Annual Faculty Council Report on Shared Governance, AY 09-10

This report represents the Faculty Council’s review in fulfillment of UAS statutes (Article 4, Section 1.0-d), which stipulates that the Faculty Council:

Provides an annual review and report to the UAS of the state of shared governance and the effectiveness of communication and collaboration between the faculty and various levels of the administration, with strategies for enhancement and goals for the year.

The report was prepared by Dr. Christine L. Krueger, chair of the Faculty Council, and members of the Faculty Council. The report was approved by the Faculty Council, April 19, 2010.

Overview

This report details significant progress during AY 09-10 on the goals for improving shared governance identified in last year’s Faculty Council report. The Faculty Council report for AY 08-09 identified two key goals for improving shared governance:

- reaching a commonly held understanding of shared governance;
- improving communication among the UAS, faculty, and administration on matters of shared governance.

Along with this progress, there were two instances of disagreement between the UAS and the Provost, one regarding the interpretation of UAS statutes in the matter of appointing academic administrators and one regarding the status of the Financial Aid Committee. Importantly, these disagreements were addressed by means of statutory UAS procedures and collegial relationships between the UAS and Provost were maintained. The Faculty Council considers this to be evidence of the positive evolution of shared governance and of the relationship between faculty and administration at Marquette.

I. AY 09-10 Actions towards promoting a commonly held understanding of shared governance

1. The UAS approved a Faculty Council motion to conduct discussions of shared governance with each academic dean and the deans’ executive body (e.g., department chairs, section heads). This process was endorsed by Provost John Pauly. Discussions were conducted in all colleges and the library on the following questions:

1. What will it take to make shared governance work at Marquette?

2. What does “working” mean with respect to shared governance?
3. When have we seen shared governance work, and when has it not?

4. How will we know if shared governance is really working?

Summaries of these discussions were reported to the Faculty Council, who prepared an executive summary which was presented to the UAS and discussed at a UAS meeting on March 22, 2010. (See appendix: “Executive Summary of Shared Governance Discussions”)

2. The Faculty Council invited Provost Pauly to attend a Faculty Council meeting, resulting in a substantive and frank exchange of views on shared governance.

Conclusions

The striking consensus which emerged from the discussions described in points 1 and 2 above clearly revealed that **a common understanding of shared governance does exist.** That common understanding is grounded in a strong sense of shared mission—both for educating students and for research—as the ultimate purpose of effective shared governance. Participating faculty, deans, and the Provost all expressed a desire to be seen as partners in achieving this mission through effective shared governance. To that end, all parties agreed that the power of the Provost to implement effective policies must be enhanced, particularly in regard to resource allocation. The shared governance discussions in colleges and the library revealed consensus on the need for:

1. greater trust in relationships between faculty and administration;
2. greater transparency, especially in financial decision-making, to create trust and ensure better decision-making;
3) better and more timely communication about decision-making to create trust and ensure better decision-making.

Recommendations

1. In their discussion of the Faculty Council “Executive Summary of Shared Governance Discussions,” UAS senators recommended that time be set aside at UAS meetings in AY 10-11 for further reflection on shared governance goals, procedures, and strategies. To implement this plan, the Faculty Council recommends that the UAS hold two meetings in September of each year, the first being an annual planning meeting and the second being a normal business meeting. The only item of business at the annual planning meeting would be setting goals for the year. The discussion would be focused on, but not limited to, a set of goals proposed by the
executive committee. Its proposed goals could, of course, be amended, supplemented, or rejected by the whole body. At the business meeting in September the executive committee would propose a plan for accomplishing the goals, including committee assignments and deadlines.

2. The Faculty Council recommends that the “Executive Summary of Shared Governance Discussions” be disseminated to faculty and academic administrators and form the basis for broader discussions among faculty about shared governance to improve constituents’ awareness of, and engagement with, the new shared governance model.

II. AY 09-10 actions to Improve communication among the UAS, faculty, and administration on matters of shared governance.

1. Announcements were sent by the UAS Executive Board via email alerting faculty to upcoming UAS agenda items

2. Revisions to UAS web links on Provost’s website are being undertaken by Faculty Council, with the assistance of Dale Kaser and the OMC, thanks to invitation from Provost and approval by UAS (in process)

Recommendations

1. Continue the practice of sending email announcements regarding upcoming UAS agenda items. This practice received enthusiastic feedback from faculty in AY 09-10.

2. Continue to monitor progress on improvements to the presence of shared governance business on the university website.

3. Increase technical staffing support to enhance digital means of communicating UAS business and soliciting faculty and administrators’ feedback.

III. AY 09-10 Actions to improvement UAS procedures

1. Charges to committee and sub-committee chairs were given by Professor Ed Fallone, UAS chair, in September 2009.

2. Elections for UAS senators moved from late April to early April to allow for new standing committee chairs to be elected earlier, thus enabling standing committees to commence work immediately at the start of AY 10-11.

3. UAS statutes were changed to facilitate improved representation by part time faculty on the Faculty Council (UAS action pending)
4. A motion from the Faculty Council to formalize 1 course per year release for UAS chair and vice chair was passed by the UAS and Provost Pauly is committed to its implementation.

**Recommendations**

1. Establishing standard meeting times for standing committees and sub-committees would improve the ability to recruit faculty to stand for election to these committees and would expedite the commencement of these committees’ work at the beginning of each academic year.

2. Establish a half-day orientation for new UAS senators and interested returning senators at which UAS statutes and bylaws would be reviewed. The orientation should be funded by the Provost.

3. Establish a half-day orientation for the Executive Board and committee and sub-committee chairs to discuss committee charges, reporting structures, and timetables for work. The orientation should be funded by the Provost.

**IV. AY 09-10 Challenges to Shared Governance**

1. UAS passed a motion from Faculty Council regarding Provost’s interpretation of UAS statutes requiring consultation for appointment of Dean of Graduate School/Vice Provost for Research and Vice Provost for Undergraduate Programs and Teaching.

2. UAS rejected a motion from Provost to disband Financial Aid Committee in order to allow for adequate procedural review of committee role within new financial aid model under finance office.

3. Follow-up assessment of UAS actions and administrative policies is inadequate.

4. Length of time required for committees and sub-committees to accomplish assigned tasks, collect relevant data and to move motions to UAS with adequate faculty input remains problematic.

**Recommendations**
1. Strengthen role of Provost as senior academic administrator, particularly over budget, in order to facilitate improved institutional decision-making that adequately integrates contributions from shared governance structures.

2. Implement 360 evaluation (eg. Faculty, Peer-Dean, alum evaluation of Deans) of administrators.

3. Increase collaboration between academic and administrative governance.

4. Include the Chair and Vice-Chair of UAS on the University leadership council, dean’s council meetings and possibly the trustees meetings in order to support the Provost’s advocacy of the academic mission of the University.

5. Create policy to govern requests for information from OIRA necessary to formulating UAS actions. (N.B., Dr. Gary Levy and OIRA have cooperated with UAS committees in AY 09-10, however, a procedure would assist in identifying appropriate requests for information and prioritizing those requests.)