

**Resolution of the Faculty Senate and Professional Staff Senate to Jointly Adopt
'The Office of University Shared Governance at UB Doctrine of Shared Governance'**

To: The Faculty Senate Executive Committee

From: UB Doctrine of Shared Governance Ad Hoc Committee

Date Proposed to FSEC: 02/13/19

First Reading to the Faculty Senate: 02/19/19

Second Reading to the Faculty Senate: 03/05/19 (Shared Governance Day)

Approved by the Faculty Senate: 03/05/19 (Shared Governance Day)

Effective Date:

Whereas, The Office of University Shared Governance at UB *Doctrine of Shared Governance*ⁱ expresses the beliefs, understandings and desires for the inculcation of shared governance principles at UB in particular and the SUNY System in general;

Whereas, the *Doctrine* is a legacy mechanism for UB Faculty Senate (FS) Chair Philip L Glick (2015-2019) and UB Professional Staff Senate (PSS) Chair Domenic J. Licata (2015-2019) as advocates for enthusiastic, relentless and sincere support for shared governance throughout the UB and SUNY system at all levels;

Whereas, this *Doctrine* emerges through a renewed collaborative spirit between the FS and the PSS, is informed by the mentorship of esteemed colleagues within UB and SUNY, and is strengthened through the trials of successes and challenges;

Whereas, it is the Chairs' hope that this shall provide a prospective reminder and accountability to their successors to support and strengthen the principles of shared governance at the campus level, at the system level, and between and among the campuses and SUNY System Administration;

Therefore, be it resolved, that the Faculty Senate and Professional Staff Senate jointly adopt the *Doctrine of Shared Governance* as a legacy and reference document to the future of Shared Governance at UB.

Sent for Consideration on: 03/18/19

Decision:

ⁱ Document attached at end of resolution.

- By an Ad hoc UB FS and UB PSS Committee on ____ day of ____ 2019
- By UB FSEC on ____ day of ____ 2019
- By UB PSSEC on ____ day of ____ 2019
- First reading by UB Faculty Senate on ____ day of ____ 2019
- First reading by UB Professional Staff Senate on ____ day of ____ 2019
- Second reading and adopted by UB FS and UB PSS at historic joint meeting at Shared governance Day at UB on 5 day of March 2019

University Shared Governance Doctrine of Shared Governance

Introductory Statement on Shared Governance

The University at Buffalo office of University Shared Governance (OSG) *Doctrine of Shared Governance* expresses the beliefs, understandings and desires for the inculcation of shared governance principles at UB in particular and the SUNY System in general. It is a legacy mechanism for UB Faculty Senate (FS) Chair Philip L Glick (2015-2019) and UB Professional Staff Senate (PSS) Chair Domenic J. Licata (2015-2019) as advocates for enthusiastic, relentless and sincere support for shared governance throughout the UB and SUNY system at all levels. This doctrine emerges through a renewed collaborative spirit between the FS and the PSS, is informed by the mentorship of esteemed colleagues within UB and SUNY, and is strengthened through the trials of successes and challenges. It is the Chairs' hope that this shall serve as a prospective reminder to their successors to support and strengthen the principles of shared governance at the campus level, at the system level, and between and among the campuses and SUNY System Administration.

The Doctrine of Shared Governance

Shared Governance is a collaboration between faculty, staff, students, administration and governing boards in carrying out the paradigm of shared governance. This collaboration includes but is not limited to: trust, collegiality, dialogue, mutual respect, sharing perspectives, listening, a shared sense of purpose, and shared accountability; always being mindful of diversity and inclusion; always remembering some of us have certain privileges and experiences of life that others have not; remaining humble, recognizing differences while remaining open to finding common ground and transparency of information. In essence, it boils down to “effective and constructive” engagement by the administration and trustees with the faculty, staff and students. Not just effective and constructive engagement, but also timely

engagement. We need to be proactive, not reactive on important issues. We all need to be at the table, with a voice and a vote.

Background information on the Doctrine of Shared Governance

In the Fall of 2010, Dr. Nancy L. Zimpher became the 12th Chancellor of the State University of New York. She understood she was becoming the leader of the largest, most diverse and potentially the most dynamic university system in our nation. Chancellor Zimpher stated, “It is our collective responsibility to protect, uphold, and nourish the incredible uniqueness that is SUNY.” To accomplish this audacious task, she adopted shared governance into SUNY’s vision, “The Power of SUNY” as an institutional leadership style.

In early 2011, Chancellor Zimpher incorporated an examination of “shared governance” into the implementation phase of the SUNY Strategic Plan by creating a Shared Governance Transformation Team. The team had, by design, a diverse membership, including the governance leaders of SUNY’s University Faculty Senate (Ken O’Brien), Faculty Council of Community Colleges (Tina Good), Student Assembly (Julie Gondar), and faculty members from all campus sectors, two college presidents, and representatives from System Administration were included on the team. The Transformation Team was charged with examining the current patterns and procedures for shared governance across SUNY, including those within System Administration. After this review, the team was to conduct research and recommend foundational documents, policies and processes to strengthen effective shared governance throughout SUNY. The Shared Governance Transformation Team developed a “toolkit” of resources to be used by governance organizations within SUNY. Although the needs of each constituent governance group may be distinct and require adaptations of the resources, the guiding principles included in this preamble are designed to be broadly inclusive.

What is Shared Governance?

Meeting the challenge of supporting and measuring effective shared governance can usefully begin with the “*Statement on Government of Colleges and Universities*,” published in 1967 by the American Association of University Professors (AAUP) and subsequently endorsed by two other representative national academic governance organizations. This was the first document to formally articulate and make legitimate the faculty role in academic governance. What came to be known as the *Joint Statement on Government* described the relationship among trustees, presidents, and faculty as intertwined through “mutual understanding, joint effort, and inescapable interdependence.” The document (also for the first time) enunciated two basic principles: “1) important areas of action involve at one time or another the initiating capacity and decision-making participation of all the institutional components, and 2) difference in the weight of each voice, from one point to the next,

should be determined by the reference to the responsibility of each component for the particular matter at hand.”¹

Within SUNY, the system of shared governance occurs among a multiplicity of groups across many different pathways:

- The relationship between and among governing boards, the Chancellor and campus presidents
- The system-wide governance organizations with representatives from SUNY campuses (e.g., the University Faculty Senate, the Faculty Council of Community Colleges, the Student Assembly)²
- The governance organizations, which may be faculty-only, professional staff-only, college-wide, or student governance groups on each campus, etc.

What remains constant among and across these groups is the commitment to define and operate within an explicit covenant to involve multiple constituencies in governance activities.

What core principles should frame and inspire shared governance?

In pursuit of general guiding principles for designing resources (e.g., the “toolkit”) for governance organizations, we offer the following framework of key ideas. The principles will be organized by using Lee Bolman & Terrence Deal’s “Four frames” – structural, human resource, political and symbolic – which have been designed to examine aspects of leadership within organizations.³

1. Structural. Providing easy access to the “structural” aspects of a governance process can facilitate an organized approach to the review of topics, and it can guide steps required for action. For example, orientation sessions for new members and trouble-free access to updated governance documents (such as by-laws and handbooks) avoid schisms between “insiders” and “outsiders” within governance organizations. “Shared governance” can be improved when all members understand what is involved in proposing and approving governance rules. Bolman & Deal stress that using this approach enables the organization to make sure that essential structural elements within the organization are complete and up-to-date.

An explicit discussion of “shared governance” incorporated into the documents of the Faculty Council of Community Colleges resonates with the *Joint Statement*, and in addition, outlines many “structural” requirements for effective governance:⁴

“There is no single model of shared governance. However, there is general agreement about the elements of effective shared governance. Such governance requires:

- Well-defined areas of authority that are the primary responsibilities of each of the governance components (i.e., faculty, administration, governing board, students, etc.);
- Recognition that various areas are interrelated and that all components have a stake in the overall governance of the institution; and
- Collegial and cooperative relationships among all components.

2. Human Resource. The second Bolman & Deal frame focuses on the issues and concerns of people involved in organizations. In the case of “shared governance,” this could be seen as concerns for facilitating meaningful constituent involvement. Maximizing transparency and communication, concerns that have received increased visibility in recent years, are consistent with this frame. It should be noted that “shared governance” differs from the representation by constituents’ labor unions. Although, at times, interests between governance and collective bargaining units may overlap, they are not identical. Principles related to the human resource frame could include references to ways the organization can pay attention to representational issues, such as those related to diversity, which include empowerment, morale, and access to resources. SUNY’s commitment to broad representation involves every group.

Awareness of concern for constituents, consistent with the human resource frame, is included in one of the seminal documents of SUNY. Although more than three decades old, the excerpt below from Chancellor’s Statement (1973), has been affirmed by each SUNY Chancellor since 1973 and appears as a definition of “**Campus Governance**” in the 1982 *Policy Manual* (p. 123):

“The University reaffirms the validity of governance as the appropriate and organic process for the involvement of constituent groups in campus decision making. University faculty, staff, and administration are reminded of the charge contained in the 1972 Master Plan that *the governance arrangements within the University will be increasingly clarified and improved methods of consultation will be developed to reflect the need for effective governance based upon widespread participation...* Since these challenges go to the very heart of the University, it is appropriate to underscore the traditional legal framework which establishes and protects University governance.”

Recognition of the empathetic aspect of “shared governance” can serve to highlight the human dimension of the sometimes abstract concept of “shared governance.”

3. Political. Inherent in the very nature of governance is politics. All governance leaders must, at times, intentionally address concerns that are more important to one group than another. How this is handled can go a long way toward building, or undermining, the credibility of the governance organization and is of particular concern at critical times (e.g., when a search for a campus

administrator is underway, when dire budget circumstances require triaging of resources). Birnbaum references Derek Bok's 2003 analysis of governance, emphasizing the way in which governance effectiveness contributes to the potential for an institution to achieve its mission.⁵ He suggests that:

“governance and institutional purpose are related...proposals that suggest, either explicitly or implicitly, that the faculty role in shared governance should be reduced or limited [are] more likely to diminish rather than improve institutional effectiveness.”

Through the Middle States review process (self-study followed by external review), campuses can make manifest their explicit depoliticizing of their governance process. The toolkit of resources, to be provided via the Shared Governance Transformation Team, will be designed to assist in this process.

4. Symbolic. “Symbolic” is probably the most unexpected of the four frames, and with it, Bolman & Deal encourage consideration of how organizations can inspire ideas and actions. Evidence of symbolism can be tangible (e.g., location for meetings of the governance organization, awards related to governance, the governance leader regularly introduces the president at events), or more abstract, such as the use of a campus “theme” to stimulate conversation, arts activities, or symposia that relate to shared governance.

When shared governance on a campus includes a symbolic dimension, constituents can identify and become connected to the *meaning* of governance, as well as governance actions. In Bolman & Deal's model, an organization that incorporates the “symbolic” will pay attention to making the *work* of the organization important and meaningful. For example, incorporating traditions and ceremonies that express the mission of the organization illustrate the symbolic. An example of the symbolic is found in *Traditions*, a compilation of symbolic drawn from many campuses in every sector of the University. “Traditions,” according to the Introduction, “are a significant part of the college experience. At best, they celebrate life, recognize individual or group achievement, and contribute to the development of a distinct campus identity.”

In summary, this preamble broadly outlines the context for our (University at Buffalo's) work ahead. It has been designed to guide and inspire the design of resources and metrics for shared governance within SUNY.⁶

UFS SUNY Voices definition of shared governance

“In a shared governance system, faculty, professional staff, administration, governing boards, and students participate in the development of policies and in decision making that affects the institution. SUNY has three main bodies that interact with each other and the Board of Trustees: The University

Faculty Senate, Student Assembly, and Faculty Council of Community Colleges. By coming together with different constituent groups who have different opinions on how an institution should be governed, the shared governance process can become the desired way to help institutions implement changes.”⁷

Why Shared Governance is Different than Joint Governance

Shared governance and joint governance are similar, but not identical. They both share the values of trust, collegiality, dialogue, mutual respect, listening, a shared sense of purpose, accountability and perspectives; always being mindful of diversity and inclusion; always remembering some of us have certain privileges and experiences of life that others have not; remaining humble, recognizing differences while remaining open to finding common ground and most importantly transparency of information. But by way of differences, joint governance is patriarchal and places the faculty and the faculty senates into a vertical silo focused only on areas such as academic freedom, admissions, curriculum, teaching, degrees, research, promotion and tenure, but with little input on other matters (budgets, councils, foundations, administrator evaluations, etc.). Shared governance espouses that each of the five pillars (faculty, professional staff, students, administration and university councils) have a seat, a voice and a vote in broader university matters.

Selective Quotes on Shared Governance

The NEA has stated: “Shared governance is critical to the culture and vitality of higher education. Any decline in the participation of faculty in governance seriously threatens the quality of higher education institutions.”⁸

The AAUP Joint Statement on Shared Governance says, “important areas of action involve at one time or another the initiating capacity and decision-making participation of all members of the institutional component. And difference in the weight of each voice, from one point to the next, should be determined by the reference to the responsibility of each component for the particular matter at hand.”¹

The Middle States Accreditation, Standard 4: Leadership and Governance, reads, “the Commission on Higher Education expects a climate of shared collegial governance in which all constituencies (such as faculty, administration, staff, students, and governing board members) involved in carrying out the institutional mission, vision and goals will participate in the governance function in a manner appropriate to that institution.”⁹

Chair of the SUNY Board of Trustees, H Carl McCall, has said, “SUNY is committed to Academic Excellence and public good through models of “Shared Governance.” He goes on to say, “Shared Governance is critical to the effectiveness of systems of higher education, like SUNY, ensuring that all of our stakeholders – from students and faculty to community representatives and elected officials – have a voice at the leadership table and are committed to working together.”¹⁰

To quote Nina Tamrowski, President of the Faculty Council of Community Colleges, from the recent SUNY Senate Fall 2016 Plenary at Buffalo State College, “Shared Governance is not about saying no. It's about ways to move forward.”

To quote Domenic J. Licata, Chair of the UB Professional Staff Senate, “It’s not about transparency, it’s about shared governance!”

And last but not least to quote Chancellor Nancy Zimpher at the 2015 SUNY Fall Plenary and Chairman of the SUNY Board of Trustees, H. Carl McCall at 2016 SUNY Winter Plenary, both on the topic of Shared Governance, “We need to get this right!”

References

1. “*Statement on Government of Colleges and Universities*,” American Association of University Professors (AAUP) Committee on College and University Governance, 1966
<https://www.aaup.org/report/statement-government-colleges-and-universities>
2. SUNY Board of Trustees *Policies*, Article XVII: Student Assembly
<https://system.suny.edu/media/suny/content-assets/documents/boardoftrustees/SUNY-BOT-Policies-June2014.pdf>
3. Bolman, L. & Deal, T., 2008. *Reframing Organizations: Artistry, Choice and Leadership*, CA: Jossey-Bass.
4. *The Role of Faculty in Shared Governance*, Statement approved by the Faculty Council of Community Colleges, October 18, 2008.
https://www.fccc.suny.edu/governance/FCCCsharedGov_10_18_08.pdf
5. Birnbaum, R., July 2003, “The end of shared governance: Looking ahead or looking back.” Prepared by the Center for Higher Education Policy Analysis (Los Angeles, CA).
<https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/epdf/10.1002/he.152>
6. http://system.suny.edu/media/suny/content-assets/documents/powerofsuny/the-process-of-the-power-of-suny/SharedGovernance_20110408.pdf
7. <https://www.suny.edu/about/shared-governance/>
8. <http://www.nea.org/home/71694.htm>
9. <https://system.suny.edu/media/suny/content-assets/documents/faculty-senate/SGMiddleStatesAccreditation-TheRoleOfFacultyGovernanceintheProcess.pdf>
10. https://issuu.com/thespectrum/docs/web_c1ced72f98821a