



COUNCIL of UNIVERSITY
SYSTEM FACULTY

**Report by the
Council of University System Faculty (CUSF)
to the USM BOR Meeting at the
University Maryland University College (UMUC)**

Friday, April 20, 2018

The last report was submitted on January 23rd for the meeting on February 9th at the University of Baltimore (UB). Since the last submission, CUSF has had two ExCom meetings and two Council meetings. The first meeting was held in Annapolis on February 21st, Advocacy Day. The second Council meeting was held at UMB on March 18th. This report covers both meetings and any other significant activities of CUSF.

MEETINGS AND ACTIVITIES: The meetings and activities of CUSF since the last report are reported below.

- **ExCom Meeting** – ExCom met on February 5th at USM in Adelphi. The main purpose of the meeting was to prepare the agenda for the February Council meeting and Advocacy Day, both which occurred on February 21st in Annapolis.
- **Advocacy Day** – USM Advocacy Day was on February 21st in Annapolis. Sponsored by USM, it was a collaborative effort between the Student, Faculty and Staff Councils. As in previous years, the Chancellor welcomed the group during lunch. The effort was organized by Patrick Hogan and Andy Clark. In the post event analysis, the activity was deemed successful.
- **Council Meeting at Annapolis** – The Council met in the Lowe State House in Annapolis on February 21st. It was a brief meeting in the afternoon. The main purpose of the meeting was to nominate the Chair and Vice Chair.
- **Nominations** – Nominations for Chair and Vice Chair were made at the February 21st Council meeting. Two nominations for Chair were made: Dr. Patricia Westerman and Dr. Chris Brittan-Powell (Note: *Trish Westerman and Philip Evers were elected*). Three nominations for Vice Chair were made: Dr. Haitham Al-Khateeb, Dr. Elizabeth Brunn, and Dr. Philip Evers. Election for these two positions will occur at the March meeting. Nominations for Secretary and At-large positions occurred at the March meeting. Also, the elections will be staggered. This is where the nominations for the next position is reopened after the previous election is finalized.
- **ExCom Meeting** – ExCom met on March 5th at USM in Adelphi. The main purpose of the meeting was to prepare the agenda for the March Council meeting at UMB which occurred on March 26st in Annapolis.
- **Council Meeting at UMB** – The Council met at the University of Maryland Baltimore on March 26st in the Saratoga Room. The Council thanks President Perman for his generous hospitality. It was a full agenda with MJ Bishop from the Kirwan Center for Academic Innovation and the

election of the Chair and Vice Chair for next year. MJ Bishop was the featured speaker and spoke on OERs and the next steps in academic integrity. Topics further delineated below include: academic integrity – the next steps, OERs, and constitutional amendment.

- **Academic Integrity, the Next Steps** – At the March Council meeting, MJ Bishop from the Kirwan Center for Academic Innovation was the featured speaker at the Council meeting at UMB. There was a robust discussion with the group on the next steps in how CUSF can assist in the academic integrity issue. MJ presented three levels of involvement. These are courses and curriculum design, educating students regarding what constitutes academic integrity, particularly foreign students, and contract cheating (e.g. tutors, paper mills, etc). The group suggested that there is a need to communicate the issue at the campus level. Next, they suggested that there may be a role for the OAG (Office of Attorney General) regarding contract cheating and the big business aspects associated with it. Third, there was a discussion of a “convening” which would be a one day in-service symposium. In summary, the session was productive and provided direction on the next steps in addressing this issue which goes to the core quality of the product being delivered.
- **OERs** – Because of time constraints, the discussion of OERs by MJ Bishop at the March meeting was brief. OERs are a tectonic change in educational materials. MJ indicated that OERs have saved millions of dollars in terms of buying textbooks. For faculty in terms of promotion, retention and tenure, OERs present some unique challenges and MJ presented some potential solutions. It is a work in progress. As with any tectonic change, it involves many facets of change.
- **Constitutional Amendment** – At the March 27 meeting, the Educational Policy and Student Life Committee of the BOR passed the constitutional amendment. The amendment clarifies the campus review process for amendments. The motion will advance to the BOR at the April meeting for approval.
- **State of Shared Governance Report** – For the calendar year 2017, CUSF completed its survey and report of senate chairs on the state of shared governance in USM institutions. All institutions participated. Overall, the state of shared governance on campuses is good. In the survey, the first question served as an overall measure of the state of shared governance on the individual campuses. Nine and one-half of the senate chairs agreed with the statement that “*Shared governance was alive and healthy on their campus.*” The public version of the report is attached.

COMMENTARIES: Since the last report, there were five commentaries. They are attached. The February commentary focused on accomplishments at the half-way point during the year. The March commentaries focused on the elections and the responsibilities on ExCom and a thank you for those who made Advocacy Day successful. The April commentary thanked Jay Jimmerman and the Regent’s Committee for their work this year.

Respectfully Submitted: April 5, 2018
Robert B. Kauffman, Ph.D.
Chair, Council of University System Faculty (CUSF)

Chair's Commentary 1802.1: The Half-way Mark

Time moves quickly and the academic year is half-over. Actually, at the time of this writing, it is more than half-over. So far, it has been a productive year. However, there is still a lot to do and a lot is currently on the schedule for completion. The following lists the accomplishments during fall semester and what is on the schedule for completion spring semester.

FALL SEMESTER – Listed below are some of the accomplishments from fall semester. Some of these accomplishments are ongoing or have entered a new phase. Most of the accomplishments are listed as action items in the Action Plan for 2017-2018.

- **Academic Integrity** – The issue of academic integrity consumed CUSF's effort for fall semester. What started as a white paper on the issue became much more. The efforts of CUSF and others has been well documented and don't need further comment. As noted in the January commentary, it was congratulations to all for a job well done. We enter the implementation phase.
- **Orientation Session** – ExCom put together an orientation session for new Council members before the beginning of the September Council meeting. It was a good idea and successful.
- **Meeting at Shady Grove** – In an effort to educate Council members on the changing face of the faculty, the September meeting was held at the Universities at Shady Grove (USG). It was the first time CUSF met at a university location other than one of the traditional institutions in System.
- **Membership and Rules Committee** – There were three initiatives from the Membership and Rules Committee. The bylaw changes involving the election process have passed and are being implement this year. A house cleaning measure to amend the constitution to change the approval process of an amendment is at the BOR for approval. Third, the bylaws and proofing their content are being verified to insure that updates have been made and errors eliminated. Unfortunately, errors were found on the System website.
- **Joint Ombudsperson Resolution** – The joint resolution has been approved by the three Councils and currently rests with the Presidents and the Chancellor's Council who are waiting for feedback from the Office of the Attorney General on several identified issues. Response from the OAG and resolution is expected prior to the end of spring 2018 semester.
- **Regent's Awards** – The Regent's Awards is one of the important yearly functions of CUSF. Under the supervision of Jay Zimmerman, the Regent's Awards have been reviewed and have been passed on to the BOR for approval. In addition, the committee has updated the procedures and rules for the awards.

SPRING SEMESTER – Spring semester is upon us. The following items and events have been scheduled for spring semester.

- **Academic Integrity (Continued)** – Now that the issue is out in the open, it needs to be addressed. The CUSF Education Policy and Student Life Committee is addressing this issue. In addition, MJ Bishop from the Kirwan Center will speak to the Council at it March meeting. Along with OERs, she will address the followup to the academic integrity issue also.

- **Elections** – Elections are a seemingly small item. However, elections do take time and are important. With the passage of the bylaw changes, Council also approved them to be staggered.
- **State of Share Governance Report** – The survey of Senate Chairs regarding the state of shared governance is quickly entering the data collection and report completion phase. The report is expected to be completed prior to April 1st.
- **Chairman Brady's Visit** – Chairman Brady is visiting Council at its April meeting. He has been very supportive of the faculty. He has worked behind the scenes on the Ombudsperson resolution to help implement it. He is committed to inclusion and diversity of the faculty and supportive of academic freedom also.
- **CUSF Panel on Faculty Evaluations** – The panel discussion was slotted for the February meeting but because of the Advocacy Day conflict, it will need to be moved to a later meeting. The Faculty Concerns Committee of CUSF has identified this as an important issue.

Chair's Commentary 1803.1: A Reflection on the Elections and ExCom Positions

At the February meeting one of the Council members asked the question regarding what were the responsibilities of each of the ExCom positions. As I reflected upon the question, I realized that at one time or another I had the privilege of serving in each position. With the upcoming elections, this is a good time to explain the responsibilities of each position, to reflect upon the different positions, and what they entail.

The first CUSF position I held was Secretary. As might be expected, Section 4.b.c of the bylaws states that “The Secretary shall keep minutes and records of Council...” Not only does the Secretary take the minutes of the Council meetings, but the Secretary takes the minutes of the ExCom and Senate Chairs meetings. Everyone jokes that it is the hardest job on ExCom and in some ways it is. One of the most important things I learned as Secretary was to write in terms of political consequences. It is important to accurately record the minutes. However, it was equally important to write the minutes in such a way as to not cause unintentional harm to those in attendance such as the Chancellor, Vice Chancellor or other members of System. One other thought. As it has been with others before me and after me, the Secretary position was an entry position onto ExCom. Because of its workload, few people actively seek it out. Rarely is it a contested position. Work hard, and take good notes. Few will acknowledge your contribution, but they will note your work ethic and desire to serve CUSF. For me it led to other roles on ExCom.

After serving as Secretary, I served in the At-large position for a year. There are two At-large positions. One of the main responsibilities of the At-large position is to write the Newsletter. On occasion, the At-large position has also served as one of the Committee chairs (e.g. Legislative Affairs, Educational Policy, and Membership and Rules). This seems to have worked well.

Section 4.5.b of the bylaws state that “The Vice-Chair shall serve as acting Chair in the absence of the Chair and shall be responsible for other duties as assigned by the Council and/or Executive Committee....” Although not specifically stated in the bylaws, the primary responsibility of the vice chair has evolved into a position of working with the Senate Chairs. At the bare minimum, this involves organizing a fall

and spring meeting. A second function has been conducting the data collection in the survey of Senate Chairs regarding the state of shared governance on the campuses. Overall, this is one area that I wish I would have done more and I believe that we need to do more. I should note that when I was a Senate Chair, I would always look forward to the fall and spring Senate Chair's meeting. It provided me a chance to learn what was going on at the other campuses and to find out what was going at System. As noted, we need to do more with the Senate Chairs. However, that is a topic for another day.

Next, I served as Chair. In Section 4.5.a of the bylaws, the duties of the Chair are a little more defined than for the other officers. The Chair shall: (1) Preside at all meetings of the Council and be responsible for supervision and execution of its business; (2) Serve as the chief liaison between the Chancellor and the Council and the Board of regents and the Council; (3) Attend all Board meetings, or send a designee; (4) Submit to the Chancellor annually a report on the state of shared governance within the system; (5) Serve one year as an ex-officio member of the Executive Committee with voice and vote as Past-Chair. Term limited, I will serve as Past Chair next year.

In contrast with the other ExCom positions, the Chair works with groups other than faculty. It is a position where you meet and work with the Board of Regents, Presidents and Provosts. In its bare essence, my job description reads "*event planner and report writer.*" It is not far from being the truth. Also, the report writing goes to goal of increasing communications. Along with preparing the ExCom and Council agendas, I write a Chair's Report for the Council, another report for Chancellor's Council, and yet another report for the BOR. Although there may be some overlap, they are different reports. Also, I write the State of Shared Governance Report for the Chancellor in March. In addition, I attend the corresponding meetings for each group including the Provosts. Fortunately, I don't have to write a report for the Provosts too.

In looking back, being a former Senate Chair was probably my best preparation for being Chair of CUSF. As a Senate Chair, I had many of the same responsibilities and functions that I currently have as the Chair of CUSF. As Senate Chair, I had to deal with a President. Now, I have to deal with twelve presidents. It was helpful training. In both positions, I had the internal committees to coordinate and help function properly. As a Senate Chair, I had to run a meeting efficiently. In these respects, it provided good training for my current position. Perhaps the biggest lesson was how to move an agenda forward and to advance the common interest when you don't have any power. Remember, we are advisory only. We have to convince others that what we believe is in our best interest is in their best interest too. This requires the development of good political skills. Often people think of political skills as a negative attribute. It isn't. Being advisory, it is a skill needed to advocate for faculty with the President and administration. It is for these reasons that when looking back over my involvement with CUSF, my training as Senate Chair was good preparation for being Chair of CUSF.

Two years have come and gone quickly. When I became Chair, I had two overriding goals. The first was to improve communication among CUSF constituencies and the second was to restore CUSF's influence as an advisory board with System and the Board of Regents. Developing communications included encouraging dialogue between campuses and in particular with System and the Board of Regents. The second goal dovetailed with the first. It was important at the time, and remains important now, for CUSF to advocate for and advance issues that are common to most of the institutions in System and not issues that affect just the home institution. Taken together, the two goals are really about developing relationships with those who we are advising. It involves trust. Remember, we are advisory and it is our job to get others to buy into what we think is important and to get them to do our bidding. I believe that we have done this. Some of the outward signs of the communications and relationships developed include the visitation by the Chancellor and Chair of the BOR to our meetings. The new Chair will have his or her

own vision. These are to increase communications among member institutions and within Council and to develop relationships that increase CUSF's advisory capacity with System and the Board of Regents.

rbk

Chair's Commentary 1803.2: Advocacy Day – A Thank You

As in previous years, System sponsored Advocacy Day on February 21, 2018. This was a team effort between System and the student, staff and faculty Councils. Special thanks goes to Patrick Hogan, Vice Chancellor, Office of Government Relations, Andy Clark, Assistant Vice Chancellor, Office of Government Relations, Caden Fabbi, Chair, USM Student Council, Lisa Gray, Chair, Council of University System Staff, and Chris Brittan-Powell, Legislative Affairs Committee Chair of CUSF. Although I participated, I took more of a secondary role in the organization efforts. For CUSF, the Legislative Affairs Committee of CUSF has taken on the organizational responsibility of Advocacy Day. In this respect, Chris did a very good job of organizing meetings with key legislators. The appearance of the Chancellor was a highlight and amplified the importance of the event. In addition, we had 15 CUSF members in attendance. Again, a thank you to everyone who helped make Advocacy Day successful.

rbk

Chair's Commentary 1804.1: Regent's Awards Committee – A Thank You

At the April meeting of the Board of Regents, there will be a breakfast honoring the Regent Award recipients. As noted at the March CUSF meeting, the awards are a big deal and a major task on the agenda of CUSF.

Yes, the awards are a big deal. The Presidents take considerable pride in their recipients. At the breakfast, they are all smiles. It is a testimony to the quality of their faculty and programs. It is an honor for the recipients, the presidents, the universities and USM. It helps to showcase the work of USM and its constituent universities.

The awards are a major function of CUSF. However, because of the efficiency of Jay Zimmerman, Chair of the Regent's Award Committee and the Committee, the work of the committee has largely gone under the radar of the Council. This is a good thing and we thank them for doing so. In addition, I need to note the work of Zakiya Lee, Chief of Staff to the Senior Vice Chancellor for Academic and Student Affairs.

The work begins over summer before the beginning of fall semester. This year there were procedures that needed to be clarified and addressed. There was the committee that needed to be formed. I should note that forming the committee is no easy task since both the research and comprehensive institutions need representation. Metaphorically, there were times that we had to beg, borrow and who knows what to make it work. There were countless emails going back and forth between Zakiya and Jay to make it work. For the most part, my role was to monitor the discourse, throw in a vote of approval when needed and add an occasional two cents to the process. It was their work that made it work.

I need to note the committee and extend this thank you to them. It included Jay Zimmerman, TU (chair),

Vanessa Jackson, CSU, Joseph Arumala, UMES, Karen Clark, UMB and Ethan Kaplan, UMCP. A special thanks to Ethan who went out of his way to contribute.

At a special breakfast on April 20th of the BOR, I will be in attendance at the Regent's Award Breakfast. It will all go off without a hitch. There will be a lot of smiles and deservedly so. In silence, I will note to myself the work of Jay, his committee and of course, Zakiya. Your tireless efforts made it happen.... A special thanks for the work you did on behalf of CUSF and the Regent's Awards.

rbk

State of Shared Governance Report
in the USM System
Survey of Senate Chairs
for 2017

to

Dr. Robert Caret
Chancellor
University System of Maryland (USM)
3300 Metzert Rd.
Adelphi, MD 20783

by

Dr. Robert B. Kauffman, Chair
Council University System Faculty (CUSF)

March 31, 2018

State of Shared Governance Report
in the USM System
Survey of Senate Chairs
for 2017

Executive Summary

For the calendar year 2017, CUSF completed its survey and report of senate chairs on the state of shared governance in USM institutions. This year 12 of the 12 institutions participated. Overall, the state of shared governance on campuses is good. In the survey, the first question served as an overall measure of the state of shared governance on the individual campuses. Nine and one-half of the senate chairs agreed with the statement that “*Shared governance was alive and healthy on their campus.*” However, this year none of the senate chair strongly agreed with the statement. Two and one-half campuses neither agreed nor disagreed. For these schools, there was usually a mitigating circumstance such as hesitancy to evaluate a new president or a retiring president. This year none of the schools disagreed with the statement.

In addition, a recommendation of this survey is for the administration and faculty to revisit the role of consulting with the faculty as presented in the I-6.00 policy of the Board of Regents. A thread emerging throughout many of the surveys and in many of the responses within the surveys is the difference between consulting with the faculty and good communications that is directionally one-way communications. The term used in the I-6.00 policy is “informed participation” and “collaboration” which suggests more of a two-way communications and involvement.

The survey and report was completed in March and the first week of April. This report along with the survey data was sent to the Chancellor in the beginning of April for use in his annual evaluation of the presidents during April. In addition, the information will be used in the five year review of presidents for the BOR. The information contained in this report is the summative results from the survey.

State of Shared Governance Report in the USM System Survey of Senate Chairs for 2017

Summary Report¹

The primary use of the survey is by the Chancellor in his annual performance evaluation of the Presidents during April. The survey provides the Chancellor with substantive data and feedback on improving shared governance practices within the individual institutions in the University System of Maryland (USM). The survey data is an internal document and not for public dissemination. A second document, the summary report, includes the generalized results of the survey. It is provided to the BOR, public, and other interested parties summarizing the state of shared governance within the System. This document is the summary report.

Procedures

The 18 questions in this survey were adapted from a short monograph by Keetje Ramo entitled *Assessing the Faculty's Role in Shared Governance: Implications of AAUP Standards (1998)*. The survey instrument has undergone several revisions and modifications since its inception in 2014. Currently, the questions consist of a five point Likert scale followed by a section for comments. This provides both quantitative and qualitative data. The survey is completed by the Senate chairs or their equivalent position within the governance structure. It covers the previous calendar year, in this case 2017. The survey is distributed to the Senate chairs in October. They are due March 10th or the week before spring break. This allows time for the Chair of CUSF to complete the analysis and submit it to the Chancellor prior to his April review of the Presidents. This year all 12 institutions participated in the survey.

Sampling – An effort was made this year to make the survey more representative of the faculty. When the survey was envisioned and being developed, the issue was considered that there was the possibility of making the survey so cumbersome that no one would complete it. The option was provided that the Senate chairs could complete the survey themselves. This option was retained as a fall back position. Only the Senate chair from UB exercised this option this year (Figure 1). The other chairs utilized their executive committee, faculty senate or faculty in general. It should be noted that within the university administrative structure, the Senate chair generally has the most contact and involvement with the President, followed by the executive committee and faculty senate. For this reason, these options should not be minimized in favor of a general survey of the faculty who have little or no involvement with the President in terms of shared governance.

¹ This report was completed by Robert B. Kauffman, Ph.D., Chair, Council of University System Faculty (CUSF).

Figure 1: Procedural Options		
Option	Option Description ¹	Number of Institutions Using the Option
Option #1:	Senate Chair Competes the Survey Alone	1
Option #2:	Senate Chair Completes the Survey in Conjunction with Their ExCom	4
Option #3:	Senate Chair Shares with Senate and Compiles Results with ExCom	2
Option #4:	Senate Chair Surveys Senate Members	4
Option #5:	Senate Completes a Survey of the Faculty	- -
Option #6:	Other – Please explain below	1 ²
¹ The full descriptions are provided within the survey instrument. ² The Frostburg Senate Chair indicated a combination of Option #4 and #5.		

Reporting Surveys – Several institutions surveyed their executive committees or Faculty Senates and reported the survey results as the percentage of responses. A two step process was performed to consolidate the responses into the most prevalent category. First, the five point Likert Scale was condensed into a three point scale. The categories were Agree (i.e. Strongly Agree and Agree), Neither Agree Nor Disagree, and Disagree (i.e. Strongly Disagree and Disagree). This consolidation determined the degree of agreement or disagreement with the statement. Procedurally, it reduces the situation where one category with a large response offsets two more evenly response categories (e.g. SA–3, A–4, D–5, SD–0). Using the most frequently occurring category in the example would result in respondents disagreeing with the statement. However, there was general agreement with the statement (i.e. SA&A–7, D&SD–5). The second step acknowledges the most frequently occurring category within the combined categories (i.e. including NAD). In the example, this was the Agree category with four responses. In the report, the agree category would be the response recorded for the university. Since there were small samples, several ties occurred between categories. When this occurred, the response was split in the reporting (i.e. 0.5 per category).

Results

Based on Keetje Ramo’s short monograph, the survey is subdivided into seven different areas covering the role of shared governance within the institution. These categories are used as the main headings and to provide the organizational structure for of this report.

Figure 2: Climate for Governance – 2017							
Survey Questions		Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree or Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Not Applicable
1.	Shared governance on our campus is alive and healthy.	--	9.5	2.5	--	--	--

Climate for Shared Governance – Question #1 served as an overall measure of the state of shared governance on the individual campuses (Figure 2). Of significance, this year none of the campuses disagreed (i.e. disagree and strongly disagree) with the statement. Nine and one-half of the senate chairs agreed with the statement that shared governance was alive and healthy on their campus. Also, of interest is that none of the senate chairs strongly agreed with this statement. Two and one-half of the senate chairs neither agreed nor disagreed with the statement.

Figure 3: Internal Communications – 2017							
Survey Questions		Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree or Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Not Applicable
2.	There are excellent communications and consultation between the administration and the faculty and senate leadership.	--	6	5	1	--	--

Internal Communications – The second question focused on internal communications between the administration and the shared governance structures of the faculty and senate leadership. Good communications is fundamental to effective shared governance. Six senate chairs agreed with the statement on communications. Five neither agreed nor disagreed with the statement. One senate chair disagreed with the statement suggesting that there needs to be better internal communications.

In reviewing the comment sections of the question, three levels of involvement seemed to emerge: Consultation, communications, and lack of communications. Consultation involves participation by and with the faculty even if the President and administration have the decision making ability. One senate chair noted that *“What keeps this rating from being Strongly Agree is that activities are ... limited to communications and not always consultation.”* Another senate chair noted that *“We receive lots of communication. But as a body we are not always consulted on important matters.”*

In contrast, good communications focuses on keeping the faculty informed. It is one-way communications. Typically, senate chairs indicating good internal communications noted that their President listened to the faculty. Examples of facilitating good communications were periodic meetings with or easy access to their President. Usually, the President and/or Provost attended Senate meetings. The President and/or Provost kept the senate chair and faculty apprised of what the administration is doing.

Several senate chairs noted the importance of communications and consultation at the dean and chair levels. In several cases there was good communications with the President and Provost, but there was a breakdown at the lower levels of administration.

The third level was poor communications. Generally, senate chairs disagreeing with the statement on internal communications reflected poor communications with the President. As might be expected, there was little if any consultation. In addition, these presidents tended to operate more external to the institution.

Figure 4: Senate’s Role – 2017							
Survey Questions		Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree or Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Not Applicable
3.	The faculty senate plays an important role in providing academic and administrative functions at the university.	1	5.5	4.5	--	1	--

Senate’s Role – The third question in the survey asked whether the faculty senate played an important role in providing academic and administrative functions at the university. Conversely, the question asked whether the faculty senate is disenfranchised by the administration. Six and one-half institutions agreed (i.e. Strongly Agree and Agree) with the statement that the faculty senate plays an important role in providing academic and administrative functions. Four and one-half neither agreed nor disagreed and one institution strongly disagreed with the statement.

Along with the diversity of institutions within System, a review of the comment section to this question reveals the duality of the relationship between the faculty and administration expressed in the I-6.00 policy of the Board of Regents. This question captures both the administrative and academic functions. These functions are split in succeeding questions. In general, the responses to the question express a desire to work with the administration. In addition, several comments echoed the comments made regarding communications with faculty including attendance at senate meetings, etc.

Figure 5: President’s Role (4-7) – 2017							
Survey Questions		Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree or Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Not Applicable
4.	Other than on rare occasions, the president seldom overturns faculty decisions and recommendations in areas in which the faculty has primary responsibility (e.g., curriculum, tenure and promotion, etc.).	4	5	2	--	--	1
5.	The president seeks meaningful faculty input on those issues (such as budgeting) in which the faculty has an appropriate interest but not primary responsibility.	1	4	3	3.5	0.5	--
6.	The president supports and advocates the principles of shared governance?	4.5	5.5	1	0.5	0.5	--
7.	The president supports and advocates the principles of shared governance at the sub-unit level also (e.g. college,	2	4	5	1	--	--

President’s Role – Questions four through seven focused on the president’s role in shared governance. The wording in questions four and five reflect the relationship between the faculty and president as defined in the BOR I-6.00 policy on shared governance. Nine of the senate chairs agreed with their presidents following the faculty’s advice in areas where they have primary responsibility such as promotion, tenure and academic matters (Question #4). Four senate chairs strongly agreed with this statement.

There was a desire that their presidents consult with them more on matters where the administration has the primary responsibility such as budgeting (Question #5). Only five senate chairs agreed with the statement. However, three senate chairs neither agreed nor disagreed and four disagreed with the statement. One senate chair summarized the sentiment with “*The faculty senators would like to have more active participation in the discussion and influence associated with the University’s budget.*” In addition, this quote echos the previously discussed consultation thread. However, one bright spot is noted by a senate chair who noted that “*New CFO (started January 2018) along with president sees faculty input on budgeting process – this is completely new and welcomed by the faculty. We hope it continues.*”

For question six, ten of the twelve institutions indicated that their president supports and advocates the principles of shared governance. Question seven was a parallel question to question six but at the sub-unit level. Six of the institutions agreed with this statement (i.e. Strongly Agree and Agree). For both questions, there was roughly three school drop-off from last year (2016) with those agreeing with the statement.

Figure 6: Faculty’s Role – 2017							
Survey Questions		<u>Strongly Agree</u>	<u>Agree</u>	<u>Neither Agree or Disagree</u>	<u>Disagree</u>	<u>Strongly Disagree</u>	<u>Not Applicable</u>
8.	Faculty’s Role: The administration is supportive of faculty involvement in shared governance.	--	7	4	1	--	--

Faculty’s Role – For question eight, seven institutions indicated in the affirmative that the administration was supportive of faculty involvement in shared governance. This was a drop-off of four schools from 2016 with four schools moving into the neither agree nor disagreed category. A review of the comments didn’t reveal any significant trends or reasons for this change.

Figure 7: Joint Decision Making (9-15) – 2017							
Survey Questions		Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree or Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Not Applicable
9.	The administration utilizes faculty involvement in the area of planning and strategic planning .	2.5	5.5	2.5	1.5	--	--
10.	The administration recognizes faculty involvement in budgeting and fiscal resource planning.	--	1	6	3.5	0.5	1
11.	The administration recognizes faculty involvement in academic affairs and program development.	3.5	7.5	1	--	--	--
12.	The administration recognizes faculty involvement in staff selection and hiring .	2	4	3	2	--	1
13.	Structures and processes that allow for shared governance are clearly defined in the governance documents (e.g. faculty handbook).	2.5	9.5	--	--	--	--
14.	Shared governance between the administration and faculty functions in an effective manner.	0.5	6.5	4	1	--	--
15.	Joint decision-making and shared governance discussed in questions 9-14 are practiced at the sub-unit levels also (e.g. college, department).	1	5.5	0.5	4.5	0.5	--

Joint Decision Making – Seven questions focused on joint decision making. Four questions focused on administrative and academic functions of strategic planning, budgeting, academic affairs, and hiring. Eight of the senate chairs agreed with the statement on strategic planning (Question 9). Regarding budgeting and fiscal planning (Question 10), there was a drop-off in agreement with only one senate chair agreeing with this statement. Traditionally, these areas are considered administrative responsibilities. Six senate chairs neither agreed nor disagreed with the statement and four institutions disagreed with the statement. Regarding Question 11, 11 institutions agreed with the statement recognizing the faculty’s role in academic affairs. This was expected. Six institutions agreed with the statement that faculty are involved in the staff hiring (Question 12).

Question 13 focuses on how shared governance is institutionalized within the institution (e.g. inclusion in the faculty handbook). All 12 institutions surveyed agreed with the statement that shared governance processes and procedures were clearly defined in the institution’s documents.

Question 14 asks whether shared governance between the administration and faculty functions in an effective manner. Seven senate chairs agreed with the statement, four neither agreed nor disagreed, and one senate chairs disagreed.

The last question in this group asked if the joint decision roles discussed in the previous questions were

applied at the sub-unit level (Question 15). It should be noted that shared governance at the sub-unit level is a continuing issue within the institutions and it is a difficult issue to address. Regardless, this question is still a barometer. Six and one-half senate chairs agreed with the statement and five senate chairs disagreed with the statement.

For this section, the comments represent differing opinions. One senate chair who disagreed with the statement noted that *“This [Joint decision making at the sub-unit level] is also variable and depends greatly on the Dean. Most College Councils seem to be dominated by the agenda of their Deans. One even calls itself the Dean’s Council now.”* Another senate chair summarized that *“Shared governance between administration and faculty is efficient, but not always effective. It varies within colleges and across departments.... There is a significant level of culture change at dean’s level and often feels as though communications are dictate out and not consulted with.”* In addition, this comment reinforces the consultation theme. In a contrasting view, another senate chair noted that *“In general, collaborative decision-making becomes prevalent at the sub-unit level.”*

Figure 8: Structural Arrangements (16-18) – 2017							
Survey Questions		Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree or Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree	Not Applicable
16.	The faculty senate and/or other institution-wide governance bodies meet on a regular basis.	9.5	2.5	--	--	--	--
17.	Faculty determine how their own representatives are selected.	9.5	2.5	--	--	--	--
18.	The administration provides adequate institutional support for shared governance to function.	2.5	8.5	1	--	--	--

Structural Arrangements – The last three questions focused on the support given to shared governance on the campuses. All the senate chairs agreed with the statement that the faculty senate and/or other institution-wide governance bodies meet on a regular basis (Question 16) and faculty determine how their representatives are selected (Question 17). All but one senate chair agreed with the statement that the administration provides adequate institutional support for shared governance. It is worth noting the importance of providing administrative and clerical support and without it, facilitating shared governance can become problematic. Reinforcing this point, one senate chair noted that *“While not universal, several other USM institutions have a clerical support person dedicated to faculty governance who can maintain documents, schedule rooms, make purchases, prepare and mail agendas, maintain websites, and other clerical support.”*

Figure 10: Historical Analysis of Climate for Governance Question			
Climate for Governance: Shared governance on our campus is alive and healthy.	2015	2016 ²	2017
Strongly Agree	4	4	0
Agree	6	3	9.5
Neither Agree or Disagree ¹	--	3	2.5
Disagree	2	2	0
Strongly Disagree	0	0	0
NA	0	0	0
¹ The “Neither Agree or Disagree” category was added in the 2016 survey. In 2015, a four point Likert scale was use. ² For the 2016 report, UMCP submitted their report after the completion of the report. The Senate Chair’s response is included in this table (i.e. NAD) but not in the report on the website.			

Historical Analysis of Climate for Governance Question – In the survey, the first question was considered to be the summary statement for the state of shared governance on campus. It asked if shared governance was alive and healthy. Although the questionnaire has been modified over time, the basic four category Likert scale remains intact enabling comparison of data over a three year period. The results are presented in Figure 10.

Review of the three years of data suggests three interesting trends. Overall, the campuses generally feel that shared governance is alive and healthy. Combining the strongly agree and agree categories, there were ten campuses that agreed with the statement in 2015, seven campuses in 2016 and nine and one-half campuses in 2017.

Second, there were generally one or two campuses in any one year that were dissatisfied with the state of shared governance on their campus. Unlike in previous years, it should be noted that in 2017 none of the reporting campuses disagreed with the statement.

Although there has been an overall increase in campuses agreeing with the statement over the three year period, those campuses strongly agreeing with the statement decreased from four in 2015 and 2016 to none in 2017. An interesting trend, no substantive reasons could be gleaned from the surveys.

Conclusion

In general for the twelve campuses that responded, the state of shared governance on the campuses is generally good. This was suggested by the response to the first question where nine and one-half of the senate chairs agreed with the statement that shared governance was alive and healthy on their campus (see Figure 1). Two and one-half of the senate chairs neither agreed nor disagreed with the statement. The one-half resulted from a survey tie between the two categories. In addition, a quick review of the other responses in Figure 2 - 9 suggest general support for the conclusion that shared governance is alive and healthy on USM campuses.

Second, the historical analysis indicates that shared governance is alive and healthy on most campuses, and that in any given year, there are one or two campuses where it is less so. An interesting trend this year was the decline in the number of senate chairs who strongly agreed with the statement. No reason was suggested for this trend.

A continuing theme that cut across multiple questions in the survey was the difference between communications and consulting. This point was noted by several senate chairs and in multiple comments. Many senate chairs indicated that there was good communications (e.g. attend Faculty Senate, monthly meetings, etc.) but poor consultation with the faculty on traditionally administrative functions such as budgeting. In addition, a three level paradigm was suggested: Consultation, good communications, and poor communications. Institutions noting poor communications generally experience lack of any consultation. Conversely, those institutions that have good consultation tended to have good communications.

Building on the previous point, there may be a need to revisit the I-6.00 policy on campuses. It defines the consultation relationship between the administration and faculty on both administrative and academic affairs. Section C of II Principles suggests that “*Shared governance requires informed participation and collaboration by faculty, students, staff, and administrators.*” “Informed participation” and “collaboration” may be synonyms for consultation. Also, collaboration and consultation doesn’t mean that the decision necessarily rests with the faculty either.

This year an effort was made to make the survey more representative of the faculty. There has been a tendency toward surveying the faculty. There can be a role for and important information can be gained through a survey of the general faculty. However, more weight should be given to those faculty who work with and have a direct relationship with the President regarding shared governance. This includes the senate chair or equivalent position, the executive committee and faculty senate. Usually, the senate chairs has the most involvement with the president followed by the executive committee and then by the Senate.