

Shared Governance Task Force Report to the Faculty Senate

Final – 5/27/2011

Revised – 8/31/2011

Endorsed by the Faculty Senate – 10/13/2011

Executive Summary

Initial Charge

In February 2009, Paul Doescher, then Faculty Senate President, and Sabah Randhawa, Provost and Executive Vice President, invited a group of faculty and administrators to participate on the Joint Task Force on Shared Governance (or SGTF, for Shared Governance Task Force). SGTF members include:

Lynda Ciuffetti, Professor, Botany and Plant Pathology, Past President, Faculty Senate (Chair)

Becky Warner, Senior Vice Provost for Academic Affairs (Co-chair)

Dan Arp, Dean, University Honors College

Roger Hammer, Associate Professor, Sociology

Goran Jovanovic, Professor, Chemical, Biological and Environmental Engineering

Michael Oriard, Associate Dean, College of Liberal Arts

Sheryl Thorburn, Associate Professor, Public Health

Meg Reeves, General Counsel, Ex-Officio

The fundamental charge of the Joint Task Force was to review and recommend policies and actions that will enhance the effectiveness of shared governance at all levels of the University. Specifically, while shared governance includes other groups such as students and staff, the Task Force was charged with examining shared governance between faculty and administrators. Among the items to be considered by the Task Force were:

- a value statement on shared governance that articulates the University's commitment to shared governance,
- guiding policies and procedures that demonstrate commitment to shared governance,
- recommendations on improving shared governance practices at OSU,
- recommendations for a process to periodically assess and ensure the effectiveness of shared governance practice across the University.

SECTION 1: Guiding Policies and Procedures

The scope and content of shared-governance practices at OSU are constrained by Oregon Administrative Rules and OUS regulations. Most of the rules and regulations are embedded in the Faculty Senate and its bylaws.

SECTION 2: Faculty Input

To identify issues of concern to faculty, the Task Force solicited their input, through a secure webpage, for improving, enhancing, and/or expanding shared governance at all levels of the

university. The major areas of concern identified in the input received from faculty include (but were not limited to):

- the failure of shared governance, especially the failure of administrators, after receiving input from faculty, to communicate with the faculty their weighing of this faculty input and their reasons for the ultimate decision (“full-cycle governance”);
- the failure of many faculty to be involved in shared governance, due to perceived lack of impact and the absence of rewards for “service”;
- the failure of the Faculty Senate, in its composition by both professorial and professional faculty, to represent faculty views adequately;
- the lack of shared governance in particular areas, chiefly budgeting, structural change (reorganization/realignment), and administrative appointments (especially of department heads/chairs).

SECTION 3 Definition of Shared Governance

Shared governance is the process by which faculty and administrators share responsibility and accountability for reaching decisions on policy and procedure. These decisions include matters of institutional planning; academic programs; curriculum and academic regulations; faculty and administrative hiring; university, college, and unit spending priorities; faculty compensation and advancement; administrative appointments and reappointments; and others that affect the success of the institution in fulfilling its missions. **As noted in the Faculty Senate Bylaws Article II, Section II, the Faculty Senate has “legislative responsibility with respect to academic policies, educational standards, curricula, and academic regulations.”**

Shared governance requires that administrators seek faculty input in these matters, weigh that input carefully, and report back to the faculty on the reasons for arriving at the final decisions. For faculty, shared governance requires careful consideration of the issue, reaching decision on the process in which faculty input will be made, reaching decision on the content and form of the input, communication of input through the channels made available, and attention to the communication from administrators regarding the final decision. The immediate goal of shared governance is to reach agreement on matters vital to the institution and its citizens, or, where disagreements remain, to assure those on the dissenting side that their views were heard and fully considered. The long-term goal of shared governance is to create a university community based on open communication, accountability, and mutual respect, for the sake of best advancing the institution’s missions. Shared governance should permeate the campus, reaching into all levels of decision-making.

Basic Principles of Shared Governance at Oregon State University

1. Administrators and faculty share responsibility and accountability in all steps of the process of reaching decisions on policy and procedure.
2. Shared governance requires broad participation from both faculty and administrators.
3. Shared governance requires a “full-cycle” approach in soliciting/formulating and making decisions on policy and procedure. For administrators, a full-cycle approach requires soliciting faculty input, weighing that input, arriving at decisions, and reporting back to the faculty on the rationale for those decisions. For faculty (in matters where faculty do not make final decision), a full-cycle approach requires decision on process, form, and content

of faculty input, and then requires effective communication between administrators and faculty.

4. Shared governance should be practiced wherever possible in institutional decision-making, including, but not limited to:
 - i. Planning and organization;
 - ii. Academic programs, curriculum, and academic regulations;
 - iii. Spending priorities;
 - iv. Faculty compensation and advancement;
 - v. Administrative appointments and faculty hiring.
5. Shared governance in all of these areas should inform decision-making at all levels: the *institutional, college, and unit* levels.

SECTION 4 Current practices and procedures for decision-making at OSU, with recommendations for improvement

Weighing these and concerns of its own members in a series of meetings, the Task Force identified a set of the most important areas of decision-making that require the input of faculty and administration. The Task Force offers the following recommendations.

A. Institutional Planning

Recommendation: Any committee/task force formed by the president and/or provost to help guide institutional planning should have at least 20% of its membership appointed by the Faculty Senate Executive Committee.

Recommendation: The recommendations of these groups' work should be presented to the Faculty Senate for discussion, input, and endorsement prior to final decisions.

B. Faculty Senate Governance

Recommendation: The principle of "full-cycle" governance should guide administrators' interactions with the faculty in general and the Faculty Senate in particular. That is, administrators should solicit faculty input, weigh that input, arrive at decisions, and report back to the faculty on the rationale for those decisions.

Recommendations: For more effective input from the Faculty Senate in institutional decision-making:

- i. Reports to the Faculty Senate, including those by the Faculty Senate committees, should be substantive (i.e. specific actions and/or recommendations), and these items should be brought to discussion and vote on the floor of the Senate.
- ii. Faculty, through the Senate, should provide more collective feedback to the President/Provost/ Deans after discussion of items on the Faculty Senate Agenda. Mechanisms should be developed that will provide more meaningful input such that "the sense of the Senate" is obtained and shared with the administration.

Recommendations: Increased participation of academic faculty in the Faculty Senate and its committees is recommended. Mechanisms for doing so include increasing the importance and value of service in P&T policies, periodic reviews, administrative (re)appointments, and merit-based salary increases.

- i. The University must value participation in the workings of the Faculty Senate. All administrative position descriptions should include a statement related to the value of and requirement to foster faculty participation in Faculty Senate and university committees.
- ii. Due to the importance and value of service in Faculty Senate and university committees, administrators should review and enforce the requirements of such service in the current promotion and tenure policies.
- iii. Annually, the Faculty Senate should work with Institutional Research to produce a summary of the composition of the Faculty Senate and its committees by apportionment unit, faculty status, and rank to be posted on the Faculty Senate website.

Recommendation: The Faculty Senate Executive Committee and the Administration should have discussions to determine if the current structure of the Faculty Senate serves adequately and equally well the interests of both academic (teaching, research, extension, and clinical) and professional faculty. A separate task force and/or ad hoc committee to review the current structure should be appointed.

C. University, College, and Unit Spending Priorities

Recommendation: Committees or task forces formed by the president and provost to help guide budget allocation and planning should have at least 20% of its membership appointed by the Faculty Senate Executive Committee.

Recommendation: The president and provost should bring to the Faculty Senate, for discussion and input, budget priorities for the University prior to implementation.

Recommendation: Each college and unit should have a transparent budget allocation process that is developed through consultation by the dean/department chair or head with the faculty.

D. Faculty Compensation and Advancement

Recommendation: The president and provost should bring to the Faculty Senate, for discussion and input, any plans for salary/benefit adjustments.

Recommendation: Each college and unit should have a transparent process for salary adjustments developed through consultation by the dean/department chair or head with the faculty.

E. Administrative Appointments

Recommendation: There should be a broad commitment by both the administration and Faculty Senate to follow the Standing Rules of the Administrative Appointments Committee.

Recommendation: All units and colleges should have written policies, agreed upon by faculty and administrators, that define the process by which faculty can provide input on the qualification of candidates and the performance of the current administrator, without concern for negative repercussions for themselves. Faculty representatives should be included on all search committees for administrative appointments. Faculty should have meaningful input into decisions about the appointment and reappointment of academic

administrators, and their input should be listened to and valued. The policies should specify direct or indirect, individual or collective, input as appropriate.

Recommendation: Units should have written policies, agreed upon by faculty, that describe processes for including faculty at all stages of the hiring process, including the identification of hiring priorities, the development of position descriptions, the selection of search committee members, and the evaluation of candidates. The majority of search committee members should be faculty from the academic unit(s) for which the position is affiliated. In units where faculty do not vote on hiring decisions, search committees should make recommendations for hiring, in addition to evaluating candidates' strengths and weaknesses. Policies should specify direct or indirect, individual or collective, input as appropriate.

SECTION 5 Review and Assessment

Shared governance is the process by which faculty and administrators share responsibility and accountability for reaching decisions on policy and procedure. A basic principle of shared governance is that it requires a "full-cycle" approach to assess its effectiveness in reaching such decisions.

Recommendation: The Faculty Senate should assess changes made as a result of this report in the next 2-3 years. Periodic climate surveys of faculty, conducted through Institutional Research, should be part of this assessment.

FULL TEXT OF THE REPORT

INTRODUCTION

Initial Charge

In late February 2009, Paul Doescher, then Faculty Senate President, and Sabah Randhawa, Provost and Executive Vice President, invited a group of faculty and administrators to participate on the Joint Task Force on Shared Governance. The fundamental charge of the Joint Task Force was:

To review and recommend policies and actions that will enhance the effectiveness of shared governance at all levels of the University.

Among the items to be considered by the Task Force were:

- A value statement on shared governance that articulates the University's commitment to shared governance.
- Guiding policies and procedures that demonstrate commitment to shared governance.
- Examples of best practices of shared governance.
- Recommendations on improving shared governance practices at OSU.
- Process to periodically assess and insure the effectiveness of shared governance practice across the University.

As part of the charge, Doescher and Randhawa stated:

Shared governance is a principle that is valued as critical to the mission and operation of Oregon State University. Currently, the Faculty Senate at OSU interacts closely with upper levels of University administration in institutional matters, such as academic planning and budget and policy review, and on matters that more directly impact faculty responsibilities and development, including curriculum development and promotion and tenure policies and practice.

The implementation of shared governance, however, is a "process" that must encompass all levels of the organization. Like any distributed process, the practice of shared governance can lack consistency across the University and every effort should be made to promote its effectiveness and consistency. The principle of shared governance is important to promoting wise and careful decision making. The need to strengthen shared governance at OSU is heightened by an uncertain future where issues surrounding budget reductions and changing societal needs may require significant changes to the direction and structure of the institution.

The basic goals of the Joint Task Force on Shared Governance are to further the principles of shared governance and promote the involvement of faculty in institutional decision making.

Note of clarification: Although the committee's original impression was that the charge of the group centered on faculty involvement in shared governance, it was not explicitly stated in the original charge. The SGTF requested clarification from the Provost, President and Past-President of the Faculty Senate, and they agreed the intent was that this group focus on faculty involvement.

Task force members included:

Lynda Ciuffetti, Professor, Botany and Plant Pathology, Past President, Faculty Senate (Chair)

Becky Warner, Senior Vice Provost for Academic Affairs (Co-chair)

Dan Arp, Dean, University Honors College

Roger Hammer, Associate Professor, Sociology

Goran Jovanovic, Professor, Chemical, Biological and Environmental Engineering

Michael Oriard, Associate Dean, College of Liberal Arts

Sheryl Thorburn, Associate Professor, Public Health

Meg Reeves, General Counsel, Ex-Officio

The SGTF had its first meetings in Spring 2009. Because issues regarding the university budget were demanding the attention and time of several SGTF members, the decision was made to postpone further SGTF activities until the following academic year. The SGTF was reconvened in January 2010 and met regularly from that point until May 2011.

In the following sections of this report, we summarize the steps the SGTF took to perform its charge of reviewing and recommending policies and actions that will enhance the effectiveness of shared governance at all levels of the University. We also define principles of shared governance, identify best practices and procedures, present a definition of shared governance, and make recommendations. More specifically, [Section 1](#) presents information regarding the guiding policies and procedures. [Section 2](#) describes how the SGTF solicited input from faculty, summarizes that input, and presents the major questions that guided the SGTF's work. [Section 3](#) presents the SGTF's definition and principles of Shared Governance. [Section 4](#) summarizes current practices and procedures for decision-making related to five areas (institutional planning, faculty senate governance, spending priorities, faculty compensation and advancement, and administrative appointments and faculty hiring). When available, best practices related to each area are noted. Recommendations are also offered for improving shared governance in each area. Finally a recommendation for periodic review and assessment of shared governance at OSU is presented in [Section 5](#).

SECTION 1 *Guiding Policies and Procedures*

Prior to looking at the policies and procedures, the SGTF determined the existing framework of authority for governance of the institution, manifested through state laws (statutes and administrative rules), policies of the Oregon State Board of Higher Education (OSBHE), policies of the University, and bylaws of the Faculty Senate. Under this framework the legislature, Board, University administration and faculty all play a role in the governance of the institution.

The Legislature has given the OSBHE comprehensive authority with respect to the institutions of the state system of higher education. Oregon Revised Statutes (ORS) Chapter 351, at <http://www.leg.state.or.us/ors/351.html>; and ORS Chapter 352, at <http://www.leg.state.or.us/ors/352.html>. Summarized broadly, the Board's authority includes controlling virtually all aspects of real and personal property purchased, sold or used by the institution; establishing and managing a personnel system for the institutions; prescribing tuition and fees; supervising the general course of instruction and the research, extension, educational and other activities of the institutions; and adopting rules and bylaws for the government of the institutions, including the faculty, teachers, students and employees therein. The Board is authorized to, and does, delegate some of these responsibilities to institution presidents ORS 351.060.

Institutional presidents are also conferred authority by the legislature. Under state law the president is the president of the faculty, as well as the executive and governing officer of the institution. Subject to the Board's authority, the President may "control and give general directions to the practical affairs of the institution." ORS 352.004.

The legislature has also established authority in the faculty of the institutions. The president and professors constitute the faculty of the institution and "as such have the immediate government and discipline of it and the students therein" ORS 352.004. In addition, "[t]he faculty may, subject to the supervision of the OSBHE under ORS 351.070, prescribe the course of study to be pursued in the institution and the textbooks to be used." ORS 352.010.

The Board and OSU have each adopted administrative rules to implement authority conferred by the legislature and, in the case of OSU, delegated by the Board. The rules adopted by the Board are in Oregon Administrative Rules (OAR) Chapter 580. The rules adopted by OSU are in OAR Chapter 576. OAR Chapter 580 is at http://arcweb.sos.state.or.us/rules/OARS_500/OAR_580/580_tofc.html; OAR Chapter 576 is at http://arcweb.sos.state.or.us/rules/OARS_500/OAR_576/576_tofc.html. Both sets of rules apply to OSU. The administrative rules, which have the force of law, cover a wide range of topics governing life at OSU for employees and students. But much of the Board's internal operating guidance for the system institutions is located in the Board's Internal Management Directives (IMD's), at http://www.ous.edu/sites/default/files/about/polipro/files/IMDdoc2011_0.pdf, and its policies, at http://www.ous.edu/sites/default/files/about/polipro/files/BdPol110325_0.pdf. OSU also has in place policies that order its internal affairs. Many of those policies are crafted and recommended for adoption by the Faculty Senate. Some of those policies are crafted by the University administration and reviewed by the Faculty Senate. Other policies, primarily related to curriculum, are crafted and adopted by the Faculty Senate independently of the University administration.

The Oregon State University Bylaws of the Faculty Senate state:

ARTICLE II: OBJECT

Sec. 1. Within the framework of legislation providing for Land-Grant Institutions and the Oregon State System of Higher Education, the Faculty Senate of Oregon State University, on behalf of the Faculty of the University, shall: (a) determine and establish the purposes of Oregon State University, formulate and evaluate policies and activities in harmony with these purposes; (b) assume responsibility for the creation, maintenance, and protection of a University environment conducive to the full and free development and preservation of scholarly learning, teaching, and research; (c) provide the means by which the administration may be apprised of representative opinion of the entire Faculty.

Sec. 2. To accomplish the Objects stated in Section 1. above, the Faculty Senate shall: (a) have legislative responsibility with respect to academic policies, educational standards, curricula, and academic regulations; (b) study and prepare recommendations to the President of Oregon State University concerning the welfare of the Faculty; (c) provide the means through which any matter of general interest to the Faculty or pertaining to the institution and its purpose may be brought to the Faculty Senate for discussion and appropriate action.

ARTICLE III: AUTHORITY AND RESPONSIBILITY

Sec. 1. The Faculty Senate shall be representative of the entire Faculty of Oregon State University and shall have both the authority and responsibility to act for and on behalf of the Faculty in all matters encompassed within the stated Objects of the Faculty Senate. The Faculty is defined as members of the Unclassified Academic Staff who: (1) are Professional Faculty, or (2) hold one of these academic ranks: Instructor, Senior Instructor, Faculty Research Assistant, Senior Faculty Research Assistant, Research Associate, Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, or Professor (as defined in Section 580-20-005 of the OSSHE Administrative Rules). Faculty in administrative or support units with joint appointments in academic units shall be included in their academic unit for the purposes of apportionment.

Sec. 2. Apportionment units represented in the Senate must comply with the Board's Administrative Rule (OAR 580-15-005), banning discrimination on the basis of age, disability, national origin, race, marital status, religion, sex, or sexual orientation.

Sec. 3. Members of the Faculty Senate are the uninstructed representatives of their constituents. It shall be the responsibility of the members of the Faculty Senate to seek for the opinions of their constituencies. Having exercised such responsibility, the members of the Faculty Senate shall feel free to make decisions and vote on matters according to their own reasoned judgments.

SECTION 2 *Soliciting Input to Guide the Work of the Task Force*

In February 2010 the Task Force emailed all faculty, requesting, through a secure webpage, suggestions for improving, enhancing, and/or expanding shared governance at all levels of the University. Faculty were asked to be as specific as possible in terms of policy and procedure and level of the University (unit, college, or university) where it should be applied. As stated on the webpage, a form was used to collect suggestions anonymously; the SGTF committed to keep individual comments confidential. The SGTF assembled the submitted suggestions/concerns under broad categories described below, and used these categories to initiate discussions amongst the SGTF and to develop the comments and recommendations provided in this document.

Analysis of Input

A total of 77 comments were submitted to the Task Force. Because the input was anonymous it could not be determined if these were independent submissions. The following classifications of comments were identified (number of times mentioned):

- Examples of Lack of or Failure of Shared Governance (23 comments)
- Preponderance of Professional Faculty in Shared Governance (8 comments)
- Support for Unionization/Collective Bargaining (7 Comments)
- Inclusion of Underrepresented Groups in Shared Governance (6 Comments)
- Lack of Shared Governance in Reorganization (5 Comments)
- Importance of Shared Governance in Curriculum, Academic Integrity and Academic Freedom (5 Comments)
- Shared Governance in Selection of Department Chairs and other Service Positions (3 Comments)
- Expansion of Contingent Faculty Undermines Shared Governance (3 Comments)
- Failure to Value Service Undermines Shared Governance (3 Comments)
- Lack Shared Governance in Budgeting (2 Comments)
- Promotion and Tenure (2 Comments)
- Faculty should not be Involved in Furlough Decision (2 Comments)
- Unclassified (8 Comments)
- Comment from the President of AAUP (not included for analysis)

After reviewing the substance of the comments received, the task force reflected upon the following four major themes as it moved forward with its work (Appendix A contains excerpts from faculty input that relate to these themes):

1. the failure of “full-cycle governance”;
2. the lack of broad faculty involvement in shared governance, due to perceived lack of impact and the absence of rewards for “service”;
3. the failure of the Faculty Senate, in its composition by both ranked and unranked faculty (see Faculty Senate Bylaws Article III, Sec. 1), to represent faculty views adequately; and
4. the lack of shared governance in particular areas, chiefly budgeting, structural change, and administrative appointments.

SECTION 3 *Definition of Shared Governance*

The SGTF developed a “definition” of Shared Governance to be considered for adoption by the Administration and the Faculty Senate and the task force used this definition as a basis for discussion of the four overarching questions stated above and for the recommendations provided in this document. Shared governance, more broadly, involves the entire university community, but the focus of this report and the charge to the task force, were limited to the relations between the Faculty and the Administration.

Definition:

Shared governance is the process by which faculty and administrators share responsibility for reaching decisions on policy and procedure. These decisions include matters of institutional planning; academic programs, curriculum and academic regulations; university, college, and unit spending priorities; faculty compensation and advancement; administrative appointments and reappointments; and others that affect the success of the institution in fulfilling its missions. As noted in the Faculty Senate Bylaws Article II, Section II, the Faculty Senate has “legislative responsibility with respect to academic policies, educational standards, curricula, and academic regulations.”

Shared governance requires that administrators seek faculty input in these matters, weigh that input carefully, and report back to the faculty on the reasons for arriving at the final decisions. For faculty, shared governance requires careful consideration of the issue, reaching decision on the process in which faculty input will be made, reaching decision on the content and form of the input, communication of input through the channels made available, and attention to the communication from administrators regarding the final decision. The immediate goal of shared governance is to reach agreement on matters vital to the institution and its citizens, or, where disagreements remain, to assure those on the dissenting side that their views were heard and fully considered. The long-term goal of shared governance is to create a university community based on open communication, accountability, and mutual respect, for the sake of best advancing the institution’s missions. Shared governance should permeate the campus, reaching into all levels of decision-making.

Basic Principles of Shared Governance at Oregon State University

From this definition, and from analysis of current practices of shared governance at OSU, input collected from faculty, and consideration of the guiding policies and procedures that identify or constrain areas for shared governance, the SGTF defined five principles that could be implemented across university, college, and unit levels:

1. Administrators and faculty share responsibility and accountability in all steps of the process related to decisions on policy and procedure.
2. Shared governance is a privilege, responsibility, and duty of all faculty and administrators and requires broad participation.
3. Shared governance requires a “full-cycle” approach in formulating and making decisions on policy and procedure. For administrators, a “full-cycle” approach requires soliciting faculty input, weighing that input, arriving at decisions, and reporting back to the faculty on the rationale for those decisions. For faculty (in matters where faculty do not make final decisions), a “full-cycle” approach requires involvement in the process, form, and content for providing faculty input. For both administrators and faculty, effective communication is essential.
4. Shared governance should be practiced wherever possible in institutional decision-making at all levels. The SGTF recognized the following priority areas in which shared governance needs to be fully implemented: i) planning and organization; ii) academic programs, curriculum, and academic regulations; iii) spending priorities; iv) faculty compensation and advancement; and v) administrative appointments and faculty hiring.

5. Shared governance in all areas should inform decision-making at *institutional, college, and unit* levels.

SECTION 4 *Current Practices and Procedures for Decision-making at OSU, with Recommendations for Improvement*

In the definition of shared governance proposed by this task force, a set of the most important areas of decisions were identified that require the input of faculty and administration. These are:

- A. institutional planning
- B. faculty senate governance
- C. university, college, and unit spending priorities
- D. faculty compensation and advancement
- E. administrative appointments and faculty hiring

Below we summarize current practices/procedures for decision-making in each area.

A. Institutional Planning

OSU administration is committed to institutional planning and decision-making processes that honor shared governance, and intentionally involves faculty, staff and student participation. The current institutional planning processes were instituted when Ed Ray became OSU President in June 2003. The 2004 Strategic Plan was built upon outcomes from the “OSU-2007 planning process” that involved hundreds of individuals since January 2002 (<http://oregonstate.edu/osu2007/>). The adoption of the 2004 Strategic Plan was followed by an annual process of assessment at the university level as well as in the colleges and other divisions. In addition to the annual review process, OSU is committed to a review of its strategic plan every five years. This process was last completed in 2009, resulting in the Strategic Plan Phase II (2009-2013) (<http://oregonstate.edu/leadership/strategicplan/>). In addition to discussion with, and input from, the Faculty Senate and its committees, the university administration also regularly involves a variety of appointed committees to participate in conversations on institutional planning. The following committees, appointed by the Provost, are chaired or co-chaired by professorial faculty:

- University Budget Committee (<http://oregonstate.edu/leadership/sites/default/files/provost-documents/2010-2011-UBC.pdf>)
- University Space Committee (<http://oregonstate.edu/osusc/university-space-committee-members>)
- University Council on Student Engagement and Experience (<http://oregonstate.edu/leadership/sites/default/files/provost-documents/2010-2011-UCSEE.pdf>)

Input received from faculty revealed significant concerns about the flow of communication on important decisions for our university (see Appendix A). As stated the Faculty Senate bylaws, the Faculty Senate is to “provide the means by which the administration may be apprised of representative opinion of the entire Faculty” (Article II, Sec 1, c) and is to “provide the means through which any matter of general interest to the Faculty or pertaining to the institution and its purpose may be brought to the Faculty Senate for discussion and appropriate action” (Article II, Sec 2, c). Since OSU values shared governance, we must ensure that decisions made by administration reflect a genuine conversation between administration and faculty. Two topics in particular were raised by some faculty as examples of “failures” of shared governance: furloughs and academic realignment. In these incidences, as well as in others, there was a sense that decisions were made prior to coming to the Senate. The SGTF agrees that “full-cycle” communication is critical for successful institutional planning, and that this includes two

essential components. First, when administration sets up committees/task forces to explore and advise on issues, faculty must be part of that conversation. Second, the work of these groups must be vetted by broader administrative and faculty groups before decisions are made.

Recommendation: Any committee/task force formed by the president and/or provost to help guide institutional planning should have at least 20% of its membership appointed by the Faculty Senate Executive Committee.

Recommendation: The recommendations of these groups' work should be presented to the Faculty Senate for discussion, input and endorsement prior to final decisions.

B. Faculty Senate Governance

The Faculty Senate is committed to decision-making processes that honor shared governance amongst the faculty and between the faculty and the administration. Within the framework of the bylaws of the Faculty Senate (Article II and Article III), the Faculty Senate is composed of the Executive Committee, Interinstitutional Faculty Senate representation, 27 standing committees, special committees and councils, and various ad hoc committees and task forces as needed (<http://oregonstate.edu/senate/committees/>). Each year the Faculty Senate sends out a form to the faculty-at-large requesting volunteers to serve on these committees and councils. The Executive Committee, elected by the Faculty Senate, meets annually and uses responses to this request in the appointment of members to these committees and councils. The Bylaws and Nominations Committee is responsible for preparation of the slate of nominees for President-Elect, Executive Committee, and Interinstitutional Faculty Senator. Through the Faculty Senate, the faculty-at-large are also requested to provide nominations for these elected positions.

The Bylaws of the Faculty Senate provide that "The Committee on Committees shall propose Standing Rules, subject to the approval of the Faculty Senate, for each of the Senate's standing committees and councils, and cause those Rules, thus approved, to be published annually in the Faculty Senate Handbook, and in each issue of the Faculty Handbook" (see Article IX, Sec. 4 of the Bylaws). It is the responsibility of the Committee on Committees to review each committee and council every five years to determine whether their activities have enhanced the functions and objectives of the Senate. The President-Elect meets with the Chair of each committee annually to review accomplishments of the past year and to target actions items for the upcoming year. Members of each committee suggest items in need of attention and faculty-at-large have the right and responsibility to bring issues of concern to the Faculty Senate for consideration of discussion or action.

It was the opinion of the SGTF that, for the most part, the committee structure of the Faculty Senate worked well and covered areas of responsibility and concern of the faculty-at-large as it refers to academic programs, curriculum, and academic regulations. However, there were examples of committees where the Standing Rules were not currently being applied and need improvement and this will be addressed in Section 4.E. of this document.

The SGTF discussed procedures of the Faculty Senate and ways that these could be improved. It was noted by the SGTF that Faculty Senators should consider being more proactive in Senate meetings. Also noted by the SGTF was that the Faculty Senate has, over recent years, realized the need for and implemented procedures to enhance communication with and among the faculty-at-large to ensure maximum effectiveness and to strengthen shared governance. Some of these activities include:

- All proposed and/or revised academic regulations are sent to all Faculty Senate committees/councils for feedback prior to Senate approval to engage faculty perspectives outside of the Academic Regulations Committee.
- Faculty Senate created mailing lists both for Senators by apportionment unit and for constituents by apportionment unit to enable Senators to caucus among themselves and to provide a method of communicating with and determining feedback from their constituents.
- Efforts to improve off-campus participation in the Faculty Senate committee structure through the ability to interact face-to-face through teleconferencing capability.
- Yearly visits to OSU-Cascades by the Faculty Senate leadership to discuss issues (e.g., curriculum) unique to the branch campus.
- Periodically, and for various issues, the Faculty Senate requests electronic input from the faculty-at large via an anonymous, open response method (comments box).
- Beginning in April 2011, Faculty Senate meetings are now webcast, which will allow off-campus Senators to remotely participate in meetings.
- Small group faculty sessions (professorial, research, professional) with the OSU President were initiated by the Faculty Senate and welcomed by administration to provide direct input to the president regarding matters of importance to the faculty.

These activities and changes have certainly improved the quality of the work by the Senate and increased effectiveness. Still, after considering many aspects related to Faculty Senate governance the SGTF maintains that a more explicitly delineated approach to different categories of issues taken up by the Senate would greatly improve ownership of decisions. In this respect clearly communicated procedures should guide the consideration and disposition of any topic brought to the Senate floor. Disciplined observance of the major principles of shared governance (appropriate application of a “full-cycle” approach, application of direct and indirect representation, and application of individual and collective expression of counsel and decision) would further improve the role of the Senate in the shared governance process.

Faculty and administrators share responsibility for decisions about curriculum. Faculty has primary responsibility for both determining and delivering the curriculum. The administration provides budgetary support. Because the curriculum is “owned” by the Faculty Senate, it is critical that teaching faculty participate in curricular decisions.

Recommendation: The principle of “full-cycle” governance should guide administrators’ interactions with the faculty in general and the Faculty Senate in particular. That is, administrators should solicit faculty input, weigh that input, arrive at decisions, and report back to the faculty on the rationale for those decisions.

Recommendations: For more effective input from the Faculty Senate in institutional decision-making:

- i. Reports to the Faculty Senate, including those by the Faculty Senate committees, should be substantive (i.e. specific actions and/or recommendations) and these items should be brought to discussion and vote on the floor of the Senate.
- ii. Faculty, through the Senate, should provide more collective feedback to the President/Provost/ Deans after discussion of items on the Faculty Senate Agenda. Mechanisms should be developed that will provide more meaningful input such that “the sense of the Senate” is obtained and shared with the administration.

Recommendations: Increased participation of academic faculty in the Faculty Senate and its committees is recommended. Mechanisms for doing so include increasing the importance and value of service in P&T policies, periodic reviews, administrative (re)appointments, and merit-based salary increases.

- i. The University must value participation in the workings of the Faculty Senate. All administrative position descriptions should include a statement related to the value of and requirement to foster faculty participation in Faculty Senate and university committees.
- ii. Due to the importance and value of service in Faculty Senate and university committees, administrators should review and enforce the requirements of such service in the current promotion and tenure policies.
- iii. Annually, the Faculty Senate should work with Institutional Research to produce a summary of the composition of the Faculty Senate and its committees by apportionment unit, faculty status, and rank to be posted on the Faculty Senate website.

Recommendation: The Faculty Senate Executive Committee and the Administration should have discussions to determine if the current structure of the Faculty Senate serves adequately and equally well the interests of both ranked and unranked faculty. A separate task force or ad hoc committee to review the current structure should be appointed.

C. University, College, and Unit Spending Priorities

The State Board of Higher Education

The budget process for the executive branch begins at the agency level. For the Oregon University System, the budget is first developed by the State Board of Higher Education, which includes two faculty members and two students appointed by the Governor. The budget is based on recommendations from the campuses and the Chancellor's Office. The Board then submits a recommended budget to the Department of Administrative Services (DAS) for review and modification. DAS submits the Board's proposed budget to the Governor who then ultimately proposes agency budgets to the Legislature.

As the budget is considered by the Legislature, each executive branch agency, including the Board and the administration of OSU, is expected to fully support the Governor's proposed budget. Individual faculty members and the Faculty Senate are not covered by this expectation of support.

The Legislature ultimately approves the budget for the Oregon University System. The Board then allocates funds from the legislatively approved budget to individual institutions, based on budget notes included by the legislature and Board approved allocation formulas, included in the "Resource Allocation Model".

The process for the 2013-15 biennium will likely be affected by two bills passed during the 2011 legislative session. SB 909 creates the Oregon Education Investment Board (OEIB), chaired by the Governor, which is charged with developing a comprehensive budget along the entire education continuum, from early childhood through post graduate programs. The legislature also passed SB 242 which established greater autonomy for OUS and eliminated many of the specific budget lines associated with the OUS budget. Over the next six months the OEIB process will become more defined as will the changes in the OUS governance.

University

During the 2004-2005 academic year the University initiated an analysis of the way Education and General (E&G) funds are allocated to academic and support units. The budget review process sought to establish base budgets and then have productivity-driven allocations of budget increases or decreases from the base budget. Two groups played an important role in the budget restructuring deliberations. The University Budget Committee led the overall analysis process, including developing and refining the methodology, developing strategies for allocating overhead costs to academic units, and helping in the refinement of data and assessing its accuracy. The Provost's Council critiqued and provided input during the development phase of the project and then provided input to university leadership relative to outcomes and their impact. The outcome of the rebasing process resulted in the university redirecting \$7.5 million in recurring funds to four colleges.

(<http://oregonstate.edu/budget/rebasinginitiative.htm>) The university is now in the process of recalibrating base budgets for units for future years.

Managing budget reductions can be a challenge in a relatively decentralized environment and requires the involvement of faculty, staff, and students. An example of how the university approaches budget reductions can be seen in the process used to prepare for a possible 20% cut in Education & General funding. In early 2009, the President established an Advisory Council for Budget and Strategic Priorities, which was chaired by the Provost and included the Vice President for Finance and Administration, President and President-Elect of the Faculty Senate, ASOSU President, Budget Director, Vice Provost for Academic Affairs and International Programs and Vice Provost for Student Affairs. Over the course of a 9-month period the President, Provost, and Vice President for Finance and Administration engaged in continuous conversation through Faculty Senate meetings, special forums, and electronic communication. The entire process is detailed on the web at:

<http://oregonstate.edu/leadership/budget/>.

The outcome of this process was a proposal for academic and system guidelines that were intended to better position the university strategically. The President approved these guidelines in 2009. A follow-up committee, the Strategic Alignment and Budget Reduction Review Committee, was formed to review proposals from units about how to adhere to the next guidelines (all work posted at the link above). The realignment process also was used to allocate incremental revenue from enrollment growth. For example, the President announced that the university will add 60-75 faculty over the next two years, with hiring focused on the signature areas within the new divisions.

The composition of the various committees deliberating the budget decisions allowed for little faculty representation.

Recommendation: Committees or task forces formed by the president and provost to help guide budget allocation and planning should have at least 20% of its membership appointed by the Faculty Senate Executive Committee.

Recommendation: The president and provost should bring to the Faculty Senate, for discussion and input, budget priorities for the University prior to implementation.

College and Department Budgets

At the same time as the President called for a look at university budget rebasing, he also called on colleges to pay attention to their budgets. In the 2004 Presidential address, he commented:

“It is now time for the University and the colleges (and the faculty, staff, and students) to ask whether or not the current budget process is serving the purposes of the strategic plan effectively. My own preference, based on my experience, is for us to seriously consider re-basing budgets. Similarly, we must develop a process to review central expenses and to determine if they are cost effective. Finally, I believe that each college should have an explicit budget allocation model of its own that is developed through a consultative process led by the Dean. The budget process should be open, and the resulting budgets should be transparent. The budget process is not an end in itself; it is a tool for implementing institutional decisions and strategies. Now that we have well defined University and unit strategic plans we can carefully assess changing current budget practices.” (<http://oregonstate.edu/leadership/president/university-day-2004>).

Current processes applied in the structuring and dissemination of College and Department budgets are quite varied in implementation of shared governance principles. In some cases, faculty are informed about the size of the operating budget without opportunity to provide input for spending priorities. Financial resources such as Foundation funds, which are outside of usual budgetary procedure, can be particularly mysterious to faculty. Where budgets have been reduced to absolutely basic operating minimum, there is little opportunity for meaningful input from most shared governance stakeholders. But wherever there are discretionary funds, which may have long lasting effects on the financial health and academic development of the college and its units, principles of shared governance should operate.

Recommendation: Each college and unit should have a transparent budget allocation process that is developed through consultation by the dean/department chair or head with the faculty.

D. Faculty compensation and advancement

Two committees of the Faculty Senate address faculty compensation and advancement. These are the Faculty Economic Welfare and Retirement Committee (<http://oregonstate.edu/senate/committees/fewrc/index.html>) and the Promotion and Tenure Committee (<http://oregonstate.edu/senate/committees/ptc/index.html>), respectively.

In 2000, the Faculty Economic Welfare and Retirement Committee presented a “Report of the Issue Group on Faculty Compensation” that was accepted by the Faculty Senate and the Administration. This report was reviewed, updated and accepted in 2005, and again in 2008. It is the understanding of the SGTF that the recommendations in this report on merit, equity, and compression had direct impact on how the last salary increases for faculty were applied, and it endorses the notion that faculty compensation should be governed by principles of shared governance.

Recommendation: The president and provost should bring to the Faculty Senate, for discussion and input, any plans for salary/benefit adjustments.

Recommendation: Each college and unit should have a transparent process for salary adjustments developed through consultation by the dean/department chair or head with the faculty.

Regarding faculty advancement, in recent years the Promotion and Tenure Committee has played an active role to ensure fair and uniform evaluation of faculty going through the promotion and tenure process. Recent changes include:

- Standardization of Student Committees in the evaluation process,
- Standardization of the documentation of peer evaluation of teaching in the dossier,
- Requirement that the unit committee be elected rather than appointed, or that the process for constituting the committee in some other way be approved by the faculty in the unit,
- Requirement that the college-level committee include faculty representation,
- Requirement of peer evaluation of all parts of the candidate's position, not just teaching and research.

Given the structures and processes, including processes for continuous revision, that are already in place, the Task Force offers no recommendation on this issue. (A recommendation on the weighing of service in evaluations for promotion and tenure appears in Section 4B.)

E. Administrative appointments and faculty hiring:

Hiring university and college level administrators: The Faculty Senate Administrative Appointments Committee (AAC) is charged with participating in the search process for the following administrative positions:

- All positions at the Provost, Vice President, Vice Provost and Associate Provost level
- All positions at the Dean level
- Other positions of academic significance, including, but not limited to, Undergraduate Academic Programs Director, Admission and Orientation Director, and Registrar.

The Standing Rules for the AAC state that “whenever there is an impending vacancy, or an actual vacancy occurs, in any of the above listed positions, or when a new administrative position is created, the Administrative Appointments Committee shall confer with the President (or his/her designated representative), review the requirements of the position, and provide advisement concerning composition of a Search Committee and the range and timing of its search.” In addition, the AAC “recommends three faculty members who shall serve on each Search Committee for appointments to vacant or newly created administrative positions.”

Input from faculty who have served on the AAC indicated that these standing rules are not being followed. The date on the website shows the last time these rules were reviewed was May 1998, and it would be worthwhile having the Faculty Senate review them, consider the current set of appointments that should have AAC input, and suggest an effective structure and process for this committee.

Recommendation: There should be a broad commitment by both administration and Faculty Senate to follow the Standing Rules of the Administrative Appointments Committee.

Hiring chairs/heads/directors: All faculty associated with a unit or college should have the opportunity to provide input regarding the evaluation of the candidates for chair, head, and director appointments, as well as for reappointment of individuals serving in those positions. It is not clear if faculty participation in providing input for administrative appointments and reappointments is fully implemented. There is anecdotal evidence that current practices are substantially different among colleges and units, and often not in line with expectations and shared governance principles.

Recommendation: All units and colleges should have written policies, agreed upon by faculty and administrators, that define the process by which faculty can provide input on the qualification of candidates and the performance of the current administrator, without concern for negative repercussions for themselves. Faculty representatives should be included on all search committees for administrative appointments. Faculty should have meaningful input into decisions about the appointment and reappointment of academic administrators, and their input should be listened to and valued. The policies should specify direct or indirect, individual or collective, input as appropriate.

Hiring faculty: Faculty and administrators at OSU most often (but not always) share responsibility for hiring academic faculty. The faculty are in the best position to judge the qualifications of candidates for academic faculty positions. Faculty participation in identifying hiring priorities and allocating positions at college and unit levels is often inadequate. Faculty involvement in the development of position descriptions varies. The SGTF does not have objective indicators to determine if current practices at all colleges and units meet basic principles of shared governance (most search committee members from the unit and the academic area with representation from other units as appropriate).

Recommendation: Units should have written policies, agreed upon by faculty, that describe processes for including faculty at all stages of the hiring process, including the identification of hiring priorities, the development of position descriptions, the selection of search committee members, and the evaluation of candidates. The majority of search committee members should be faculty from the academic unit(s) for which the position is affiliated. In units where faculty do not vote on hiring decisions, search committees should make recommendations for hiring, in addition to evaluating candidates' strengths and weaknesses. Policies should specify direct or indirect, individual or collective, input as appropriate.

SECTION 5 *Review and Assessment*

Shared governance is the process by which faculty and administrators share responsibility and accountability for reaching decisions on policy and procedure. A basic principle of shared governance is that it requires a "full-cycle" approach to assess its effectiveness in reaching such decisions.

Recommendation: The Faculty Senate should assess changes made as a result of this report in the next 2-3 years. Periodic climate surveys of faculty, conducted through Institutional Research, should be part of this assessment.

Appendix A

Input to Guide the Work of the Task Force:

Excerpts from faculty input that relate to the four major themes

[Minor edits have been made to protect the identity of the writer. Extremely disparaging remarks about individuals or groups of individuals have also been removed.]

1. The failure of shared governance, especially the failure of administrators, after receiving input from faculty, to communicate with the faculty their weighing of this faculty input and their reasons for the ultimate decision ("full-cycle governance").

[Shared governance is] entirely inconsistent with my experience here and the observations of most of my colleagues. From the perspective of a faculty member with >20 years of experience, here is what I see: OSU operates as a top down central administration model with powerful deans and weak department chairs that faculty have virtually no input on regarding their hiring or evaluation. Soliciting feedback through open forums and websites is one thing. Actually listening to the faculty, truly respecting them, and allowing them real and meaningful input regarding university processes and decisions is another. I don't believe faculty at OSU have a very strong voice at the university. Collectively, we are a weak faculty when it comes to university governance.

It was too convenient for the president to ask the faculty senate to debate and approve furloughs and promise to abide by their decision. Notice that he didn't ask the FS to vote on the creation of divisions, the creation of business centers, or the consolidation of departments, or budget cuts. The administration uses the FS when it is convenient for the administration to do so and otherwise treats it as question and answer forum. The FS should vote on every important matter at the university, like the budget, even if those votes are only advisory.

I have four points to make, a couple of them suggestions. One is that the committee review AAUP guidelines for shared governance and make sure that OSU follows them -- much of this material is available on the national AAUP web site.

Often faculty/student committees are created for input into decisions and that input is then ignored when it goes contrary to the desires of the administration. When the conclusion of such committee deliberations concurs with administration plans, then all is well and good. This looks much more like an appearance of shared governance than the real thing.

Rarely if ever have I seen administration plans opposed by the faculty senate much less stopped.

When I have attended faculty senate meetings over the past years, what strikes me is that the Faculty Senate President and the members of the Executive Committee who present, almost always are there representing the point of view of the central administration, i.e., the President and Provost. If there is ever going to be actual shared governance, the Fac Sen Pres and Executive Committee will instead have to represent the faculty point of view to the Administration. Anything else cannot be shared governance. Given who nominates the people for Fac Sen Presidency are former Presidents themselves, then this orientation ends up being perpetuated.

Shared governance at OSU means that the administration seeks input from faculty including the faculty senate and its committees and then the administration makes the decision. Usually even the claim of seeking input is not realized but instead the administrator just answers questions that faculty raise. It can rarely be determined how the faculty input affected the decision, partly because the faculty senate rarely takes an "up or down" vote on any of the administration's proposals.

Shared governance should be about meaningful input regarding significant decisions affecting OSU. This is exactly what is NOT happening here. The administration makes decisions and then approaches the faculty for comment.... Of course, they will tell whoever will listen (or through their carefully controlled market outlets) how they held numerous forums, etc. to gain input. ...Any input the faculty may have now will be minor. We should have been having meaningful (shared) discussions from the beginning. The manner in which the administration seeks input (when it is politically strategic) has eroded any sense of shared anything on this campus. The faculty, especially those who have been here a long time are the ones who are in the best position to offer institutional memory and history. Yet, we are also the ones who have become the most disillusioned by the lack of shared governance. I am not sure what recommendations to make to this Task Force, as it is hard not to believe that this is yet another waste of time to appease the university leadership. I imagine your report will be given a cursory examination and then placed on the shelf along with so many others. I do not doubt the commitment of the members of this committee to find ways to improve faculty involvement and shared governance. I do doubt the ability of our administrations' willingness to give up any of their power or to share in significant decision-making.

Although the antagonistic relationship between the faculty and the administration at UO may not be ideal it seems to have protected the interests of faculty there to a greater extent than at OSU. OSU faculty salaries are lower than our comparison group and are lower than UO too. In recent years salaries at UO have increased to a greater extent than at OSU and so we are falling further behind. UO didn't even consider furloughs.

2. The failure of many faculty to be involved in shared governance due to a perceived lack of impact and the absence of rewards for "service".

The OSU institutional reward structure does not properly support service work, as well as it does scholarship and teaching. Senate committees charged with academic oversight eventually become committees of primarily non-tenured faculty or professional faculty members Non-tenured faculty members and professional faculty do not often challenge powerful administrators about matters of academic standards and curriculum. Their hesitancy to do so further deprives faculty Senate's power over these curricula, tenure, and academic standards.

Shared governance cannot be achieved at this university when service to the university is not valued. If I am to be rewarded (e.g., promotion and/or merit) it has been made more than clear to me that I had better minimize my service. Even when elected to faculty senate, show up a few times and sign in, and then my service obligations are complete and I can go back to my research (which is where the administrators would rather see me). It makes me look good and the administrators can proclaim faculty input (despite not having real debates, discussions, or faculty involvement). I have met my minimal service obligations to achieve Full Professor, the administration is going to do whatever it wants anyway, now I can go back to my research. This is a common sentiment of seasoned faculty members on this campus. The point is that shared governance cannot take place when service is a token part of our position descriptions and there is no sense of anything shared or meaningful input.

3. The failure of the Faculty Senate, in its composition by both professorial and professional faculty, to represent faculty views adequately.

I am all for shared governance, but the current classification of numerous administrative workers as "professional faculty" is inappropriate. Such administrators do not share either common job descriptions or common goals with traditional faculty; both voices need to be heard, but separately. I am particularly dismayed to see the existing structure abused by higher level administrators, who refer to "faculty support" for measures which are in fact strongly opposed by traditional faculty, but supported by professional faculty. Traditional faculty need a voice, which they no longer have.

It also seems that the faculty senate is dominated by professional faculty that are mostly administrators, including at least one assistant dean. These professional faculty are on one year contracts so their participation in faculty senate needs to please their supervisors their contracts might not be renewed. The Executive Committee seems to be particularly dominated either by professional faculty or by faculty that are, were, or want to be administrators, at least department chairs. As a result, faculty senate is not representative of the faculty but just another quasi-administration entity. Administrators, including those in academic and student affairs, should not be considered faculty.

There are professional faculty that do not even have bachelor's degrees.These members of the professional faculty have the same voting rights for faculty senate and therefore the same input into matters of curriculum and P&T as tenured faculty. This has decreased the effectiveness of shared governance at OSU.

Third, I note that the proportion of professional faculty in the faculty senate has been steadily increasing. As these folks are much more beholden for their jobs to their bosses, this means that the administration is more likely to be in charge of the faculty senate than the faculty.

Put in bold the word 'Faculty' in "Faculty Senate." Stipulate that by faculty it is meant here the tenured and tenure track academic faculty doing teaching and research. It does not include the so called "professional faculty." This exclusion is not meant to be a sign of elitism but a realization that the roles, interests and commitments of the academic faculty are drastically different from those of the professional employees.

4. The lack of shared governance in particular areas, chiefly: budgeting, structural change (reorganization/realignment), and administrative appointments (especially of department heads/chairs).

Make budgets more transparent. I was very shocked to find out that deans often do not give department chairs their budgets. This, along with not allowing carry over, makes it very difficult to plan for growth or any sort of future expenses.

Allow chairs to share budget issues with faculty. At my previous institution, faculty were apprised of general budget details and we decided as a faculty how much to set aside for future hires & emergencies (generally 10% of the budget), and how we should utilize any surplus (within reasonable guidelines).

The "open budget process" is really NOT, because the numbers can be presented in any way to support administration assertions, and the average person can't make sense of it unless they want to devote their life to getting to the bottom of it....and not spending any time doing their job!

The "centralize more" concept (e.g., business centers, divisions, etc.) repeats mistakes we learned from a decade ago at OSU. The lesson we learned then was "decentralize, i.e., put the people in the trenches with the people they serve". Centralizing removes contact from the trenches and also adds more meetings.

The only justification for centralizing more would seem to be cutting positions, but that has not happened. So, I suggest go back to decentralizing.

I believe we need to bring a "faculty vote" into major departmental/college decisions associated with activities such as (for example) Divisional plans. For instance, reorganization of departments within Colleges should include a faculty vote of acceptance/rejection of the plan. A vote would foster collaboration between faculty and administrators to insure that plans have had appropriate vetting and discussion. Currently, some colleges have as part of their culture fairly good academic democracy processes; others do not.

I am unhappy with the way the divisional realignment has been handled. Here are two things that trouble me: The upper administration made this decision, but the people accountable at the forums are the deans and not the individuals who made the decision. Attending these forums is not a good use of faculty time since nothing said has a chance of making a difference. It is a charade.

Two years ago, faculty senate leaders praised the administration for changing their mind after receiving solid faculty input against merging Arts and Sciences.

This was given as an example of how the administration listens to us.

It would be nice if there was some clarity and consistency in what the Business Centers are expected to accomplish! Initially, we were told they would save \$10M and processes would improve. At this time we have seen no process improvements, peoples' lives are being disrupted and the implementation costs are soaring...

Department chairs and school directors should be elected by the faculty members. More and more colleges are even moving away from faculty having any meaningful input into the selection of their leadership but instead those positions are just appointed by the deans following a cursory request for input from faculty. The notion that faculty have input but that the appointment is the dean's decision is farcical. At OSU the best situation that faculty can hope for is that they will have input as long they support a leadership candidate that the dean likes. It is impossible to have a department chair or school director that will stand up to the dean or the administration in general, because they are beholden to the dean.
