

Report of the Ad-hoc Senate Institutional Review Committee

September 27, 2022

The Ad-hoc Senate Institutional Review Committee was appointed by the Faculty Senate Executive Committee on April 13, 2022. It was charged to conduct a review of the organization and functioning of the Faculty Senate with particular reference to four aspects of its work:

1. Organization of committees and relationship to the FSEC and FS
2. Structure of FS leadership
3. Diversity of representation on the FS and its committees
4. Use of technology to improve conduct of FS business

It was also charged to include in its final report a recommendation about whether the bylaws and standing orders should be amended to include a provision specifying the frequency and procedures for future periodic reviews.

The committee (members listed in Appendix I) worked over summer 2022 to gather information and insights about counterpart organizations at peer institutions (listed in Appendix II). In September 2022, based on comparisons of our Senate with those at peer institutions, the committee formulated the following report and recommendations.

Overarching conclusion

The UB Faculty Senate is weak and ineffective. Faculty Senate committees are mostly inactive and ineffective; they have atrophied and have been duplicated/replaced by administration-appointed committees. This duplication of effort has undermined the appeal of service on the Senate and may raise concern during our Middle States accreditation process. Structural problems with the leadership of the Faculty Senate contribute to the weakness of Senate committees. Given the Senate's weaknesses, it will be hard to address the issue of diversity of representation on it and its committees. The Faculty Senate has not kept up to date with technology to facilitate its work.

An effective Senate can serve to engage and organize faculty to meet UB's educational and research missions and support the aspiration to rise into the ranks of top 25 public research universities. If the current Senate leadership (chair and executive committee) agrees with this premise, we call on it to devise a plan to address the weaknesses we have outlined below. Our report confines itself largely to identifying the problems. The FSEC must decide how to proceed from here. We do recommend, however, that provisions for a regular review of the Senate be added to the governance documents.

1. Organization of committees and relationship to the FSEC and FS

Compared to our peer institutions, our Senate committees—with the clear exception of the Academic Policies and Grading Committee—are not thoroughly engaged in the work of the university. Many of them have not met in recent years. Active and effective university-wide committees comprising faculty and staff exist, but their relationship to the Senate is remote. They

operate independently of the Senate and do not report to it. We believe more Senate committees should resemble the Academic Policies and Grading Committee. They should be responsible for weighing in on important matters related to academic programs and the life of the university regularly. In some cases (e.g., the FS Budget Priorities Committee), duplicate committees exist, with members appointed by the administration. In other cases, academic governance bodies (e.g. the Council on International Studies and Programs and the Graduate School Executive Committee) that at peer institutions are constituted by and report to the counterparts of our Senate are not and do not at UB.

Senates at our peer institutions that are strongest and most robust have active committees. A striking example is the University of Maryland at College Park, where the Elections, Representation, & Governance Committee periodically reviews governance plans for every academic unit on campus. At Stony Brook University, the Graduate Council, which advises the dean of the graduate school on program changes and graduate curricula, is one of the standing committees of the Senate itself. The Stony Brook Senate also has a standing Administrative Review Committee which is the chief body of the Senate for reviewing and evaluating administrative performance and proposed reorganizations, and which is consulted about and represented on all search committees at the level of dean or above. At the University of Michigan, the Financial Affairs Advisory committee, whose members are appointed by the senate, advises and consults with the Executive Vice President and Chief Financial Officer concerning all topics of interest related to university finance and infrastructure. At CU Boulder, the Senate has an important role in overseeing sports programs, through the Intercollegiate Athletics Committee (e.g., IAC's recent resolution on [sports betting](#)). At the University of North Carolina Chapel Hill, where most senate committee members are elected, there is an active Committee on Salary Equity. At the University of Pittsburgh, the Senate Budget Committee works with the University Planning and Budget committee in recommending salary increases, tuition increases, etc. At the University of Washington, the Faculty Senate routinely reviews and comments on major external institutional grants that shape the university.

2. Structure of FS leadership

One possible explanation for the proliferation of faculty-staff committees that report to administrators rather than to the Senate—which, as discussed above, we believe has caused Senate committees to atrophy—is the constitutional weakness of the Senate leadership at UB. Too much burden is placed on the shoulders of one person, the Senate chair.

Most of the highly functional senates we investigated have a strong leadership team at the top, including a chair, immediate-past chair, and incoming chair, in addition to other officers such as secretary and parliamentarian. The leadership team divides responsibilities for serving on key committees and for recruiting new leadership and senate members. The team also often meets collectively with top university administrators to consult about senate work. At Binghamton, a chair and incoming chair team up with Binghamton's three SUNY Faculty Senate representatives to form a team known as the CGL (Campus Governance Leaders), which meets with the president and provost together once a month and with the provost alone once a month. At many universities, the equivalent of our Faculty Senate Executive Committee is smaller and more active. The University of Kentucky, for example, has a Senate Council comprising nine faculty

members and two students. The University of Michigan's Senate Council on University Affairs (SACUA) is composed of nine faculty members elected by the Faculty Assembly.

Another approach many peer universities use to ensure that their Senate leadership is effective is by compensating senate officers for their service, including with course release, stipends, or some combination of the two. At almost all peer institutions examined, compensation for service for officers is much more substantial than it is at UB, and it includes course releases for the senate chair during the term of their service. At UB, policies relating to compensation for service as a Senate officer are not transparent.

A strong senate leadership could appoint and rely on a nomination committee to recruit officer candidates and a committee on committees to make sure committees are staffed and functioning. Our peer institutions have such committees. Most peer senates, though, have considerably more staff support than does UB's Faculty Senate. The UC Irvine senate employs an executive director, an associate director, six senate analysts, and one operations manager. The analysts are assigned to particular senate committees, and take minutes of committee meetings in addition to gathering information relevant to the committee's work.

3. Diversity within the Senate and its committees

Senate leaders at peer institutions report that ensuring diversity across disciplines is achieved via guidelines that specify broad representation from among different units. Other types of diversity—e.g. rank, gender, and racial/ethnic identity—is more difficult to achieve, given the serious service demands placed on URM faculty and the need to protect vulnerable faculty from excessive service obligations. Given the weakness of our Senate, this issue will need to be addressed gradually as we strengthen our institution.

4. Use of technology to improve conduct of FS business

Almost all of the peer institution senate websites we visited offered more information and were more welcoming than that of the UB Faculty Senate. Although not part of our study, Penn State senate has a particular well organized [website](#), including a page with a form that any faculty member can fill out to request information or make suggestions to the senate. The list of peer institutions in Appendix II includes links. The Universities of Kentucky and Maryland both have excellent document management systems to handle committee and senate business and to create an easily accessible archive of senate proceedings. The University of Pittsburgh senate's [website](#) lists all the active issues currently under consideration.

In addition to maintaining effective websites, many peer senates communicate regularly with their constituents via newsletters and other means. Some use technology to ensure convenient and secure discussions and votes. The University of Maryland senate holds Zoom meetings in webinar mode, with senators given panelist privileges; all other attendees must be recognized by the chair if they wish to speak. It uses a clicker system for voting.

Other observations:

Committee members were struck by the diversity of senates at our peer institutions. One of the most significant differences among the senates we investigated concerns their constituencies. Stony Brook University, the University of Maryland, and other institutions have university senates that comprise faculty, staff, and students. That model may be worth considering here at UB. We note that the FS and Professional Staff Senate have worked together effectively in the past, producing an impressive set of documents on the principles and spirit of shared governance (see Appendix III). Strategies to strengthen such cooperation going forward could be considered.

Committee members spoke with leaders of the SUNY Faculty Senate, who noted that the SUNY FS offers consultancy services to individual SUNY campuses in regard to governance issues, which our FSEC might draw on in future. The SUNY Faculty Senate Governance Committee is currently considering adopting a rubric that can be used to assess governance institutions SUNY-wide, working from a draft created by SUNY Empire State and based on materials from the AAUP and the SUNY Faculty Council of Community Colleges (see Appendix IV).

Appendix I: Ad-hoc committee members

Adly Fam
Philip Glick
R.J. Multari
Gabriela Popescu
Barbara Prinari
Sarah Robert
Kristin Stapleton, chair
Fred Stoss, *ex officio*
Matteo Taussig-Rubbo

Appendix II: List of peer institutions examined by the committee

Binghamton University	https://www.binghamton.edu/faculty-senate/index.html
Stony Brook University	https://www.stonybrook.edu/univsenate/
University of California, Irvine	https://senate.uci.edu
University of Colorado, Boulder	https://www.cu.edu/faculty/faculty-senate/about
University of Kentucky	https://www.uky.edu/universitysenate/
University of Maryland	https://www.senate.umd.edu
University of Michigan	https://facultysenate.umich.edu
University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill	https://facultygov.unc.edu
University of Pittsburgh	https://www.univsenate.pitt.edu
University of Washington	https://www.washington.edu/faculty/senate/

APPENDIX III: Shared Governance Doctrine adopted by the UB FS and PSS

See here:

https://www.buffalo.edu/content/www/facultysenate/Governance/resolutions/_jcr_content/par/download_904539307/file.res/SG%20Doctrine%20Resolution%20FS%20Final.pdf

APPENDIX IV: Report of the SUNY Empire State Governance Evaluation Working Group with draft governance rubric, which the SUNY Faculty Senate Governance Committee is considering for adoption SUNY-wide

Governance Evaluation Working Group: May 2022

Background:

At the June 2021 Senate meeting, the Senate charged the Senate Chair to form a working group about the Governance Evaluation committee. Specifically, the working group was tasked with creating and re-focusing a suggested charge for the Committee for the coming year.

Said working group suggested a direction, make up, and deadline for the Governance Evaluation committee. The working group felt that the committee should differentiate its work from the Climate Committee. As the Climate Committee was planning to survey members of the college community, the working group suggested that the Governance Evaluation Committee utilize more of a program evaluation approach for its work.

Specifically, the committee could take the following steps:

- Generate a definition of effective governance.
 - Specifically on a larger level, of the Senate and its committees, how do we define governance.
 - The Climate Committee will assess how individuals feel about governance and its effectiveness.
- Create measurable outcomes from this definition.
- Create a tool or survey to examine these outcomes.
 - The tool needs to be realistic in its use, feasible for all, and something that can be utilized to assess the outcomes.
 - Features of the committee work could be assessed, such as the charge or membership.
- Create a process to carry out the survey. This would involve examining the Senate as a whole or each committee on this respective outcome.

- Select one or two objectives/outcome to work on for the year.
- Create a cycle to work on these, specifically when each outcome will be examined on a yearly basis.
- Analyze the results and come up with definitive suggestions.

This report and its charge were approved by Senate during its August 2021 meeting. The working group tasked with this project are Senate Chair Thalia MacMillan, Senate Vice-Chair David Puskas, Teal Abel, Emma Bowman, Sadie Ross, Eric Strattman, and Christopher Whann.

Model:

The Group started with definitions of shared governance from the Association of American University Professors (AAUP) and SUNY.

AAUP calls for shared responsibility among the different components of institutional government and specifies areas of primary responsibility for governing boards, administrations, and faculties. Shared governance, according to the Association’s Statement on Government of Colleges and Universities, refers to the responsibility shared among the different components of the institution—governing boards, administrations, and faculties—for its governance, and the specifies areas of primary responsibility for each component.

SUNY states that 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. By coming together with different constituent groups who may have different opinions on how an institution should be governed, the shared governance process can become the desired way to help institutions implement changes.

SUNY’s Faculty Council of Community Colleges had an extant rubric intended to serve as a diagnostic tool for campuses to use and adapt when conducting a self-assessment of the effectiveness of their shared governance processes; a rubric rooted in criteria set forth by AAUP and the Association of Governing Boards (AGB). The working group used this rubric as a jumping-off point in November.

Throughout the Fall term and into the Spring, the working group focused on tweaking the rubric – removing sections that made no sense considering our structure, editing others to make it speak more pertinently – rather than trying to build a rubric from the ground up. Significant edits included removing the term “faculty” which was somewhat too specific considering our structure, and substituting the word “Constituents” where appropriate; and removing sections related to interactions with Trustees and Local Boards, for which we could find no internal analogue.

The edited rubric for our institution’s use may be found at the end of this document; the original rubric document may be found at https://www.sunydutchess.edu/faculty/mklein/FCCC_Shared_Gov_Rubric_word_FINAL.9.17.18.pdf

Future:

Part of the difficulty in measuring the effectiveness of governance is that it has been very subjective – with no rails on either side of the conversation to define the question, many surveys about governance returned responses about how individuals FELT about governance, and not about its effectiveness, as effectiveness was never defined. It is the working group's hope that the college community will use this tool in conjunction with annual reporting and governance planning.

- Senate, standing committees, and governance units are made aware of this document's use during the 2022-23 academic year and begin to identify which components are most applicable to measure.
- During annual reporting at the College Assembly, those groups include an analysis of the criteria they attempted to measure, how they believe they ranked, and showing examples as reference.
- These groups then have the ability at the annual Governance Planning meeting to reflect on the past year vis-a-vis their rubric report (what went exceedingly well and needs to continue vs. what did not work as well as intended and needs to be improved in the future), and these decisions then become a focus for the groups during their next governance year.

Doing this begins to build a cycle of assessment in governance that reflects our institution's culture of assessment.

SHARED GOVERNANCE RUBRIC

Category	Criteria	Does not meet	Meets	Exceeds
<i>I. Parameters for Shared Governance</i>	1. The administration and governance representatives model collegiality, respect, tolerance and civility towards other members of the campus community and each other.	1. Rather than collegial, the relationships among the constituencies are poorly established, adversarial or divisive; decisions are often made arbitrarily or without a clear, formalized process for input agreed upon by constituent groups; representation in decision-making processes is not always determined by constituent groups.	1. Constituencies work respectfully and collegially through formalized, transparent decision-making processes to achieve institutional goals.	1. Constituencies work respectfully and collegially through formalized, transparent decision-making processes to achieve institutional goals; administration readily seeks and includes both formal and informal recommendations from constituent groups in decision-making processes.

Comments:

Goals:

Category	Criteria	Does not meet	Meets	Exceeds
<i>I. Parameters for Shared Governance</i>	2. Negotiations and communications among college constituencies are open and carried out in good faith and in an atmosphere of trust	2. Decision-making processes and their related communications are not always open and clear, leading to perceptions of arbitrariness, personal deal-making, and distrust.	2. Constituency groups engage in formalized, collaborative decision-making processes; opportunities exist for vertical as well as horizontal communications.	2. All constituency groups engage in thoughtful deliberation and respectful communications and processes aimed at achieving institutional mission and goals; faculty/campus governance leadership is welcomed and provided a reasonable opportunity to report to the president, cabinet and Board of Trustees and engage in matters of shared governance and decision-making.

Comments:

Goals:

Category	Criteria	Does not meet	Meets	Exceeds
<i>II. Institutional Communication</i>	1. Collaboration by the Administration with governance leadership allows for a reasonable amount of time for deliberation and a mechanism for governance leadership to consult with their constituents before offering recommendations	1. Timelines are often arbitrary and insufficient for thoughtful input or widespread participation by constituents; the mechanism for consultation and development of recommendations is lacking, unclear or unreasonably difficult; requests for input and their deadlines are frequently timed for non-academic periods of the year, when faculty participation would be limited. Important information necessary for deliberation is difficult to access. Communication among constituent groups is mostly for the purpose of delivering information about decisions already made.	1. Timelines and processes for decision-making are reasonable and clearly articulated and easily accessible so governance leaders can consult with their constituents before offering recommendations. Communication among constituent groups is not merely an information update or a report on decisions already made.	1. Timelines and processes anticipate upcoming decisions and provide clear means of consultation and reasonable time frames for thoughtful review through established processes prior to the finalization of recommendations; in the face of insufficient time, the constituents consider flexibility in favor of better information and decisions rather than less effective recommendations solely to meet a deadline.

Comments:

Goals:

Category	Criteria	Does not meet	Meets	Exceeds
<i>II. Institutional Communication</i>	2. Constituent bodies as a whole, in addition to governance representatives, has timely access to information necessary for faculty members to give meaningful input into governance processes.	2. Not all constituencies have sufficient time to access and digest information in order to engage meaningfully in the decision-making processes; information is difficult to access or is incomplete.	2. Constituencies have reasonable time to access information necessary to effectively engage in the decision-making processes; information is easily accessible.	2. All constituencies have both reasonable time and can easily access all information pertinent to the decision-making processes; constituencies actively seek the information, thoughtfully process it, and reference such information as they engage in the decision-making processes; requests for further information are honored.

Comments:

Goals:

Category	Criteria	Does not meet	Meets	Exceeds
III. The President's Role in Shared Governance	1. The president accepts, and only on rare occasions overturns, governance decisions and recommendations	1. The president frequently and arbitrarily overturns governance decisions and recommendations; the president bypasses governance decision-making processes; the president does not communicate clearly and in a timely manner, his or her rationale for the rejection of or changes to campus governance decisions or recommendations; the president does not meet regularly with governance leaders or include them in ceremonial events.	1. Campus governance decisions and recommendations arising from established governance processes and structures are taken seriously and respected; with rare exception, the president accepts and implements governance recommendations pertaining to curriculum and academic standards; when necessary, the president provides timely and clearly written rationale for changes to or rejection of such decisions or recommendations; the president regularly meets with governance leaders and includes them in ceremonial events.	1. The president clearly respects the decisions or recommendations arising from established governance processes and procedures and implements governance recommendations pertaining to curriculum and academic standards; when necessary, the president opens a dialogue with governance leaders and affected faculty when he/she has concerns regarding governance recommendations in an attempt to solve problems collaboratively rather than simply reject the recommendations; when necessary, the president communicates in writing and in person the rationale for any changes or rejections of such recommendations; the president encourages engagement in the process and facilitates the resources for governance processes to work effectively and efficiently; governance leaders are a part of the president's cabinet and are included in ceremonial events.

Comments:

Goals:

Category	Criteria	Does not meet	Meets	Exceeds
III. The President's Role in Shared Governance	2. The president seeks meaningful governance input on those issues in which governance has an appropriate interest but perhaps not primary responsibility.	2. Decisions in which faculty have a serious and appropriate interest but not primary responsibility are made without sufficient consultation or input from governance; governance is not sufficiently involved in planning and budgeting, even though these affect achievement of institutional goals and educational priorities; the president does not routinely accept the recommendations of governance, especially regarding curriculum and academic standards; and the president fails to systematically respond to recommendations in writing or in a timely manner.	2. The president regularly and systematically seeks and takes into serious consideration the input of governance on non-academic matters which impact the institution and achievement of its mission as an institution of higher education; mutually agreed upon systematic and transparent shared governance processes are followed in the creation and update of institutional strategic plans and assessments and establishment of budgeting priorities.	2. The president encourages shared governance processes, for budgeting, planning and other institutional areas that are inclusive of all constituencies and that provide clear direction for institutional priorities that help the institution achieve its educational mission and goals. The shared governance processes are systematic, transparent, timely, and are agreed to by all constituencies.

Comments:

Goals:

Category	Criteria	Does not meet	Meets	Exceeds
<p>IV. The Constituencies' Role in Shared Governance</p>	<p>1. Constituencies have access to and participate in governance processes, and understand and value the purpose of shared governance.</p>	<p>1. Governance is discouraged or non-existent; participation is limited by schedule, location or other means of access; governance representatives are not regularly selected by fair and open processes; representatives do not report regularly to or seek input from constituencies; constituencies rarely engage in governance issues and view governance as ineffective; governance regularly fail to protect and promote the principles of academic freedom and the right to participate in shared governance and at times misuse or abuse those rights.</p>	<p>1. Governance representatives are selected by fair and open processes; governance meetings are scheduled to allow for maximum attendance and participation; representatives regularly seek and convey input from constituencies; constituencies engage in conversations concerning issues under consideration by governance; the principles and responsibilities of academic freedom and the right to participate in shared governance are protected and promoted by governance, but not misused or abused; governance has a clear relationship with UFS.</p>	<p>1. Participation in governance is both encouraged and expected; governance representatives are selected by fair and open processes; representation is broad across disciplines; governance meetings are scheduled during specifically designated time blocks to allow for maximum attendance and participation; the governance system includes an established process for representatives to report to and seek input from constituencies; constituencies engage in conversations concerning issues under consideration by governance as well as propose initiatives that would benefit the college and their students rather than only reacting to issues brought to them; the principles and responsibilities of academic freedom and the right to participate in shared governance are protected and promoted by faculty and governance, and a system of checks and balances exists to prevent misuse or abuse of shared governance by an individual or small group of constituencies not responsive to the body of the whole; governance actively engages with the UFS.</p>

Comments:

Goals:

Category	Criteria	Does not meet	Meets	Exceeds
IV. The Constituencies' Role in Shared Governance	2. Governance processes are clear and transparent to all constituencies and include bylaws, committee charges, membership expectations, clearly defined roles, a standard parliamentary rule, and procedures for changes, etc.	2. Constituents are not sufficiently familiar with or have not been informed about governance; bylaws, committee charges and membership, meeting schedules and minutes are not readily accessible or communicated clearly to all constituencies; constituents express confusion over what shared governance is and its value; constituents often do not know their governance leaders or means of communicating with representatives.	2. Constituents are oriented to governance structure and processes; bylaws, committee charges, membership expectations and flow of information are clearly articulated and readily accessible to constituencies.	2. All constituents are familiar with the basic structure and processes of governance; bylaws, committee charges, membership expectations, meeting schedules and locations, and flow of information are clearly articulated and easily accessible to constituents; members are familiar with and respect parliamentary procedure; agendas and minutes of meetings are easily accessible to constituents.

Comments:

Goals:

Category	Criteria	Does not meet	Meets	Exceeds
IV. The Constituencies' Role in Shared Governance <i>Continued</i>	3. Constituents accept their responsibility for appropriate participation in campus governance processes.	3. Constituents are reluctant or unlikely to participate in governance processes; constituents have inadequate means for participation in decision-making.	3. Constituents participate on Governance committees; governance representatives communicate in a timely manner, allowing for due consideration; constituents actively participate in votes on recommendations related to these areas; proposal and approval processes facilitate collaborative and collegial opportunities with administration but are not unduly bureaucratic.	3. Constituents recognize and readily accept their responsibility by active engagement on governance committees; representatives clearly communicate proposals and actively seek input from their constituencies in a timely manner allowing for thoughtful consideration; significant numbers of constituents participate in thoughtful deliberations and votes; proposal and approval processes facilitate collaborative and collegial opportunities with administration but are not unduly bureaucratic.

Comments:

Goals:

Category	Criteria	Does not meet	Meets	Exceeds
<i>IV. The Constituencies' Role in Shared Governance continued</i>	4. The roles between governance and collective bargaining are clearly defined and understood.	4. Confusion exists between the role of governance and the role of collective bargaining; constituents regularly bring issues to the inappropriate body; governance and collective bargaining units regularly do not work collegially or collaboratively; evidence of distrust or disrespect between governance leadership and collective bargaining leadership is too often apparent.	4. Governance engages in decision-making and recommendations on academic and educational matters; collective bargaining units engage in matters of contract and workload.	4. Governance and collective bargaining roles are clear and well respected by each; issues of common interest are addressed appropriately in each venue and collaboratively when necessary; governance leaders and collective bargaining work collaboratively to direct issues to appropriate body; liaison relationships exist between both bodies to perpetuate the sharing of information.

Comments:

Goals:

Category	Criteria	Does not meet	Meets	Exceeds
<i>V. Joint Decision-Making</i>	1. The institution recognizes joint responsibility for decision-making in the area of strategic planning.	1. The administration are not sufficiently consultative or inclusive of governance, in the development and assessment of strategic planning; the planning process is strictly administrative and not necessarily formalized or clearly articulated; programming is not central to strategic planning goals.	1. Given the primacy of the mission of the college as an institution of higher education, strategic planning includes the involvement and input of governance, administration, and student governance; input to strategic planning is provided through a mutually agreed upon formal process developed in collaboration with governance.	1. Given the primacy of the mission of the college, strategic planning includes the involvement and input of governance, administration, and student governance; input to strategic planning is provided through a mutually agreed upon formal process developed in collaboration with governance; mutually agreed upon shared governance processes are implemented in the monitoring, assessing, and revising of the approved plans.

Comments:

Goals:

Category	Criteria	Does not meet	Meets	Exceeds
<i>V. Joint Decision-Making</i>	2. The institution recognizes joint responsibility for the selection and evaluation of the president and senior administrators.	2. Searches for college president and senior administrators do not have broad campus representation, including governance leadership, on search committees; evaluation of college president and senior administrators does not sufficiently include constituents or governance leadership perspectives.	2. Search committees for selection of a college president and senior administrators include member(s) of governance and student governance leadership as well as representatives of all major constituencies on campus; processes for evaluation of college president and senior administrators encourage input from constituents and governance leadership.	2. Search committees for selection of a college president and senior administrators include governance and student governance leadership as well as representatives of all major constituencies on campus; the majority of members are selected from the campus community, with faculty well represented; governance and student governance select their own representatives to serve on search committees; the search process is as clear and transparent as possible, with reasonable opportunities provided for the various constituent groups to meet the final candidates and provide feedback to the search committee which is then seriously considered in the final decision-making processes. Evaluation of college president and senior administrators includes a mutually established process for broad input constituents and campus governance leadership, solicits that input and includes it as an important factor in the overall evaluation, and conveys the results to the appropriate authority.

Comments:

Goals:

Category	Criteria	Does not meet	Meets	Exceeds
V. Joint Decision-Making	3. Structures and processes that allow for governance are clearly defined in governance documents; the governance body is respected and honored by the administration, which includes the body's right to create and modify its own governing documents as needed by following its own clear and transparent processes.	3. Governance documents do not clearly articulate roles, charges, structures and processes for gathering input and advancing recommendations; collaboration among shared governance groups is poorly defined or non-existent; committee members tend to act as individual agents and not as representatives of their defined constituencies, thus undermining shared governance; processes for creating or amending governance documents are unclear and the autonomy of a shared governance body is not sufficiently protected by those documents.	3. Governance documents, particularly the bylaws, contain clearly articulated role definitions, committee charges, and processes for gathering input and advancing recommendations; individuals acting within the shared governance framework collaborate as representatives of their defined constituencies and through committees, not as individual agents; processes for creating or amending governance documents are open and transparent and are determined by the governance body to which the documents apply.	3. Governance documents, particularly the bylaws, contain clearly articulated role definitions, committee charges, and processes for gathering input and advancing recommendations; individuals acting within the shared governance framework collaborate as representatives of their defined constituencies and through committees, not as individual agents; within the clearly defined structures and processes allowing for shared governance are guidelines for committee collaborations, ad hoc committees, and the development of processes and procedures to respond to arising mandates, initiatives, and needs from local, state, and national agencies; processes for creating or amending governance documents are open and transparent and are determined by the governance body to which the documents apply, but are made available to other shared governance bodies for feedback prior to final vote.

Comments:

Goals:

Category	Criteria	Does not meet	Meets	Exceeds
<i>V. Joint Decision-Making</i>	4. Governance structures and processes function in an effective manner.	4. Shared governance committees are confused about their charges and consume excessive time trying to clarify them; processes are either held to unreasonably short deadlines or are excessively long and exhaustive, resulting in either hasty decisions or delayed decisions that render the recommendations moot; recommendations are often dismissed; results of forwarded recommendations are not followed up on or communicated back to committees; committees and their work are not assessed for effectiveness and improvement.	4. Shared governance committees address charges and issues in a timely manner; committee work directly relates to and accomplishes its charge; clearly articulated and committee-vetted recommendations are reasonable, practical and workable; shared governance leadership follows up on the status and success of recommendations and committee work; shared governance leadership regularly assesses charges and effectiveness of committees and processes.	4. As well as addressing charges in a timely way and providing meaningful, useful recommendations, shared governance self-assesses and uses those assessments as a means of ongoing improvement of its structures and processes; shared governance solicits input from its committee leaders and members and its governance bodies for suggestions for improvement; shared governance leadership effectively and efficiently follows through on governance business.

Comments:

Goals:

Category	Criteria	Does not meet	Meets	Exceeds
<i>VI. Structural Arrangements for Governance</i>	1. Governance body meets on a regular basis.	1. No such body exists, or if such body exists, it does not meet with any frequency or regularity.	1. The governance body meets on a regular basis throughout the academic year; meeting dates and times are established by the start of the academic year and communicated to all in an accessible way.	1. The governance body meets on a regular basis throughout the academic year; meeting dates and times are established by the start of the academic year and communicated to all in an accessible way; reminders for upcoming meetings are communicated regularly and in a standard way; agendas and relevant materials are provided well in advance of meetings.

Comments:

Goals:

Category	Criteria	Does not meet	Meets	Exceeds
<i>VI. Structural Arrangements for Governance</i>	2. Constituents determine how their representatives are selected.	2. A clearly articulated process for selection of representatives does not exist, or if it does exist, it is inadequate or not regularly followed; administration or governance leadership hand selects representatives; length of terms and limits are not clear.	2. Governance bylaws include the methods by which representatives are selected, their terms and limits, and the process for replacement, if needed; representation is the purview of the constituency and not of the administration; administration does not interfere in the selection process.	2. Constituents adhere to established methods and processes for selecting governance representatives; constituent engagement results in competitive elections rather than volunteerism for representation; the administration accepts representation as determined by the established processes.

Comments:

Goals: