack of transparency on the performance of the medical students in the new curriculum*.

*He has a vision for research, but has problems keeping researchers here.*

*Dean Kaushansky has placed a high value on research and scholarship. My only suggestion is that the current Vice Dean for the Office of Academic and Faculty Affairs (Dr. Latha Chandran) has been given almost no resources to take on the new faculty development role/responsibilities. She currently doesn’t have anyone on her team that can coordinate research (e.g., basic science, translational science, or clinical science) research training to support faculty development. Thus, this is a big "gap" in the Dean’s office current leadership team.*

*The Dean of the medical school has decided that all new basic science faculty would be required to pay half of their salary on grants. He insists that this is a workable model despite...*
dropping NIH funding rates. However, I don't see a lot of hot shot new faculty bringing in big grants, and the recently reported flat funding rates suggests his plan has not been successful.

SCHOOL OF NURSING

QUESTION 27.1: HOW WOULD YOU RATE YOUR DEAN ON ACADEMIC LEADERSHIP?

34 people provided a response to this question. The overall response was negative with 11.8% rating the Dean as excellent, 29.4% as good, 8.8% as fair, and 50.0% as poor. The positive/negative ratio was 41.2/58.8.

QUESTION 27.2: HOW WOULD YOU RATE YOUR DEAN ON ADMINISTRATIVE MANAGEMENT, INCLUDING ACCESSIBILITY, RESPONSIVENESS, AND BUDGETARY DECISIONS?

34 people provided a response to this question. The overall response was negative with 8.8% rating the Dean as excellent, 23.5% as good, 23.5% as fair, and 44.1% as poor. The positive/negative ratio was 32.4/67.6.

QUESTION 27.3: HOW WOULD YOU RATE YOUR DEAN ON THE QUALITY OF ADMINISTRATIVE APPOINTMENTS (INCLUDING ASSOCIATE AND ASSISTANT DEANS AND CHAIRS)?

34 people provided a response to this question. The overall response was negative with 17.6% rating the Dean as excellent, 29.4% as good, 26.5% as fair, and 26.5% as poor. The positive/negative ratio was 47.1/52.9.

QUESTION 27.4: TO WHAT EXTENT DOES YOUR DEAN INVOLVE FACULTY, STAFF, AND STUDENTS THROUGH THE GOVERNANCE STRUCTURE IN DECISIONS THAT AFFECT POLICY?

32 people provided a response to this question. The overall response was negative with 18.8% rating the Dean as excellent, 21.9% as good, 28.1% as fair, and 31.3% as poor. The positive/negative ratio was 40.6/59.4.

QUESTION 27.5: TO WHAT EXTENT DOES YOUR DEAN PROVIDE THE INFRASTRUCTURE AND RESOURCES TO SUPPORT ACADEMIC RESEARCH PROGRAMS?

32 people provided a response to this question. The overall response was negative with 18.8% rating the Dean as excellent, 21.9% as good, 21.9% as fair, and 37.5% as poor. The positive/negative ratio was 40.6/59.4.
QUESTION 27.6: TO WHAT EXTENT DOES YOUR DEAN RECRUIT HIGH LEVEL EXPERIENCED RESEARCHERS TO SUPPORT ACADEMIC RESEARCH PROGRAMS?

32 people provided a response to this question. The overall response was neutral with 18.8% rating the Dean as excellent, 31.3% as good, 21.9% as fair, and 28.1% as poor. The positive/negative ratio was 50.0/50.0.

QUESTION 27.7: TO WHAT EXTENT IS YOUR DEAN ABLE TO RETAIN HIGH-LEVEL EXPERIENCED RESEARCHERS TO SUPPORT ACADEMIC RESEARCH PROGRAMS?

31 people provided a response to this question. The overall response was neutral with 16.1% rating the Dean as excellent, 35.5% as good, 12.9% as fair, and 35.5% as poor. The positive/negative ratio was 51.6/48.4.

Analysis

We compared the 2016 scores for the Dean of the School of Nursing with the scores in the 2013 survey. Both the 2013 and 2016 survey results refer to the performance of Dean Lee Anne Xippolitos. The number of responses from the School of Nursing to the 2013 survey request did not reach our threshold for publication, while the 2016 survey response number did. Now, three years after the publication of the 2013 survey results, we chose to provide some 2013 survey summary data in order to show a general trend in attitudes among the faculty and staff of the school. While the 2016 survey contained more dean-specific questions than the 2013 survey, the first few questions were almost identical to those of the 2013 survey. However, some of the questions in the 2013 survey had an unbalanced (3 positive/2 negative) set of responses, making a direct comparison problematic. Despite these differences, we see a similar pattern of responses, continuing a high percentage of negative responses.

Table 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question Number</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Very Good</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Poor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q27.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>1 (16.7%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4 (66.7%)</td>
<td>1 (16.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>4 (11.8%)</td>
<td>10 (29.4%)</td>
<td>3 (8.8%)</td>
<td>17 (50%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q27.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>1 (14.3%)</td>
<td>1 (14.3%)</td>
<td>1 (14.3%)</td>
<td>2 (28.6%)</td>
<td>2 (28.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>3 (8.8%)</td>
<td>8 (23.5%)</td>
<td>8 (23.5%)</td>
<td>15 (44.1%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question Number | Excellent | Very Good | Good | Fair | Poor |
---|---|---|---|---|---|
Q27.3 | How would you rate your dean on the quality of administrative appointments (including Associate and Assistant Deans and Chairs)? |
2013 | 3 (42.9%) | 0 | 0 | 2 (28.6%) | 2 (28.6%) |
2016 | 6 (17.6%) | 10 (29.4%) | 9 (26.5%) | 9 (26.5%) |

There were two other questions on the 2013 survey. One of them had a different set of responses, and the other was not repeated on the 2016, so they were not included in the table above. However, the results show the same pattern of positive responses.

Representative Comments

Has a facade infrastructure for solicitation of input but does not use input. Complains to faculty about her lack of resources which affects scholarly creativity and morale among the faculty. Does not hold academic rank and has limited academic acumen. Does not engage in continuing development to mitigate her lack of academic acumen. Has limited credibility among her Dean peers on the regional and national level. Has no scholarship.

The Dean asks for input into decisions, then most often makes unilateral decisions without considering the short and long term ramifications of her decisions. It is very disheartening. I could give several examples. However, I am uncertain of repercussions or retaliation.

This Dean was appointed with no experience as an academic leader and this lack of experience shows in the decline of the services offered to students. Behind closed doors she is unprofessional in demeanor and is retaliatory against faculty and students.

We work in a hostile environment. None of the faculty of the School of Nursing will speak up because we are all afraid of losing our jobs. The moral is at its lowest every due to the Dean’s punitive [...] behavior. The good news is we have each other but the Administration is vindictive and evil.

There is a great concern that this survey will result in retaliation (as is the history). People are reluctant to answer the survey. Please protect our anonymity in every possible way. Please do not link to employment status etc.

Limited resources to enhance faculty numbers and quality. Limited resources for staff leaving gaps in available faculty admin support. Issues arise because of the lack of adequate coverage as students complain.
SCHOOL OF PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Only 8 respondents reported working in the School of Professional Development. That number is below our publication threshold, and consequently we do not publish the results. However, the limited set of responses was generally positive.

UNIVERSITY ADMINISTRATION OFFICES

Only 24 respondents reported working in the University Administration Offices. That number is below our publication threshold, and consequently we do not publish the results. However, the limited set of responses was generally positive.

UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES (DEAN CONSTANTIA CONSTANTINOU)

Q27.1. HOW WOULD YOUR RATE YOUR DEAN ON ACADEMIC LEADERSHIP?

35 people provided a response to this question. The overall response was negative with 20.0% rating the Dean as excellent, 17.1% as good, 25.7% as fair, and 37.1% as poor. The positive/negative ratio was 34.1/62.9.

Q27.2. HOW WOULD YOU RATE YOUR DEAN ON ADMINISTRATIVE MANAGEMENT, INCLUDING ACCESSIBILITY, RESPONSIVENESS, AND BUDGETARY DECISIONS?

37 people provided a response to this question. The overall response was negative with 13.5% rating the Dean as excellent, 8.1% as good, 29.7% as fair, and 48.7% as poor. The positive/negative ratio was 21.6/78.4.

Q27.3. HOW WOULD YOU RATE YOUR DEAN ON THE QUALITY OF ADMINISTRATIVE APPOINTMENTS (INCLUDING ASSOCIATE AND ASSISTANT DEANS AND CHAIRS)?

36 people provided a response to this question. The overall response was negative with 16.7% rating the Dean as excellent, 11.1% as good, 30.6% as fair, and 41.7% as poor. The positive/negative ratio was 27.8/72.2.

Q27.4. TO WHAT EXTENT DOES YOUR DEAN INVOLVE FACULTY, STAFF, AND STUDENTS THROUGH THE GOVERNANCE STRUCTURE IN DECISIONS THAT AFFECT POLICY?

34 people provided a response to this question. The overall response was negative with 11.8% selected “a great deal,” 20.6% selected “some,” 29.4% selected “a little” and 38.2% selected “not at all.”
The positive/negative ratio was 32.4/67.6. Q27.5. To what extent does your Dean provide the infrastructure and resources to support academic research programs?

29 people provided a response to this question. The overall response was negative with 17.2% selected “a great deal,” 24.1% selected “some,” 31.0% selected “a little” and 27.6% selected “not at all.” The positive/negative ratio was 41.4/58.6.

Q27.6. TO WHAT EXTENT DOES YOUR DEAN RECRUIT HIGH LEVEL EXPERIENCED RESEARCHERS TO SUPPORT ACADEMIC RESEARCH PROGRAMS?

27 people provided a response to this question. The overall response was positive with 29.6% selected “a great deal,” 29.6% selected “some,” 14.8% selected “a little” and 25.9% selected “not at all.” The positive/negative ratio was 59.3/40.7.

Q27.7. TO WHAT EXTENT IS YOUR DEAN ABLE TO RETAIN HIGH-LEVEL EXPERIENCED RESEARCHERS TO SUPPORT ACADEMIC RESEARCH PROGRAMS?

27 people provided a response to this question. The overall response was negative with 11.1% selected “a great deal,” 22.2% selected “some,” 29.6% selected “a little” and 37.0% selected “not at all.” The positive/negative ratio was 33.3/66.7.

Analysis

We compared the 2016 scores for the Dean of the University Libraries with the scores in the 2013 survey. The 2013 survey responses referred to the performance of Dean Daniel Kinney while the 2016 survey results refer to the performance of Dean Constantia Constantinou. The number of responses from the University to the 2013 survey request did not reach our threshold for publication, while the 2016 survey response number did. Now, three years after the publication of the 2013 survey results, we chose to provide some 2013 survey summary data in order to show a general trend in attitudes among the faculty and staff in that unit. While the 2016 survey contained more dean-specific questions than the 2013 survey, the first few questions were almost identical to those of the 2013 survey. However, some of the questions in the 2013 survey had an unbalanced (3 positive/2 negative) set of responses, making a direct comparison problematic. The small number of 2013 responses make it impossible to draw any comparisons. However, the percentage of negative responses in the 2016 is worthy of note.
Table 6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question Number</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Very Good</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Poor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q27.1 How would you rate your Dean on academic leadership?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>2 (50.0%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1 (25.0%)</td>
<td>0 (0.0%)</td>
<td>1 (25.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>7 (20%)</td>
<td>6 (17.1%)</td>
<td>9 (25.7%)</td>
<td>13 (37.1%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q27.2 How would you rate your dean on administrative management, including accessibility, responsiveness, and budgetary decisions?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>1 (33.3%)</td>
<td>1 (33.3%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1 (33.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>5 (13.5%)</td>
<td>3 (8.1%)</td>
<td>11 (29.7%)</td>
<td>18 (48.6%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q27.3 How would you rate your dean on the quality of administrative appointments (including Associate and Assistant Deans and Chairs)?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>6 (16.7%)</td>
<td>4 (11.1%)</td>
<td>11 (30.6%)</td>
<td>15 (41.7%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There were two other questions on the 2013 survey. One of them had a different set of responses, and the other was not repeated on the 2016, so they were not included in the table above. However, the results show the same pattern of positive responses.

Representative Comments

An excellent leader and communicator.

For some staff, the work environment in the library is toxic. On the other hand, she has oversen the transition of Central and North Reading Rooms into 21st century spaces; this is a positive and beneficial development for the patrons, students and scholars who need and use the Library.

There seems to be a glut of new hires and not enough support for some employees who have longevity and vast experience in their field. Performance programs and job descriptions are ignored and positions that employees have had under their permanent appointment status are changed at will. At least twelve employees have either retired or resigned in the last year. If conditions were different, there would not be this kind of attrition rate.

I feel I need to refrain from all comments concerning the Dean of Libraries. However, I must say that I don't feel that she has been able to jump from a small-time school to the level that Stony Brook should have.
Regardless of station or standing among one’s peers, all faculty are expected to conduct themselves with a high level of decorum and professionalism in which everyone seeks to be collegial, courteous, communicative, adept and open. The person in the position of ‘Dean’ is expected to conduct herself to the highest of standards, both as an effective librarian but also as a head academic officer of the library. She is expected to stand as a true example to emulate and follow, and exhibit the traits in which she purports to judge the faculty within whom their daily oversight is part of her portfolio of responsibilities. The ability to communicate clearly, to listen to input, to show respect to subordinates, to be courteous to colleagues, and to make effective decisions are just a few of the traits expected of any Dean and which have been inconsistently lacking in the current Dean of Libraries.

The Dean of Libraries possesses an energy and drive found in few but at the expense and sacrifice of reasonable traits such a common courtesy, general decorum and competence. Examples of the Dean of Libraries lack of decorum have been exhibited in personal, denigrating comments to subordinate staff made by the Dean of Libraries about other members of staff. In one set of examples, the Dean of Libraries made faces behind a visitor’s back, and found in another, when the Dean of Libraries lost her temper over a box being left in the wrong place […] and then responded by kicking it into a room full of people without apology. Besides these examples of personality, the Dean of Libraries also exhibits a bullying and aggressive management style, edged with almost a compulsive refusal to take input from faculty, and when responses are issued she publicly intimidates or embarrasses [an] individual. But whether difference in personal mannerism or other, the most worrying of relevant examples are the Dean of Libraries’ inability to effectively communicate and accept input in [the] decision-making processes. […] The poor behavior is complicated and made worse by the atmosphere of fear and intimidation developed and honed by the Dean of Libraries and her associate deans, all of whom regularly engage in physical and psychological harassment and abuse in the forms of the excessive use of counseling memorandum[s], excessive discipline of staff, threats of insubordination, workload increase as a form of retaliation, sabotage of faculty work, punishment of tenured faculty for tenure votes, written threats, disruption of work schedules, staff/faculty isolation, mobbing, and more. The abuses of power have been perpetrated by the library administration along with dedicated staff members who are rewarded for reporting any real or perceived infraction of the unspoken rule “keep your head down and don’t question anything.” The impact of her retaliatory and vindictive management style have led to numerous faculty and staff resignations […], an increase in reports of stress-related illness among the current faculty and staff, along with budgetary shortfalls due to the replacement costs associated with constantly replacing departing faculty and staff […].

Where to begin? A management style like Stalin. Utter disregard for the professional staff and anyone she considers an obstacle or a threat to her plans. Complete lack of empathy, especially if she knows that her policies and those of her subordinates are hurting staff. A real leader leads by example, not by terrorizing people. People can’t be at their best when they are under attack.
This Dean's attitude towards staff and faculty is extremely insulting and derogatory. This Dean has no respect for her staff. This has resulted in extremely low morale in the Library. Staff are being targeted if they criticize any action of the Dean to the extent that they are forced to leave. Employees get backlash from the Dean.

The library reorganization was a nightmare, and showed her lack of understanding and leadership in how the library was previously run and the positions of the employees here.

The dean of libraries appointments has always been suspect. Search committees have been told not to recommend candidates, searches have been declared failed by the dean until a library intern graduates, the position rewritten to eliminate set years of experience, and then suddenly it's a successful search when the newly graduated intern is hired despite scores of more qualified applicants. She created a Library IT department without consulting or considering DoIT, and then hired her friend from her old job to come and lead it, despite his lack of qualifications for the job [...] After being here over 2 years, he has accomplished nothing, except to get another raise and promotion from the dean of libraries to assistant dean of library technologies. [...] All committee members and chairs are held by dean favorites, some of whom are not tenured or permanent, and so are bound by the dean’s wishes to keep their positions. No faculty, staff, or students are involved in governance or policy making except the dean and her one main advisor, the assistant dean of academic engagement. Voice[s] are either silenced or unheard, and none are invited. None of our new hires are well known in the field, and can't be considered high-level experienced researchers. Her retention is even worse, as many new hires have left after a few months to a year. Only those who gained this position despite their lack of experience are staying, as with their lack of experience they cannot get a similar position or salary anywhere else. Our budget has had problems only since the new dean of libraries has come. [...] At the end of every academic year we are out of money before the semester ends, and in some cases the library will refuse to hire available work study students for no foreseeable reason other than to force professional staff to perform student job duties instead of their professional ones, which are then taken away. [...] There are an infinite number of more examples this dean has failed the library, and the University. The library renovation was great, but lead by DoIT and the University, not the library dean. Her ideas in the reorganization, sort of a 'streamlining' of the services and departments in the library, was not bad in itself. It was how she did it, how she ignored the current skill sets and experiences of the library's faculty and staff, and how she refuses to acknowledge that some of the moves were not good for any of the parties involved (the library, and its faculty and student users [...] Reorganizing and running a library towards more modern ideas is fine. But you are not an efficient leader if you refuse to look at the people you are leading. Ignoring them and attempting to replace them with new hires indebted to you is a coward's way of leading, and shows insecurity and lack of conviction in your ideas. A true leader would look at the people they are leading in their department, look at their skills and experience, their likes and dislikes in the job, and see how they best match up with a modern library vision and roles. Instead, we have a dean of libraries who
rules like a dictator, is protected by the University administration through HR and Labor Relations, and is driving our library into the ground with red budgets, fleeing new hires, and an unstable vision for our libraries' future.