

What does shared governance mean to you?

Sharing the responsibilities associated with governing a university. In shared governance faculty have oversight of the curriculum and all curricular matters. Administrators have oversight of the administrative functions of the university but seek input from faculty and staff as appropriate.

Shared governance means that faculty are the primary stakeholders and center of a university; they are solely responsible for curriculum design, academic program development, and the hiring and review of faculty, whereas issues of public relations and fund generating are the purview of the other branches of the university. Without the faculty at the center of the university, a university will cease to be a university and will, instead, be a country club whose purpose is no longer for the greater good.

Transparency, partnership, putting the decisions related to an area of expertise in the hands of the expert, working together for needed change.

That appropriate stake holders and end-users are consulted for input on matters of policy and procedures that affect them or need to be implemented by them or are their primary responsibility.

My input is heard. Communication is maintained. Many views are considered and ultimately the choice that most closely meets needs is put into practice.

Faculty involved in the decision-making activities of the university in some form. It has to be more than the 'contrived democracy' that is exerted through the Senate, Search processes, and tenure and Promotion activities. Recommendations of the faculty should not be dismissed as so often happens. Search committees make recommendations and administration makes contrary decisions. Faculty must be made to feel that their time and effort in decision-making is not a waste of time.

Participation by all impacted by the decision in the process at all levels. Open and transparent communication to all stakeholders.

faculty have a voice in decision making and that voice is heard and respected; it is not just a phrase tossed around by upper administration while they continue to do as they please unilaterally

shared governance means that decisions are made with significant input from all (or most) of the stakeholders who are impacted by the decision.

Employees are provided decision making authority

Typically, shared governance is a model wherein faculty have predominant oversight of curricular matters and administration oversees the overall management of the institution. However, both parties (faculty and administration) still must collaborate on both areas. For example, a new program requires resources. While the faculty may advocate for the new program, the administration will have to determine whether there are adequate resources for the new program. In turn, faculty should be able to provide input on issues that affect them. Ultimately, both parties need to recognize that the final decision resides with the board of trustees.

Ideally, that decisions are reached in such a way that all interests are honored and, at least balanced, in the outcome. Cynically, it means 'We will ask for your input and then go ahead with what we wanted to do anyway.'

That information is shared with all parties involved.

That as a group we are determining what and how things are done.

Successful shared governance is actually centered on bringing skills/competence/ability/desire/experience/etc into the decision making process (i.e. - each to their own level). It is NOT centered on the 'country club'/old Tech/give the whiners something to do/only my social group is good enough mentality. Unfortunately, ATU's administration continues a long and sordid habit of filling decision making/leadership/administrative positions with 'country club'/whiners/'only my social group'/etc. Everyone outside of these 'favored few' is then treated as an outsider. This is the number one reason why we continue to have the challenges that we have.

Clear, visible/accessible, timely metrics for our core goals as an institution along with examples of leadership (people 'rocking it') in these areas. Straightforward and streamlined mechanisms for collecting input from the governed in the context of group decision-making (e.g. a way of putting forth new issues along with a forced prioritization system - can't vote something up without also voting something else down). 'Cooling' mechanisms to prevent hot tempers from dominating the conversation.

This is an open-ended question. A 'survey' of this type should have multiple choices that I can pick from.

That all stakeholders have the privilege of participating in decisions that affect the university, the department and/or the student. It also means an open line of communication.

<p>Merriam-Webster:</p> <p>Shared: used, done, belonging to, or experienced by two or more individuals</p> <p>Governance: government (synonyms: administration, authority, government, jurisdiction, rule)</p>
<p>It means that faculty, staff, and students not only have a voice, but a vote in the decision-making process about matters concerning them. It means more than just lip-service or having representatives 'in the room'. It means that the respective Senates can select representatives to help craft policy and can give dissenting voices to matters that impact them, without fear of reprisals. It means that at all levels of decision-making, a representative of all three branches are present and equipped with voting responsibility when it impacts them.</p>
<p>open communication and decision making</p>
<p>Faculty control the curriculum, faculty appointments and faculty promotions. Faculty are consulted and have a voice on other major matters.</p>
<p>Staff, faculty, department heads, deans, VP academic affairs, and president working together on specified goals.</p>
<p>It means that we are all stakeholders and that we are informed of discussions or decisions being made and are able to provide input.</p>
<p>From AAUP's Statement: (1) important areas of action involve at one time or another the initiating capacity and decision-making participation of all the institutional components, and (2) differences in the weight of each voice, from one point to the next, should be <u>determined by reference to the responsibility of each component for the particular matter at hand</u></p>
<p>Shared governance is a practice of involving all organizational stakeholders input into decision-making processes for an organization. The level of input and control over decision-making may vary for each stakeholder group, depending on the issues. For example, budgetary issues would involve faculty but fall primarily on the administrative stakeholders for final decision-making (e.g., roughly 70% admin and 30% faculty). Curriculum, on the other hand, would be almost exclusively faculty with some limited input from administration (e.g., 80% faculty; 20% admin).</p> <p>Ideally, any shared governance initiative would include the creation of a permanent 'shared governance' committee that would evaluate issues, set policy/procedures, and allocate stakeholder participation by issue. In some instances, that committee may also determine that certain issues do not require full stakeholder involvement, depending, once again, on the issue. In other instances, the committee may determine that the issue requires full participation from all stakeholders. Members of this committee must have knowledge of the handbook, ATU procedures, and experience in the faculty senate or other, related administrative experience.</p> <p>Thus far, ATU has been moving away from shared governance. Job searches are held in secret and hiring decisions appear to be made without any real notice or opportunity for input. The faculty senate also tends to rubber-stamp administrative initiatives without full faculty input or time to consider the issues fully. Department heads are often more authoritarian in their management of departments, with little consideration of faculty input. Faculty have even been blocked from fully following the handbook procedures on P/T when it is inconvenient for dept. heads.</p> <p>The faculty want shared governance, despite what you may see in responses. The problem is that they are demoralized and have been beaten down so much lately that they won't trust any effort at expanding it here at ATU. Why would any faculty member waste their time on something that they feel will go nowhere? Will this initiative be different? History at ATU suggests no. I hope I'm wrong, and I honestly hope <u>that we are moving toward a real shared governance model.</u></p>
<p>All stakeholders, administration, faculty, and staff have input into decision making including issues such as budget, policies, etc.</p>
<p>Everyone (board, administration, and faculty) having input. That input does not have to come from a paid outside source for its opinions to be counted.</p>

I have largely adopted the AAUP's understanding of shared governance, as discussed in the Red Book.

In order for there to be true shared governance, the following must be present:

- 1) Shared responsibility must be present. Just as our forebearers knew that there could be no freedom in the absence of responsibility, there can be no shared governance in the absence of shared responsibility.
- 2) The potential, and occasional need, for unequal sharing must be acknowledged and tolerated. Each individual, or groups, has(have) their own gifts, skills, expertise and experience. True shared governance dictates that those with gifts/experience in a particular topic will have greater input in those areas compared to those with little or no knowledge/experience of the topic.
- 3) Mutual respect - Unfortunately, numerous areas at ATU appear to be a bit short on this at the moment. Campus-wide, we continue to witness bullying, mobbing, retribution against outspoken individuals, favoritism, cronyism, plagiarism of/claiming credit for others' work/projects/ideas, exclusionary behaviors, etc. This is occurring at virtually every level of the institution including faculty, staff and administration! A very unhealthy environment.

Several things come to mind when I think of shared governance. First, it means involving faculty (and staff for that matter) in decisions that impact their jobs. For faculty, it means that decisions that will impact teaching, research, and job security at the university should be arrived at in a joint fashion with faculty interacting with administration to arrive at mutually beneficial decisions. For matters that involve running the university faculty may not necessarily need to be directly involved in decision-making, but should be made aware of the decision process (transparency).

It means that decision-making is shared, that the faculty have a voice in how the institution is run.

Shared governance means that I have a role in contributing to the decision making process as a member of campus community. I may not make the decisions, but I have a role in that the process that I may participate in.

When all parties concerned are sharing in the policy-making and implementation. Access to representation is important in large groups. Outreach to all members of a large group is also important.

That appropriate administrators, faculty and staff are part of the process for all decisions affecting the University. You will notice that I have not included students. Although they are our primary concern, typical students are not experienced enough to make educated decisions on most issues.

Getting members of people from around the university together to make decision

Participation by faculty and staff for appropriate procedures and processes. Also input in the creation of the procedures and processes.

Faculty and administration having near-equal input on decision-making and in carrying out those decisions

That the group members participate in the decision making

Faculty hold an important role as to the direction of the university. They share responsibilities of administration and instruction.

Faculty should be in charge of the curriculum. EC should not be in charge of the curriculum.

Shared governance is both a structure and a process. Properly applied, it creates 'ownership' in the minds of the shareholders, and serves as a partnership that leads to better equity and accountability. The most important component of shared governance is that it actively involves those who will be carrying out the decisions.

The administration seeks input from those directly involved with a decision. Thinking about adopting a new software product for scheduling? ask the opinion of those who will use it. Needing to implement standards about curriculum, advisement, assessment-ask faculty and departmental leadership. Need to tear out trees? Consult those in nearby buildings and grounds keepers. Have a new policy about managing grants? Ask those who have been awarded grants on how to solve the problem.

input from faculty , staff, students concerning the goals, plans, and directions associated with the university
Transparency. It means that major decisions are made with the input of faculty and/or staff and is taken into account .
Academic faculty make the decisions about faculty and curriculum while other divisions take care of their side of things. Divisions that are not academic should not be telling faculty what, when, and how to do things and vice versa.
Employees voices and oppinions are heard AND considered.
Each right to participate in the decision making of the organization. All voices heard.
That PRIOR to implementation of any new campus policies or new campus procedure, or alteration(s) of campus, the administration ask for comments/inputs from faculty/staff (especially those faculty/staff that the changes might impact.) in a timely manner, and then thoughtfully consider this input before implementation.
Open dialogue, transparency, actually taking suggestions from committees and implementing them
Transparent decision-making by the administration, plus faculty representation in such decision-making.
Administration, faculty and staff (and students when appropriate) working together, sharing thoughts and information, deliberating collaboratively, to make policy for the university. No one entity makes the decision autonomously, but the pursuit of a general consensus is what should win the day.
It means that shared governance includes staff and students as stakeholders and decision-makers. It means transparency in hiring. It means representation on search committees for administration (which should include staff and faculty and yes, even a student). It means that faculty and staff and students have the opportunity to formally evaluate their leaders. It means that governance minutes--including the Board of Trustees minutes--are available online or in the library for public viewing by anyone, at anytime, for any reason. It means the Executive Council would include the faculty senate chair, the SGA chair, and Staff Senate Chair.
It means that faculty have equal input in the policies, procedures, and decisions made by the University
Cooperation between the faculty and administration on actions taken by and decision made by the university. Input from faculty organizations/committees is taken seriously and not merely listened to as some perfunctory obligation that is immediately dismissed.
Faculty are involved in decisions at the departmental and university levels that affect the university, faculty and students.
It means that faculty, administrators, and staff (at least-maybe more categories) are appropriately afforded opportunities to influence the planning and implementation of policies, and procedures that contribute to successful execution of our institutional mission. As a professor, I feel strongly that who we look to for what is 'appropriate' in this context SHOULD BE the AAUP rather than our board or any administrators.
Shared GOVERNANCE of ALL aspects of university life: curriculum AND instruction AND policies AND procedures. Governance meaning active participation in the goals, policies, and administration of all university functions, and participation in the execution of those goals, policies, and administrative actions. Thus, at least in theory, faculty could share in the governance of everything ranging from the curriculum necessary for a certain degree to the price of a Pepsi at a football game.
It means that the administration and faculty work together to promote the efficacy of education. Within that framework, the faculty should have more say on issues regarding instruction while the administration should have more say on issues associated with finances.

Faculty is responsible for curriculum types of governance and administration is responsible for administrative types of governance. Both work in tandem to make sure there is a good balance that serves the best for all.

Working together (faculty, admin, and/or staff) toward innovative, problem solving, or enhancement solutions for the betterment of the University.

That the faculty are involved in most decisions that impact faculty, curriculum or programs, even those outside of Academic Affairs. The level of involvement will likely vary from topic to topic, but there should be input from faculty on almost every decision made campus-wide. An couple of examples of when this was NOT done are the revision of the LLC's and the move to early registration for incoming freshmen (especially the Saturday sessions). Both of these decisions were made, it appears, outside of Academic Affairs with no real input or even advance notice to departments/programs that would be affected by the decisions. Faculty shouldn't expect 'shared governance' on things like salary structure, but on university policies, since they are directly affected and often are the one upon which any burden falls, they should have a voice.

Everyone has a say in the the decisions made that affect them.

The people who will be affected by a decision are included in the decision making process. They don't just get to share an opinion but they get to vote on it, or are represented on the committee that decides.

faculty hold a central role in making important decisions for the university

Representation.

Shared governance means adequate representation. Faculty have the greatest amount of contact, of any office/division, with our student. Yet, we are locked out of any of the major decision making. We are often the most affected by budget changes. Yet, we are left out of any meeting or votes concerning the budget. With shared governance, I believe that with share governance, transparency becomes a priority.

Campus-wide involvement in decision making

It means that stakeholders have a say.

It means that various groups across campus share in university-level decision making.

Personally, I am skeptical. How was the committee established? Why we are now interested in shared governance after previous attempts were unsuccessful? Were members of the committee hand picked? Who picked them and why? Did the faculty members have to be 'approved' by higher ups to be on the committee? Where is the staff in this mix?

If there was any administrative approval for membership on the committee and/or members were hand picked, then that tells me everything I need to know about how 'shared' governance will be when this is all done. Add in the lack of staff on the committee and I am even more skeptical. Seems like business as usual. It looks like an attempt to mollify faculty and staff after the survey results were released.

Respectful two way communication between faculty and the administration in such a way that faculty views are meaningfully included in current, near-term and future planning in the university.

Shared governance is when stakeholders at every level of the University feel as if they have an ability to shape the University at which they work. It does not mean that everyone has to have input on every decision, but instead, opportunities for input are actively created in the decision-making process.

Shared governance means that participation in decision-making regarding the operation of a university is shared broadly within pertinent constituencies according to each parties expertise and role. Faculty exercise primary responsibility for ensuring a quality curriculum and instruction. Administration exercises primary responsibility for operational, support, and auxiliary functions. Both sides work to facilitate appropriate communication, realizing that the Board of Trustees has ultimate legal authority over and for the institution.

There is a representative from each Department/Program on a university council to provide direction to the university president.

The ability to have input into key decisions. For examples should we move from the appointed department head model to the elected chair model. When we hire a dean, do the faculty have real influence or are the opportunities for faculty to see the candidates all for show? When faculty provide feedback or attempt to develop policy, new courses etc. we here back in a reasonable amount of time that the work has been received and has been considered. For example some faculty have been requested to submit work multiple years in a row only to have the work sit and not be accted upon by the department head, dean, etc. etc. etc.

Another example of lack of shared governance is lack of communication and lack of being my department being invited to participate in the rehabilitation of the notorious eyesore on campus, Williamson Hall. Hospitality faculty and the deptatment head should have a seat at the table during most planning and design sessions.

Shared governance means to me that there is 'input' from all parties. That the work on this campus is done collaboratively to the extent that it is possible. Shared governance looks like everyone having the opportunity to lead. AS a faculty member, shared governance would mean that I have the opportunity to provide my thoughts about the governance of ATU and to know the reasoning behind contrary decisions made.

Faculty, staff, and administrators have equal say in decisions. Some decisions that are more appropriately made by one of those groups should be left to those groups (like faculty having the final say in the curriculum).

Shared governance means that all interested parties at all levels are directly involved in making decisions regarding policies and processes by which the university is run in as egalitarian a manner as possible. It also means that the processes by which decisions and policies are made are described clearly to all parties in a timely manner and that processes of policy and decision making do not deviate from those descriptions. Finally, it means that information is shared amongst all parties in a transparent manner. I would also like to suggest that those most affected by decisions and policies should be directly involved in decision and policy making to the greatest degree possible.

Having a voice and being able to collectively and collaboratively make decisions concerning university policy and administrative decisions.
Transparency

Shared governance to me is allowing faculty and staff to participate in decision making process

If you are aware of any great examples of shared governance, please provide the name of the institution or a link to any informative documents.

Magnet facilities have some of the best examples of shared governance. Arkansas Children's Hospital and CHI St. Vincent are the two Magnet facilities in Arkansas.

I've served numerous universities in my career and those have all been the same. Talked of shared governance is widespread, but actual practice is negligible.

AAUP Statement on shared governance: [<https://www.aaup.org/our-programs/shared-governance>]

None

None

AAUP has a document from the 1960s that is still used as the core document.

I am not aware of any such examples.

na

Why do you think you need an external resource? Why do you need a consultant? Why not just talk to the bloody ATU faculty? The only thing that this question has done is to illustrate the continued resistance of this 'chain of command' to work directly with its own faculty and to bring them into the 'group'. Sad times!

The APACHE web server is developed through a collaborative, volunteer, open-source process. I suspect they have a good system for making decisions.

This definitely is not a 'survey' question.

Johns Hopkins medicine; cardiovascular progressive unit in Sheik Zayed West

I think the Board of Trustee policy for campus governance at UAF looks pretty good: https://www.uasys.edu/wp-content/uploads/sites/16/2018/04/810.1-UAF-Local-Campus-Government.pdf . We should consider having a Campus Council (https://provost.uark.edu/campus-governance/index.php). We should also have a faculty member appointed as a member of the Board of Trustees (Clemson: https://www.clemson.edu/faculty-staff/faculty-senate/representative.html).
University of Texas - Austin and University of Missouri - Columbia.
https://www.aaup.org/report/statement-government-colleges-and-universities
<p>Some universities have moved to appoint a generally elected faculty member on the Board of Trustees. This would be a good first effort. The faculty member would need to be elected at-large from among all faculty members. There is a tendency at ATU to 'handpick' faculty based on popularity with administration rather than competency. That practice also has served to demoralize faculty and even kill efforts to participate. Why run when you know the fix is in?</p>
I am not aware of any.

The AAUP Red Book provides a highly useful extended statement of shared governance.

Many faculty like to point to AAUP guidelines. This is a fine place to start, However, I think it important to remember that one of the fundamentals of the AAUP viewpoint revolves around faculty responsibility.

none

Unfortunately, each University has an individual history, experience and culture. ATU must forge our own path. If we try to institute examples from, say, schools that have departmental chairs, our institution is not culturally equipped to operate under those strictures.

Promotion and tenure, curriculum, annual peer review.

None

What is outlined in a variety of AAUP (American Association of University Professors) publications. These publications include seminal template for shared governance and how that model is applied at various institutions from then to present.

An extremely interesting example is the transformation at Jasper High School over the past three years. (While this is secondary level, the same basic principles should apply to Higher Ed.) JHS went from a traditional High School to a highly-successful 'School of Innovation.' A key component of this transformation was shared governance. For example, the Student Council is now actively involved in all decisions impacting students, and students now feel a strong sense of ownership in the total school program. The same is true for teacher representation. This is a significant shift from the previous 'top down' model. For more information on their approach to shared governance, the best contacts would be Todd Parker (district federal programs and former JHS counselor) and Jeff Lewis (principal).

I have no Idea.

none
Epic has shared governance and ACH in Little Rock.
The recent adoption of the new academic integrity policy, which was produced by a committee with multiple representatives from the administration, staff, faculty and students.
NA
N/A
Look to AAUP and do NOT ineptly flounder further at re-inventing the wheel or asking anybody else to do the leg-work wasting our time finding links for you---the Office of Academic Affairs should have this posted on their wall.
I am not.
The university of Alaska is a good example. I have also heard that UCA has a better model of shared governance than does ATU.

An article with some good ideas as to best practices: <https://agb.org/trusteeship-article/how-to-make-shared-governance-work-some-best-practices/>.

I know of institutions at which everything must be approved by a general faculty assembly. I don't think we could or would want to do that at ATU.

n/a

Magnet hospitals do this. Arkansas Children’s Hospital has magnet status. It takes years and a lot of hard work (and change) to be recognized as magnet. I don’t know of other universities that have true shared governance. They might exist, I just don’t know who they are.

None

N/A

not off the top of my head

Not a clue.

I am not aware of any.

No

...sorry I don't!

NA

Please provide any additional comments or questions for the committee.

We do not have shared governance at ATU right now; we have a mockery of it where faculty committee input is not respected and where VPs of non-academic branches for some reason have say over academic areas. The executive council is a construct that needs to be abolished, as it has done a tremendous amount of harm to ATU by de-centering the university away from academics as its primary purpose. The way EC has functioned (as an unqualified oligarchy) has made ATU a particularly hostile place for faculty to work, and they are leaving for other institutions at greater rates than ever before.

Distributed leadership at this university would benefit from more command and control authority to Directors, Departments, Programs. (i.e. appropriate decision making and financial authority needs to be pushed down and empower those in leadership positions).

I think a good place to start is to ask the administration what they perceive as shared governance. Distributive leadership in whatever form, relies on the ability to share leadership. That is the hardest thing for leaders to accept. What does our Executive Committee feel they can allow faculty to do without feeling that they have been usurped in power? Otherwise, this whole process is another case of all talk, and no walk.

Share these comments with the university community at large.

I think shared governance here is mostly superficial. Recent experiences I've had, including on search committees, has made me cynical. I don't think it is a real thing that makes any tangible difference in the way the university is run.

N/a

If I understand correctly, our use of distributed leadership goes beyond that on shared governance. Distributive leadership allows faculty input into a broader range of issues And also allow staff input on issues as well

In theory, shared governance is a noble idea and I think we should continue to pursue it, but I have been in public school settings, and university settings for over 25 years (having first heard the term 'shared governance,' in 1996) and still am waiting for it to be fully realized beyond a small-group setting. Good luck.

na

Try talking to/working with/listening to/etc someone that is not a member of your personal entourage. It's amazing what you can learn about what they can, and will, do for ATU..

The committee needs to do some work on this, before they ask for faculty input.

There is not enough 'authority, jurisdiction, rule' given to those in leadership positions (outside of EC) on this campus.

I think a vision statement is less important than implementing real changes to existing policies and governance structures. A vision statement may make us feel good, but it doesn't address the underlying issues or alleviate concerns about transparency and lack of participation of stakeholders in campus governance. Maybe if we start doing something first, a vision statement will follow. Let's just do something.

I'm worried that we only have one member of the committee affiliated with AAUP. AAUP has been the main force behind shared governance on university campuses and we need more members from our campus chapter involved. Also, one this committee's co-chairs has never been involved in the curriculum process. How can she provide leadership on the primary component of shared governance when she has no practical experience? I hope the committee brings more voices to the table.

Resentment/contempt of faculty and staff by the EC and upper administration is leading to morale problems beneath their collective grades. Also academic programs are in atrophy because financial support is not forthcoming from administration.

The Red Book should be required reading to sit on this committee.

What are the specific goals and initiatives that this committee will implement? Mission statements are meaningless. The faculty need to see real action before they will overcome their reluctance and embrace shared governance.

I believe that Tech would benefit from doing the following:

- (1) Establish an elected faculty representative who would be responsible for making a regular faculty report to the Board of Trustees at their meetings.
- (2) Ensure that all search committees have the opportunity to rank candidates.
- (3) Have the entire faculty participate in a direct election of the Faculty Senate President.

Thanks for taking on this critical task. It's a blessing to work with a group of people who actually care!

Lack of transparency and what I call 'psuedo' shared governance are problems at the university I work for. Oftentimes the administration will involve a couple of faculty on a committee and call that shared governance. Or, we will find out about a decision that affects the faculty after-the-fact and after the decision has already been implemented. A big part of getting effective shared governance will be to convince administrations to allow faculty to have a true voice in decisions that impact the university.

This is actually quite simple - involve more members of the ATU family in major decisions.

The Insurance Committee is clearly not an example of shared governance. I mean, how can this continue into the future years with these vast premium increases? Start there. At any other university faculty would refuse these changes and throw a fit. We just take these increases. Start your 'shared governance' there. Who has what title on some strategic planning committee is meaningless for shared governance. Paying \$1000 a month to insurance is vital for shared governance. Fix what matters, not some theoretical construct.

Kudos for your continued support of this idea and your attempts to effectively implement it.

Personally, I do not want to run the show but I would like to be informed/consulted when a policy change from governing bodies or simply a new idea is going to impact my performance in the show.

Facilities Management should be informed of any grant and grant timeline that would require 'plant modification' to make sure (PRIOR to submission) that any and all 'in kind' contributions or plant modifications can be done in accordance with the proposed grant timeline.
Right now, shared governance is more vocalized than practiced as a general rule on campus. It seems as if the administration allows shared governance only when it is convenient for them... The lack of shared governance is most visible in recent hiring of key positions on campus, where the committee's recommendation is ignored as the executive board hires the individual they want.
Did this survey go out to staff? If not, why not? Why did we not get emails in advance-of all candidates for the open dean positions, including their CVs? Why did the candidates' information disappear from OneTech? Why do we not have an online form to evaluate them, and given at least a few days after their presentations to submit them (anonymously). Are the members of SGA, Faculty Senate, and Staff Senate able to evaluate their administrators? Do other faculty and staff and students have that ability? Do the governing bodies--including SGA and Staff Senate--have any real power or decision-making authority?
Why has the Faculty Salary & Benefits Committee been excluded from all insurance discussions the past several years?
We're a long way from it---good luck.
At Leadership Tech recently, Dr. Bowen provided a very clear and succinct definition of shared governance. Hers was based on an AAUP document from 1966 (I believe) which defined shared governance as a sort of split governance: faculty are responsible for curriculum and instruction while administrators are responsible for policies and procedures. Her definition was clear and useful, but also narrow. I think many faculty members (at ATU and around the country) would accept the AAUP definition as a formal and practical definition of distinct roles, but I also think most faculty members would embrace a broader concept of shared governance whereby ALL stakeholders (faculty, staff, admin, board, alumni, students) should have a say in ALL matters, and faculty especially should have MORE than a say, not only in curriculum and instruction but also in policies and procedures., that is, how much a Pepsi costs at a football game (at least in theory).
The biggest problem that I see at ATU is that the administration often makes unilateral decisions without consulting the faculty (for example, deciding that all freshmen and sophomore should be advised by an advising center instead of the faculty). I would like to see more pushback from the faculty against such actions because the administration continues to behave as if the faculty have nothing important to contribute regarding how the university should function. Until we demand a say in governance we will not achieve shared governance.

I believe the communication piece is critical in this discussion. I know there is a committee that has been formed to review this. I did not receive the email asking for volunteers, just like I did not receive the original email asking for input on this topic. Perhaps it was posted somewhere and no email was sent? I am hopeful that the results of this committee as well as the communications committee will help in having a voice and lead to an improved environment.

I think shared governance is a good thing. This works well within my department. I feel sometimes we may not always have the appropriate stakeholders for university shared committees. Not to say we have to make the committees larger, but have a way to effectively communicate suggestions to allow for input from those outside the committee. Also make sure we are not working on the same problem from two different standpoints, ie) appointed faculty senate subcommittee vs an already elected standing committee that could look at the issue. Hopefully if we improve communication these downfalls will be minimized.

The main complaint that I think the faculty at large have with regard to shared governance is that it is talked about a lot and statements are made supporting it, but then decisions and policy changes come to us 'out of the blue' with no notice/warning.

I appreciate that this is being discussed and - hopefully - will be attempted at ATU. Decisions have been top-down for far too long, and faculty members often just roll our eyes at each other when we hear of decisions that affect us directly but were made with such little forethought or input from us. The examples are endless.

I hate to be cynical but there is NO WAY that Bowen is going to faculty have any say. If that was the case, the university wouldn't be in its current condition. She has created a cabinet of 'Yes Men' and I doubt that door to that cabinet will ever be closed. The past four years have been my worst years here. I was excited for the change in leadership. I was made promises by the new leader. I was lied to. We were all lied to. While I believe the committee to be courageous for even existing, I fear what I know will be retaliation down the line.

If we had a true shared governance, most of us wouldn't feel like we do.

Decisions need to be made by administration, but others can provide input and freely exchange ideas.

I believe that there should be faculty representation at both the EC and board of trustee level. As it stands right now, there is no transparency to President and EC decisions. Having a faculty representative would help to create that transparency and strengthen the Academic representation at the university.

Why does the President of Faculty Senate not sit on the Executive Council? The academic function of the university is the primary one, and yet it is looked at equally to student affairs, athletics, administration, etc. There should be a faculty voice on this decision-making body in addition to the VPAA who is an administrator in the end.

Will the committee be acting as a voice for their respective departments/programs or as an independent council?
How will the committee make an collective decision in a timely manner or will this slow-down the process of a decision or direction to be implemented?
Who will the committee answer to (e.g. VPAA) or will the committee only be providing suggestions?

The hospitality labs are not useable. It has been up to them to find replacement facilities that are no where near what they need to be to achieve the educational mission of ATU. It has been 8 months since the fire. The lack of progress and the lack of urgency to find suitable lab space for the hospitaliy program is stunning and telling of the true priority
ATU places on student learning and acheivement. Lack of support for the Hospitality program is deplorable. Lack of support and communication srarts with the department head and travels throught the dean to the VPAA, president and board. Hospitality should not be asked to put up with the status quo for another two years while this gets sorted.

How might ALL of us help build-up the morale on our campus? How might we create an environment where all employees enjoy Tech (& not just because of the need for a paycheck)?? So for the expected future, it does not appear that our budgetary concerns will abate, how might we make this an environment where we ALL can thrive?? Are there policies that can be relaxed to improve the situation for faculty & staff? How might the general faculty know the workings of advisory committees where we have a faculty rep (such as budget advisory)? Do the faculty reps actually have true input into the process? (If NOT, then it doesn't appear to truly be shared governance!)

No comments

When it comes to matters such as these, it's better for morale not to do something than to go through the motions for the sake of appearance.

Enhance the communication process between all parts of the process