

The Role of Faculty in Shared Governance

A Report by the Governance Task Force of the Senate

Summary:

Our aim in this report is to advance and contribute to our shared institutional understanding of shared governance; to educate and inform the Senate and faculty about the principles and indicators of a healthy governance system as drawn from the literature and documents; and to make recommendations to the Senate that may lead to an in-depth and broad examination of LMU's governance structures as well as improvement in said structures. We also hope that an understanding of the role that governance plays in the life and well-being of the faculty may provide a thread linking the efforts of other committees and task forces working to address issues of faculty concern, including: rank and tenure, the economic well-being of the faculty, the core curriculum, faculty work load, committee structure, handbook revisions, and campus climate, among others.

This report continues the discussion of the state of faculty participation in University governance that first emerged as an underlying issue in assessments of campus climate and was embodied in the work of the ad hoc Senate committee led by Paul Harris. The current task force was commissioned by the Senate to initiate a review of the state of shared governance at LMU and report back to the Senate. We have reviewed the literature on governance in higher education and taken into account the experience of a range of other colleges and universities.¹ Our conclusion is that there are serious issues involving the faculty's role in governance at LMU on all levels: institutional, college and school, and departmental and there is need for a full and complete audit of governance structures.

This report is shaped by several assumptions:

- Governance is one of the primary ways by which we constitute ourselves as an ethical community of scholars.
- The interdependence and cooperation of the administration, faculty, and governing board are essential to legitimate and effective governance.
- The participation of faculty in the governance of the university is the right and responsibility of a scholarly community.
- A healthy governance structure ensures that the faculty is able to exercise its fundamental role in academic decisions while protecting legitimate faculty aspirations, the implementation and preservation of academic standards, and the promotion of the welfare of the students.
- Consultation with the faculty and mutual approval of agreed-upon goals can only strengthen the administration's and the trustee's leadership.
- A wise administration and board of trustees will cherish faculty participation in governance and work to develop the conditions in which faculty scholarship, teaching, creativity, and service can flourish.
- Shared governance is linked to academic freedom as well as to Jesuit and Catholic identity.
- A healthy governance system will be characterized by accountability, transparency, integrity, collegiality, mutual trust, and good faith. It will be collaborative and

consultative, allowing full participation and joint responsibility throughout the decision making process.

Recommendations:

We recommend the following:

1. That the Senate adopts the principles and characteristics of a healthy shared governance system as a framework for discussing and assessing shared governance at LMU,
2. That the Senate establishes a permanent Governance Committee,
3. That the initial charge of the Governance Committee be to conduct a full governance audit of the faculty role in governance,
4. That the Governance Committee of the Senate would have a continuing mandate to monitor the state of faculty participation in shared governance and develop recommendations for improvement.

The Governance Task Force

Dr. Sue Scheibler, Chair

Dr. Gary Kuleck

Dr. Seth Thompson

10 April 2008

The Role of Faculty in Shared Governance at Loyola Marymount University A Report by the Faculty Senate Governance Task Force

Introduction:

This document presents a framework for evaluating and assessing the health of shared governance at LMU. While shared governance includes the engagement of all constituencies—the Board of Trustees, academic administrators, faculty, staff, and students—our focus here is on the role that the faculty plays in the governance of a university. It is not an attempt to make a statement about the health of governance at LMU but rather to provide a framework for assessment and development.

We acknowledge that a successful governance structure must balance the desire for full collaboration and consultation with the need for efficiency. The system works best when the faculty recognizes the oversight authority of the board, the president, and university administration; the university administration, president and board recognize the primacy of faculty in academic affairs; and all of these constituencies regard shared governance and academic freedom as essential to the health of the institution.

We believe that the time is ripe for an open discussion of shared governance at LMU and academia at large. The corporatization of higher education has seriously impacted the ways that universities have traditionally governed themselves. At the same time, LMU has undergone tremendous growth. We have added a new school, new departments in existing schools, and more faculty members. The organizational structure has changed dramatically, with the addition of new Vice Presidents as well as a Executive Vice President/Provost. The decentralization of authority and the investment of that authority in the Deans has had an impact on governance at the level of schools and colleges as well as departments. This increased complexity has had an impact on the roles that the various constituencies play in the governance of the University as well as on the way that decisions are being made.

Context:

During the 2005-2006 academic year, a campus climate survey was undertaken, due, in great part, to concern over issues of faculty retention, especially of faculty of color and female faculty. The completed report included the finding that “the level of overall faculty satisfaction at LMU is lower than the national average, indicating that faculty dissatisfaction is an important issue facing the University.” In fact, the report concluded that the “additional analysis of these responses by race and gender does, however, point to some issues that are worthy of additional examination and consideration for action.”²

At the same time, an ad hoc committee of the Faculty Senate conducted a series of faculty forums and conversations in order to determine and clarify perceptions among faculty members about their role in governance at LMU. Over the course of the year, it became clear that there was real concern among faculty that their role in governance was seriously diminished. Faculty attending the forums expressed their belief that the governance structure on all levels lacked transparency, openness, accountability, real communication, negotiation, and an atmosphere of mutual trust. Many faculty expressed concern over the lack of consultation by the administration with faculty, especially with respect to those areas having

to do with faculty responsibility. A great number of faculty members, including many among the junior faculty, noted that they did not feel that they could raise dissenting views or opinions without fear of reprisal. This perception was especially strong among female faculty and faculty of color. In light of these conversations, the committee, chaired by Paul Harris, came to the conclusion that, while the administrative structure at LMU has changed dramatically in the past five years, the long standing tradition and practice of shared governance has not always been maintained.

Since the release of the results of the campus climate survey, the Administration has taken several steps to identify, clarify, and begin to address these serious issues. These steps have included an Academic Leadership Workshop devoted to the theme of “Building a Shared Vision of Academic Excellence at LMU” (Spring 2007); the CAO’s Open Forum and report on the workshop; the formation of the Faculty Workload Task Force; the appointment of a Special Assistant to the CAO to review the current Rank and Tenure process as well as mentoring and orientation; the formation of a University Housing Committee as well as of a Course Evaluation Subcommittee; and the report “Creating a Climate Where LMU Faculty Can Thrive: A Synthesis based on studies concerning faculty of color and women faculty, 2001-2006.”

The Faculty Senate and its leadership have also made great effort to amplify the voice of the faculty. Recent Senate agendas have focused on a series of critical issues: Faculty Handbook revisions; examination and evaluation of the Committee structure; review of Deans and the CAO; review of rank and tenure procedures, survey of senate effectiveness, and faculty work load, all of which have important implications for the faculty’s role in shared governance. In fact, it is our view as a task force that an understanding of and commitment to the principles of shared governance should be an explicit consideration in all these efforts. In light of our reflection on these reports as well as conversations that have taken place in the Senate, it is the feeling of this task force that the time has come for a comprehensive assessment of the faculty’s role in shared governance at LMU.

Definition of Shared Governance:

The concept of shared governance is embedded in academia in the United States and supported by all key associations of higher learning, including the American Association of University Professors (AAUP), the Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges (AGB) and the American Council on Education (ACE). Shared governance in academia is a principle adopted by most major universities in the United States, including Jesuit institutions of higher education, and a long standing tradition at LMU. A healthy governance structure provides the procedures through which the faculty, administration, and governing board can communicate with each other about the issues and decisions facing the university before decisions are made. As such it is collaborative, consultative, and collegial. It also ensures that the university is able to benefit not only from the accumulated wisdom and knowledge of its faculty but also from the multiple viewpoints and voices that a truly diverse scholarly community can offer. Because a healthy and truly shared governance structure provides a vehicle for the involvement and participation of all stakeholders in the decision making process, it guarantees that diversity is given real weight and taken seriously by all.

When governance is shared, the decision making process and the setting of university-wide goals is collaborative and collegial, allowing for input from the board, administration, faculty,

staff, and students. Grounded in transparency, accountability, integrity, mutual trust, and good faith, it is enabled by clear communication at all points in the decision making process and is built on a system of dialogue across the university. Because faculty are seen and allowed to act as partners, not just advisors, their advice is given full consideration by the administration. Truly collaborative, the decision-making process allows time for ample discussion and substantive consultation before decisions are made.

Principles of Shared Governance:

1) Strengthens academic excellence and Catholic/Jesuit identity: Shared governance strengthens academic excellence and the Catholic and Jesuit identity of the University in a mutually reinforcing way. As Edward Glynn, SJ, states “shared governance actively promoted in integral to the successful achievement of institutional mission. The process of promoting and implementing shared governance encourages the shared conversation necessary for successfully achieving a shared institutional self-understanding of what, how, and why we do what we do and increases our shared responsibility for institutional actions and their consequences. Individuals shape institutions. We are each responsible for the institution we shape by our action and inaction. We all necessarily live with the successful and unsuccessful institutional consequences.”

Roger Fortin also argues that “...shared governance is not only wise but a necessary investment in the future success of the institution. It is essential for three reasons: (1) to help maintain the moral legitimacy and core values of the institution as a Catholic and Jesuit University; (2) to help sustain and nurture the University’s academic culture; and (3) to promote greater effectiveness in the management of the institution. In my judgment, without full fledged shared governance the university in the long run will be putting its identity as a Catholic and Jesuit university at risk...when governance is less shared, especially with the faculty, the institution becomes less academic and the moral legitimacy and core values of the institution are in jeopardy.”

2) Defined by an atmosphere of good faith and mutual trust: Communication, collaboration, and negotiations between and among the faculty, university administration (including chairs and deans), president, and board of trustees are carried out in good faith and in an atmosphere of mutual trust founded on the conviction that the university can flourish only if there is a healthy sense of community in which all members have a role in working for the common good.

3) Establishes a decision making process that is open, accessible, and understandable to all: All constituents recognize that there are domains of primary authority and responsibility and that each domain may require a different approach to decision-making in order to be efficient, effective, and productive. Even so, good practices in governance ensure that decision-making is open, accessible, and understandable to all members of the community.

4) Depends on a decision making process that involves multiple stakeholders: Decisions affecting multiple stakeholders are made collegially, following extensive and elaborate review of numerous ideas, proposals, and demands that, at all times, involve multiple stakeholders. The involvement of multiple stakeholders provides more eyes, ears,

wisdom, and diverse viewpoints; promotes shared responsibility and shared accountability; and strengthens community as all stakeholders feel involved and valued.

5) Guided by policy documents: The university community looks to policy documents and reports of appropriate national professional organizations for guidance in the governance of the university. The structures of governance foster innovation and change in a climate in which all participants strive for continuous improvement.

6) Linked to academic freedom: In the spirit of academic freedom, the university community values free inquiry, diverse opinion and practices, schools of thought and perspectives in practice, not just in principle. All faculty members are encouraged to participate in leadership roles, without fear of reprisal. All stakeholders agree that academic freedom and shared governance are essential to the health of the institution and to the institution's identity as a Catholic and Jesuit university dedicated to compassionate leadership and social justice.

7) Characterized by the attitude that speed is not always an asset: While faculty involvement in decision making is often perceived as either slowing down the process or making governance too unwieldy, speed in decisions is not always an asset. Faculty involvement in decision making on all levels can assure more thorough discussion and sharper focus on the mission and direction of the institution than may occur when faculty are not allowed to participate in a substantive and meaningful manner.

8) Dedicated to transparency, openness, and accountability: Transparency, openness, and accountability are central to a healthy governance structure. Governance is strengthened by a complete information sharing mechanism that enables reliable and timely information sharing. This mechanism allows for the sharing of two kinds of information: (1) information prior to decisions being made in order to provide for a fully informed and actively engaged community; and (2) information after decisions are made. An attitude of openness on the part of all participants means that everyone engaged in the conversation is open to other views and is open to having one's own views changed through thoughtful engagement with the viewpoints of others. Accountability is ensured through a process of evaluation and assessment, including the evaluation of deans and chairs on a regular basis and through a transparent and open system.

An informed community is one with an increased sense of engagement and involvement. In order to ensure full participation, communication must go beyond information to include interaction; that is, it must be dialogic. Feedback is solicited and opinions and diverse points of view are valued, as are dissent and discussion. Open and transparent communication depends on the creation of a safe environment. People feel free to engage in open and honest debate and discussion without fear of reprisal.

9) Dedicated to the importance of evaluation and assessment: Evaluation is an essential component of the process of change and an essential ingredient in restoring trust in academic planning, decision making, and management. Trust must be earned and can only be achieved in a context of diffused authority and responsibility that accompanies shared governance.

10) Embodied by an effective senate: A strong and effective faculty senate serves as a forum for developing consensus across faculties, disciplines, Schools and colleges as well as one in which faculty can express concerns about the institution. It becomes, through its deliberations and records, an institutional memory of actions. A healthy senate provides the administration and board of trustees with reliable and trustworthy knowledge of the faculty's stance on vital questions and is a mechanism for formal interaction on critical issues.

The senate helps faculty develop positions on critical issues and keeps the larger community informed of these positions. In the process, it enables faculty and administration (on the level of departments, schools and colleges, as well as the institution as a whole) to develop productive personal working relationships that are vital to the health of the institution. A functioning senate encourages effective decision making at all levels, even as it allows for progress in manageable pieces. The senate looks for the development of campus leadership, and provides a perfect place to cultivate faculty leaders.

At its foundation, the senate is the gatekeeper of ideas, the defender and integrator of academic values, a monitor and watchdog of change, and one of the providers of checks and balances in the governance of the university. It is the formal body from which oversight of those areas defined as areas of faculty responsibility is discharged, either as a combined body, through its executive board, and/or through its standing committees.

11) Embodied by a committee structure that reflects faculty areas of responsibility:

The faculty sets agendas, chooses representatives and leadership, and establishes procedures for committees that oversee the areas in which the faculty has primacy. It routinely assesses the effectiveness of academic committees, evaluates shared governance and institutional practices, recommends necessary changes, and shares in institutional decisions that affect academic life. Moreover, the faculty participates in the establishment of standards and procedures for evaluating academic administrators.

AAUP Characteristics of a Healthy Shared Governance Structure:

- The trustees, administration, and the faculty model collegiality, respect, tolerance, and civility towards other members of the campus community and each other.
- Relationships between the faculty, academic administrators, and governing board are cooperative.
- The institution fosters shared governance by maintaining reasonable workloads, supporting faculty development of governance skills, and rewarding participation in governance work (for example by giving weight to service when considering merit evaluations as well as tenure and promotions).
- The campus climate fosters participation and leadership by women, persons of color, and members of other underrepresented groups.
- Negotiations and communications among university constituents are open and carried out in good faith and in an atmosphere of trust.
- The institution recognizes joint responsibility for decision making in the area of long range planning, existing or prospective physical resources, and budgeting.
- The governing board and administrators (president, provost, chief academic officer, vice presidents, and deans) verbally acknowledges the importance of shared governance.

- Faculty members view participation in shared governance as a worthwhile faculty responsibility.
- The campus climate supports a diversity of opinions, schools of thought, perspectives, and personal styles, and faculty members can express dissenting views on governance without reprisal or fear of reprisal.
- Structures, policies, and procedures for disciplinary and dismissal hearings, grievance, appeals, and allegations of sexual harassment are consistent with the AAUP standards of due process.
- The structures and processes that allow for faculty collaboration are clearly defined in the governance documents (faculty handbook, by-laws of Schools and Colleges, etc).
- The faculty is given reasonable time to provide input and make recommendations regarding institutional practices.
- The president and governing board avoid overturning faculty judgment in those areas in which the faculty has primacy (i.e. curriculum, subject matter and methods of instruction, research, faculty status, and those aspects of student life that relate to the educational process).
- The faculty periodically reviews and, when appropriate, proposes changes to the faculty handbook, senate by-laws, and similar documents.
- Formal arrangements exist for regularly and accurately communicating faculty positions and concerns to the governing board, and for regularly and accurately communicating the views of the governing board to the faculty.
- The president and the board use established mechanisms to ensure a faculty voice in matters of shared concern, consulting either the faculty as a whole or representatives who have been selected or approved by the faculty.
- Faculty members who represent the faculty on the governing board, institutional committees, and advisory groups are selected from a list provided by the faculty.
- The faculty has an influential role in developing the institutional budget.
- The faculty shares with the governing board the primary responsibility for selecting a president.
- Faculty participation influences the evaluation of academic administrators.
- The governing board responds expeditiously to faculty concerns and the need for action on institutional issues.
- Faculty committees largely determine policies and decisions concerning those aspects of student life that relate to the educational process.
- Faculty committees determine educational policy, curriculum design, curriculum review, and standards and procedures for evaluating teaching and scholarly production as well as standards and criteria for retention, promotions, and tenure.
- The representation of faculty on joint committees appropriately reflects the degree of the faculty's stake in the issue or area the committee is charged with addressing.
- Recommendations of faculty committees largely determine the nature of decisions regarding the faculty status of individuals.
- The faculty sets agendas, chooses representatives and leadership, and establishes procedures for committees that oversee those areas in which the faculty has primacy.

- The faculty as a whole has had an opportunity to meet and comment on “short-listed” academic administrative candidates before hiring decisions are made.
- The faculty determines criteria and procedures for conferring faculty status on administrators, librarians, coaches and other professionals.
- Since they may administratively overrun or override decisions and judgments of the faculty, academic officers do not have votes on faculty committees and legislative bodies.
- Faculty members have timely access to the information they need to make informed decisions or recommendations on institutional matters.
- Faculty representatives to institutional committees, advisory boards, and the governing board have adequate time to consult with their constituencies before voting or making recommendations on important issues.
- The faculty has a voice regarding the nature and goals of relationships with outside entities such as accrediting bodies, athletic conferences, etc.
- The faculty’s participation in governance can improve and has improved working conditions for the faculty.
- The faculty has a strong influence on the selection of academic administrators.

Appendix 1: AAUP Statement on Government of Colleges and Universities: The Faculty

The faculty has primary responsibility for such fundamental areas as curriculum, subject matter and methods of instruction, research, faculty status, and those aspects of student life which relate to the educational process. On these matters the power of review or final decision lodged in the governing board or delegated by it to the president should be exercised adversely only in exceptional circumstances, and for reasons communicated to the faculty. It is desirable that the faculty should, following such communication, have opportunity for further consideration and further transmittal of its views to the president or board. Budgets, personnel limitations, the time element, and the policies of other groups, bodies and agencies having jurisdiction over the institution may set limits to realization of faculty advice.

The faculty sets the requirements for the degrees offered in course, determines when the requirements have been met, and authorizes the president and the board to grant the degrees thus achieved.

Faculty status and related matters are primarily a faculty responsibility; this area includes appointments, reappointments, decisions not to reappoint, promotions, the granting of tenure, and dismissal. The primary responsibility of the faculty for such matters is based upon the fact that its judgment is central to general educational policy. Furthermore, scholars in a particular field or activity have the chief competence for judging the work of their colleagues; in such competence it is implicit that responsibility exists for both adverse and favorable judgments. Likewise, there is the more general competence of experienced faculty personnel committees having a broader charge. Determinations in these matters should first be by faculty action through established procedures, reviewed by the academic chief officers with the concurrence of the board. The governing board and president should, on questions of faculty status, as in other matters where the faculty has primary responsibility, concur with

the faculty judgment except in rare instances and for compelling reasons which should be stated in detail.

The faculty should actively participate in the determination of policies and procedures governing salary increases.

The chair or head of a department, who serves as the chief representative of the department within an institution, should be selected either by departmental election or by appointment following consultation with members of the department and related departments; appointments should normally be in conformity with department members' judgment. The chair or department head should not have tenure in office; tenure as a faculty member is a separate right. The chair or head should serve for a stated term but without prejudice to reelection or to reappointment by procedures which involve appropriate faculty consultation. Board, administration, and faculty should all bear in mind that the department chair or head has a special obligation to build a department strong in scholarship and teaching capacity.

Agencies for faculty participation in the government of the college or university should be established at each level where faculty responsibility is present. An agency should exist for the presentation of the views of the whole faculty. The structure and procedures for faculty participation should be designed, approved, and established by joint action of the components of the institution. Faculty representatives should be selected by the faculty according to procedures determined by the faculty.

In sum, areas of faculty responsibility include:

- Reviews and approves new curriculum
- Reviews and approves proposals for creating or disestablishing all new and existing academic programs, departments, schools, and other units served by the faculty
- Participates in all decisions pertaining to academic resource allocation, including the determination of faculty salaries and benefits
- Participates in the recruitment and selection of academic senior administrative officers
- Approves all policies pertaining to faculty workload, working conditions, academic appointments, and the award of tenure
- Participates in the preparation and approval of comprehensive and long-range plans for the university
- Works with the administration to resolve faculty grievances and complaints, and to ensure openness, full participation, and equity across the University community
- Establishes principles, works to implement them, and regularly reviews them to make sure the system remains healthy

Appendix 2: Shared Governance and Academic Freedom

According to the AAUP's 1994 statement "On the Relationship of Faculty Governance to Academic Freedom," shared governance and academic freedom have always been "inextricably linked" and "reinforce one another." In the spirit of academic freedom, the

university community values free inquiry, diverse opinions and practices, schools of thought and perspectives in practice, not just in principle. In fact, diverse opinions and perspectives are sought out and cultivated in order to ensure the most thoughtful approach to making decisions. Academic freedom ensures that faculty can speak freely regarding their institution's affairs and policies. It can be argued, therefore, that "academic shared governance, in tandem with academic tenure, is an essential institutional pillar of academic freedom." (Loyola Chicago AAUP Chapter Statement on Shared Governance)

At the same time, communication, collaboration and negotiations between and among all the constituencies are carried out in good faith and in an atmosphere of mutual trust. All faculty members are encouraged to participate in the life of the university and are free to express dissenting views without reprisal or fear of reprisal. A system of checks and balance as institutionalized in the faculty handbook and other governing documents ensures this. A culture of evidence by which administrators are evaluated on a regular basis in a clear and transparent manner provides a framework of accountability that enables all participants to continually assess the health and well-being of governance structures and procedures across departments, Schools and Colleges, and the institution as a whole.

Appendix 3: Joint Statement of the AAUP, ACE, and AGB on Areas of Joint Effort:

In the joint statement by the key associations of higher education, key areas where joint effort (of the governing board, administration, and faculty) is necessary **prior** to final decisions being made in academia are delineated:

- 1) Faculty consultation is needed on "*such matters as major changes in the size or composition of the student body and the relative emphasis given to various elements of the educational and research program*";
- 2) Since "*the framing and execution of long-range plans, one of the most important aspects of institutional responsibility should be a central and continuing concern in the academic community*" it "*demands that the broadest possible exchange of information and opinion should be the rule for communication among the components of a college or university*";
- 3) "*A second area calling for joint effort in internal operation is that of decisions regarding existing or prospective physical resources. The board, president, and faculty should all seek agreement on basic decisions regarding buildings and other facilities to be used in the educational work of the institution.*"
- 4) "*The allocation of resources among competing demands is central in the formal responsibility of the governing board, in the administrative authority of the president, and in the educational function of the faculty. Each component should therefore have a voice in the determination of short-and long-range priorities, and each should receive appropriate analyses of past budgetary experience, reports on current budgets and expenditures, and short- and long-range budgetary projections. The function of each component in budgetary matters should be understood by all; the allocation authority will determine the flow of information and the scope of participation in decisions.*"
- 5) "*Joint effort of a most critical kind must be taken when an institution chooses a new president.*"

Resources:

The Policymaking Function of the Faculty Senate in a Comprehensive Liberal Arts University: A Case Study, Emil A. Ricci, 2001
<http://www/newfoundations.com/Policy/Ricci.html>

A Statement on Shared Governance and Faculty Senate in Academia,
<http://www.drexel.edu>

Loyola University Chicago Shared Governance, <http://www.luc.edu/sharedgovernance>

Loyola University AAUP Chapter Statement on Shared Governance,
<http://www.luc.edu/sharedgovernance>

Santa Clara University Governance, <http://www.scu.edu/governance/comittees/policy.cfm>

University of Detroit/Mercy Shared Governance,
<http://www.udmercy.edu/governance/index.html>

University of Scranton Statement of Governance Principles,
<http://academic.scranton.edu/department/pairo/governance-documents/Governance-Principles.doc>.

Organization and Procedures of the University Faculty, <http://web.cornell.edu/UniversityFaculty/gove/OPUR.html>

Shared Governance Memorandum of Understanding, The University of Arizona,
<http://fp.arizona.edu/senate/Shared%20Governance%20MOU%204-4-05.html>

Principles of Faculty Involvement in Institutional and Academic Unit Governance at the University of Michigan, <http://www.umich.edu/~sacua/AcadAff/aaacdoc.html>

Shared Governance prevails at Santa Clara University, Johnson, Hans P., May/June 2000,
<http://www.findarticles.com>

AAUP Statement on Government of Colleges and Universities,
<http://www.aaup.org/AAUP/pubsres/policydocs/governancestatement.htm?PF=1>

AAUP Introduction to “Indicators of Sound Governance”;
<http://www.aaup.org/AAUP/issues/governance/ramntro.htm?PF=1>

Results from the Loyola Marymount University *Speak Up, Speak Out* Survey, Eric L. Dey

CAO Open Forum, Thursday October 11, 2007, “Academic Leadership Workshop Follow-up”

Creating a Climate Where LMU Faculty Can Thrive: a synthesis based on studies concerning faculty of color and women faculty, 2001-2006, A report commissioned by CAO E. Rose,

Fall 2007, Margaret Kasimatis, PhD, Office of Institutional Effectiveness and Jennifer Abe-Kim, PhD, Bellarmine College of Liberal Arts

The following articles for *Conversations on Jesuit Higher Education*, Fall 2005, Number 28

“From the President’s Chair,” Edward Glynn, SJ

“Sharing Governance at Xavier,” Roger Fortrin

“Collegiate, Collaborative, or Consultative Governance: How Do We Get There From Here?” Richard T. Ingram

“Building a Culture of Trust at Santa Clara

“A Firewall but Not a Conflict,” Carol Weisfeld

“In Shared Governance, What Role for the AAUP?” Robert Moore, Jr.

“Shared Governance: The Elusive Role of Jesuits as Trustees,” Kevin P. Quinn, SJ

¹ This document examines the definition and purpose of shared governance as established by the vast literature available, including policy papers by national associations such as the American Association of University Professors, the Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges, and the American Council on Education as well as statements on governance by a variety of Jesuit Universities, including Xavier, Santa Clara, Gonzaga, Loyola Chicago, John Carroll, and Detroit Mercy

² The report states “As was seen in the overall comparative analysis, LMU faculty were the least satisfied overall which is not particularly surprising given the critical nature and analytical acumen of many college faculty. The additional analyses of these responses by race and gender does, however, point to some issues that are worthy of additional examination and consideration for action. If we examine the level of agreement amongst the faculty respondents toward questions about LMU as an organization, we see the lowest f ratings associated with issues related to communication and accountability. Only one in five faculty members agreed strongly or somewhat that there were clearly defined areas of accountability for decisions within the institution. Only about one-third of the faculty agreed with four separate items on communication performances at LMU, while less than one-half believed that diverse viewpoints were being sought out and valued, with substantial gender differences existing (56.1 percent of the men compared to 29.6 percent of the women). Nonetheless, nearly all respondents indicated support for helping LMU succeed.” *Speak up, Speak out*, pg. 16