Final Report of the MSU Denver Shared Governance Task Force

Submitted Thursday, May 28, 2015 to
Dr. Stephen M. Jordan, President
Metropolitan State University of Denver

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

During the fall 2014 semester MSU Denver President Stephen M. Jordan assembled the Shared Governance Task Force (SGTF) and charged it to review and recommend policies and actions for effective University governance. For five full months members of the SGTF addressed this charge, aware that questions of governance at MSU Denver—as is the case nationally—are often fraught with ample contestation and limited trust. In an effort to engage the University community in the process, the SGTF focused early efforts on gathering data: one, it designed and administered a survey to all MSU Denver employees and currently enrolled students; two, it conducted several focus groups for individuals wanting to share a deeper or more intimate perspective; three, reviewed a range of documents.

From its analysis of the aforementioned data and several robust discussions, the SGTF has provided members of the MSU Denver community a set of findings and recommendations, including a proposed values statement and next steps. Key to the findings was the consensus notion that the core educational mission of the institution should be at the center of all work related to governance. Successfully implementing governance will require a culture of trust, accountability, and communication at all levels, across all constituency groups, and within all units at the University.

The SGTF offers a number of recommendations in light of its findings. Fundamentally, we suggest an overarching shift in decision-making that puts trust in our colleagues' expertise and knowledge. We are proposing several changes that would move principal authority on processes and decisions closer to where information lies (College/School and Unit/Department). Additionally, we propose a reconceptualization of President's Cabinet to better situate it in terms of University governance. The SGTF believes that its recommendations should result in a more nimble, effective, and collegial system of governance at the University. We offer this document, including its recommendations, as a reflective, data-driven launching pad for a University-wide dialogue on issues of governance during the 2015-2016 academic year.

PROLOGUE

During the fall 2014 semester MSU Denver President Stephen M. Jordan assembled

the Shared Governance Task Force (SGTF). The task force included eight tenured or

tenure-line faculty members, four administrators, three students (with no more than

two serving at one time) and two classified staff members. Of the faculty represented,

three were department chairs. Of the administrators represented, two were deans, one

each in academic and student affairs, and two were program directors in academic and

student affairs. Of the students represented, two had formal connections to the

Student Government Assembly and one did not. Of the classified staff members

represented, one was a program assistant in an academic department and the other a

member of the Office of Institutional Research staff. There was brief discussion about

having a member of the Board of Trustees (BOT) serving on the SGTF in an ex-officio

capacity; however, that never materialized. Beginning in late October, after

solidification of its membership, the SGTF began the task of taking up the following

charge that Dr. Jordan presented this multi-constituency group:

> To review and recommend policies and actions that will develop a structure of
> effective shared governance at all levels of MSU Denver. This includes:
>
> • Solicit feedback from elected governance leaders advisory group, as well as the
>   MSU Denver community
> • Review the shared principles of shared governance that were developed at the
>   Sept. 2014 Board of Trustees retreat
> • Solicit feedback, seek Best Practices from other institutions, and gather criteria
>   for evaluating effective shared governance
> • Have a transparent process that provides updates to the Board of Trustees,
>   University community and relevant outside groups
> • Draw upon key elements of the *MSU Denver Strategic Plan — A Time for
>   Transformation,* and develop a value statement and guiding principles that
>   demonstrate a commitment to effective shared governance
> • Provide final recommendation of an effective shared governance structure to
>   the MSU Denver Board of Trustees at the May, 2015 business meeting

For five full months members of the SGTF have endeavored to fulfill our responsibility to address the aforementioned charge, realizing full well that questions of governance at MSU Denver—as is the case nationally—are often fraught with ample contestation and limited trust.

In an effort to embrace the spirit of transparency called for later in this document, there are several issues that should be considered. First, each member of the SGTF was appointed, not elected. This fact has raised eyebrows for some members of the MSU Denver community, particularly senior fulltime faculty members who witnessed firsthand notions of shared governance evaporate with earlier senior administrations and governing boards. Although we have not operated from hidden agendas, we appreciate that this may be a concern for some. Second, members of the SGTF, not unlike individuals at universities across the country, have grappled with the issue of defining as concretely as possible the term *shared governance*. While some have argued that the term itself is inclusive of all MSU Denver constituencies, others have argued that it refers exclusively to decision-making relationships between presidents, governing boards and faculty. In an effort to press forward, a consensus began to emerge in the SGTF that the terms *governance* and *university governance* would prove more palatable to a larger percentage of MSU Denver citizens than the specific term *shared governance.* Third, the SGTF had to come to terms with the fact that the internal dynamics of the group may have spoken to how members of various constituencies often perceive themselves in relation to fundamental issues of power. Specifically, the SGTF experienced the greatest degree of turnover from two groups: classified staff members and students.

In part because of the issues raised in the previous paragraph, we cannot underscore enough that we offer this document, including its recommendations, as a reflective, data-driven launching pad for a University-wide dialogue on issues of governance during the 2015-2016 academic year. However, we respectfully submit that the document is substantive and should serve to guide conversations both within existing constituency groups and in the larger MSU Denver community.

GOVERNANCE IN CONTEXT

Governance is a constellation of processes and structures that allow for a range of participatory decision making (including strategic planning and policy formation) and the cultivation of a culture that builds trust, with members of all MSU Denver constituencies having a sense that their voices not only have been fully articulated, but vetted and heard. MSU Denver governance is at once a living reality and an aspirational goal, one informed by the University's strategic plan.

Historically, governing boards, presidents (or chancellors) and faculty have been the driving forces that have shaped discourse on and application of governance at universities across the country. MSU Denver is no different in this regard. As a cornerstone of its operational mission and statutory role, the Board of Trustees establishes policies, procedures and oversight that help guide the University administratively and financially. The Board of Trustees delegates to the President, as chief executive officer of the University, principal authority and responsibility for administering the institution. However, the President and Board of Trustees do not operate in a vacuum. Representing a tradition that precedes the foundational Statement on Government of Colleges and Universities, faculty members have an essential relationship to the decision making process.[1] At MSU Denver the Faculty Senate has been a key voice, particularly with regard to tenure and promotion decisions and ownership of the curriculum. In recent years the Council of Chairs has been an important additional voice. Faculty members have tended to be the most vocal constituency regarding the need to guard against the corporatization of the institution at the expense of its core educational mission.

---

[1] The formal leadership structures of the American Association of University Professors (AAUP), American Council on Education (ACE) and Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges (AGB) endorsed the joint "Statement on Government of Colleges and Universities" in fall 1966.

At MSU Denver there has also been an ongoing effort to strengthen the relationship of other campus constituencies to the discourse on and application of governance. Members of the classified staff, individuals who work at the University as contractual employees of the State of Colorado, have sought a more meaningful relationship to decision-making and a climate more conducive for their concerns to be heard. The Classified Staff Council is the formal advocacy group that has articulated some of these concerns. Members of the Exempt Administrative staff have also sought a more meaningful relationship to decision-making. Represented formally by the Council of Administrators, these members of the University sometimes have a more substantive relationship to governance, yet paradoxically, operate with less job protection than do Classified Staff members. The largest constituency group at the University has also been its most transient: MSU Denver students. Formally represented by the Student Government Assembly, students have asserted that they have the most remote relationship to governance, even though their tuition dollars sustain the University.

The realization of governance at MSU Denver occurs within the context of several important challenges.[2] First, the University faces acute resource constraints that impact a wide range of matters including, but not limited to: workload and compensation issues for most individuals who work here; delivery of support services to students; and tone and scope of communication between all MSU Denver citizens. Second, although the University benefits from the existence of the five aforementioned advocacy groups, the majority of MSU Denver community members do not regularly engage with them as a mechanism to participating in governance. Additionally, there are other bodies such as President's Cabinet and specialized committees and work

---

[2] Every university in the country is facing its own set of peculiar challenges in this regard. Please see Steven C. Bahls, *Shared Governance in Times of Change: A Practical Guide for Universities and Colleges*. Washington: AGB Press and the Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges, 2014; William E. Bowen and Eugene M. Tobin, *Locus of Authority: The Evolution of Faculty Roles in the Governance of Higher Education*. Princeton: Princeton University Press and ITHAKA, 2015.

groups charged with shaping initiatives related to specific topics that impact decision-making and the future direction of the University. Third, the transition to university status at MSU Denver has sparked a call for expanded autonomy for its College of Business, College of Letters, Arts and Sciences, College of Professional Studies and School of Education, a definite change in trajectory from the highly centralized decision making of the past. Fourth, the University's respective constituent groups are far from monolithic. There are different perspectives and relationships to power among classified staff members that are often tied to their specific roles on campus. The same is true for administrators. MSU Denver students are diverse in every way. And using the umbrella term *faculty* misses key distinctions between tenure-line (Category I), fulltime non-tenure-line (Category II) and affiliate (Category III) professors.

PROCESS

The SGTF met just twice in the fall semester. Initial conversations focused on understanding the purpose and scope of existing representative constituency groups. An Advisory Group, comprised of the presidents/chairs of the Faculty Senate, Classified Staff Council, Student Government Assembly, Council of Chairs and the Council of Administrators, along with the Faculty and Student Trustees, was convened to serve as a resource for the SGTF. The Advisory Group was invited to attend an initial SGTF meeting to share information about their respective groups. Additionally, the co-chairs of the SGTF met with the Advisory Group members in the fall semester to inquire about their needs, wishes, and any possible concerns regarding the task at hand.

In an effort to engage the University community in the process, the SGTF focused early efforts gathering information regarding the current state of governance at MSU Denver, as well as an ideal or aspirational vision. The group determined that it was important to offer an opportunity for individual members of our community to provide input. As such, a survey was designed and administered to all MSU Denver employees and currently enrolled students. Members of the task force worked collaboratively to design both the instrument and invitation to participate in the survey. (See Appendix B

for the survey tool.) A summary report of the SGTF survey results is attached to this report (see Appendix C). Members of the SGTF also offered opportunities for individuals wanting to share a deeper or more intimate perspective a mechanism to do so. To this end, focus groups were scheduled. All members of the University community were invited to participate in the focus groups, although attendance was generally quite low. Two focus groups were held for members of the classified staff, two for administrators, four for faculty, and one for students. The focus groups each had between three and nine participants and were facilitated by members of the SGTF who were offered training on focus group facilitation by a skilled facilitator who was a member of the Office of Institutional Research. To protect the confidentiality of the focus group participants, the data from those conversations are not attached. However, please note that the SGTF reviewed the findings, discussed key themes, and considered this information in the development of the findings and recommendations in subsequent sections of this report.

The SGTF then began the rather daunting process of analyzing and synthesizing the data provided by members of the campus community. Additionally, the SGTF reviewed a range of documents, including the book *Shared Governance in Times of Change: A Practical Guide for Universities and Colleges*, and maintained a Dropbox folder to store working documents and resources.   Several documents had been compiled with explicit peer models in mind, including a report by the Education Advisory Board (EAB) entitled "Shared Governance Structures," a coauthored report by MSU Denver Provost Vicki Golich and Dean of the College of Professional Studies Sandra Haynes, and an analysis and recommendations drafted by Professor Emeritus of Music Larry Worster.

 Over the course of several spirited conversations in the winter of 2015, key themes and challenges outlined in the findings section of this report emerged. The task force also received a request from the MSU Denver chapter of the American Association of University Professors (AAUP) to meet and discuss its perspectives on shared governance. The SGTF met briefly with four members of this group's executive

committee in March 2015 to receive their input on our work and process. In addition to offering commentary on a variety of shared governance topics, the group emphasized a request that the SGTF hold true to the guidelines for institutional governance set forth by the AAUP nationally.   Specifically, the MSU Denver AAUP leadership requested that SGTF recommendations regarding governance at MSU Denver adhere to the AAUP guidelines in full, rather than selectively.

Also during March 2015 the SGTF co-chairs met with several members of the Advisory Group to provide an interim report and generally to respond to any new questions or concerns that might have emerged. During these conversations it was apparent that a primary concern of some Advisory Group members was the timing of this report, and the opportunity for community members to provide feedback before action would be taken. In short, there was concern that a report submitted at the end of the academic year might result in action by the Board of Trustees during the summer term when many faculty and students are not engaged with the University. After consultation with Dr. Jordan, we were assured that although a report would be submitted at the conclusion of the spring semester, action would not be taken until the Fall 2015 semester, at the earliest, so that faculty, staff, and students would be able to participate in and dialogue about possible implementation and/or other next steps.

SGTF members had several conversations about the possible development of a new governance group that would address University-wide matters (i.e. a University Council, as first proposed in March 2012). Many of the models in place at other institutions do indeed include such a group, so it was only natural that MSU Denver consider the same, particularly given that our shared governance statement and charge for the SGTF includes broad participation from all University community members. Nevertheless, after weighing both the strengths and limitations of such a group, the sense among SGTF members was that we should work on improving existing structures—and relationships between those structures—rather than adding a new group. This sense, which was further deepened by input from the University community at large, was that a new group was unlikely to "fix" or otherwise improve the culture of

University governance at this time. However, this may be a future consideration for the University, once certain current challenges have been addressed.

The recommendation (see below) to redefine the President's Cabinet and utilize this group more effectively as a collaborative body emerged from these conversations about a University Council. Related to this point, it is clear that if we move to a model of governance and operations at MSU Denver where decisions are more often made at the College/School and Department/Unit level ("where the information is"), as is being recommended, a centralized body will indeed be necessary for sharing information, discussing University-wide initiatives, and making University-wide decisions. The SGTF believes that at this time, however, this centralization of information and decision-making, when and where appropriate, should occur within a redefined President's Cabinet.

Given the complexities of the issues at hand, and the relatively short timeframe in which the SGTF was operating, the group invited Dr. Stephen J. Reno, Chancellor Emeritus of the University of New Hampshire system and consultant on governance issues across the country, to assist with the final phase of our work. Dr. Reno reviewed preliminary documents developed by the SGTF, visited campus to converse with key institutional leaders, including the Advisory Group, and facilitated an extended SGTF meeting. Dr. Reno also offered welcomed guidance to the group about the framework for this report.

FINDINGS

GENERAL

- There is consensus that the educational mission of the institution should be at the center of all work related to University governance.
- Time constraints due to heavy workloads impact the ability of faculty, staff, and students to participate in governance and activities that support effective governance.

- The majority of MSU Denver community members were unaware of the existing statement on shared governance (found in the Trustees Policy Manual and the Handbook for Professional Personnel) prior to being asked to take a survey about shared governance in February of 2015.

- Although MSU Denver community members across all groups generally agree with the vision expressed in the existing statement on shared governance, there is a general sentiment that the vision expressed is not currently being realized at MSU Denver.

A NOTE ABOUT TERMINOLOGY

- Language has far reaching impact on many areas of the governance structures in place for the University. There are strong feelings regarding the term "shared governance," as it has traditionally been used in higher education.

- The University community is not in agreement about the definition of shared governance and how it should be executed at MSU Denver.

  o Some faculty do not want to deviate from the 1966 joint statement endorsed by the American Association of University Professors (AAUP), American Council on Education (ACE) and Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges (AGB), "Statement on Government of Colleges and Universities," and therefore view the inclusion of staff and students in shared governance as inherently problematic.

  o Some faculty, and likely most staff and students, do not know, understand, or agree with the traditional *Statement on Government of Colleges and Universities*.

  o Some staff, students, and faculty want to respect the traditional definition of shared governance and adopt new terminology for University governance to avoid confusion and negative reactions by faculty who hold true to the traditional definition.

- The term "democratic workplace," which implies that we aspire to operate as a democracy, is noted as a misleading and inappropriate goal for a modern University. *NOTE: We think that the 'refresh' of the MSU Denver Strategic Plan, currently in progress, will address this misuse of the term* democracy.

HISTORY

- Based on incidents from the past, some faculty and staff do not trust one or more of the following: Faculty Senate, the "administration," specific individuals in the administration, or the Board of Trustees. Trust is central to effective University governance.
- The wounds that some members of our faculty and staff carry from past incidents are significant. Forward progress may be thwarted if an effort to address the past perceived or real injustices is not undertaken.
- While some of our existing constituency groups have a rich history at the University with consistent themes, others are newer and/or have significantly shifted themes over time.

TRUST

- Lack of trust is a challenge (and perhaps always will be), and impedes many aspects of governance.
- Successfully implementing governance will require working towards a culture of trust and accountability at all levels, across all constituency groups, and within all units at the University.
- Some members of the University community are suspicious of whether other individuals, of the same or other constituencies, operate in good faith.
- Some members of our community believe that a sense of fairness and civil discourse are lacking.
- Representative constituency groups do not have the full confidence of their constituents and are not always seen as the appropriate arena for decision-making. In fact, based on survey and focus group data, no constituency has a

high level of faith in its representative group to adequately represent the needs and perspectives of its diverse constituency.

COMMUNICATION

- Many staff, faculty, and students are passionate about improving communication at the University as it is seen as an integral part of improving governance.

- There is a perception that changes to significant policies, procedures, and systems within the institution are poorly communicated to faculty, staff, and students.

- MSU Denver tends to rely on informal and relational communication that may be better suited to a smaller organization.

- Internal communication at the University is primarily the responsibility of Marketing and Communications. As such, there is a perception that most communication is an internal public relations effort and/or done to drive the agenda of the President and/or Vice Presidents, rather than communication for the sake of efficiency or information sharing.

- In regards to communication, there is an expressed need for:
  - Opportunities for meaningful engagement in dialogue/conversation/debate in order for the best strategic decisions to be made. (Note: Not all decisions need everyone involved, but who, where, and how decisions get made make a difference.)
  - Clarity about what decisions are made where (at what level) and by whom and how participation in that decision process occurs.
  - Timely information (and training) about changes in policy and procedure that impact faculty, professional staff and students.

POLICIES and DECISION MAKING

- There is consensus that policies need to reflect the educational mission and values of MSU Denver.

- The process for development of policies and procedures, as well as communicating about those policies and procedures, is crucial to employee satisfaction and engagement, as well as the development of wise policies and procedures that support our mission.

- MSU Denver has an inordinate number of standing committees, task forces, and subgroups of various bodies, which results in the institution being "over-governed."

- Currently most MSU Denver community members do not know how new policies come about, the process for updating existing policies, who makes the decisions, or who was consulted prior to arriving at a decision. In many cases this causes a combination of distrust and frustration.

- The draft *Policy Development Process* appears to meet many needs related to consultation/input in policy development, as well as communication about policies and their formation.

- There is a perception that decisions are too centralized and also that decision-making is too often approached from the top-down.

- Many find it difficult to act on decisions at the departmental level when there are three or four levels of approval necessary for actions that do not necessitate all the levels.

- Many members of the University community do not believe that there is a high level of transparency in the decision-making processes.

VOICE

- Members of multiple constituent groups feel that their voices are not heard or honored on issues that matter to them and that they are left out of decision making; yet, many do not know where to participate or how to make their voices

heard. In some instances, employees fear ramifications for expressing their voice, which is a barrier to full participation. This may be particularly pronounced for administrators and non-tenured faculty members who do not have the protections offered to tenured faculty and members of the classified staff.

- Faculty, administrators, students, and classified staff each feel that their constituent groups do not accurately or appropriately represent their voices/needs to the overall University. The issues of each are a bit different, but all feel "not represented" to varying degrees.

- Some faculty, staff, and students are interested in having a voice and/or the opportunity to participate in a governance system that is not limited to participation in existing constituency groups (i.e. Faculty Senate, Classified Staff Council, etc.).

- Members of our community acknowledge that governance does not mean that everyone gets a voice or a vote on every decision made here, but we do need to have voices at the table for groups that may be impacted by any decision made.

- The overrepresentation of faculty in certain University groups leaves members of other constituency groups on campus feeling disenfranchised at times.

STRUCTURE, COMMITTEES, and EXISTING CONSTIUENCY GROUPS

- There is much murkiness about who (which group and/or individual) has principal responsibility and/or final approval for major University functions and/or decisions, and how others outside of that group can learn about and contribute.

- Although there are some shared priorities and values, the primary concerns of the faculty, the primary concerns of classified and administrative staff, and the primary concerns of students are often quite different. At times, these differences detract from understanding or recognizing that our ultimate goals are the same: to carry out the institutional mission by educating students.

- Existing constituency groups vary in their scope and identity as actual governing bodies. While each group operates as an *advocacy* group of some kind, not all operate as *governance* groups. For example:
  - The current Student Government Assembly (SGA) does not wish to be perceived as a governing body per se; rather the SGA aspires to be a resource to the students.
  - The Council of Administrators is set up as an advocacy group.
  - The Classified Staff Council emphasizes its role in fostering unity among members of the classified staff.
  - The Faculty Senate arguably has the most traditional governance role.
  - The Council of Chairs has operated as both an advisory group and an advocacy group.
- Accordingly, the different groups have very different ways of carrying out their respective missions and collaboration between groups is sometimes limited because of this.
- That said, there are some fine examples of constituency group collaborations. These examples are primarily related to social functions or informational/educational sessions, such as the fall 2014 anti-bullying presentation cosponsored by the Council of Administrators, Classified Staff Council and Faculty Senate.
- The President's Cabinet is the only body that brings existing constituency groups together formally.
- The President's Cabinet and the senior staff in the President's Office ('VP group') likely play important roles in University governance. However, the purposes of these groups are not clearly articulated and their principal responsibilities are not widely known.
- The experience of individuals in a constituency group often depends more on where in the University they work or study, not their classification. Certain units

are well functioning for all members: students, faculty, staff, and administrators. In other units, no one is satisfied.

- A lot of power within the University, both broadly and within constituencies, is concentrated in a few individuals. These individuals each serve on many committees, and subsequently have a lot of information and influence. Oftentimes these individuals hold positional leadership roles (i.e. Faculty Senate, SGA, or University President and/or Vice Presidents). These individuals are sometimes perceived as far from and inaccessible to the average member of the University community.

ON THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES:

- Surprisingly, the Board of Trustees (BOT) is largely absent from discourse on the topic of shared governance.
- Interaction between members of the University community and the BOT is limited to the inclusion of the ex-officio student and faculty Trustees, who are each charged with representing their diverse constituency's views.
- Some faculty members have expressed concern that the Faculty Trustee is a non-voting member of the BOT; however, others have indicated that having a sole representative for the entire faculty is problematic.
- Efforts are in place to communicate regularly with the University community about BOT activities with updates in the daily communication sent to faculty and staff and web-casted public meetings. Despite these efforts, the general University community is largely unaware of BOT activities and unclear about the critical role that the BOT plays in decision making for the University.

RECOMMENDATIONS

In light of the findings outlined above we offer a number of recommendations. We suggest an overarching shift in approach to operations and decision-making at MSU

Denver that puts trust in our colleagues across the institution. Faculty and staff across the University have expertise, knowledge, and information that we should more appropriately leverage when making decisions and/or planning for the future. As such, we are proposing several changes that would move principal authority on processes and decisions closer to where information lies (College/School and Unit/Department), and where our in-house experts reside. Based on our findings, doing so should result in a more nimble, effective, and collegial system for governance at the University. This shift is reflected in several of the recommendations below. We firmly believe that although we can design new structures and/or systems, they will only improve our community if there is trust that the people within are operating in good faith towards our collective mission. Likewise, the institution's primary guiding documents, such as the statement on shared governance and strategic plan, need to be centered on our educational mission.

A number of the recommendations address issues of developing, maintaining, and assuring that trust is a predominant theme for the University now and in the future. It is also worth noting that the shift in decision making to where information lies (de-centralization) itself is symbolic of the type of trust that we believe should be a cornerstone of governance at MSU Denver as we continue to grow over the next fifty years. Lastly, please note that some of the specific recommendations are in response to needs, concerns, or desires expressed by particular pockets of individuals within our community. In some cases these pockets may represent quite a small contingent. However, in some of these cases the needs are so significant that the issue(s) merited our attention, regardless of the relatively small number of impacted parties. In other instances we are responding to requests or needs that many individuals have expressed across multiple constituency groups, Colleges/School, and units/departments. As much as possible, we have tried to articulate this distinction.

ESTABLISHING A DISOURSE OF TRUST

- A new culture on shared governance must include an ongoing commitment to actively cultivating trust. To this end, the University community should adopt and act upon the following values statement for University governance:

Honor Everyone ~ Governance is often situated within the context of relationships between governing boards, presidents and faculty.   At MSU Denver we boldly seek to expand that traditional framework to include participation in the decision-making process from students, administrators and members of the classified staff.

Communicate Effectively ~ A key component of governance nationally is effective communication. That is no less true at MSU Denver. For communication to be effective here it must have integrity. An effort should be made to communicate policy and procedural changes with honesty and respect for each member of the University community.

Promote Transparency ~ A cornerstone of effective communication is transparency. Whether at the department/unit, college/school or University level, openness should be an essential feature of decision-making. However, openness is hollow without being inextricably bound to bedrock insistence on accountability at every level.

Embrace Dialogue ~ Governance at MSU Denver should be guided by an embrace of and respect for dialogue. Debate certainly has its place. Dialogue requires a willingness to actively listen to other voices, however, and consider other perspectives. Individuals are more likely to consider that they are valued when they sense that their voices have been heard.

Cultivate Trust ~ Governance is successful when a spirit of effective communication and dialogue lead to the establishment of trust over time. Cultivating trust is difficult, even painful. Yet, it is necessary work. When members of each MSU Denver constituent group engage in such work, effective decision-making can take place.

Respect Structure ~ When governance structures take precedence over individual personalities, MSU Denver's institutional culture becomes more open to dialogue, trust and respect for all voices. The trajectory of successful decision-making, including policy formulations, should not be guided primarily by the power of personalities.

Think Institutionally ~ When we honor everyone, communicate effectively, promote transparency, embrace dialogue, cultivate trust and respect governance structures, we engage in the difficult but important task of thinking institutionally. Doing so is never easy, particularly at resource-challenged institutions. Yet, moving beyond our more narrow interests—no matter how important they are—allows for the cultivation of participatory citizenship at MSU Denver. Furthermore, the University's Strategic Plan should serve as a guiding light for such efforts.

- Develop a framework within which the institution can reach a workable model regarding what matters require uniformity (more centralized) throughout the university and what matters are best addressed at the College/School and department/unit level so that decisions are more often made "where the information lies" (more decentralized, subject to applicable centralized approval), for example, the curriculum and tenure and promotion processes.

- Policy and procedural changes should not be announced after the fact; rather, timely information should be broadly disseminated to all interested parties with adequate time for input, including rationales articulating the need for such actions. The current draft process for policy development appears to address much of this.

- Embark on a process to dialogue about past real or perceived violations experienced by some faculty, senior administrators, and staff for the purpose of repairing harm and relationships between effected parties and senior administration and/or the BOT, even if those who feel aggrieved represent a

relatively small segment of the MSU Denver community. Contract with a skilled facilitator in the area of restorative justice or similar field to work through a voluntary healing process. Regardless of current involvement in conflict, key community members should participate in a symbolic and/or representative fashion to appropriately offer reconciliation for past real or perceived violations.

COMMUNICATION

- Prioritize communication about University-wide, as well as department/unit and/or College/School decisions and processes. In order to be effective as communication that contributes to the betterment of institutional processes and culture, this communication must not be conflated with internal public relations and/or event related communication. This may require funding for staff to manage this vital communication effort.
- Revise the statement on shared governance to better articulate the meaning of governance at MSU Denver. See Appendix A for an example that could be considered by the University community and the Board of Trustees.
- Develop a new website on Shared Governance at MSU Denver populated with relevant information, including but not limited to:
  - A revised statement on Shared Governance (see Appendix A for a draft).
  - An 'at-a-glance' overview that identifies the major activities of the institution and the group and/or individual who has principal responsibility for decision making on each activity.
  - Brief information articulating the purpose of each constituency group that identifies it as primarily an advocacy or governance group. Current contact information for representative constituency group should also be prominently displayed.
  - Information on opportunities to share one's voice (see below).

Members of our community (faculty, staff, and students) should be educated on governance and referred to this site when they first join the institution through their respective orientations. All members of the community should be reminded of this information regularly.

POLICIES and DECISION-MAKING

- Fast track the approval and implementation of the proposed policy development and process. Members of the proposed Policy Advisory Committee (PAC) should be both appointed from logical units across the institution, as well elected at the College/School level and at-large.

- In line with the framework referenced in the first item of this recommendations list, situate two major faculty processes, Curriculum and Retention, Tenure and Promotion (RTP), so that they reside at the level of the Colleges/School with final approvals at the level of the Provost, President and BOT. The streamlined curriculum approval process recently approved by the Faculty Senate is an important step in this direction.

- Post-Tenure Review (PTR) should be conducted exclusively by senior faculty and ideally by full professors.

- The new summer budgeting model that provides department chairs with autonomy over course scheduling and enrollment is a good example of de-centralization and trust in our colleagues at the department level. Explore similar strategies to empower departments throughout the academic year. For example, department chairs should have a degree of latitude related to low enrollment for new courses if they believe that these curricular offerings are viable contributions to the University.

VOICE

- Opportunities for members of our community to interact with key decision makers (both individuals and groups) should be expanded. These opportunities

should be formal and informal. For example, the "lunch with the Provost" series is a good example of an informal opportunity for administrators and faculty to have their voices heard. Representative constituency groups, Vice Presidents, Deans, Department Chairs, and Associate Vice Presidents, and others should be encouraged to identify creative and appropriate means to engage in similar conversations.

- Rather than relying solely on representative groups (Council of Chairs, Faculty Senate, etc.) for committees, solicit members from the community at large to serve in an effort to broaden the voice of our community members, as well as expand access to formal opportunities for input. However, a mechanism will have to be developed to insure a structural connection between these groups.

STRUCTURE, COMMITTEES, and EXISTING CONSTIUENCY GROUPS

- Consider a moratorium period on the development of new standing committees unless they are developed at the College/School or department/unit level to serve the specific needs found within, for example, the School of Education Leadership Cabinet. Likewise, all existing groups and the University should consider doing an assessment of existing standing committees in order to avoid duplication or unnecessary groupings.

- Re-conceptualize the President's Cabinet to serve as a connection point for members of representative constituency groups and key institutional leaders. Consider a name change to the group that reflects its purpose. Articulate a specific scope of responsibility and purpose for this group to include:
  - Approval of polices that are put forward by the PAC in the Policy Development Process;
  - Strategic planning (development and ongoing monitoring);
  - Train members on role/expectations and take care to ensure that the group functions as a productive team (i.e. teambuilding, retreats, etc.).

- Articulate the role of the existing "VP group" (is this group really what others may think of as a Cabinet?), its role(s), and areas of principal responsibility.

- Existing constituency groups are encouraged to consider internal structures and procedures that reflect our current institutional structure/organization (i.e. Colleges/School) and adapt to future shifts in institutional structure and/or demographic shifts. For example, as graduate programs grow, the Student Government Assembly might take strides to ensure that graduate students are appropriately represented in the SGA and/or a new graduate student assembly might be formed.

- Those who serve on governance groups, including committees and task forces, should consider their role as representative and actively communicate back to others, as well as solicit contributions/input from their peers. Processes should be adjusted as needed to allow for the timely gathering of information. Doing so strengthens accountability and builds trust.

- Existing constituency groups should consider revisiting their by-laws to better reflect the nature of their specific relationships to University governance.

- Encourage existing constituency groups to consider inviting individuals or groups outside of their own membership to participate in meetings, committees/work groups, or otherwise for the purpose of gathering input more broadly for work across campus. For example, the Faculty Senate might ask students to join the Student Affairs Committee, or invite administrators or members of the Classified Staff to join the curriculum committee as non-voting members.

ON THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES

- Respectfully encourage the BOT to consider a range of possible options for moving forward in terms of University governance: (a) pursue a change to state statute to do away with the existing model of a sole Faculty Trustee and Student Trustee and Develop a BOT Advisory Group comprised of elected faculty

members (by School/College or rank) and a second Advisory Group comprised of elected students (by School/College or class standing); (b) pursue the continuation of the existing structure, but with the faculty and student trustees having voting privileges; or (c) the status quo.

- Encourage the BOT to develop appropriate mechanisms for engaging with the University community at large outside of open public business meetings. For example, early in both the fall and spring semesters the BOT might facilitate a community forum for members of the University community to provide input to the Board. The Chair/Vice Chair of the BOT should lead this forum.

NEXT STEPS

This report will be submitted to the President from the Shared Governance Task Force in late May 2015 and a summary presentation will be made to the Board of Trustees at its June 2015 business meeting. Following these presentations, we respectfully offer the following recommended next steps and considerations for implementation.

- The summer 2015 semester should be considered a period of reflection on the report. That is, no community action should be taken on the report during this time.

- However, during this time period, the President and/or Chair of the Board of Trustees might consider identifying a project manager or implementation lead to coordinate all aspects of the process going forward. Note that we think that it would be wise to consider an independent project manager and/or an individual who is devoid of political associations within the institution. The project manager would not be a decision maker or driver; rather, he or she would be a facilitator of the process who would coordinate dialogues, develop an operational plan for implementation, and otherwise ensure that the project maintains forward momentum.

- o Most members of the Shared Governance Task Force have indicated a willingness to serve in an advisory capacity to the project manager on a limited basis over the course of the 2015-2016 academic year, should he or she desire such input.

- The project manager, and the University community at large, should have a clear understanding of which recommendations in this report will be implemented, and which may be set aside, as well as the rationale for those decisions. If a decision is made to postpone or forgo a particular recommendation—and certainly there may be good cause to not act on all that are included—that should be an intentional and clearly articulated decision. **The process of implementing any recommendations must model the key tenets of governance outlined in this report**. That is, implementation should adhere to its stated values, as well as cultivate transparent and active communication.

- At the start of the fall 2015 semester the President and/or the Chair of the Board of Trustees should share the report in its entirety with the University community. Should they see fit, they may provide discretionary commentary on the findings and recommendations and invite participation in the next steps (see below) phase of the process.

- Likewise, at the start of the fall 2015 semester, the University should convene one or two large community forums where faculty, staff, and students can learn about the task force's report, and begin to engage in implementation activities.

- As soon as possible the University should convene a work group of faculty and Deans (with representation from both the Faculty Senate and the faculty at large—to include at least one Category II faculty member, one Affiliate faculty member, and one Department Chair) to work through the framework referenced in the second recommendation of this report (model for when decisions should be centrally held vs. pushed to the periphery). Members of this group should engage in substantive dialogue with their faculty peers. Note that this same model could be used across the institution to guide where decisions are made;

however, given that this will impact the two major faculty processes (Curriculum and RTP/PTR) most directly, the committee should be comprised exclusively of faculty and deans. The framework, and subsequent modifications to existing processes, should be ushered through the requisite approval process by the work group.

A NOTE ABOUT EVALUATION

The Shared Governance Task Force charge included an expectation that we would offer criteria for evaluating effective shared governance. Admittedly this was an area that we did not fully flesh out in our work together. That said, points relevant to evaluation were embedded into our discussions. With that in mind, we offer the following:

- The existing Campus Climate surveys (one version administered to all categories of employees, another to students, and one to faculty via Faculty Senate) offer us valuable insight on the issues of campus culture as related to trust and voice—central issues to effective governance. We might consider an analysis of the Climate Survey data that specifically examines governance issues and use this as a benchmark for our work. Subsequently, we can look to this data for an indication of progress.

- Likewise, the survey instrument that our Task Force developed could be used in the same way to measure progress. For example, we could fairly easily learn how the community knowledge base around governance has shifted over time, as well as the tenor on effectiveness of constituency groups. Rather than administering this survey annually, we suggest that we allow time for the impact of any shifts to permeate the University culture, and re-administer it in three-to-five years after implementation of recommendations in this report.

- While the surveys listed above will offer quantitative measures of some of the intended outcomes and goals of effective governance, their ultimate

effectiveness ultimately should be *experienced*. When we reflect on our governance in the future, we might ask ourselves the following:

- o Do our community members feel that they have a voice?
- o Do our community members have access to timely information about pending decisions and both know how to offer input and feel comfortable doing so?
- o Are decisions made "where the information lies" and do decisions leverage the expertise and close perspective within our Colleges/School and departments/units?
- o Do we regularly engage in substantive dialogue on challenging issues that matter? Who is invited to the conversation? Are we respectful?
- o Are our community members empowered to fulfill their *expectation,* articulated in the Statement on Shared Governance (both current and proposed versions), to participate in the decision making process at the University?
- o Do we operate in ways that earn the trust of our students and colleagues, and if so, do we reciprocate by trusting each other?

We respectfully and unanimously submit this report and its appendices on Thursday, May 28, 2015:

Tyler Antikainen, MSU Denver Class of 2015 (February 2015-)

Philip Bernhardt, Assistant Professor and Chair, Department of Secondary, K-12 and Educational Technology

Bobbi Capps, MSU Denver Class of 2015 (November 2014-February 2015)

Gloria Eastman, Professor of English

Gail Garcia, Program Assistant I, Department of Political Science (November 2014-March 2015)

Winston Grady-Willis (SGTF co-chair), Professor and Chair, Department of Africana Studies

Rey Hernandez, Associate Professor of Economics

Elizabeth R. Hinde, Dean, School of Education

Raj Khandekar, Professor of Management

Matthew Matovina, Statistical Analyst I, Office of Institutional Research (March 2015-)

Adriana Nieto, Associate Professor, Department of Chicana/Chicano Studies

Braelin Pantel (SGTF co-chair), Associate Vice President for Student Engagement and Wellness/Dean of Students

Elizabeth Parmelee, Director, Center for Individualized Learning

Norman Provizer, Professor of Political Science

Matthew ReCorr, MSU Denver Class of 2016

Tara Tull, Associate Professor and Chair, Department of Human Services

Steven Willich, Director, Gay, Lesbian, Bisexual, and Transgender Student Services

APPENDIX A: Governance at MSU Denver

University Governance at MSU Denver is defined as a constellation of processes and structures that allow for a range of participatory decision making (including strategic planning and policy formation) and the cultivation of a culture that builds trust, with members of all MSU Denver constituencies having a sense that their voices not only have been articulated, but vetted and heard. MSU Denver governance is at once a living reality and an aspirational goal inextricably bound to the institution's educational mission.

As a cornerstone of its operational mission and statutory role, the Board of Trustees establishes policies, procedures and oversight that help guide the University administratively and financially. The Board of Trustees welcomes and expects the participation of faculty, students, staff, and other University constituencies in the decision-making process, but delegates to the President, as chief executive officer of the University, principal authority and responsibility for administering the institution.   However, the President and Board of Trustees do not operate in a vacuum. Representing a tradition that precedes the foundational 1966 Statement on Government of Colleges and Universities,[1] faculty members have principal jurisdiction over curriculum, tenure and promotion. Likewise, the President may delegate oversight of applicable areas of University operations, planning, and decision making to structures and/or individuals within the community. The Board of Trustees looks to the President of the University as its primary liaison with each of these constituencies. To be effective in this role, the President must establish an environment of transparent communication, substantive dialogue and mutual accountability that will foster trust by faculty, students and staff regarding matters considered by the Board of Trustees.

---

[1] The formal leadership structures of the American Association of University Professors (AAUP), American Council on Education (ACE) and Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges (AGB) endorsed the joint "Statement on Government of Colleges and Universities" in fall 1966.

APPENDIX B
Shared Governance Survey

INSTRUCTIONS:
Dr. Stephen Jordan, President of MSU Denver, has convened a task force to examine shared governance at MSU Denver and to review and recommend policies and actions that will develop a structure of effective shared governance at all levels of MSU Denver. To this end, the task force would like to hear from you about your personal experience with and/or desire for shared governance at the University. Please complete this brief survey to share your perspective and thoughts with the task force. This is an anonymous survey. Results will be used to help ensure the task force is representing University constituencies in their work related to shared governance.

This survey should take approximately 5-10 minutes to complete.

Please read the existing Board of Trustees statement below regarding shared governance.

MSU Denver's Shared Governance Statement
Within the [University's] statutory role and mission and the Board of Trustees' operational mission, all constituencies have a role and a responsibility in assisting the [University] to achieve excellence in all areas of [University] activity.

In pursuing excellence, the Board of Trustees welcomes and expects the participation of faculty, students, staff, and other [University] constituencies in the decision-making process.

The Board of Trustees encourages a broad exchange of information and ideas. To facilitate the exchange of information and ideas, the Board of Trustees looks to the President of the [University] as its primary liaison with the [University] constituencies.

To be effective in this role, the President must establish an open environment of communication with all members of the [University] community and establish avenues for consultation and recommendation by faculty, students, and staff regarding policy matters considered by the Board of Trustees.

The Board of Trustees delegates to the President, as the chief executive officer of the [University], full authority and responsibility for administering the [University] within the policies and procedures established by the Board of Trustees. Within this delegation is the expectation that the President will elicit the participation and facilitate the fulfillment of the roles and responsibilities of the [University's] campus constituencies in the [University's] internal decision-making processes. It is through the initiative, participation, and effort of all the [University's] constituencies that excellence is achieved.

Q1 I was first made aware of the institutional shared governance statement above....
○ During my orientation to the University
○ Through my involvement in an existing governance group (Classified Staff Council, Council of Administrators, Council of Chairs, Faculty Senate, President's Cabinet, Student Government Assembly, etc.)
○ At some other point prior to taking this survey
○ Only now while taking this survey

Q2 To what extent is the vision expressed in this statement currently being achieved? Please rate from 1 (not at all) to 10 (completely):
○ 1
○ 2
○ 3
○ 4
○ 5
○ 6
○ 7
○ 8
○ 9
○ 10

Q3 To what extent do you agree with the vision expressed in the above statement?
Please rate from 1 (not at all) to 10 (completely):
○ 1
○ 2
○ 3
○ 4
○ 5
○ 6
○ 7
○ 8
○ 9
○ 10

Q4 Are there any elements of the shared governance statement above that you would want to eliminate? If yes, please list those elements. Please limit your answer to no more than 100 words.

Q5 Are there any elements of shared governance missing in the statement that you would like to see included? If yes, please list those elements. Please limit your answer to no more than 100 words.

Q6 To what extent do you currently have opportunities to provide input in decision-making processes at the University?

❍ Often
❍ Sometimes
❍ Rarely
❍ Never

Q7 How important is it for you to be able to participate in the decision-making processes at the University?

❍ Very important
❍ Important
❍ Neither important or unimportant
❍ Somewhat important
❍ Not important

Q8 What are some possible factors that may limit your participation in the University's decision-making process? (Select all that apply):

❑ Not applicable- my participation is not limited.
❑ I trust that those making decisions are effective. Therefore, I don't personally need to participate.
❑ I don't have the time to participate.
❑ I don't want to participate.
❑ I am unsure how I would even go about participating in the decision-making process.
❑ I am fearful of repercussions if I participate in the decision-making process.
❑ I do not think that my participation would be valued.
❑ Other (please specify): _____

Q9 In your opinion, to what extent is shared governance part of the culture at the University?

❍ Very much
❍ Somewhat
❍ Not Much
❍ Not at all

Q10 Moving forward, please list 3-5 elements that you deem important to the future of successful shared governance at the University? Please limit your answer to no more than 100 words.

Q11 With which group do you primarily identify? (select one)
- ❍ Student
- ❍ Faculty - Tenured/Tenure-Track
- ❍ Faculty - Category II
- ❍ Faculty - Affiliate
- ❍ Faculty - Department Chair
- ❍ Administrator
- ❍ Classified Staff

Q12a Please evaluate the effectiveness of the STUDENT GOVERNMENT ASSEMBLY:
NOTE: Only participants who self-identified as students in the item above were able to respond to this item
- ❍ Highly effective
- ❍ Somewhat effective
- ❍ Neither effective nor ineffective
- ❍ Somewhat ineffective
- ❍ Completely ineffective
- ❍ No opinion

Q12b Please evaluate the effectiveness of the FACULTY SENATE:
NOTE: Only participants who self-identified as faculty (Tenured/Tenure-Track, Category II, Department Chair, or Affiliate) in the item above were able to respond to this item
- ❍ Highly effective
- ❍ Somewhat effective
- ❍ Neither effective nor ineffective
- ❍ Somewhat ineffective
- ❍ Completely ineffective
- ❍ No opinion

Q12c Please evaluate the effectiveness of the COUNCIL OF ADMINISTRATORS:
NOTE: Only participants who self-identified as Administrators in the item above were able to respond to this item
- ❍ Highly effective
- ❍ Somewhat effective
- ❍ Neither effective nor ineffective
- ❍ Somewhat ineffective
- ❍ Completely ineffective
- ❍ No opinion

Q12d Please evaluate the effectiveness of the CLASSIFIED STAFF COUNCIL:
NOTE: Only participants who self-identified as members of the Classified Staff in the item above were able to respond to this item
- ❍ Highly effective
- ❍ Somewhat effective
- ❍ Neither effective nor ineffective

❍ Somewhat ineffective
❍ Completely ineffective
❍ No opinion

Q12e Please evaluate the effectiveness of the COUNCIL OF CHAIRS:
NOTE: Only participants who self-identified as <u>faculty</u> (Tenured/Tenure-Track, Category II, Department Chair, or Affiliate) in the item above were able to respond to this item
❍ Highly effective
❍ Somewhat effective
❍ Neither effective nor ineffective
❍ Somewhat ineffective
❍ Completely ineffective
❍ No opinion

Thank you for taking the time to complete this survey! The Shared Governance Task Force will conduct focus groups in the upcoming weeks to provide members of the University community the opportunity to share their perspectives on the decision-making process at MSU Denver through targeted conversations. If you are interested in participating in one of the focus groups, please click on the following link: https://events.msudenver.edu/shared-governance-task-force.

APPENDIX C

Summary Report of Shared Governance Survey Administered February 2015

INSTRUCTIONS:
Dr. Stephen Jordan, President of MSU Denver, has convened a task force to examine shared governance at MSU Denver and to review and recommend policies and actions that will develop a structure of effective shared governance at all levels of MSU Denver. To this end, the task force would like to hear from you about your personal experience with and/or desire for shared governance at the University. Please complete this brief survey to share your perspective and thoughts with the task force. This is an anonymous survey. Results will be used to help ensure the task force is representing University constituencies in their work related to shared governance.

This survey should take approximately 5-10 minutes to complete.

Please read the existing Board of Trustees statement below regarding shared governance.

MSU Denver's Shared Governance Statement

Within the [University's] statutory role and mission and the Board of Trustees' operational mission, all constituencies have a role and a responsibility in assisting the [University] to achieve excellence in all areas of [University] activity.

In pursuing excellence, the Board of Trustees welcomes and expects the participation of faculty, students, staff, and other [University] constituencies in the decision-making process.

The Board of Trustees encourages a broad exchange of information and ideas. To facilitate the exchange of information and ideas, the Board of Trustees looks to the President of the [University] as its primary liaison with the [University] constituencies.

To be effective in this role, the President must establish an open environment of communication with all members of the [University] community and establish avenues for consultation and recommendation by faculty, students, and staff regarding policy matters considered by the Board of Trustees.

The Board of Trustees delegates to the President, as the chief executive officer of the [University], full authority and responsibility for administering the [University] within the policies and procedures established by the Board of Trustees. Within this delegation is the expectation that the President will elicit the participation and facilitate the fulfillment of the roles and responsibilities of the [University's] campus constituencies in the [University's] internal decision-making processes. It is through the initiative, participation, and effort of all the [University's] constituencies that excellence is achieved.

I was first made aware of the institutional shared governance statement above....

#	Answer	Bar	Response	%
1	During my orientation to the University		12	4.18%
2	Through my involvement in an existing governance group (Classified Staff Council, Council of Administrators, Council of Chairs, Faculty Senate, President's Cabinet, Student Government Assembly, etc.)		55	19.16%
3	At some other point prior to taking this survey		71	24.74%
4	Only now while taking this survey		149	51.92%
	Total		287	100.00%

To what extent is the vision expressed in this statement *currently being achieved*?
Please rate from 1 (not at all) to 10 (completely):

#	Answer	Bar	Response	%
11	1		36	12.68%
12	2		27	9.51%
22	3		33	11.62%
23	4		32	11.27%
24	5		59	20.77%
25	6		24	8.45%
26	7		38	13.38%
27	8		25	8.80%
28	9		5	1.76%
29	10		5	1.76%
	Total		284	100.00%

To what extent *do you agree with the vision* expressed in the above statement?
Please rate from 1 (not at all) to 10 (completely):

#	Answer	Bar	Response	%
11	1		7	2.49%
12	2		6	2.14%
22	3		5	1.78%
23	4		14	4.98%
24	5		27	9.61%
25	6		23	8.19%
26	7		36	12.81%
27	8		67	23.84%
28	9		52	18.51%
29	10		44	15.66%
	Total		281	100.00%

To what extent do you currently have opportunities to provide input in decision-making processes at the University?

#	Answer	Bar	Response	%
2	Often		36	12.72%
3	Sometimes		90	31.80%
4	Rarely		103	36.40%
5	Never		54	19.08%
	Total		283	100.00%

How important is it for you to be able to participate in the decision-making processes at the University?

#	Answer	Bar	Response	%
1	Very important		109	38.25%
2	Important		107	37.54%
3	Neither important or unimportant		24	8.42%
4	Somewhat important		35	12.28%
5	Not important		10	3.51%
	Total		285	100.00%

What are some possible factors that may limit your participation in the University's decision-making process? (Select all that apply):

#	Answer	Bar	Response	%
1	I don't have the time to participate.		73	25.98%
2	I don't want to participate.		12	4.27%
3	I trust that those making decisions are effective. Therefore, I don't personally need to participate.		41	14.59%
4	I am unsure how I would even go about participating in the decision-making process.		121	43.06%
5	I am fearful of repercussions if I participate in the decision-making process.		91	32.38%
6	I do not think that my participation would be valued.		124	44.13%
7	Other (please specify):		54	19.22%
8	Not applicable- my participation is not limited.		24	8.54%
	Total		540	100.00%

In your opinion, to what extent is shared governance part of the culture at the University?

#	Answer	Bar	Response	%
1	Very much		20	7.09%
2	Somewhat		123	43.62%
3	Not Much		96	34.04%
4	Not at all		43	15.25%
	Total		282	100.00%

With which group do you *primarily* identify? (select one)

#	Answer	Bar	Response	%
1	Student		70	24.56%
3	Faculty - Tenured/Tenure-Track		92	32.28%
4	Faculty - Category II		10	3.51%
6	Faculty - Affiliate		11	3.86%
7	Faculty - Department Chair		12	4.21%
8	Administrator		58	20.35%
9	Classified Staff		32	11.23%
	Total		285	100.00%

10 Please evaluate the effectiveness of the STUDENT GOVERNMENT ASSEMBLY:
  NOTE: Only participants who self-identified as <u>students</u> in the item above were able to respond to this item

#	Answer	Bar	Response	%
1	Highly effective		2	2.99%
2	Somewhat effective		13	19.40%
3	Neither effective nor ineffective		25	37.31%
4	Somewhat ineffective		7	10.45%
5	Completely ineffective		12	17.91%
6	No opinion		8	11.94%
	Total		67	100.00%

11 **Please evaluate the effectiveness of the FACULTY SENATE:**
NOTE: Only participants who self-identified as <u>faculty</u> (Tenured/Tenure-Track, Category II, Department Chair, or Affiliate) in the item above were able to respond to this item

#	Answer	Bar	Response	%
1	Highly effective		6	4.92%
2	Somewhat effective		43	35.25%
3	Neither effective nor ineffective		12	9.84%
4	Somewhat ineffective		28	22.95%
5	Completely ineffective		25	20.49%
6	No opinion		8	6.56%
	Total		122	100.00%

Please evaluate the effectiveness of the COUNCIL OF ADMINISTRATORS:
NOTE: Only participants who self-identified as <u>Administrators</u> in the item above were able to respond to this item

#	Answer	Bar	Response	%
1	Highly effective		1	1.82%
2	Somewhat effective		13	23.64%
3	Neither effective nor ineffective		10	18.18%
4	Somewhat ineffective		11	20.00%
5	Completely ineffective		5	9.09%
6	No opinion		15	27.27%
	Total		55	100.00%

13 Please evaluate the effectiveness of the CLASSIFIED STAFF COUNCIL:
NOTE: Only participants who self-identified as members of the <u>Classified Staff</u> in the item above were able to respond to this item

#	Answer	Bar	Response	%
1	Highly effective		3	9.38%
2	Somewhat effective		10	31.25%
3	Neither effective nor ineffective		7	21.88%
4	Somewhat ineffective		8	25.00%
5	Completely ineffective		1	3.13%
6	No opinion		3	9.38%
	Total		32	100.00%

14 Please evaluate the effectiveness of the COUNCIL OF CHAIRS:
NOTE: Only participants who self-identified as <u>faculty</u> (Tenured/Tenure-Track, Category II, Department Chair, or Affiliate) in the item above were able to respond to this item

#	Answer	Bar	Response	%
1	Highly effective		8	6.56%
2	Somewhat effective		33	27.05%
3	Neither effective nor ineffective		21	17.21%
4	Somewhat ineffective		7	5.74%
5	Completely ineffective		15	12.30%
6	No opinion		38	31.15%
	Total		122	100.00%