Shared Governance Reconsidered:
Improving Decision-Making in the California State University.

March 29, 2001

CONTENTS

Additional documents of interest (not attached):

"Collegiality in the California State University System," in *Principles and Policies: papers of the Academic Senate, The California State University.* (Long Beach, California 1985)

Shared Governance in the CSU: Internal Perceptions (preliminary report), January 2001

INTRODUCTION

This document is the report of the Study on System-wide Shared Governance that has been undertaken and supported by the Academic Senate, California State University (ASCSU) and the Chancellor's Office (CO). The purpose of this study is "… to suggest policies, procedures and practices that can strengthen shared governance in the CSU at the system level."

Following this introduction is an overview, which provides background on the current study, including its links to the 1985 position paper of the ASCSU *Collegiality in the California State University System.* This section also highlights some of the major insights of this study and contains some broad recommendations. The concluding section consists of suggestions that are more specific, organized around a model of shared governance (see Appendix C). In the interest of brevity, much relevant material has been placed in the appendices.

This report is not a statistical analysis of attitudes toward shared governance. The data that we collected for this report are, by design, not quantifiable. With a few exceptions, we were looking for a broad range of ideas, not numbers. The open-ended questions permitted respondents to include as many or as few items as they felt suitable. Precisely counting such items would not be meaningful.

The list of suggestions in the body of this report is not a comprehensive list of suggestions from the survey. A more extensive listing can be found in Appendix E. To keep the report manageable, using the model developed from our readings and outside interviews, we have grouped suggestions and reduced the potential list to those that we believe are most likely to receive serious discussion or be implemented. We do not view our list of suggestions as the final word.

This report is **a vehicle to engender discussion** within and among relevant constituencies in the California State University (CSU) concerning how to improve system-wide shared governance. We hope and expect that important ideas for making shared governance more vital will derive from these discussions. In his respect, this report remains a work in progress: new suggestions that emerge from discussions may be added at any point.

We would like to thank Lorie Roth for her assistance in writing the first draft of the overview section of this report, and for her comments on other parts of the document. We would also like to thank the members of CSU who returned the survey and all of the individuals who gave generously of their time to be interviewed.

The survey was administered by the Social Science Research Center at Cal State Fullerton. Greg Robinson, Director, and Raveena Singh of the SSRC, and Fran Horvath of Cal State Northridge were among those who contributed to the development of the questionnaire. Their help and that of others -- including the advisory committee -- who contributed to this study, is greatly appreciated.

Vince Buck
Jim Highsmith

OVERVIEW OF THE SYSTEM-WIDE SHARED GOVERNANCE STUDY

In the year 2000, the Academic Senate California State University (ASCSU) undertook a study of system wide shared governance, defined as follows:

> Shared governance describes the relationship between the administration and the faculty in which the faculty participate in giving direction and advice to the university on important policy decisions. At the system level this involves the relationship between the system-wide Academic Senate and the Chancellor's Office, the Trustees and parallel advisory bodies (e.g., the Executive Council).

As part of the investigation, we reviewed the literature on shared governance; interviewed national, state, and system experts (see Appendix A); and surveyed the California State University (CSU) system and campus administrators, members of the Academic Senate CSU, campus senate chairs, and a small group of CSU faculty. The survey (Appendix G) was distributed to 224 faculty and administrators in October, and 135 surveys were returned by mid-December. The wealth of information obtained could have been organized and presented in many ways.

This summary looks at the information through the lens of the policy statement entitled *Collegiality in the California State University System,* prepared and adopted by the Academic Senate, California State University (ASCSU) and the CSU Board of Trustees (BOT) in 1985. The summary uses the structure of the policy statement as a framework to organize the comments and insights of those who participated in the 2000 study. The 1985 statement on collegiality proposes a model of shared governance, and the participants in 2000 give us a reflection of how well that model is working in the California State University.

Collegiality in the California State University System, a 1985 Position Paper of the ASCSU

We begin with a brief overview of *Collegiality in the California State University System.* This 1985 document explicitly uses "collegiality" as a synonym for "shared governance," and in several different contexts defines shared governance as consisting of two components: a process and a state of mind (e.g., "Collegiality consists of a shared decision-making process and a set of attitudes . . ." "The state of mind of participants in collegial decision-making is an important determinant of the success of the process.")

The position paper explores each of these two components of shared governance: attitude and process. The words and phrases used to characterize the appropriate state of mind all focus on trust and respect: "level of mutual respect," "respect and understanding," "tolerance," "a civil regard for differing opinions and points of view," and "respect and honesty." In addition to emphasizing an atmosphere of trust, the document also provides an overall model for process, including specific comments on the process appropriate for each of the "three major types of decisions" to be made through shared governance.

The overall process recommended in the 1985 position paper is "a formal governance structure" (such as a senate), and open and honest discussion between faculty members and administrators, which would lead to consensus; if no consensus is possible, then compromise is the preferred outcome. If disagreement persists, each party should be willing to explain and reconsider its opinion.

The position paper also addresses "the two approaches to decision-making" current in the CSU, collective bargaining and shared governance. One is adversarial; the other collegial: "The adversarial implications of collective bargaining terminology must be left to the bargaining table and the grievance hearing process and must not enter into the collegial decision-making process." *Collegiality in the California State University System* (hereafter *Collegiality*) concludes with four specific recommendations for CSU system administration: (1) allow sufficient time for the faculty to fully consider and deliberate; (2) model the collegiality described in the position paper; (3) encourage campus presidents to model collegial behavior; and (4) make collegiality a criterion in the evaluation of presidents. Fifteen years later these suggestions continue to surface as desiderata as the 2000 survey reveals.

The rest of this overview will present the findings of the 2000 research under the headings of the overarching issues addressed in 1985: the state of mind necessary for shared governance; the process; the relationship between collective bargaining and shared governance, and the specific recommendations for system administrators. Because of their importance in this survey, two topics not directly addressed in the 1985 document are discussed: communication and evaluation of the future of shared governance in the CSU.

Attitudes Necessary for Successful Shared Governance

The Senate's 1985 document, the review of the literature, and interviews with national experts all affirmed that trust and mutual respect were necessary conditions for effective shared governance. According to the collegiality document, "Differing perspectives must be tolerated and respected …All members of the university community must treat one another with respect and honesty."

Most respondents to the 2000 survey expressed strong support for the ideal of mutual trust and openness but found that the reality was far from what would be desirable. Several commentators indicated that they found the dominant environment today to be largely one of mutual skepticism and cynicism. Faculty indicated that they perceive that they are not respected by the administration and that they believe that the administration does not treat them as an "equal partner" in the governance of the institution. The survey indicated that faculty, in general, are skeptical not only of administrators' intentions and motives, but also of the notion that shared governance even exists. In short, it appears that some people believe the notions of "respect" and "trust" are so important to concepts of shared governance that their absence indicates that shared governance does not really exist—despite the presence of formal structures and processes.

On a more hopeful note, administrators and faculty alike believe in the power of attitude to improve shared governance. The attributes of good faith and desire to make shared governance work were mentioned repeatedly. Necessary attitudes and behaviors most often noted were trust, mutual respect, civility, honesty, truthfulness, early and effective communication, broad and frequent consultation, transparent processes, and open and frank discussion. With this present, most governance procedures and structural arrangements can be made to work beneficially for all.

An attitude critical to making shared governance work was determined to be present abundantly in the CSU: a belief in the importance of shared governance (Table I).

TABLE I
PERCENT RESPONDING THAT EXISTENCE OF
SHARED GOVERNANCE IS VERY IMPORTANT

	Presidents N=12	VPAA/ Provosts N=15	Chan. Off. Staff N=12	CSU Senators N=34	Campus Chairs N=19	Faculty N=43
Campus governance	75	87	NA	97	100	95
System-wide governance	58	60	75	91	79	72

Tempered by the realization that shared governance may mean different things to different respondents, this finding represents an important level of support for the concept of shared governance and a solid base upon which to build.[1]

Processes Necessary for Successful Shared Governance

Because comments addressing attitudes and views predominated in the survey, not as much attention was paid to formal processes and mechanisms, with one major exception. The major process issue that arose from the survey results is: **Who sets the agenda?**

The 1985 *Collegiality* document answers the question in some detail, specifying that there are three areas in which shared governance must operate: (1) curriculum, (2) general academic policy, and (3) faculty. The position paper specifies who should initiate proposals in each area. It says, for example, "In the case of curricular decisions, the faculty should usually be the initiator of the policy, within the constraints of budget, law, and system policy. By contrast, in the case of academic policy, proposals for changes in policy or for new policy may arise from academic administrators."

Collegiality also enumerates a sequence of actions and behaviors that should take place as a proposed change works its way through the governance process. In terms of faculty decisions, for example, "administrators should decide contrary to faculty recommendation only if there is clear indication of violation of system or campus policies or clear indication that the faculty committee failed to consider relevant information." *Collegiality* is fairly precise in identifying various aspects of the process of shared governance.

Although not disputing the adequacy of processes in place, the 2000 survey revealed a perception of an imbalance of power. A faculty view emerged: that administrators have taken the initiative in the area of academic policy and that faculty members have been relegated to a reactive or defensive mode. Thus the faculty job has become to stop bad things from happening rather than promulgating good academic policy. (Sample comments: "At best we are able to modify and react to top-down agendas." "I think our success is not in what we have done, but what we have kept the CO and BOT from doing."). Other comments suggested that

---

[1] Missing data are not excluded in these computations. For more details on this item, see Appendix B.

administrative activism, whatever the varied motives might be, was exacerbated by faculty senates that were slow, ineffectual, excessively formal, and loathe to prioritize.

Several survey respondents pointed up the differences among the types of administrator-faculty involvement in governance: "joint decision-making" vs. "consulting" vs. "informing." They suggested that the trend was towards "informing."

The example of Cornerstones, as it appeared in survey responses, is illuminating. In the survey, most references to Cornerstones by administrators cite it as a success of shared governance, whereas most faculty references cite it as a failure, often in very strong terms. This contrast indicates that different groups assign different meanings to the phrase "shared governance." Administrators view it as a process that seeks faculty input and uses that feedback to craft the final document. Faculty respondents, however, feel that Cornerstones should have been jointly conceived and birthed; that their extensive input should have had more effect on key features of the document; and that their feedback should have had a greater impact.

In addition to the overarching question of "who sets the agenda," other survey comments on the process of shared governance focused on creating a more effective process. Among the suggestions: recognition of university governance service in the RTP criteria; a more manageable workload; better training for faculty who participate in governance; and professional staff hired to support governance.

There was a striking array of remarks claiming that informal structures of shared decision-making and communication were as powerful, if not more powerful, than the formal ones. Two examples:

> The greatest successes in shared governance system-wide are when the administration and faculty share ideas at an informal level... The Vice Chancellor came to that [campus senate chairs] meeting and in a very informal way sat and discussed many issues with us. Everyone came away feeling that ideas and concerns were shared.

> The Asilomar Conference last year was a superb example of successful system-wide shared governance…On numerous occasions both formal and informal, faculty and administrators from all levels remarked that when we get together and communicate this way in person, barriers dissolve. At Asilomar we affirmed that face-to-face communication in an informal setting is a key.

Whereas many questioned the success of the formal governance process, informal conversations and discussions of issues were lauded by nearly everyone who addressed them. They were viewed not only as important occasions for communication, but more importantly as opportunities to build trust, respect, and the relationships that are necessary to make shared governance work.

Shared Governance and Collective Bargaining

In *Collegiality in the California State University System,* the Academic Senate CSU expressed that hope that "this statement will help to keep separate the two approaches to decision-making and simultaneously will help to maintain and improve the collegial process of shared decision-making." The data from 2000 indicated that this is still a vexed enterprise.

In responding to the survey, administrators were more critical of the impact of the union on shared governance than were the faculty. Administrators most often noted that having a union creates a confusing and adversarial situation that leads to a non-professional environment. In addition, concern was expressed about union encroachment into issues such as criteria and standards that are not "terms and conditions." Although some felt that there was no impact, only one administrator viewed the presence of a union as positive.

Faculty members are divided on the impact of union representation on shared governance. Many see it as positive. Some believe that the union's impact is mixed or non-existent. Still others feel that the union has a negative influence on shared governance.

Those making positive comments most often suggested that the union is willing to be more outspoken than the Senate in dealing with the administration. Others noted that the union gets more "self-serving" issues, leaving the Senate to deal with the more "intellectual issues." Some felt that the discomfort arising from the collective-bargaining/shared-governance mix was fostered and encouraged by administrators as a means to divide the faculty. Those who take a negative view of the effect of collective bargaining on shared governance say that it removes issues from collegial discussion, divides the faculty, makes communication more difficult with faculty, makes senators timid about taking up issues that may be in bargaining, makes the administration more hostile, and creates an "us" versus "them" environment, exactly the opposite of shared decision-making, or "collegiality."

The seepage between an adversarial (collective bargaining) environment and a collegial (shared governance) approach is evident in survey responses that urge the senates to be more "aggressive" and "confrontational." Addressing the difficulty of knowing when one should be adversarial and when one should be collegial, one commentator remarked, "Under any circumstance, the shortcomings of shared governance would be the limitations of human beings. It will never be perfect because we ourselves are not perfect. However, in the CSU today, shared governance is under continual attack. It is being supplanted by a politics of opposition in which each side tries to undermine and destroy the other."

The Academic Senate CSU has worked for the past twenty years to define carefully and concretely the areas and approaches appropriate to collective bargaining and those appropriate to shared governance, often with success in delineating roles and responsibilities. The 2000 survey shows that this enterprise will likely continue into the foreseeable future.

Communication

The survey responses stressed the need for improved communication at all levels. Good communication is widely recognized as essential for shared governance to function well. Open and transparent procedures help build trust and provide the necessary information to make good decisions. Decisions made behind closed doors or in isolation breed distrust and exacerbate "us v. them" attitudes. Shared governance structures are recognized and valued for their role in gaining and disseminating information. Respondents often mentioned the important role that shared governance plays in this regard in the CSU. (Sample comments: "ASCSU is very successful in providing the conduit for information to keep faculty on campuses informed and assuring faculty input into key policy and decision-making." "It makes us aware of what is going on at other campuses.") However, it is also recognized that much remains to be done (Sample comments: "Neither the CO nor the Senate communicates." "Lack of outreach to campuses"

"Secrecy undermines shared governance." "Lack of advance notice of future agenda items." "No communication." "No information.")

Supporting the view that improved communications are needed are the results of our question asking how well informed our respondents are about various CSU institutions (Table II). Understandably, respondents are better informed about campus institutions than about system-wide institutions. Except in the case of local senates, however, the level of information about all institutions is regrettably low, especially among faculty. It should be noted that the faculty respondents were active in campus governance, and no doubt better informed than less involved faculty.[2]

TABLE II
Percent of Respondents Indicating That They
Are Well Informed About CSU Institutions

Well informed Re Institution Below	All Respondents N=135	Presidents N=12	VPAA/ Provosts N=15	Chan. Office Staff N=12	CSU Senators N=34	Campus Senate Chairs N=19	Faculty N=43
Campus Senate	94%	100	100	NA	94	100	93
Campus CFA	53%	64	33	NA	47	58	61
Campus Admin.	60%	100	100	NA	38	63	51
CSU Senate	52%	67	60	67	81	26	30
CSU CFA	24%	34	13	33	25	16	24
Chan. Off. Admin.	32%	83	73	83	22	11	7
Board of Trustees	32%	92	73	67	25	5	7

Many suggestions to improve communication surfaced in the survey. Some were merely admonitions, while others dealt with specific aspects of communication such as the use of technology. The CSU will benefit from serious consideration of these suggestions.

Preparing for the Next Generation of Shared Governance

Despite the many difficulties in seeking an effective system of shared governance, the respondents to the 2000 survey show strong support for the concept of shared governance, especially at the local level. There is some anxiety, however, that this traditional form of academic governance in the CSU, imperfect and flawed as it might be, could be endangered by the imminent transition in faculty leadership. Much of the concern focuses on new faculty. With a very large cohort of CSU faculty about to retire, with a gap in the middle ranks created by years of not hiring, and with so many new faculty about to be hired, there is concern about whether new faculty members will participate and how they will learn to be effective in governance activities. Moreover, the changing demands of the workplace (e.g., more emphasis

---

[2] Missing data were not excluded from these computations. See Appendix B for a more complete exploration of this data.

on research, more part-timers) have resulted in new faculty being less likely to participate in governance activities than was the case for previous generations of faculty.

The survey captured a number of suggestions to increase the likelihood that shared governance continues to function in the future: hire tenure-track professors; have administrators--particularly the campus presidents and the chancellor--voice public support for shared governance; make sure that participation in shared governance is acknowledged and rewarded; make a concerted effort to recruit, socialize, and train new faculty members for participation in shared governance; and experiment with new structures. (See Appendix F for a fuller treatment of new faculty and shared governance.)

Recommendations

Later in this document many specific recommendations are offered about how shared governance might be improved. However the broad issues identified in this overview should be at the core of future discussions:

1. **Attitudes:** Expect collegial behavior of faculty and administrators alike. Build trust and respect.
2. **Agenda:** Set agendas jointly. Involve the Senate early and regularly in identifying policy issues and developing policy. Permit adequate time for consultation.
3. **Informal interactions:** Develop more opportunities for informal interactions between faculty and administrators and trustees. Reduce the isolation of trustees from faculty.
4. **Communication:** Study ways to improve communication among the system and its campuses, and to strengthen the Senate as a communication link.
5. **New Faculty:** Encourage efforts to recruit new faculty participants in governance and train them in effective participation.

NEXT STEPS: TOWARD MORE VITAL SHARED GOVERNANCE

Based on the readings, interviews, and questionnaire results, we have developed the following list of recommendations.[3] We believe that these recommendations are consistent with the purposes of shared governance as stated in the 1985 *Statement on Collegiality*, and if adopted, would make system-wide shared governance in the California State University more vital and effective.[4] Each recommendation is followed (in parentheses.) by the party or parties primarily responsible for carrying forward the recommendation.

Environment

The model environment for shared governance would have a faculty that is largely tenured or tenure track with a long-term commitment to the university, whose workload provides opportunities for participation in governance, is rewarded for participation, and is provided the

---

[3] This is not a comprehensive list of every suggestion that is to be found in the survey. A more extensive reading of those can be found in Appendices D and E. Some important suggestions which are being addressed elsewhere are not included here (i.e. hiring more tenure track faculty).

[4] The format of presentation is that of the *Model of Shared Governance,* which appears in Appendix C.

resources to support effective participation. Shared governance will not thrive if faculty members are consumed with other tasks and responsibilities. Although this is a local campus concern often reflected in the retention, tenure, and promotion (RTP) process, the CSU administration and Senate can take leadership in directing attention to this issue.

Recommendation 1. During the workload study process, address the importance of participation in shared governance activities and how this relates to workload issues. (Chancellor, Senate)

Several administrators expressed a concern that the dividing line between the Senate and the Union was not clear.

Recommendation 2. Clarify and publicize existing policy and agreements on the appropriate roles of the Senate and the Union. Should this not be adequate, form a tri-partite committee to explore ways to reduce harmful confusion. (Chancellor, Senate)

Attitudes

Shared governance can only thrive where there is set of attitudes that support it, including those of trust and respect. Collegiality should be an expectation, and administrators should be recruited and evaluated on their ability to work in a shared governance environment. Attitudes can change and be changed. A culture that values shared governance should be nurtured.

Recommendation 3. Encourage CSU trustees and system administrative leadership to model collegial behavior. Make collegial behavior the norm for local campus administrators as well as system wide administrators. (Chancellor, Board of Trustees)

Recommendation 4. Evaluate administrators on how effectively they work in a shared governance system. Provide faculty with an important role in this evaluation. (Chancellor)

Participation and Training

Participation in governance activities should be an expectation of all members of the university community. University leaders must value and demonstrate that they value participation. Recruitment, orientation, and training must take place.

Although participation at the system level depends on effective participation at the campus level, there are actions that the CSU can take to facilitate effective participation.

Recommendation 5. Develop a Senate-sponsored training and orientation program that could be used on campuses to help faculty become familiar with roles in shared governance. Include elements that address system as well as local matters. (Senate)

Recommendation 6. Provide more opportunities for non-senate faculty to participate in, and to become informed about, system-wide activities. (Senate)

Recommendation 7. Involve the ASCSU (and local senates as appropriate) in orientation and training in shared governance for new trustees and new administrators – especially new campus presidents. (Chancellor, Senate)

Authority

Authority for participation in shared governance by both faculty and administrators should be clear, accepted, and respected. The purposes and limitations of shared governance should be widely discussed with the goal of a shared understanding emerging.

Recommendation 8. Revisit and publicize the 1985 position paper on *Collegiality* and other "Blue Book" documents. Encourage discussion. Reaffirm or revise as seems appropriate. Encourage endorsement by local campuses. Strongly support and defend the core principles identified in *Collegiality*. (Chancellor, Senate)

Range of Decisions

As the CSU and its individual campuses have expanded and grown in complexity, so too have the decision-making arenas that effect the core mission. Critical decisions in many areas including budgeting, strategic planning, new initiatives and the hiring and evaluation of administrators need the involvement of faculty representatives through shared governance.

Recommendation 9. Incorporate meaningful faculty participation in all budget and strategic planning processes. (Chancellor)

Recommendation 10.   Provide important roles for faculty in the selection and evaluation of top Chancellor's Office and campus administrators. (Chancellor)

Form, Extent, and Style of Shared Governance Activities

The degree to which all parties are involved in shared governance activities and the manner and style with which they approach these activities determine the effectiveness of shared governance. The different forms of shared governance need to be spelled out (decision-making, joint action, consultation, and discussion). Constructive problem solving is preferable to confrontation. Emphasizing mutual problem solving is commendable.

Recommendation 11. Avoid unilateral administrative decisions affecting the academic life of the university. Consult (not inform) widely, frequently, and authentically. (Chancellor)

Recommendation 12. Provide early Senate involvement in issues. Provide opportunities for the Senate to work collaboratively with administrators to seek solutions to problems. Do not limit faculty involvement to simply reacting to administrative proposals. (Chancellor)

Recommendation 13.   To lessen the isolation of trustees and faculty, provide for more formal interactions between the Board of Trustees and the Senate. Have a report from

the Senate on the agenda of each Board of Trustees' meeting. (Chancellor, Board of Trustees)

<center>**Structure**</center>

There is no single ideal governance structure. Structure should reflect the institutional culture. The Senate should have broad representation and have close and continuing contact with all significant decision-makers.

There are many structural changes in the CSU that would facilitate effective shared governance. Among those are changes that would strengthen the links among the Senate, the Chancellor's Office, the Board of Trustees, and campus senates. There is also a need to build lateral links. At the system level shared governance is too often between the Chancellor's Office and separate constituencies. Links should be made between these separate "silos" of participation (i.e., Senate and provosts, Senate and Executive Council). The Senate's relationship with the Board of Trustees should also be strengthened.

> **Recommendation 14.   In order to facilitate communication and better working relations between the Senate and the Executive Council, include the Senate chair in the meetings of the Executive Council.** (Chancellor)

> **Recommendation 15.   Include Senate-appointed representatives, wherever possible, on administrative and administratively appointed committees, councils, or boards, including the meetings of the academic vice presidents.** (Chancellor)

> **Recommendation 16.   Create closer working relationships between the Senate and the Board of Trustees by appointing a Senate member as a nonvoting liaison-member to each of the Board's committees. Increase the number of faculty trustees to two.** (Chancellor, Board of Trustees)

> **Recommendation 17.   Encourage presidents and trustees to attend Senate meetings on a rotating basis.** (Chancellor, Board of Trustees)

> **Recommendation 18.   Develop closer working relations with campus senates by having periodic joint meetings between campus chairs and the Senate and by recommending to campuses that all CSU senators sit on local executive committees.** (Senate)

> **Recommendation 19.   Promote diversity of Senate membership, perhaps by reserving certain seats for younger and other underrepresented faculty**. (Senate)

> **Recommendation 20.   Test the usefulness of joint committees or working groups involving senators, administrators, and trustees.** (Chancellor, Senate)

> **Recommendation 21. Create a Senate oversight committee, or make oversight explicitly a part of standing committees functions, to track implementation of CSU policy.** (Senate)

<center>12</center>

Recommendation 22. Hire professional education policy staff for the Senate in order to provide more focused and timely work. (Chancellor, Senate)

Procedures and Processes

In the model shared governance environment, agenda setting would be shared and the faculty would be involved in working with administrators on policy proposals from an early stage. All processes would be open and transparent, and adequate time would be provided for full faculty consultation.

Recommendation 23. Set CSU's policy agenda jointly each year. Focus the primary Senate agenda on only a few important issues each year. (Chancellor, Senate)

Recommendation 24. Provide the Senate with adequate time to consider policy matters, including sufficient time for consultation with campus senates. (Chancellor)

Recommendation 25. Create Senate processes that assure timely advice and recommendations in urgent situations requiring a rapid response. (Senate)

Recommendation 26. For greater continuity and to accommodate year round operations of the university, hold at least one summer meeting of the Senate, including a Senate agenda setting retreat. Compensate summer activities by senators. (Chancellor, Senate)

Informal Interactions

Much as attitudes are often considered to be more important than procedures, informal interactions are considered to be at least as important as formal ones. It is through these informal interactions that trust and respect develop and relationships are formed that make working together possible. These interactions need to take place among all elements of the community including student and alumni/ae representatives. They are critical in eliminating the separate "silos" of participation.

Survey respondents suggested that the Chancellor's Office and the Senate should increase the opportunities for these interactions to take place, not for a few, but for many faculty members. In particular the Board of Trustees was felt to be isolated from faculty.

Recommendation 27. Arrange more frequent retreats, workshops, or other opportunities for the senate, non-senate faculty, administrators and trustees to meet and work together. Revive the Outstanding Professors' Dinner. (Chancellor, Senate)

Communication

One of the most common concerns and frequently mentioned needs is better communication. There must be open and full communication at all levels: among the CO, BOT and the Executive Committee and the Senate: and among the Senate, the CO and the campuses. Communication of decisions or courses of action made after the fact is not shared governance. Secrecy or inadequate communication leads to distrust. Almost every link is felt to be important, and almost every

communication link can be improved. The Senate is a critical and especially valued link in the communication process. Serious attention needs to be given about how the communication network surrounding the Senate and the Chancellor's Office might be strengthened.

Recommendation 28. Establish a task force to make recommendations concerning improvement of Senate communication, both internally and with campus senates, campus faculty, the BOT, the Chancellor's Office, the media, and the public. (Chancellor, Senate)

Recommendation 29. Make greater use of web pages, e-mail, and other technology to strengthen Senate communication. (Senate)

Recommendation 30. Use focus groups or other small, informal and non-traditional, non-Senate groups for discussions on policy. (Chancellor, Senate)

APPENDIX A

HOW THE EXPERTS VIEW SHARED GOVERNANCE

Through a series of interviews concerning shared governance with experts nationwide and in California, we developed a set of general ideas to stimulate discussions regarding improving governance in the CSU. All of the experts indicated that shared governance was an important part of an effective university, and that shared governance was generally viable throughout the U.S. Some viewed it a reasonably healthy, but struggling, or as given lip service to without really being implemented. Several experts thought that it was primarily operational in the sphere of curriculum, whereas other issues of the institution might be resolved with little or no faculty input. Pat Callan thought that those outside of the university felt that it was flourishing (but they did not necessarily think that was a good thing) while those inside of the academy felt that it was not especially healthy.

A central question raised and discussed by several experts is: "What is good governance?" The definition likely varies on an institutional basis, with some universities thinking that little faculty involvement in decision-making is needed and some having a culture of significant faculty involvement in all issues that touch educational quality.

The questioning of experts centered on the nature and practice of shared governance at the system level that would produce beneficial results for the educational process and all parties involved. Many experts had greater experience with campus governance and answered drawing on that experience. A number of key suggestions regarding shared governance in a multi-campus system emerged from the interviews. Many of these have used in, and indeed formed the basis for the "Model of Shared Governance" (Appendix C). Some of the more notable ones are listed below in the "Model" format. (Where no suggestions are reported, headings are left blank)

Environment

Attitudes

1. *Make governance important by having a variety of personal recognitions for faculty members' and administrators' work at the campus and system levels.* Professionals involved in higher education are often motivated by non-monetary rewards. Recognizing the accomplishments and hard work of individuals in tangible and obvious ways contributes to the desire to spend time in these efforts. At the campus, the president should take the lead in promoting good governance and the involvement of the best teacher-scholars by publicly and regularly recognizing the efforts of those involved.

Participation And Training

2. *Have a shared governance orientation for new campus senate leaders, new ASCSU members and leaders, new administrators, and new board members.* The need for better education about shared governance was raised regularly as an area of institutional responsibility for

executive and faculty leaders. This would assist in establishing trust, respect and mutual expectations among the university leadership and faculty.

3. *Assure that governance is recognized in the rewards / compensation system.* If governance work is important to the successful functioning of a successful university, attention must be paid to rewarding all participants in it. Basing retention, promotion, tenure, and merit pay decisions on criteria that ignore shared governance leads to faculty cynicism about its true importance to the administration.

Authority

4. *Develop an agreed upon definition of good shared governance at the system level that satisfies the needs of all parties given the operating environment.* Discussions about the meaning of good shared governance may enhance the awareness and understanding of the motivations of individuals in various university groups. Building trust and respect among its constituents is critical for the successful university. An effective university does not exist unless the faculty feel empowered. In some respects, a CSU definition has been agreed to with the 1985 adoption of *Collegiality*. Implementation of the principles embodied in *Collegiality* has not always been robust, however. Any definition of governance recognizes the ultimate authority of a person or board to decide an issue. Good governance is designed to create an environment for full participation and consensus in decision-making whenever possible, coupled with the trust and respect which allows for support of a decision that is unsatisfactory to some, so long as the decision is adequately explained.

Range Of Decisions

5. *Do system-wide planning and issue identification collaboratively among faculty, administration, and the governing board.* This will assist in coordination among the governance groups and assure that focus of shared governance work is on the bigger, broader, more important issues. Senate members should avoid being parochial and recognize their representation is to achieve what is best for California and the CSU as a whole. The Senate and the Chancellor's cabinet may need to explore new kinds of interaction to assure goals are agreed to in planning. Improvement is needed in getting issues out to the Senate when they arise.

Forms, Extent And Style Of Shared Governance Activities

6. *Institutionalize governance and make it as transparent as possible.* The CSU has a more formalized shared governance process than many similar universities, but faculty involvement could be enhanced in a number of new ways. A leadership institute could be established that serves academic affairs and functions similarly as the Executive Fellows program. Retreats, orientations, prepared materials emphasizing the functions, role, and benefits of shared governance, can all assist in making the process accessible and transparent to faculty throughout the system. Transparent process engenders trust.

Structure

7. *Have professional staff who can assist in communication and research of issues* Although faculty and administrative staff have carried on the work of the Senate for years, a few experts indicated that professional Ph.D. staff enable a senate to work more expeditiously. Often these professional staff are used for policy analysis, project coordination, and communications work.

Procedures And Processes

8. *Develop a system of timely interaction and response on all sides of shared governance.* In the arena of education and public policy, there are many influences that necessitate rapid responses to issues. An effective system of shared governance in the contemporary environment must be designed to operate at a quicker pace when necessary. This must be done without harming the deliberative process that protects against rash responses that will later prove unwise. Likewise, the shared governance process cannot afford to be in recess during intersessions and summers.

9. *Have continuous strategic planning with annual revision done jointly.* Strategic planning on an annual basis including the Senate chair or executive committee was suggested by internal experts, as was the need for greater internal coordination among the administrative leaders regarding issues of Senate concern.

Informal Interactions

Communication

10. *Develop an efficient and interactive process of communication to faculty concerning current issues being dealt with through shared governance.* Constituents cannot know what is involved in shared governance, what issues are under discussion, or how to involve themselves unless there is good communication to the system. Communication is critical to the building of community and of shared purpose. A neutral ombudsperson might serve a useful role in assuring that communication of facts and issues is taking place effectively, as well as in reducing the tension that often exists among constituencies.

System/Campus Issues

Allow campuses to establish different operating definitions of shared governance at the respective campus levels so long as system-wide needs are met. Campus cultures differ throughout the CSU system. The campus president often sets a tone that contributes to or challenges the extant culture. Given notions of campus autonomy found in *Cornerstones,* it seems sensible to permit each campus to create its own functional definition of good shared governance, so long as it does not conflict with system-wide requirements.

Experts and Scholars Interviewed

John Douglass, UC,Berkeley
Peter Eckel, ACE
Tom Longin, AGB
Mary Burgan, AAUP
Gene Rice, AAHE
Otway Pardee, Syracuse University
Peter Faccione, Santa Clara
Martin Schneider, AAUP
Keetjie Ramo, AAUP
Sheila Slaughter, University of Arizona
Fred Carter, President, Francis Marion College
George Mehaffy, AASCU
John Hammung, AASCU
Carol Schneider, AACU
Robert Berdahl, Univ. of Maryland
Jack Schuster, Pomona College
Bill Tierney, USC
Pat Callan, National Center for Public Policy in Higher Education
Peter Krieser, AAUP
Ralph Wolff, WASC
Barbara Perkins, AGB
Barry Munitz, Getty Trust
Joe Flynn, SUNY
Richard Yelland, OECD

Internal Interviews

Charles Reed, CSU
David Spence, CSU
Richard West, CSU
Jackie McClain, CSU
Douglas Patino, CSU
Larry Gould. CSU
Martha Fallgatter, CSU.

Q7A "How important is it to you that shared governance exists on your campus" by Echelon

| | | | Q7A How important shared governance - my campus | | | | Total |
			1 Very Important	2 Somewhat Important	4 Not Important At All	9 Missing	
ECHELON	**1 Presidents**	Count	9	1		2	12
		% within ECHELON	75.0%	8.3%		16.7%	100.0%
	2 VP/Provosts	Count	13	1		1	15
		% within ECHELON	86.7%	6.7%		6.7%	100.0%
	3 CSU Senator	Count	32			1	33
		% within ECHELON	97.0%			3.0%	100.0%
	4 Campus Senate Chair	Count	19				19
		% within ECHELON	100.0%				100.0%
	5 Faculty	Count	41	2			43
		% within ECHELON	95.3%	4.7%			100.0%
	6 Chancellor's Office Staff	Count	3		1	8	12
		% within ECHELON	25.0%		8.3%	66.7%	100.0%
Total		Count	117	4	1	12	134
		% within ECHELON	87.3%	3.0%	.7%	9.0%	100.0%

Q7B "How important is it to you that shared governance exists at the CSU system level" by Echelon

			Q7B How important shared governance - CSU system					Total
			1 Very Important	2 Somewhat Important	3 Somewhat Unimportant	4 Not Important At All	9 Missing	
ECHELON	**1 Presidents**	Count	7	3			2	12
		% within ECHELON	58.3%	25.0%			16.7%	100.0%
	2 VP/Provosts	Count	9	4			2	15
		% within ECHELON	60.0%	26.7%			13.3%	100.0%
	3 CSU Senator	Count	30	1		1	1	33
		% within ECHELON	90.9%	3.0%		3.0%	3.0%	100.0%
	4 Campus Senate Chair	Count	15	4				19
		% within ECHELON	78.9%	21.1%				100.0%
	5 Faculty	Count	31	9	3			43
		% within ECHELON	72.1%	20.9%	7.0%			100.0%
	6 Chancellor's Office Staff	Count	9	1			2	12
		% within ECHELON	75.0%	8.3%			16.7%	100.0%
Total		Count	101	22	3	1	7	134
		% within ECHELON	75.4%	16.4%	2.2%	.7%	5.2%	100.0%

6

Q1A "How well informed are you about the activities and roles of your Campus Senate" by Echelon

			Q1A How well informed - your campus senate			Total
			1 Well Informed	2 Somewhat Informed	3 Not Well Informed	
ECHELON	1 Presidents	Count	12			12
		% within ECHELON	100.0%			100.0%
	2 VP/Provosts	Count	15			15
		% within ECHELON	100.0%			100.0%
	3 CSU Senator	Count	30	1	1	32
		% within ECHELON	93.8%	3.1%	3.1%	100.0%
	4 Campus Senate Chair	Count	19			19
		% within ECHELON	100.0%			100.0%
	5 Faculty	Count	40	3		43
		% within ECHELON	93.0%	7.0%		100.0%
	6 Chancellor's Office Staff	Count			2	2
		% within ECHELON			100.0%	100.0%
Total		Count	116	4	3	123

Q1B "How well informed are you about the activities and roles of your CSU Senate" by Echelon

			Q1B How well informed - CSU Senate				Total
			1 Well Informed	2 Somewhat Informed	3 Not Well Informed	4 Not At All Informed	
ECHELON	1 Presidents	Count	8	4			12
		% within ECHELON	66.7%	33.3%			100.0%
	2 VP/Provosts	Count	9	6			15
		% within ECHELON	60.0%	40.0%			100.0%
	3 CSU Senator	Count	26	6			32
		% within ECHELON	81.3%	18.8%			100.0%
	4 Campus Senate Chair	Count	5	14			19
		% within ECHELON	26.3%	73.7%			100.0%
	5 Faculty	Count	13	23	6	1	43
		% within ECHELON	30.2%	53.5%	14.0%	2.3%	100.0%
	6 Chancellor's Office Staff	Count	8	4			12
		% within ECHELON	66.7%	33.3%			100.0%
Total		Count	69	57	6	1	133
		% within ECHELON	51.9%	42.9%	4.5%	.8%	100.0%

Q1C "How well informed are you about the activities and roles of your Board of Trustees" by Echelon

			Q1C How well informed - Board of Trustees				Total
			1 Well Informed	2 Somewhat Informed	3 Not Well Informed	4 Not At All Informed	
ECHELON	**1 Presidents**	Count	11	1			12
		% within ECHELON	91.7%	8.3%			100.0%
	2 VP/Provosts	Count	11	3	1		15
		% within ECHELON	73.3%	20.0%	6.7%		100.0%
	3 CSU Senator	Count	8	20	4		32
		% within ECHELON	25.0%	62.5%	12.5%		100.0%
	4 Campus Senate Chair	Count	1	15	3		19
		% within ECHELON	5.3%	78.9%	15.8%		100.0%
	5 Faculty	Count	3	19	17	4	43
		% within ECHELON	7.0%	44.2%	39.5%	9.3%	100.0%
	6 Chancellor's Office Staff	Count	8	3		1	12
		% within ECHELON	66.7%	25.0%		8.3%	100.0%
Total		Count	42	61	25	5	133
		% within ECHELON	31.6%	45.9%	18.8%	3.8%	100.0%

Q1D "How well informed are you about the activities and roles of your Chancellor's Office" by Echelon

			Q1D How well informed - Chancellor's Office				Total
			1 Well Informed	2 Somewhat Informed	3 Not Well Informed	4 Not At All Informed	
ECHELON	1 Presidents	Count	10	2			12
		% within ECHELON	83.3%	16.7%			100.0%
	2 VP/Provosts	Count	11	4			15
		% within ECHELON	73.3%	26.7%			100.0%
	3 CSU Senator	Count	7	21	4		32
		% within ECHELON	21.9%	65.6%	12.5%		100.0%
	4 Campus Senate Chair	Count	2	12	5		19
		% within ECHELON	10.5%	63.2%	26.3%		100.0%
	5 Faculty	Count	3	25	14	1	43
		% within ECHELON	7.0%	58.1%	32.6%	2.3%	100.0%
	6 Chancellor's Office Staff	Count	10	1	1		12
		% within ECHELON	83.3%	8.3%	8.3%		100.0%
Total		Count	43	65	24	1	133
		% within ECHELON	32.3%	48.9%	18.0%	.8%	100.0%

Q1E "How well informed are you about the activities and roles of your Local CFA Chapter" by Echelon

			Q1E How well informed - local CFA Chapter				Total
			1 Well Informed	2 Somewhat Informed	3 Not Well Informed	4 Not At All Informed	
ECHELON	1 Presidents	Count	7	4			11
		% within ECHELON	63.6%	36.4%			100.0%
	2 VP/Provosts	Count	5	8	2		15
		% within ECHELON	33.3%	53.3%	13.3%		100.0%
	3 CSU Senator	Count	15	12	4	1	32
		% within ECHELON	46.9%	37.5%	12.5%	3.1%	100.0%
	4 Campus Senate Chair	Count	11	7	1		19
		% within ECHELON	57.9%	36.8%	5.3%		100.0%
	5 Faculty	Count	26	14	3		43
		% within ECHELON	60.5%	32.6%	7.0%		100.0%
	6 Chancellor's Office Staff	Count	2			3	5
		% within ECHELON	40.0%			60.0%	100.0%
Total		Count	66	45	10	4	125
		% within ECHELON	52.8%	36.0%	8.0%	3.2%	100.0%

Q1F "How well informed are you about the activities and roles of your CSU CFA" by Echelon

			Q1F How well informed - CSU CFA				Total
			1 Well Informed	2 Somewhat Informed	3 Not Well Informed	4 Not At All Informed	
ECHELON	**1 Presidents**	Count	4	7			11
		% within ECHELON	36.4%	63.6%			100.0%
	2 VP/Provosts	Count	2	12	1		15
		% within ECHELON	13.3%	80.0%	6.7%		100.0%
	3 CSU Senator	Count	8	17	5	2	32
		% within ECHELON	25.0%	53.1%	15.6%	6.3%	100.0%
	4 Campus Senate Chair	Count	3	13	3		19
		% within ECHELON	15.8%	68.4%	15.8%		100.0%
	5 Faculty	Count	10	26	5	1	42
		% within ECHELON	23.8%	61.9%	11.9%	2.4%	100.0%
	6 Chancellor's Office Staff	Count	4	5	2	1	12
		% within ECHELON	33.3%	41.7%	16.7%	8.3%	100.0%
Total		Count	31	80	16	4	131
		% within ECHELON	23.7%	61.1%	12.2%	3.1%	100.0%

Q1G "How well informed are you about the activities and roles of your local campus administration" by Echelon

			Q1G How well informed - local campus administration				Total
			1 Well Informed	2 Somewhat Informed	3 Not Well Informed	4 Not At All Informed	
ECHELON	**1 Presidents**	**Count**	12				12
		% within ECHELON	100.0%				100.0%
	2 VP/Provosts	**Count**	15				15
		% within ECHELON	100.0%				100.0%
	3 CSU Senator	**Count**	12	14	6		32
		% within ECHELON	37.5%	43.8%	18.8%		100.0%
	4 Campus Senate Chair	**Count**	12	5	2		19
		% within ECHELON	63.2%	26.3%	10.5%		100.0%
	5 Faculty	**Count**	22	18	1	2	43
		% within ECHELON	51.2%	41.9%	2.3%	4.7%	100.0%
	6 Chancellor's Office Staff	**Count**	1	3			4
		% within ECHELON	25.0%	75.0%			100.0%
Total		**Count**	74	40	9	2	125
		% within ECHELON	59.2%	32.0%	7.2%	1.6%	100.0%

APPENDIX C

A MODEL OF SHARED GOVERNANCE

The model outlined here is based on a reading of the literature as applicable to systems, and from interviews with selected individuals outside of the CSU. Like the rest of this document it should be viewed as a work in progress and open to change. This model may be refined or other models developed using inputs including interviews, the internal survey, and our own analysis.

It is generally recognized that there is no perfect model for shared governance, that any model must be based on the culture of a particular institution, and that the informal environment and arrangements are often far more important than any given set of structures. That being said, it is also recognized that certain structures, procedures and behaviors may be more supportive of effective shared governance than others, and that certain principles must be honored for shared governance to work.

ENVIRONMENT
- Faculty workload should not be so burdensome that it discourages participation in shared governance.
- Rewards should reflect the work we want done.
- Tenured and tenure track faculty are essential to the health of shared governance
- Adequate resources are necessary for effective governance.

ATTITUDES
- The single most important element in effective shared governance is mutual trust and respect. The faculty and administration share the responsibility of creating an open, respectful and tolerant atmosphere on campus.
- The attitudes of the president or chancellor, and other top administrators are critical. They must value shared governance and convey to others that they believe shared governance is important. They should not convey the attitude that they mistrust shared governance or that it is ineffective and a barrier to important decisions. They should create and convey a strong sense of shared purpose.
- A culture that values shared governance should be nurtured
- There should be an expectation that the direction of the university will be determined through cooperative and collegial interactions
- It should be the expectation that the success of shared governance depends on widespread faculty participation
- The appropriate model for governing a university is a one of a community of scholars or an organization of professionals, rather than a top-down or bureaucratic model.
- The effectiveness of shared governance will also depend on how faculty view themselves (e.g. subjects, citizens, partners, professionals) and what model of governance they bring to the table.

PARTICIPATION AND TRAINING

- Broad participation of faculty is essential to effective shared governance
- It should be the expectation that participation in shared governance activities is part of the professional responsibility of all faculty.
- Participation in shared governance activities should be rewarded in the RTP process, with recognition and with resources.
- Faculty should receive orientation and training in the importance of shared governance and in how to participate effectively. Faculty need to be informed of their rights and responsibilities.
- Senators and senate chairs should also be trained
- Presidents and other administrators should be trained in shared governance and evaluated on their effectiveness in shared governance
- Faculty need to develop a sense of institutional culture that supercedes disciplinary or departmental boundaries
- Willingness to participate will depend on how shared governance structures are valued and how effective they are believed to be. If they are believed to be impotent, faculty rightly will not participate.
- Governance duties should not repeatedly fall on the same faculty members.
- Opportunities for short-term participation should be developed so that junior faculty can participate and learn about shared governance without being over burdened.

AUTHORITY

- "Shared governance" should be clearly defined
- The role of the faculty and senate should be clearly spelled out (see below). Equally, it should be clear what administrations can and cannot do.
- Outside intrusion into the faculty's areas of primary responsibility must be guarded against.
- Faculty decisions in areas of primary responsibility should be upheld by administrators and governing bodies "except in rare instances and for compelling reasons which should be stated in detail."

RANGE OF DECISIONS

- The faculty should have a significant role in important decisions effecting the institution including, but not limited to: planning, budget, new initiatives, selecting administrators including presidents and chancellors, evaluation of administrators, curriculum, admissions, the academic calendar, RTP, standards for graduation, and relations with outside agencies.
- The faculty must play a central role in strategic planning since this process has become critical in determining the distribution of resources.
- Faculty should be involved in evaluating administrators on their effectiveness in shared governance.
- Wherever practical, policies that govern local practices should be made at the local level.

FORM, EXTENT AND STYLE OF SHARED GOVERNANCE ACTIVITIES

- The forms of faculty participation (determination, joint action, consultation, discussion, none) should be clearly stated for each broad decision-making area.
- Collegial collaboration should be viewed at the appropriate decision making approach. Confrontation should be a last resort.
- The faculty should have opportunity for direct contact with the governing board.
- Effective faculty participation includes developing initiatives, not just helping carry out administrative policies.

STRUCTURE
- There is no single ideal structure. The structure should reflect the campus culture.
- There should be broad representation on a senate and diversity of membership.
- Administration membership should be limited since administrators have the opportunity to participate elsewhere in the process; and so that the faculty voice is clear.
- On joint committees, faculty representation must reflect the importance of the faculty stake in the issue.
- Wherever practicable, there should be faculty representation on administrative boards and committees. Administrative meetings behind closed doors creates an "us/them" atmosphere not conducive to collegial governance.
- There should be (more) faculty representatives on governing boards
- Professional staff could increase the effectiveness and efficiency of senates.

PROCEEDURES AND PROCESSES
- The involvement of the faculty in decision-making should be early and timely.
- The senate should control its own agenda. Administrators should not set the agenda for senates or chair senate committees.
- Institutional agendas should be set jointly.
- Senates should limit the amount of time spent on minutiae, or trivial or tangential matters.
- In important decisions, time is needed for consultation with the entire faculty. .
- At times it is valuable to slow the decision making process to allow for adequate consideration of an issue.
- There should be expeditious responses to requests and required actions by both administrators and faculty.
- It may be desirable to set deadlines to insure a timely response from both administration and faculty.
- Faculty and administrative procedures must be open and transparent. Closed meetings, processes and procedures undermine trust and the attitudes necessary for shared governance to succeed.
- Faculty must have the necessary information and the necessary time to make decisions.
- Where possible, the full senate should not be doing work that committees could do; although the faculty must be kept informed about this work.
- Shared governance is not just between senates and top administrators, but between faculty and administrators at all levels
- Faculty representatives to committees should be selected by faculty.
- Processes should be kept simple.

INFORMAL INTERACTIONS
- Informal interactions are often more important than formal ones.
- Informal interactions between and among faculty and administrators should be frequent.
- Informal interactions should be consistent with the campus culture.
- There should be opportunities for faculty to interact with governing board members.

COMMUNICATION
- Open communication at all levels is critical. Maintenance of communication channels is a joint responsibility.
- An important role of senates is serving as a communication link between faculty and administrators.
- Senates should set an example by openly and frequently communicating their actions and agendas. It is important for senates to communicate to all constituencies what they do.
- Communication after the fact is not shared governance
- Distinctions between structures and processes of communication and structures and processes of decision-making should be made clear.
- Governing boards need to be educated about what faculty do and of the value of shared governance.

This compilation reflects the analysis of the authors. While numerous sources were consulted in constructing this list the following were especially helpful:

Ramo, Keetjie, *Assessing the Faculty's Role in Shared Governance: implications of AAUP standards.* American Association of University Professors (Washington, D.C. 1998).

Schuster, Jack, *Key Propositions Regarding the Faculty Role in Governance.* (mimeo), (Claremont, California 1999)

"Collegiality in the California State University System," in *Principles and Policies: papers of the Academic Senate, The California State University.* (Long Beach, California 1985)

**SUMMARY OF POSITIVE AND NEGATIVE COMMENTS,
FROM CSU SURVEY**

I. POSITIVE COMMENTS

Many of the positive comments had to do with the impact on specific policies, the writing of specific reports and providing communication in both directions. Among the specific policies mentioned were: YRO, Cornerstones, the accountability document, the shift to semesters, CalStateTeach, remedial education, 120 unit baccalaureate minimum, reaffirmation of admission standards, narrowing the salary gap, blended teacher preparation programs, establishment of ITL, general education, CSU Mission Statement, Trustees Statement on Collegiality, The Study of the Baccalaureate, the implementation of EO 665, technology projects, IGETC, The Dinielli Committee on graduate education, development of admission standards, faculty diversity, the Merit Pay Task Force, service learning and work on CSU Counselors. While administrators generally mentioned these policy actions favorably, faculty often mentioned the role of the Senate in slowing, stopping or modifying Chancellor initiated proposals.

The headings in these sections parallel those in "A Model of Shared Governance," (Appendix C) and for that reason some are blank where no comments were made.

A. ENVIRONMENT

B. ATTITUDES
- I appreciate the almost universal attendance by [The Executive Vice Chancellor]
- [The Vice Chancellor] talked about being grateful for feedback from campuses on the accountability draft and he outlined how he would use campus input….
- The Vice Chancellor came to that meeting and in a very informal way sat and discussed many issues with us. Everyone involved came away feeling that ideas and concerns were shared

C. PARTICIPATION AND TRAINING

D. AUTHORITY

E. RANGE OF DECISIONS

F. FORMS, EXTENT AND STYLE OF SHARED GOVERNANCE ACTIVITIES

1. Extent of Participation or Impact by the Faculty
- The rare occasions when the concerns of the faculty have caught the ear of the Chancellor and the BOT
- Just by being there

- Just its existence is a success in the present environment, and with the present leadership of the CSU…
- The fact that it has happened at all, that the faculty have maintained their watch
- There are no successes [at the system level] beyond the statewide Senate
- Maintained enough "sharing" to still deflect or sculpt some administration initiatives
- Involvement in many key issues
- Some reports are influential
- Works that resulted in valuable documents for the CSU
- The Senate Task Force on Merit Pay was successful in producing a sensible document, but unsuccessful in seeing it implemented
- Whatever quality of education is left has been maintained because of the faculty opposing policies that reduce it
- It reduces polarization inherent in collective bargaining
- Provides significant faculty voice in system deliberations of the BOT
- Keeps the faculty/academic perspective in the forefront
- Substantially reduced some micro-management behaviors
- Impact on state and other systems general vision
- Raising awareness of system-wide issues
- Committees have developed stronger relations with the campuses, legislature and the BOT
- There must be full sharing of information, full consultation and broad-based discussion for it to work; when these things occur everyone feels like a "stakeholder"
- Faculty and administrators working together toward common goals
- There were greater successes in earlier years: the push to get the Trustees to adopt a statement on collegiality and the general ability to keep the Board and Chancellor focused on fiscal matters and out of professional standards and curriculum.
- I have confidence in our statewide senate and do believe the process is working
- The quality of shared governance at the system level has been in my opinion a function of the excellent people assigned to that function. Great people can make a process work well even if the underlying policy is not the best.

2. Senate Style
- A great deal depends on who the executive officers are and how well they work with the central administration. The Senate is more successful when it sticks to academic matters and stays out of contract negotiations
- Intelligent discourse, which is most welcome in deliberations before the BOT
- Successes come when the Senate is most active
- What we have kept the CO and BOT from doing
- We are the major speed bump in the CO and BOT freeway to mediocrity

3. Administrative Style
- Most successes come after the CO had acted in someway
- At best we are able to modify and react to top-down agendas

4. Policy Impact
- Usually add value to the development of system policy in academic affairs
- Always adds credibility to the development of academic policies.
- The opportunity to influence system wide program development
- Provide guidance to the Chancellor and his staff regarding faculty views
- To take last year, the Senate improved Trustees decisions, with one glaring exception
- The ASCSU had had quite a positive impact on the system. Certainly the general shape of educational policy in the system bears the stamp of faculty input placed there by shared governance
- Helpful in setting the terms of debate

(Many specific policies were mentioned. See Introduction)

G. STRUCTURE
- Provides a faculty trustee

H. PROCEEDURES AND PROCESSES

I. INFORMAL INTERACTIONS
- On numerous occasions, both formal and informal, faculty and administrators from all levels remarked that when we get together and communicate this way in person, barriers dissolve. At Asilomar we affirmed that face-to-face communication in an informal setting is a key.
- The greatest successes in shared governance system wide are when the administration and the faculty share ideas at an informal level

J. COMMUNICATION
- Facilitating communication
- Providing a faculty voice
- Informing the whole CSU community
- Improved understanding of the complexities of public higher education
- Better communication of campus or multi-campus concerns and ideas to the Chancellor
- Statewide resolutions and dispersal of current information to campuses
- ASCSU is very successful in providing the conduit of information to keep faculty on campuses informed and assuring faculty input into key policy and decision-making
- The liaisons to the standing committees are very useful and welcome in facilitating the flow of information and have produced some faculty orientated decisions
- Disclosure – being provided with information about various initiatives
- Shared knowledge about leading edge educational processes
- It helps inform the CO and BOT and faculty of issues and activities of each. It is a vehicle for getting input to the BOT and Chancellor

K. SYSTEM/CAMPUS ISSUES
- Our senate is greatly influenced by the work of the statewide Academic Senate and they in turn influence the shared governance of the campus

- The statewide senate seems to be very responsive to campus concerns
- The statewide senate may provide some model policies that local senates can implement
- Assisting our campuses with some of the big issues on the horizon
- Academic Conference where the different campuses discussed and shared information about their " best practices" for collaboration and replication
- The efforts by statewide chairs to moderate the corporatese in the initial Cornerstones draft…
- Our willingness to support a system of campuses with differences in mission/focus/strengths/weaknesses
- It makes us aware of what is going on at the other campuses

II. NEGATIVE COMMENTS

Among the most noted negative comments were: the attitudes of administrators; a belief that there is very little shared governance or that it is ineffective; and a failure to communicate effectively.

A. ENVIRONMENT
- Senate and union are too close
- Senate and union are on different tracks
- System is too large and hard to represent
- Cumbersome bureaucracies
- Too large and diverse
- Cumbersome to get feedback

B. ATTITUDES
- Board of Trustees in out of touch and ignorant of education policy
- Administration does not consult; ignores faculty concerns
- [Top level CO administrators] do not care and have no respect for or interest in faculty
- Administrators believe that faculty is resistant to change, obstructionist
- Faculty is cynical; believe they are powerless
- Distrust toward CO and Senate
- Faculty is combatitive and defensive
- Shared governance is under continual attack
- CO disregards the collective wisdom of the faculty

C. PARTICIPATION AND TRAINING
- Not involve enough people
- Bunch of pols
- Some senators serve too long; same people

D. AUTHORITY
- Faculty believe that they should make the decisions

E. RANGE OF DECISIONS
- Senate not defend faculty interests
- Not defend curriculum; not defend academic standards
- Not take strong stand on Cornerstones and tenure

F. FORMS, EXTENT AND STYLE OF SHARED GOVERNANCE ACTIVITIES

1. Extent of Participation or Impact by the Faculty
- There is none; it is an illusion; powerless; little influence; doomed
- Top down; told, not asked; done deals
- Union and CO determine everything
- There is no shared governance in the business model
- Campus initiatives are ignored
- Little faculty involvement; senate reports ignored
- Pro-forma; co-optation
- Influence limited by time
- Only pass resolutions

2. Senate Style
- Not confrontational [enough]
- Not bring normal faculty in
- Time wasted passing resolutions

3. Administrative Style
- Failure to disclose information

   (Also see comments under F1 above)

4. Policy Impact

G. STRUCTURE

H. PROCEEDURES AND PROCESSES
- Inefficient; slow
- Unrealistic deadlines
- Brought in too late; not enough time; too little time
- Trivial issues take up too much time
- Episodic meetings

I. INFORMAL INTERACTIONS
- Senate too cozy with CO

J. COMMUNICATION
- Unknown; no communication; no information; colleagues unaware
- Neither the CO or the Senate communicates
- Lack of outreach to campuses

K. SYSTEM/CAMPUS ISSUES
- Unsupported mandates
- Destructive system wide initiatives
- Disconnect between ASCSU and campuses
- System wide issues not relevant to individual campuses
- Proliferation of policy… makes it difficult to stay current

**SUGGESTED IMPROVEMENTS IN SHARED GOVERNANCE
FROM THE CSU SURVEY**

The headings in this section parallel those in "A Model of Shared Governance," (Appendix C) and for that reason some are blank where no comments were made.

A. ENVIRONMENT
- Avoid mixing CB with academic policy
- Decide what the relationship with CFA is
- Involve CFA more
- Keep the union and Senate separate; do some responsibility mapping

B. ATTITUDES
- Trust, mutual respect, civility, honesty, truthfulness, good communication, broad and frequent consultation, transparent processes and open and frank discussions
- A chancellor and board who have a deep appreciation of faculty culture and shared governance
- The Chancellor should serve as a role model to presidents in terms of respect for faculty
- Respect for all members of the CSU family….may be the only 'extra' that can make things work

C. PARTICIPATION AND TRAINING
- Support participation by junior faculty
- Value participation in RTP; give more weight to it
- Formal orientation for all new faculty
- Encourage junior faculty to become more involved
- Create more opportunities for faculty to be involved system-wide
- Involve faculty at all levels of governance. Listen to Faculty. Trust faculty
- Introduce workshops and training promoting ethics in decision-making. Maybe case studies would be a beginning
- We can benefit from our emeritus or retired faculty colleagues… Perhaps a task force could be set up to examine emeritus or retired faculty in relation to shared governance

D. AUTHORITY
- Arrive at a shared definition of shared governance
- Cleary categorize issues where consultation is needed: required, advisable, not needed
- Set core principles and not compromise on them
- Strengthen and enforce HEERA regulations on shared decision-making, not just consultation.
- Have the Trustees reaffirm the 1985 "CSU Statement on Collegiality."
- Have CO develop effective measures to ensure support of administrators for shared governance

- The collegiality document is very important to defining what we do and why. It needs to be given a periodic ceremonial rereading and re-endorsement

E. RANGE OF DECISIONS
- Be involved in the budget process; more Senate involvement in setting budget priorities.
- True engagement on budget expenditures, workload and campus initiatives
- Require that there be faculty/staff/student representation on all levels of budget making
- Create a planning process and models that can drive the budgeting process rather than vice-versa
- Involved in strategic planning
- Stronger role in Chancellor and presidential selection
- Ensure that accountability measures ensure… respect for shared governance
- Insist that CO develop more effective mechanisms for ensuring a truly shared mode as a given for campus administrators
- We need the ability to evaluate administrators. Make administrators accountable to faculty
- Have statewide and local governance evaluate their administrators and publish the results.

F. FORMS EXTENT AND STYLE OF SHARED GOVERNANCE ACTIVITIES

1. Extent of Participation or Impact by Faculty
- Have Senate Report on BOT agenda.
- Authentic consultation on all matters, not just those that the administration finds convenient.

2. Senate Style
- Be firm/ aggressive
- Be bold; question everything that seems odd; do not be afraid of a public fight
- Be less deliberative and put more emphasis on effecting change and cooperating with the administration
- Know the business of administrators as well as they know ours, especially in the area of the fiscal impacts of strategic planning.

3. Administrative Style
- Faculty resolutions must be acknowledged
- Stop unilateral imposition of politically expedient decisions
- Administrators must recognize the difference between informing and consulting
- Remind administrators that their job is to facilitate what faculty do
- The administration must recognize faculty as an equal partner

4. Policy Impact
- The baccalaureate document is our best weapon at the moment to resist creeping erosion of quality… We need a similar re post-baccalaureate education
- We need to take the lead in fighting against conversion of more and more faculty positions to temp positions

G. STRUCTURE

- Place administrators and students on the Senate
- Top administrators should attend every meeting
- Diverse membership
- Have local chairs sit as ex officio members of the Senate
- More joint committees to build agendas or propose solutions
- Chair should sit on Executive Council.
- Participation upward by Senate Chair and by local campus chairs
- Break down institutional barriers between faculty and Trustees
- More faculty Trustees
- Create an oversight committee on implementation of system policies
- Have positions for non-tenured and recent faculty on the Senate

H. PROCEEDURES AND PROCESSES

- Joint agenda setting
- More shared agenda setting and problem solving
- Create a collaborative working relationship between Executive Council, provosts and Senate to share ideas before reports are written
- Focus on two or three key issues each year and be proactive
- [More] time allotted for decisions
- Earlier involvement in issues
- Allow time for planning so that items do not suddenly appear on the BOT agenda
- Be alert to issues at the earliest possible point
- Provide more time for faculty input in administrative decisions
- Spend less time on irrelevant issues
- Streamline the process and committee structure
- Debate ways to respond more quickly and effectively
- Specialize and reciprocate
- Involve local chairs more
- Formal censure mechanisms for those who deliberately violate policy
- Get administrators more fully involved in functions of the Senate
- Have summer meetings
- Set up a system of checks and balances. All proposals would have to be negotiated
- An ability to override if the president rejects would give the faculty some feeling of power
- Term limits or rotation of senators
- Officers should be elected by all faculty
- Ensure reporting to Exec on a regular basis of all senate appointments to committees and commissions
- Involve CFA more

I. INFORMAL INTERACTIONS

- Regular meetings with high level administrators (and BOT)
- Cultivate more opportunities for trust building. It's all about relationships

- Substantive interaction among faculty, administration and Trustees on issues
- More retreats like Asilomar
- Cultivate a stronger connection with the BOT
- Use smaller and more informal gatherings to share ideas. Insure that information gathered is distributed to campuses

J. COMMUNICATION
- Communicate, communicate, communicate
- Communicate issues and policy decisions briefly and widely to make Senate's role clearer
- More accountability to constituents
- More regular communication in the summer
- Place all committee agendas and minutes on the web page
- Increased opportunities to learn more about shared governance by those not directly involved
- Use technology more for direct participation
- Small informal "university council" to share information
- Have a forum (not retreat) based on system wide issues where the whole Senate meets and interacts with campus chairs
- Meet on campuses
- More reports from administrators at plenary meetings
- More reports from Exec on meetings with administrators
- More visits by CO personnel to campuses
- Have members of Exec meet with local senates more than now
- Make system wide governance more visible
- Conduct focus groups of non-Senate faculty to discuss policy
- Explain statewide planning venues

K. CAMPUS/SYSTEM ISSUES
- Decentralize the system

L. MISCELLANEOUS
- Senate leaders should not accept administrative positions; limit ability to do so
- Remind system wide leadership that they represent faculty
- Take time to fully understand the responsibilities of administration
- Bring back faculty scholarly presentations to the BOT
- Bring back System Outstanding Professor Awards
- Get sympathetic legislators to carry legislation on our behalf
- Nurture independent sources of power (legislative lobbying, unionization)
- Form a task force to issue a report on this matter
- Field test new initiatives
- Carrying the CSU message to Sacramento is part of what the CSU Senate does… and few things are more important than bring people to meet legislators

Addendum: recommendations suggested by the above list that have not been included in body of the report

- Examine emeritus or retired faculty in relation to shared governance
- Ensure that accountability measures ensure… respect for shared governance
- Be bold, firm, aggressive
- New document on post-baccalaureate education. [Use documents more]
- Place administrators and students on the Senate
- Have checks and balances; everything should be subject to negotiation
- Provide for an override if faculty recommendations rejected
- Formal censure mechanism for those who deliberately violate policy
- Officers elected by all the faculty
- Specialize and reciprocate
- Term limits or rotation of senators
- Streamline the committee structure
- Create a small "university council" to share information
- Meet on campuses
- More reports from Administration at plenary meetings
- Have Exec report on meetings with administrators
- Senate leaders should not accept administrative positions; limit ability to do so
- Remind system wide leadership that they represent faculty
- Take time to fully understand the responsibilities of administration
- Bring back faculty scholarly presentations to the BOT
- Bring back System Outstanding Professor Awards
- Get sympathetic legislators to carry legislation on our behalf
- Nurture independent sources of power (legislative lobbying, unionization)
- Form a task force to issue a report on this matter
- Field test new initiatives
- Carrying the CSU message to Sacramento is part of what the CSU Senate does… and few things are more important than bring people to meet legislators
- Decentralize the system

SHARED GOVERNANCE AND THE NEXT GENERATION OF FACULTY

(A version of this paper was presented at the AAHE Conference on Faculty Roles and Rewards Tampa, February 2001.)

The California State University Senate and Chancellor's Office is currently undertaking a study to examine how system wide shared governance might work more effectively. A critical element of this is look at how to involve the faculty more fully in shared governance activities. Of particular concern the involvement of new faculty in shared governance.

The importance of participation by new faculty in the California State University (CSU) is accentuated by the hiring patterns of the past 40 years. Many faculty were hired in the 1960s and early 70s during a period of rapid growth in the multi-campus (currently 23) CSU. In the 19809s and early 1990s economic pressures led to far fewer tenured or tenure track faculty being hired. As a result of this pattern, many faculty are now about to retire and there are few faculty in the middle ranks. Within the next ten years the bulk of the faculty on many campuses of the CSU will be relatively new.

The CSU is facing what some have termed a "crisis" in participation in shared governance. Many observers report that it is increasingly difficult to get faculty to become informed and to participate in shared governance activities. The reasons are many including increased workload, discipline and departmental focus, and a decrease in the percentage of tenured and tenure track professors.

Currently senior faculty carry out much of the shared governance activities. But with so many skilled and knowledgeable faculty reaching retirement age and so many new faculty being hired or to be hired, and few faculty in the middle, there is a great concern about where new faculty participants will come from and how they will learn how to be effective.

While the CSU shared governance study focused on system wide shared governance, participants in system wide governance come from local campuses and have usually been involved in local campus activities for some years before participating at the system level. Since the statewide Senate rests firmly on the bed of local shared governance, it is not an entity unto itself. If local shared governance is healthy then so too will be the system-wide Senate. Or at least the opposite is true. Participation questions therefore are rightly focused on local campuses.

The Governance study has three parts: an internal survey, interviews with scholars and other experts, and an examination of other similar systems. The material presented in this paper is based largely on the internal survey.

Respondents in the governance survey (approximately 150 administrators and active faculty) were asked to address what might be done to encourage active and effective participation in shared governance among new faculty. Most, but not all, agreed with the evaluation of the situation: that the changing demands of the workplace have resulted in new faculty being less likely to participate in governance activities than was the case for previous generations of faculty. Most had answers to

the perceived problem. The proposed solutions fall mainly into a few (sometimes overlapping) categories:

- Change environmental factors
- Change attitudes
- Modify structures and processes
- Increase rewards and incentives
- Decrease disincentives
- Recruit, socialize, train
- Communicate

1. Environmental Factors

The environmental factor of most concern was that of the decline in the relative number of tenure track faculty. With fewer tenure track faculty members there are fewer individuals to carry the weight of shared governance. Moreover these faculty also must carry the weight of other obligations that part time faculty do not. The solution is to reverse the trend of hiring temporary and part-time faculty.

Concern was also expressed about the coming shift to year round operation (YRO) at some campuses, and that this would dilute faculty participation and the impact of faculty participation.

An additional factor is a perceived decline in community. Strong participation grows out of a strong and valued community and institutional commitment. A number of factors, both societal and campus – including workload -- have weakened the university community no many campuses. The answer lies in a variety of activities designed to strengthen this community: faculty dining rooms, social events, intellectual interchanges, etc.

2. Values and attitudes

Of prime concern is the attitude of members of the university community towards shared governance and towards each other. Of utmost importance are how both administrators –especially campus presidents and the Chancellor -- and faculty value the work of shared governance. Over and over again our respondents mentioned this and mentioned that if the work of the Senate is valued, individuals will want to participate. Two typical quotes make this point:

> The faculty and administration must support shared governance; new faculty must be encouraged by their peers and administration to participate in governance. Administrators and faculty peers must make sure that the new faculty members understand the importance of shared governance.

> The tone starts at the top of the CSU system and filters down to each campus. If faculty see that their voices are heard and they can really make a difference in higher education in the future, they will willingly step up to the plate.

> Second is attitude towards each other, especially the contentious attitude that is viewed as accompanying the collective bargaining process. If the processes of shared governance is seen as one of pointless bickering and antagonism many faculty will be turned off to the process.

Finally there is the attitude of professional obligation and the role that professionals have in controlling their own work and workplace. If faculty believe that shared governance activities are part of their professional obligation or if they see that these activities have an important impact in improving their working conditions and the quality of education, they will be anxious to participate.

The solutions here are not simple, and most rely on other pieces of the puzzle. Faculty attitudes are influenced by many of the items mentioned later: procedures, rewards, socialization, etc.

Changing the attitude of administrators can be influenced by their reward system: if ability to work in a shared governance system is part of administrators' evaluation, behavior at least would change; and behavior often influences attitudes. At several points throughout the survey it was suggested that administrators ability to operate in a shared governance environment should be evaluated, that faculty should play a major role in that evaluation, and that it should be an important factor in determining compensation and promotions.

3. Structural and Procedural Changes

A number of changes were suggested in structure and process, most with the idea of making the work itself more efficient and more meaningful. Second, changes that encourage or make it easier for junior faculty to participate were suggested. A third suggestion was testing new structures to make the system work better and thereby increase its value:

- Do only meaningful work: reduce the size and number of committees so that faculty time is spend on significant issues
- Focus on a few critical issues; do not take up trivial issues
- Limit the opportunity for endless talk
- Reserve seats for junior faculty
- Limit the number of years a faculty member can serve on senates or committees
- Provide more opportunities for participation without major time commitments
- Test newer forms of shared governance such as joint faculty-administrator committees

Some of these proposed solutions come with costs. Reducing the size of committees also reduces the opportunities for junior faculty to participate and learn how shared governance works. Term limits removes the most experienced and perhaps most effective faculty from senates, as it has from those state legislatures where it is in effect.

4. Rewards and incentives

The rewards mentioned most often are those that are most obvious: release time, attention in the RTP (retention, tenure, promotion) and merit pay processes. The intrinsic value of doing worthwhile work was often mentioned, however, such as influencing one's workplace and helping set direction for the institution. Additional rewards may come in the form of public recognition for the work done by faculty: favorable comments by a president, service awards, plaques for outstanding service etc.

If and when faculty are persuaded that this work will reflect favorably when they apply for promotions/tenure they will participate. Assigned time will encourage faculty to become and remain involved.

To substantively participate in shaping and guiding the educational mission of the institution would appeal to many.

I think that faculty will be active if there is a response that gives substantive credibility to the idea that their efforts are valued.

The time commitment is large. There should be some release time for Academic Senate activities.

While the importance of these cannot be overlooked, here too there may be costs. It was noted that making shared governance service count in RTP leads some individuals to get on committees only for that purpose with no intention of making a worthwhile contribution. There is disagreement – perhaps from campus to campus -- about whether merit pay encourages or discourages participation in shared governance.

5. Disincentives
This is the flip side of incentives. Disincentives include: the increasingly heavy workload, a belief that shared governance work is not worthwhile or that the Senate is not listened to, and the contentious atmosphere that sometimes accompanies differences between faculty and administrators.

Faculty members have to accommodate more students, larger classes, more administration, develop distance learning courses, become involved in global activities, increase community involvement, assess outcomes as well as formally grade courses, complete more administrative imposed reports, compete competitive applications for campus movies, etc., etc., external fund raise, and raise research funds.

New faculty are being oriented and socialized into a system in which the interests of faculty are being portrayed as in opposition to the interests of the institution.

The answer here is, of course, to increase incentives and decrease disincentives. However there is disagreement on whether or not some matters encourage or discourage participation, notably conflict. If conflicting issues are not addressed, the faculty may feel that the Senate is not doing its job. If the Senate is aggressive in standing up for faculty rights, faculty may feel that it is engaged in important work – fighting the good fight -- and that it is worthwhile to support it.

6. Recruitment, socialization and training.
A concentrated effort to make new faculty aware of the importance of shared governance, introduce them to it, and provide them with the skills to participate is often viewed as the most important element in creating new campus activists. While some suggest that junior faculty must be shielded from the pressures of involvement, others suggest that early involvement is critical.

A. Recruitment. Graduate schools provide little if any training in shared governance beyond the department, much as they provide little training in teaching. It is suggested that recruitment must begin with the initial contacts with potential faculty and actively continue: Among the suggestions:
- Job listings and job descriptions should include explicit requirements of active involvement in governance activities
- Orientation programs should have a specific governance component and senates should be involved in these programs (see below).
- Encourage early involvement beyond the boundaries of academic departments.
- One-on-one recruiting of younger faculty for committees and senates
- Specific invitations to participate
- Enlist department chairs to spread the word and be part of the solution and not part of the problem
- Make senates a more vital factor in campus life beyond shared governance

B. Socialization. Since graduate schools do not provide the necessary orientation, socialization should begin with new faculty orientation. It has been suggested that this orientation should not be a single day or single week activity, but should go on throughout the first couple of years, with frequent Senate involvement. Socialization can continue through early involvement of faculty in committee work, mentoring, and communication from the Senate and faculty leaders.

C. Training. On the job training may be the most important and early committee work has been mentioned before. However specific training in how shared governance works and in effective committee and Senate work was also mentioned. An additional suggestion was training in shared governance ethics for both faculty and administrators. Respondents felt that the responsibilities of the academy need to be taught and that while mentoring may do this, specific training was needed. This training should start at the department level but needs – early – to spread outward. Campus faculty development centers should be involved. Faculty should be provided with specific documents that discuss the rights and obligations or faculty in the CSU.

7. Communication
Throughout this survey the need for better communication was mentioned. While most of this focused on system wide governance activities, it was also pointed out that many faculty were unaware of the activities of local senates. This would be especially true of junior faculty. Among the proposed solutions to this situation were: wider use of new technology to inform faculty, including e-mail and web pages; newsletters or other publications explaining senate activities and actions; focusing senates on a few key high visibility issues; and, forums, focus groups and other opportunities to involve faculty not already involved.

The above framework identifies areas that must be given attention in order to nurture new academic citizens. It seems equally clear that it is necessary to pursue a multi-faceted strategy touching upon all of these areas if we are to successfully encourage the effective activity among faculty that will be required for shared governance survive and even thrive.

CSU SYSTEM-WIDE SHARED GOVERNANCE SURVEY

The Academic Senate and the Chancellor's Office are undertaking a study on system-wide shared governance. The purpose is to suggest policies, procedures and practices that can strengthen shared governance in the CSU at the system level. In addition to looking at practices outside of the CSU, we are interested in internal perceptions of the status of CSU shared governance.

For purposes of this study we define shared governance as follows:

> Shared governance describes the relationship between the administration and the faculty in which the faculty participate in giving direction and advice to the university on important policy decisions. At the system level this involves the relationship between the system-wide Academic Senate and the Chancellor's office, the Trustees and parallel advisory bodies (e.g. The Executive Council).

It would be helpful to us if you would answer the following questions. If this format does not permit you to fully express your opinions and observations, please make additional comments at the end. We are primarily interested in qualitative information and not quantitative data. If you can provide specific examples when asked for, it would be very useful**. If you prefer to complete and return this questionnaire by e-mail, please contact ravsingh@fullerton.edu and we will send you a copy for that purpose.**

Please feel free to contact us directly:

Vince Buck   vbuck@fullerton.edu
Jim Highsmith jamesh@csufresno.edu

Name (optional): _____
Campus: _____

Position On Campus:

( ) President   ( ) Vice President/Provost   (X) CSU Senator

   ( ) Campus Senate Chair   ( ) Faculty   ( ) Chancellor's Office Staff

1.   How well informed are you about the activities and roles of:

Your Campus Senate…

( ) Well Informed   ( ) Somewhat Informed   ( ) Not Well Informed

( ) Not At All Informed

The CSU (system-wide) Senate…

( ) Well Informed   ( ) Somewhat Informed   ( ) Not Well Informed

( ) Not At All Informed

The CSU Board of Trustees…

( ) Well Informed   ( ) Somewhat Informed   ( ) Not Well Informed

( ) Not At All Informed

The Chancellor's Office…

( ) Well Informed   ( ) Somewhat Informed   ( ) Not Well Informed

( ) Not At All Informed

Your Local Union Chapter (CFA)…

( ) Well Informed   ( ) Somewhat Informed   ( ) Not Well Informed

( ) Not At All Informed

The CSU (system-wide) CFA…

( ) Well Informed   ( ) Somewhat Informed   ( ) Not Well Informed

( ) Not At All Informed

Your Local Campus Administration…

( ) Well Informed   ( ) Somewhat Informed   ( ) Not Well Informed

( ) Not At All Informed

2.   **What are the most common comments that you hear from colleagues about system-wide shared governance in the CSU?**

3.   **In your view, how accurate are these comments?   Please explain…**

4.   **In your experience what are the successes of system-wide shared governance? If possible, please provide examples.**

5.   **What do you see as the shortcomings of system-wide shared governance? Please provide examples.**

6. **Based on your experiences, are there lessons (good or bad examples) that the system could learn from the way shared governance works on your campus? Please provide specific examples.**

7. **How important is it to you that shared governance exists on your campus and at the system level?**

My Campus:

( ) Very Important   ( ) Somewhat Important   ( )Somewhat Unimportant

( ) Not Important at all

CSU System:

( ) Very Important   ( ) Somewhat Important   ( )Somewhat Unimportant

( ) Not Important at all

8. **Large numbers of new faculty will be joining the CSU in the near future. Given the changing demands of the university workplace, some people believe that these faculty will not be as active or effective in shared governance as current faculty. What do you think might be done to encourage active and effective participation in shared governance among new faculty?**

9.	**In what ways do you think union representation of faculty in collective bargaining affects shared governance?**

10.	**Given your understanding of how shared governance works, what two or three changes might be made to improve system-wide shared governance?**

Please share with us any additional views or information that you believe is relevant to improving system-wide shared governance.
Thank You