

Appendix I: LUC Shared Governance Charter

Website: <http://luc.edu/governance/introduction.shtml>

Appendix II: Charge to the Task Force on Shared Governance System Evaluation

**Interoffice Memorandum
Loyola University Chicago**

Office of the President

Date: October 24, 2005

To: Martin Berg (Biology)
 Laura Bityou (USG President)
 Jamie Caldwell (LUMC Research Services)
 Michael Kabbaz (Ph.D. Candidate in Higher Education)
 E.J. Neafsey (Cell Biology, Neurobiology, and Anatomy)
 Peter Schraeder (Political Science)
 Kelly Shannon (Marketing and Communications)
 David Yellen (Law School)

From: Michael J. Garanzini, S.J., President

Copy: Linda Heath, Psychology
 Fred Wezeman, Orthopedic Surgery
 Deans
 President's Cabinet
 University Coordinating Committee

Subject: Task Force on Shared Governance System Evaluation

I am writing to ask for your service on a very important task force. Our *Shared Governance Charter*, adopted in February 2003, has guided our efforts in institution-wide internal policy development for the past two years. The Charter calls for an evaluation "in two years." Since the first policy committees were constituted in June 2003 but actually began functioning in the fall of that year, it is now time after two full years of the system to evaluate it and seek ways to improve upon it.

After seeking counsel from a variety of individuals, and at the recommendation of the University Coordinating Committee, I would like to charge a task force of particularly knowledgeable individuals like yourselves with the duty of developing and carrying out this evaluation process. The aim of the review should be developmental. That is, it should tell us about the strengths and weaknesses of the present system and make suggestions on how to improve our system. What works? What does not? Given the long list of accomplishments, consultation with past and present members of the University Policy Committees is imperative. Equally valuable would be a survey of opinions and perhaps a few open fora. Consultation with the affinity groups- Faculty Council, Staff Council and the Unified Student Government Association- would also be essential.

As part of this effort, I'd like the task force to address the following three broad issue areas:

1. Knowledge of the Shared Governance System: Do faculty, staff and students have general knowledge about the system? Is information from the UPCs effectively communicated to the wider University community? Are shared governance documents (i.e. agendas, minutes, policies) easily accessible to the University community at large?

2. Effectiveness of the System: Is the UPC structure (i.e. having a coordinating committee and seven UPCs) effective? Are the seven issue areas the right ones for our university (i.e. Academic Affairs, Faculty Affairs, Staff Affairs, Student Affairs, Strategic Planning, Budgeting and Finance, and Research)? Is the jurisdiction of the UPCs effectively communicated and managed? Is it clear which issues are handled administratively versus those funneled to the UPCs? Is the system relevant to faculty, staff and students? Is the system designed to address unique needs of the Lake Shore Campuses as well as the Medical Center Campus?

3. Participation in the System: Does the system permit and encourage participation by faculty, staff and students? Is the nomination/appointment process for membership on the UPCs well communicated? Is it transparent? Should UPC members be elected rather than appointed to the committees? Are the UPCs composed of the right mix of faculty, staff and students? Is the system representative of a diversity of opinions and expertise? Are the UPCs too big or too small? Does the system effectively engage affinity groups, i.e. Faculty Council, Staff Council and the Unified Student Government Association?

I have asked Linda Heath and Fred Wezeman to co-chair this task force. I'd ask that as one of your first duties you think about how you will solicit faculty, staff and student input. The University Coordinating Committee will oversee this effort and be on hand to assist the task force as necessary. I would ask that the task force begin its work this semester and, after submitting an interim report to the Cabinet at the January retreat, conclude its work by April 2006.

I hope you will agree to serve as a task force member. The first task force meeting will take place on Thursday, November 10 from 3:00-4:00 p.m. at 25 East Pearson in Room 713. If you are able to help us and attend this first meeting, please follow-up with Lorraine Snyder in my office at phone 312/915-6411 or lsnyde2@luc.edu.

Thanks for your consideration.

Appendix III: List of groups for Listening Sessions

Primary List

President Garanzini
 The Cabinet
 Dean's Council
 Kim Dell Angela (Faculty Handbook)
 UCC
 UPCs (all 7)
 Faculty Council
 Unified Student Government
 AAUP
 Staff Council LUC
 Faculty Senate LUMC
 Executive Faculty Group LUMC
 Medical Council LUMC
 Staff Council LUMC
 Graduate Student Council LUMC
 Graduate Student Council LSC
 Academic Departments LSC, LUMC
 Professional Studies
 Graduate School
 Law School
 Business School
 School of Social Work
 School of Education
 LUMC Executive Faculty Group (all chairs, directors, Graduate School Assoc. Dean, and School of Nursing)
 College of Arts and Sciences (Council of Chairs and Program Directors)
 Dean's Full Council LUC

Appendix III cont.**SGTF Completed Interviews****Peter:**

Faculty Council
 Academic Council
 Current Chair, Academic Council
 Past Chair, Faculty Affairs UPC

Linda and Fred:

Executive Faculty Group (all LUMC clinical and basic science chairs and depts. LUMC
 administration, School of Nursing, Graduate School LUMC)
 Medical Council, LUMC
 President Garanzini
 UCC
 Kim Dell Angela (Faculty Handbook Committee Chair)
 AAUP Officers
 President's Cabinet
 Graduate Student Council LUMC

Laura:

Student Affairs UPC
 Unified Student Government LSC

Michael:

Strategic Planning UPC
 Graduate Student Advisory Committee

Jamie:

Budget and Finance UPC
 Staff Council

E.J.:

Academic Affairs UPC
 Faculty Senate Executive Committee, LUMC

Martin:

Research UPC

Kelly:

Staff Council
 Staff Affairs UPC

David:

Faculty Council

Appendix IV**Nov. 10, 2005****Minutes: Shared Governance Evaluation Task Force**

Present: all members, with the exception of Dr. Yellen

1. Welcome and introductions were made
2. The rationale for the evaluation and its developmental nature were presented
3. The charge as given by the President and the UCC was presented
4. The TF reviewed the questions developed by the UCC. These will be incorporated into the survey.
5. A discussion of the strategy followed. Interviews will first be conducted by the TF with individuals from administration and affinity groups. This will precede the electronic survey.
6. More discussion followed concerning the mechanics of the evaluation. We need to acquire/analyze survey data by: campus, groups, schools, gender, tenure, rank, length of service, student year, undergraduate, graduate, commuter, residential, age.
7. It was brought to our attention that Faculty Council knows nothing about the existence or purpose of the TF. It was agreed that we must first have knowledge that our TF has been formally announced to the university community, the membership identified, and the purpose stated. Following this, the TF will engage the process. We agreed that this announcement should emanate from the President's office.
8. We will introduce the process by creating a broad advertising campaign to increase participation in the survey. We will also include a paragraph of information at the top of the survey to aid the respondent in understanding the survey (e.g. what Shared Governance is, what UCC and UPC are, etc.). A statement will be included that the response is confidential.
9. As part of creating a climate of participation, we will ask that department chairs promote the survey in faculty meetings.
10. Interviews with the following will occur first and that information will feed our development of the survey questions:

Interviews:

Linda and Fred will meet with the UCC and the President's Cabinet
 Academic Affairs UPC: E.J.
 Faculty Affairs UPC: Peter
 Staff Affairs UPC: Kelly
 Student Affairs UPC: Laura
 Strategic Planning UPC: Michael
 Budget and Finance UPC: Jamie
 Research UPC: Marty

Affinity Group Interviews:

Faculty Council: Peter and David
 USG at LUC: Laura
 Staff Council LUC: Kelly

Faculty Senate LUMC: E.J.
Staff Council: Jamie
Medical School Council: Fred
GSC at LUMC: Fred

The following to be asked to respond (placement on agenda and report to us):

Professional Studies
Graduate School
School of Nursing
Department Chairs
Dean's Council, CAS
Executive Faculty Group, LUMC
Dean's Full Council LUC
Law School
Business School
School of Social Work
School of Education

11. All interviews etc. will ask the three questions stated by the President: 1) knowledge of shared governance, 2) effectiveness of shared governance, 3) participation in shared governance.

12: Interim report due Jan-February. Final report due April-May.

13. At the next meeting we will refine the questions for in-person interviews and the survey.

Appendix IV cont.

**Shared Governance Task Force
December 8, 2005 meeting minutes**

Present: Linda Heath & Fred Wezeman (Co-chairs), Martin Berg, Laura Bityou, Michael Kabbaz, Peter Schraeder, Kelly Shannon, Lorraine Snyder, David Yellen
Not Present: Jamie Caldwell, E.J. Neafsey

1. Progress Update: Brief feedback from the meetings that had occurred since the last TF meeting was presented.
 - a. Kelly Shannon met with the Staff Affairs UPC to solicit their input on the Shared Governance system. Minutes from that meeting were shared with the TF prior to the meeting. Kelly distributed a fuller description of the feedback from the Staff Affairs UPC to the TF at the meeting..
 - b. Linda Heath and Fred Wezeman met with Kim Dell'Angela, who has served both as chair of Faculty Council and as a member of the UCC.
 - c. Laura Bityou raised the Shared Governance review with the USG and solicited initial response from that group.
2. AAUP input on Shared Governance.
 - a. The AAUP Proposal on Shared Governance for Faculty Council (November 9, 2005) that had been forwarded to the TF was discussed.
 - b. The TF briefly discussed the ways in which the AAUP positions merge with or diverge from the input we have received to date from other sources.
3. Interview Questions.
 - a. In preparation for our meetings with various constituencies, we discussed format for leading those meetings. (For a list of meetings, see Nov. 10, 2005 minutes.)
 - b. We agreed to structure the feedback sessions around the issues outlined in the Draft Survey compiled by the UCC on 9/28/05.
 - c. We agreed to present the issues in three broad areas (Knowledge of Shared Governance System, Effectiveness of Shared Governance System, and Participation in Shared Governance System) with the sub-points outlined in the draft serving as follow-up probes if time permits.
 - d. We agreed to keep the feedback format fairly open-ended, within the above parameters, to solicit the most useful information for the survey generation.
 - e. We decided to add a 4th area to the above three, asking for input on how the system can be improved.
 - f. We reiterated the developmental nature of the review.
4. Tentative Schedule
 - a. February 1: complete interviews with various groups
 - b. February: Interim report to the President
 - c. March – April: Survey faculty and staff online

- d. April – May: Analyze data and prepare report
- 5. Survey update
 - a. We decided it is premature to begin work on the survey until we have the interviews completed.
 - b. Rick Hurst was recommended by Kelly Shannon as a resource for crafting the actual online survey.
- 6. Next meeting: February 2, 2005, 3:00 p.m. tentatively to be held at 713 25 East Pearson.

Appendix IV cont.

**Shared Governance Task Force
February 3, 2006 meeting
Minutes**

Present: Linda Heath & Fred Wezeman (Co-chairs), Lorraine Snyder, Martin Berg, Laura Bityou, Kelly Shannon, Lorraine Snyder, David Yellen, Jamie Caldwell, E.J. Neafsey

1. Progress Update: Brief feedback from the meetings that had occurred since the last TF meeting.
2. Survey Questions: The TF broke into small groups and developed a total of 15 questions for the electronic survey. To those will be added the "boilerplate" questions on demographics of the respondents. Once the survey is developed, the TF will review it via teleconferencing.
3. Schedule:
 - a. Fr. MJG will include reference to SGTF and survey in his "State of the University" addresses
 - b. Kelly will use the mass email system to announce that the survey is forthcoming. Lorraine will draft the message
 - c. SGTF will meet on Feb 22 to review final survey
 - d. Feb 23: launch survey
 - e. March 9: survey close date and start of data analysis
 - f. Interim report is due in February to Fr. MJG

Appendix V: Shared Governance Committee Issue and Policy Discussions 04-05

**Shared Governance Committee Issue and Policy Discussions
Academic Year 2004-2005**

University Coordinating Committee

- The UCC reviewed the NCA Site Visit Report and asked all UPC chairs to review it as well. It was agreed that the UCC chair and select members of the University Policy Committees would meet with NCA representatives during the visit.
- The Committee hosted two open forums and solicited feedback on the provisional shared governance system from the LSC, WTC, and SSOM communities.
- The UCC managed UPC Membership Appointments vacated by faculty and staff that left the university.
- The Committee assembled a draft report on university policies and procedures relating to the selection, appointment, and evaluation of faculty for endowed chairs and endowed professorships and filled procedural gaps. The draft was circulated for comment by the Council of Deans and was then sent to the Faculty Affairs UPC for review and recommendations.
- The Faculty Council requested that the UCC offer a better understanding of how topics/issues get to the various UPCs. Father Garanzini subsequently met with the Faculty Council and suggested that the faculty on UPCs be invited to join Faculty Council as ex-officio members in order to enhance communication.
- The UCC approved a system of nomination and approval of elections for the UCC and UPCs and agreed to send the call for nominations in April. In May, nominations for the University Policy Committees were vetted and nominees were chosen for the available open positions.
- The Committee discussed making amendments to the Shared Governance Charter during its review this summer and a decision was made to hold a meeting between the UCC and President Garanzini to discuss the most effective and inclusive way to engage the university committee in this review process in August.
- There Committee reviewed Loyola University's agreement with St. Joseph's Seminary. The UCC decided that the President's Office, in consultation with the Jesuit Community liaison, Father Harnett, and the dean of the College of Arts and Sciences, should continue the renegotiation of the affiliation agreement with the archdiocese through the completion of that project.

Academic Affairs (Alan Gitelson, Chair)

- Approval of new CAS major: Bioinformatics
- Approval of new CAS major: Forensic Science
- Approval of new SBA M.S. degrees: MS in Software Technology; Ms in Scientific and Technological Computing; Ms in Information Technology

- Recommended lowering of minimum number of hours needed for a dual degree from 160 to 128 hours
- Approval of transfer of the BSSW program from the CAS to the SSW
- Approval of changes in current major for the BS in Computer Science and the addition of three new majors: BS in Communication Networks and Security; BS in Enterprise Information and Data Management; BS in Software Development
- Approval of new IPS M.A. in Spirituality
- Approval of School of Education programs: B.S.Ed. in Bilingual/Bicultural Education with Elementary certification; B.S.Ed. in Science education with Elementary Certification; M.Ed. in School Technology
- Approval of MBA in Health Care Management
- Approval of MSW in Leadership and Development in Social Services
- Approval of new CAS major in the Communications Dept.: Advertising and Public Relations
- Approval of new SBA Concentration in Entrepreneurship
- Approval of SBA proposal for a Center for Excellence in Hospitality-Tourism Management
- Approval of combined five-year BBA/MBA program
- Approval of MS in Clinical Research Methods (Dept. of Preventive Medicine-MC)
- Approval of School of Nursing BS in Health Systems Management
- Review of the Academic Calendar with future discussion planned
- Committee meetings also included discussions regarding the agenda for the 2005-2006 academic year.

Faculty Affairs (Paul Jay, Chair)

- Drafted a comprehensive Faculty Appeal and Grievance Procedure (Note: a number of important new policies and procedures related to faculty rights in the tenure and promotion process, and with respect to the disposition of grievances, were formulated during the year-long work on this document.)
- Reviewed and commented on draft North Central Self-Study document
- Reviewed and endorsed new Protocol on Endowed Chairs
- Reviewed and supported exploration of provision for health care benefits for domestic partners
- Reviewed and clarified process for faculty reconsideration of negative tenure and promotion recommendations by the University Rank and Tenure Committee
- Reviewed policies related to summer teaching stipends
- Reviewed and approved weighted voting system for rank and tenure and faculty development review committees
- Reviewed and approved new campus security proposal
- Reviewed and approved revisions in tuition remission benefits plan
- Initiated a comprehensive review of Loyola's faculty research leave policy and consideration of a proposal for sabbatical leaves presented by Faculty Council

- Initiated a review of tenure and promotion policies and guidelines for newly reorganized schools

Staff Affairs (Carolyn O'Connell, Chair)

- Reviewed final draft of the University Employee Tuition Benefits Policy and provided input to Vice President for Human Resources. The committee endorsed the final draft submitted to the President.
- Initiated discussion on the feasibility of a Compassion Bank for time off for staff employees.
- Devoted much time and effort into a thorough discussion of the university offering health care benefits for domestic partners and/or legally domiciled adults. Final recommendation on this topic is on the September 2005 meeting agenda.
- The Staff Affairs UPC chair met with North Central Accreditation team members.

Student Affairs (Father Richard Salmi, S.J., Chair)

- Domestic partner benefits: we did not have a policy to review but we did look at the issue to provide feedback to the university. The minutes of that meeting (Nov 18, 2004) say "it should be noted that the members of the Student Affairs UPC supports in principle domestic partner benefits and would welcome a policy for further review."
- North Central Accreditation (NCA) report and site visit. The UPC met to discuss the report and to affirm that it accurately reflected the self-governance structure of the university (March 30th).
- Proposal to enhance safety through expanding the jurisdiction of Campus Safety. The UPC met twice to review this policy. The minutes of that meeting (May 24, 2005) note that "the Student Affairs UPC recognizes that the proposal to enhance campus safety and expand its jurisdiction is complex. We would encourage the university to: 1) consider any increased liability due to the expanded jurisdiction and arming of officers, 2) make a genuine effort to increase communication about the implementation of this proposal, especially to students and neighbors and 3) recognize and respect that there will be a segment of our university population strongly opposed to arming our safety officers. Given these concerns the Student Affairs UPC voted to support the proposal (6 yes 1 no) and send it to the UCC for its consideration."

Strategic Planning

- The SPUPC reviewed the NCA Self-Study recommendations and determined that the recommendations along with the self-study report should be circulated throughout the University for review.

- The Committee met with Bob Ward, Director of Alumni and Special Events, to present his plan for enhanced alumni relations and services.
- An update on the work of Institutional Research and the enhanced staffing of the office was presented by John Frendreis, Vice Provost and Rick Hurst, IR Director. It was recommended that as the official source of university data, all external reports such reports as the ABA and AALS be completed by Institutional Research. It was also recommended that IR continue to de-centralize data collection and data reporting so other units can get data themselves and to standardize the Reporting Data Service so that all units on campus receive the same results. With anticipated staff increases, it was reported that IR would be in a position to make a greater effort on internal reporting needs of Administrators, Deans, and Chairs.
- The SPUPC was updated on Capital Planning by Wayne Magdziarz, VP Capital Planning. It was recommended that the university formulate an economic plan that will guide the decisions of the TIF, i.e., how to best finance the renovation of Mundelein Center. Additionally, the Committee suggested that naming opportunities in Mundelein Center should be determined
- A review was made of the "Check-List of University-Wide Initiatives." It was agreed that progress was being made on many fronts and that select others should now be initiated.
Specifically, the SPUPC recommended the following actions:
 - Establishment of a task force on diversity that will study ways to improve the gender, racial and ethnic diversity in the student body, faculty ranks, staff and administration; to determine the parameters of an affirmative action plan; and to set achievable goals for increasing diversity within each of these areas.
 - Benchmark student satisfaction across all the schools.
 - Establish a working group to assess the future direction of university libraries under the leadership of Logan Ludwig, Stritch School of Medicine Librarian.
- The SPUPC reviewed the formation of three new work groups: the Task Force on the Future of Career, Internship and Placement Services; the Ad Hoc Committee on Alumni Educational Opportunities; and the Commission on the Status of Women at Loyola University. The efforts of all three work groups will be presented to the Strategic Planning UPC in the fall.
- An update on the work of the Library Task Force was presented by John Pelissero. Father Garanzini noted the importance of including Task Force members in the architectural design effort while ensuring that members focus on best practices and strategic planning.
- An update on the status of Academic Advising and Support Services as well as on the Graduating Senior Student Survey was presented to the SPUPC by John Pelissero.

Budget and Finance (Bill Laird, Chair)

- Fringe Benefit Rates- Examined all of the University's fringe benefit programs and related costs in comparison with other competitor universities in order to achieve fairness, affordability, and stability and to properly match our costs with available revenues. Recommended a plan of principles to accomplish this.
- Retiree Health Care Benefits- Recommended revisions to the retiree health program for a program the University can afford. Many firms are eliminating this benefit entirely.
- Pension Plan Changes- In order to better control costs and improve our competitive position with competitor universities, endorsed a decision to eliminate the staff defined benefit pension program and replace it with a defined contribution program consistent with the faculty program.
- School Profit & Loss Financial Statements- Reviewed a University developed methodology for allocating revenues and expenses in order to assess the financial profitability of the University. Credit hours taught are used to allocate undergraduate tuition revenues as a way to better match revenues with the costs.
- Tuition Benefit Policy- Recommended revisions to the University's Tuition Benefit Policy consistent with the notion of better controlling fringe benefit costs.
- Socially Responsible Investing- Met with Loyola University Chicago students interested in discussing a possible University socially responsible investing policy.

Research (Allen Samarel, Chair)- No meetings convened during the 2004-2005 academic year.

Appendix VI: Motions regarding Shared Governance passed by affinity groups

Motion on Shared Governance

In the interests of giving the only elected university-wide body of faculty a greater and more formal role in our evolving structure of Shared Governance, Faculty Council requests that the following changes be made in the existing structure. Part I concerns the relationship between Faculty Council and the University Policy Committees in general. Part II proposes a stronger relationship between Faculty Council and the UPC most directly concerned with faculty affairs, namely, the Faculty Affairs UPC. Part III addresses the selection of faculty to serve on the various UPCs.

I. Regarding the general relationship between Faculty Council and the University Policy Committees, it should be policy that:

A. Faculty Council be informed by the UCC of each policy issues sent to a UPC at the time the policy issue is sent to the UPC.

B. Faculty Council be informed of each policy recommendation a UPC intends to send to the President.

C. Those policy recommendations deemed by Faculty Council to have significant bearing on faculty interests be brought before the Faculty Council for discussion, comment and a vote (Faculty Council may not amend the proposal, although the relevant UPC may choose to do so in light of the Faculty Council deliberation. If it does so, the amended proposal should be brought before the Faculty Council for consideration.)

D. If a proposal that has been rejected by the Faculty Council is sent to the President, and the President does not concur with the vote fo the Faculty Council, he respond to the Faculty Council in writing, setting out the reasons for his decision.

II. Regarding the special relationship between Faculty Council and the Faculty Affairs UPC, the Faculty Affairs UPC will:

A. Keep the Faculty Council apprised of policy recommendations under consideration by the FAUPC by sending a monthly report to FC;

B. Submit preliminary recommendations to FC for deliberation and vote before sending them on to the President;

C. Revise or withdraw any proposal that fails to secure Faculty Council approval;

D. Submit any revised proposal to FC for deliberation and vote;

E. Not forward any proposal to the President until it has been endorsed by FC.

III. Regarding the selection of faculty to serve on University Policy Committees, it shall be policy that Faculty Council shall work with the University Coordinating Committee in appointing Faculty to serve on the University Policy Committees.

A. It is understood that appointments should reflect relevant expertise.

B. Faculty Council may nominate faculty to serve on the UPCs.

C. The UCC will make the initial selection of faculty to serve on the UPC.

D. The UCC will give serious consideration to those candidates nominated by FC, but is not confined to this set.

E. The UCC selection of faculty to serve on the UPCs must be confirmed by Faculty Council.

F. Faculty Council will select the Chair of the Faculty Affairs UPC from among those faculty members appointed to that UPC.

Appendix VI cont.

AAUP Proposal on Shared Governance for Faculty Council November 9, 2005

I. Positions:

Committees cannot be simply advisory to the senior administration in *shared* governance. Appointments to committees need to be made by *elected* faculty and student bodies, such as Faculty Council, not by senior administrators. The appointment of faculty based on “expertise” is not in keeping with best practices.

Communication is crucial. Reports of issues brought to a UPC, the minutes of meetings, and the actions taken need to be reported to faculty regularly in emailed or mailed communications, not just posted on a website. If all UPCs report to Faculty Council, a report from the FC would cover this charge.¹

Process is crucial as well. University committees and administrators should not have the power to change website language or policies and procedures at will. The Faculty Handbook should spell out procedures for changing policies that include dissemination of changes to all faculty and broad consultation.

II. Recommendations:

Incorporate most UPCs as standing committees of Faculty Council, *e.g.* Faculty Affairs, Academic Affairs, Research, and even the UCC. Expand the faculty and student representation on each of these committees.

Make the Academic Affairs UPC a full-fledged university curriculum committee.

Create an Academic Council for the Rome Center Campus, which should be fully integrated into the governance structure of the university.

Make Faculty Council a full-fledged faculty senate, with legislative authority, not just an advisory role. A Faculty Senate would appoint members of university committees, and establish procedures for those committees. It would also participate in the hiring and evaluation of administrators. The Academic VP would attend all meetings, as an *ex officio* member.

Assure student participation in UPCs.²

¹ “The means of communication among the faculty, administration, and governing board now in use include: (1) circulation of memoranda and reports by board committees, the administration, and faculty committees, (2) joint ad hoc committees, (3) standing liaison committees, (4) membership of faculty members on administrative bodies, and (5) membership of faculty members on governing boards. Whatever the channels of communication, they should be clearly understood and observed.” (AAUP Statement on Government)

² “When students in American colleges and universities desire to participate responsibly in the government of the institution they attend, their wish should be recognized as a claim to opportunity both for educational experience and for involvement in the affairs of their college or university. Ways should be found to permit significant student participation within the limits of attainable effectiveness.” (AAUP Statement on Government)

Key quotations:

“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.” (AAUP Statement on Government)

“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. The agencies may consist of meetings of all faculty members of a department, school, college, division, or university system, or may take the form of faculty-elected executive committees in departments and schools and a faculty-elected senate or council for larger divisions or the institution as a whole.” (AAUP Statement on Government)

“The legitimacy of a decision-making body depends on its power and on the *election* of respected members.” (“What Makes Shared Governance Work?”, *Academe*, May-June 2005, p. 21; emphasis added)

“The faculty sets agendas, chooses representatives and leadership, and establishes procedures for committees that oversee the areas in which the faculty has primacy.” (“Principles of Shared Governance at Xavier University,” *Conversations*, Fall 2005, p. 10)

Appendix VI cont.**A Resolution of the *Unified Student Government* 06r04**

**Sponsors: Nellie Sires, Vice President of Student Affairs LSC, Matt Johnson, Vice President of J.U.S.T.I.C.E.; Atheni Asihel, Vice President of Public Relations;
First Reading: January 24, 2006**

Shared Governance

Whereas: University Shared Governance is currently under review and USG President, Laura Bityou, has been asked to sit on the review committee, and

Whereas: the purpose of the shared governance charter is to foster collaboration between various university constituencies and university administration, and

Whereas: section II of the charter recognizes the need for an established student government with appropriate means to host forums and address the concerns of the student population, and

Whereas: USG has been established a government organization for the undergraduate population, and

Whereas: USG has established goals, addresses student issues, plans activities, and acts as “the VOICE” of the undergraduate student population to the administration, and

Whereas: students are the primary patrons of all university services (ie education, residency, etc), and

Whereas: current undergraduate representation on University Policy Committees is an arbitrary assignment process offering no democratic representation or requiring any real knowledge of student concerns for membership

Therefore, be it resolved by the Unified Student Government that President Bityou bring the following recommendations to the review committee:

1. The President of USG sit on the University Coordinating Committee, in an effort to bring representative and democratic student input to the assignment of policy considerations
2. Representatives from USG be assigned to sit in the undergraduate positions on each of the individual policy committees
3. The university policy committees with no undergraduate student representation have a USG representative added in recognition of students importance in the University structure

Appendix VII: Overview of Electronic Survey Topics

**DRAFT Survey of Loyola University Chicago's Shared Governance System
Compiled by the UCC on 9/28/05**

This is intended to serve as a guideline for the development of a qualitative survey to solicit feedback on the strengths and weaknesses of the present shared governance system and garner suggestions on how to improve our system. The review of the system offers an important opportunity to assess the extent to which the University community is knowledgeable about the shared governance system, and provides a vehicle for enhancing communication about our system.

A. Knowledge of Shared Governance System

1. Do you have general knowledge about the shared governance system?
2. Have you read the Shared Governance Charter, drafted in February 2003?
3. Is information from the University Policy Committees effectively communicated to the wider University community?
4. Are shared governance documents (agendas, minutes, policies) easily accessible to the University community at large?

B. Effectiveness of Shared Governance System

1. Is the University Policy Committee structure (i.e. having a coordinating committee and seven UPCs each charged with specific issue areas) effective?
2. Are the seven issue areas the right ones for our University (i.e. Academic Affairs, Faculty Affairs, Staff Affairs, Student Affairs, Strategic Planning, Budgeting and Finance, and Research)?
3. Is the jurisdiction of the UPCs effectively communicated and managed? Is it clear which issues are handled administratively versus those funneled to the UPCs?
4. Is the shared governance system relevant to you and your work at the University?
5. Is the system designed to address unique needs of the Lake Shore Campuses as well as the Medical Center Campus?

C. Participation in Shared Governance System

1. Does the system permit and encourage participation by faculty, staff and students?

2. Is the nomination/appointment process for membership on the University Policy Committees well communicated? Is it transparent?
3. Are the University Policy Committees composed of the right mix of faculty, students and staff? Is the system representative of a diversity of opinions and expertise?
4. Does the shared governance system effectively engage affinity groups, i.e. Faculty Council, Staff Council and the Unified Student Government Association?

Questions pertinent to the respondent:

1. Are you currently serving or have you in the past served on a University Policy Committee?
2. If yes, was your experience on a University Policy Committee a positive or negative experience? Why?
3. If you have not served on a University Policy Committee, how much knowledge do you have about the system and its function?
4. How do you propose we improve the shared governance system?

Appendix VIII: Survey Weblink

<https://surveys.luc.edu/opinio5/s?s=1715>

Appendix IX: Electronic Survey Overall Results

[\[print\]](#)

Summary report

Lists all the questions in the survey and displays summary information for each question. Text input is not included.

Report date: Friday, April 7, 2006 1:28 PM
 Start date: Thursday, February 23, 2006 3:26 PM
 Stop date: Wednesday, April 5, 2006 11:59 PM

1. Overall, to what extent are you familiar with Loyola's Shared Governance System, which was established in 2003?

Option	Count	Percent	Cum. count	Cum. percent	Cum. sum
1. Very familiar	65	3.71%	65	3.71%	65
2. Moderately familiar	114	6.51%	179	10.22%	293
3. A little familiar	184	10.51%	363	20.73%	845
4. Not very familiar	332	18.96%	695	39.69%	2173
5. Not at all familiar	1056	60.31%	1751	100.0%	7453
Total	1751	100%	1751	100%	7453

Total responses: 1751

2. Have you ever looked online for material about Loyola's Shared Governance System (e.g., charter, agenda, minutes)?

Option	Count	Percent	Cum. count	Cum. percent	Cum. sum
1. Yes	237	13.54%	237	13.54%	237
2. No	1514	86.46%	1751	100.0%	3265
Total	1751	100%	1751	100%	3265

Total responses: 1751

3. Were you able to find the material you were looking for?

Option	Count	Percent	Cum. count	Cum. percent	Cum. sum
1. Yes	110	47.21%	110	47.21%	110
2. Only some of it	112	48.07%	222	95.28%	334
3. None	11	4.72%	233	100.0%	367
Total	233	100%	233	100%	367

Total responses: 233

4. Of the material you found, how much of it did you read?

Option	Count	Percent	Cum. count	Cum. percent	Cum. sum
1. All of it	26	11.02%	26	11.02%	26
2. Quite a bit of it	63	26.69%	89	37.71%	152
3. Some of it	114	48.31%	203	86.02%	494
4. A little of it	31	13.14%	234	99.15%	618
5. None of it	2	0.85%	236	100.0%	628
Total	236	100%	236	100%	628

Total responses: 236

5. How often do you discuss Loyola's Shared Governance System with others within the Loyola community?

Option	Count	Percent	Cum. count	Cum. percent	Cum. sum
1. Frequently	51	2.91%	51	2.91%	51
2. Occasionally	127	7.25%	178	10.16%	305
3. Rarely	253	14.44%	431	24.6%	1064
4. Never	1321	75.4%	1752	100.0%	6348
Total	1752	100%	1752	100%	6348

Total responses: 1752

6. Do you know who the members of the University Policy Committees are?

Option	Count	Percent	Cum. count	Cum. percent	Cum. sum
1. Most or all of them	29	1.66%	29	1.66%	29
2. Some of them	335	19.12%	364	20.78%	699
3. None of them	1388	79.22%	1752	100.0%	4863
Total	1752	100%	1752	100%	4863

Total responses: 1752

7. How effectively would you say the University Policy Committees communicate with the wider university community?

Option	Count	Percent	Cum. count	Cum. percent	Cum. sum
1. Very effectively	15	0.9%	15	0.9%	15
2. Moderately effectively	292	17.45%	307	18.35%	599
3. Not very effectively	727	43.45%	1034	61.81%	2780
4. Not at all effectively	639	38.19%	1673	100.0%	5336
Total	1673	100%	1673	100%	5336

Total responses: 1673

8. How easily accessible are the shared governance documents (e.g., agendas, minutes, policies)?

Option	Count	Percent	Cum. count	Cum. percent	Cum. sum
1. Very accessible	49	2.81%	49	2.81%	49
2. Moderately accessible	180	10.33%	229	13.15%	409
3. Not very accessible	122	7.0%	351	20.15%	775
4. Not at all accessible	43	2.47%	394	22.62%	947
5. Don't know	1348	77.38%	1742	100.0%	7687
Total	1742	100%	1742	100%	7687

Total
responses: 1742

9. Are you aware of policy decisions that have resulted from University Planning Committees' discussions or actions?

Option	Count	Percent	Cum. count	Cum. percent	Cum. sum
1. No, none	1271	72.96%	1271	72.96%	1271
2. Yes, one or two	307	17.62%	1578	90.59%	1885
3. Yes, a few	141	8.09%	1719	98.68%	2308
4. Yes, many	23	1.32%	1742	100.0%	2400
Total	1742	100%	1742	100%	2400

Total
responses: 1742

10. How clear is your understanding of which issues should be funneled through the University Policy Committees?

Option	Count	Percent	Cum. count	Cum. percent	Cum. sum
1. Very clear	20	1.15%	20	1.15%	20
2. Moderately clear	144	8.26%	164	9.41%	308
3. Not very clear	433	24.84%	597	34.25%	1607
4. Not clear at all	1146	65.75%	1743	100.0%	6191
Total	1743	100%	1743	100%	6191

Total
responses: 1743

11. How well does the shared governance system function on your campus?

Option	Count	Percent	Cum. count	Cum. percent	Cum. sum
1. Very well	13	0.74%	13	0.74%	13
2. Moderately well	103	5.88%	116	6.62%	219
3. Not very well	102	5.83%	218	12.45%	525
4. Not well at all	125	7.14%	343	19.59%	1025
5. Don't know	1408	80.41%	1751	100.0%	8065
Total	1751	100%	1751	100%	8065

Total
responses: 1751

12. To what extent does Loyola's Shared Governance System encourage participation by faculty, staff, and students?

Option	Count	Percent	Cum. count	Cum. percent	Cum. sum
1. To a great extent	27	1.55%	27	1.55%	27
2. To some extent	144	8.24%	171	9.79%	315
3. Only a little	183	10.48%	354	20.26%	864
4. Not at all	172	9.85%	526	30.11%	1552
5. Don't know	1221	69.89%	1747	100.0%	7657
Total	1747	100%	1747	100%	7657

Total
responses: 1747

13. To what extent is the process by which people become members of the University Policy Committees fair and open?

Option	Count	Percent	Cum. count	Cum. percent	Cum. sum
1. To a great extent	31	1.77%	31	1.77%	31
2. To some extent	106	6.06%	137	7.83%	243
3. Only a little	119	6.8%	256	14.63%	600
4. Not at all	107	6.11%	363	20.74%	1028
5. Don't know	1387	79.26%	1750	100.0%	7963
Total	1750	100%	1750	100%	7963

Total responses: 1750

14. Do you agree or disagree that faculty and staff who hold major positions on the University Policy Committees should be compensated in some way for their work?

Option	Count	Percent	Cum. count	Cum. percent	Cum. sum
1. Strongly agree	154	9.09%	154	9.09%	154
2. Agree	914	53.92%	1068	63.01%	1982
3. Disagree	466	27.49%	1534	90.5%	3380
4. Strongly disagree	161	9.5%	1695	100.0%	4024
Total	1695	100%	1695	100%	4024

Total responses: 1695

15. Positions on the University Policy Committees should be:

Option	Count	Percent	Cum. count	Cum. percent	Cum. sum
1. elected only	442	25.29%	442	25.29%	442
2. both elected and appointed	816	46.68%	1258	71.97%	2074
3. appointed only	46	2.63%	1304	74.6%	2212
4. Don't know	444	25.4%	1748	100.0%	3988
Total	1748	100%	1748	100%	3988

Total responses: 1748

16. Who should make appointments to the University Policy Committees?

Option	Count	Percent	Cum. count	Cum. percent	Cum. sum
1. a University Coordinating Committee comprised of senior administrators (including the Provost) and the heads of elected university bodies (e.g., the president of Faculty Council)	237	27.69%	237	27.69%	237
2. Elected bodies on campus, such as Faculty Council, Staff Council, Undergraduate Student Government	428	50.0%	665	77.69%	1093
3. Don't know	154	17.99%	819	95.68%	1555
4. Other (please specify)	37	4.32%	856	100.0%	1703
Total	856	100%	856	100%	1703

Total responses: 856

17. To what extent does the Shared Governance System work effectively with related groups, such as the Faculty Council, the Faculty Senate, the Staff Council, and the Undergraduate Student Government?

Option	Count	Percent	Cum. count	Cum. percent	Cum. sum
1. To a great extent	28	1.61%	28	1.61%	28
2. To some extent	114	6.56%	142	8.17%	256
3. Only a little	105	6.04%	247	14.21%	571
4. Not at all	68	3.91%	315	18.12%	843
5. Don't know	1423	81.88%	1738	100.0%	7958
Total	1738	100%	1738	100%	7958

Total responses: 1738

18. Which of the following methods of communication about Shared Governance activities would be most effective? Check all that apply.

Option	Count	Percent	Cum. count	Cum. percent	Cum. sum
1. "Inside Loyola" weekly email edition	780	12.48%	780	12.48%	780
2. "Inside Loyola" monthly print edition	490	7.84%	1270	20.32%	1760
3. Alumni magazine	198	3.17%	1468	23.48%	2354
4. Department/school newsletters	492	7.87%	1960	31.35%	4322
5. Phoenix	673	10.77%	2633	42.12%	7687
6. Web	794	12.7%	3427	54.82%	12451
7. Broadcast email	967	15.47%	4394	70.29%	19220
8. Plasma screens	223	3.57%	4617	73.86%	21004
9. Bulletin boards	468	7.49%	5085	81.35%	25216
10. Kiosks	155	2.48%	5240	83.83%	26766
11. Open Houses, open forums, University Addresses	505	8.08%	5745	91.91%	32321
12. Department/division meetings	506	8.09%	6251	100.0%	38393
Total	6251	100%	6251	100%	38393

Total responses: 1702

19. To what extent are your concerns and interests well represented in Loyola's Shared Governance System?

Option	Count	Percent	Cum. count	Cum. percent	Cum. sum
1. To a great extent	38	2.48%	38	2.48%	38
2. To some extent	352	22.98%	390	25.46%	742
3. Only a little	383	25.0%	773	50.46%	1891
4. Not at all	759	49.54%	1532	100.0%	4927
Total	1532	100%	1532	100%	4927

Total responses: 1532

20. Do you have any other comments about Loyola's Shared Governance System?

21. Number of years at Loyola

Option	Count	Percent	Cum. count	Cum. percent	Cum. sum
1. Less than 3 years	941	53.86%	941	53.86%	941
2. 3-4 years	335	19.18%	1276	73.04%	1611
3. 4-10 years	185	10.59%	1461	83.63%	2166
4. More than 10 years	286	16.37%	1747	100.0%	3310
Total	1747	100%	1747	100%	3310

Total responses: 1747

22. Main campus of work or study

Option	Count	Percent	Cum. count	Cum. percent	Cum. sum
1. Lake Shore Campus	983	56.49%	983	56.49%	983
2. Water Tower Campus	511	29.37%	1494	85.86%	2005
3. Maywood Campus	240	13.79%	1734	99.66%	2725
4. Rome Center	6	0.34%	1740	100.0%	2749
Total	1740	100%	1740	100%	2749

Total responses: 1740

23. Gender

Option	Count	Percent	Cum. count	Cum. percent	Cum. sum
1. Male	638	36.79%	638	36.79%	638
2. Female	1096	63.21%	1734	100.0%	2830
Total	1734	100%	1734	100%	2830

Total responses: 1734

24. Primary race/ethnic identification

Option	Count	Percent	Cum. count	Cum. percent	Cum. sum
1. Caucasian, White	1311	76.8%	1311	76.8%	1311
2. African-American, Black	78	4.57%	1389	81.37%	1467
3. Latino/Hispanic, Latino/Hispanic American	103	6.03%	1492	87.4%	1776
4. Asian, Pacific Islander, Asian American	132	7.73%	1624	95.14%	2304
5. Other	83	4.86%	1707	100.0%	2719
Total	1707	100%	1707	100%	2719

Total responses: 1707

25. Primary status

Option	Count	Percent	Cum. count	Cum. percent	Cum. sum
1. Undergraduate student	753	43.1%	753	43.1%	753
2. Graduate/professional student	395	22.61%	1148	65.71%	1543
3. Faculty	307	17.57%	1455	83.29%	2464
4. Staff	292	16.71%	1747	100.0%	3632
Total	1747	100%	1747	100%	3632

Total responses: 1747

26. Study or work status

Option	Count	Percent	Cum. count	Cum. percent	Cum. sum
1. Full-time	1528	88.07%	1528	88.07%	1528
2. Part-time	207	11.93%	1735	100.0%	1942
Total	1735	100%	1735	100%	1942

Total 1735

responses:

27. Faculty rank

Option	Count	Percent	Cum. count	Cum. percent	Cum. sum
1. Instructor	52	18.18%	52	18.18%	52
2. Assistant professor	43	15.03%	95	33.22%	138
3. Associate professor	96	33.57%	191	66.78%	426
4. Full professor	95	33.22%	286	100.0%	806
Total	286	100%	286	100%	806

Total
responses: 286

28. Tenure track status

Option	Count	Percent	Cum. count	Cum. percent	Cum. sum
1. Tenured	168	55.81%	168	55.81%	168
2. Tenure-track	32	10.63%	200	66.45%	232
3. Non-tenure track	101	33.55%	301	100.0%	535
Total	301	100%	301	100%	535

Total
responses: 301

29. School or division

Option	Count	Percent	Cum. count	Cum. percent	Cum. sum
1. College of Arts and Sciences - Humanities	114	16.99%	114	16.99%	114
2. College of Arts and Sciences - Natural Sciences	44	6.56%	158	23.55%	202
3. College of Arts and Sciences - Social Sciences	64	9.54%	222	33.08%	394
4. School of Education	95	14.16%	317	47.24%	774
5. School of Law	69	10.28%	386	57.53%	1119
6. School of Social Work	59	8.79%	445	66.32%	1473
7. Business School	69	10.28%	514	76.6%	1956
8. Stritch School of Medicine	122	18.18%	636	94.78%	2932
9. School of Nursing	21	3.13%	657	97.91%	3121
10. Institute for Pastoral Studies	14	2.09%	671	100.0%	3261
Total	671	100%	671	100%	3261

Total
responses: 671

30. Current administrative appointment

Option	Count	Percent	Cum. count	Cum. percent	Cum. sum
1. None	257	85.67%	257	85.67%	257
2. Part time administrator	28	9.33%	285	95.0%	313
3. Full time administrator	15	5.0%	300	100.0%	358
Total	300	100%	300	100%	358

Total
responses: 300

31. Current administrative position

Option	Count	Percent	Cum. count	Cum. percent	Cum. sum
1. President/Provost (including Assistant and Associate)	4	13.33%	4	13.33%	4
2. Dean (including Assistant and Associate)	15	50.0%	19	63.33%	34
3. Chair	11	36.67%	30	100.0%	67
Total	30	100%	30	100%	67

Total responses: 30

32. School or College

Option	Count	Percent	Cum. count	Cum. percent	Cum. sum
1. College of Arts and Sciences	547	73.03%	547	73.03%	547
2. School of Education	20	2.67%	567	75.7%	587
3. School of Law	1	0.13%	568	75.83%	590
4. School of Social Work	12	1.6%	580	77.44%	638
5. Business School	119	15.89%	699	93.32%	1233
6. Stritch School of Medicine	2	0.27%	701	93.59%	1245
7. School of Nursing	46	6.14%	747	99.73%	1567
8. Institute for Pastoral Studies	2	0.27%	749	100.0%	1583
Total	749	100%	749	100%	1583

Total responses: 749

33. Degree program

Option	Count	Percent	Cum. count	Cum. percent	Cum. sum
1. MBA	46	11.73%	46	11.73%	46
2. Other master's level	134	34.18%	180	45.92%	314
3. Ph.D.	78	19.9%	258	65.82%	548
4. Ed. D.	11	2.81%	269	68.62%	592
6. M.D.	57	14.54%	326	83.16%	934
7. J.D.	56	14.29%	382	97.45%	1326
8. Other professional	10	2.55%	392	100.0%	1406
Total	392	100%	392	100%	1406

Total responses: 392

34. Type of position

Option	Count	Percent	Cum. count	Cum. percent	Cum. sum
1. Hourly	93	32.07%	93	32.07%	93
2. Salaried	126	43.45%	219	75.52%	345
3. Manager/supervisor	39	13.45%	258	88.97%	462
4. Department director or above	32	11.03%	290	100.0%	590
Total	290	100%	290	100%	590

Total responses: 290

Appendix X: Electronic Survey Results by LUC Group

Results of Shared Governance Survey, by respondent's primary status (%)

		Students			Faculty	Staff	High administration
		Undergrad	Grad/prof'l				
Familiar with SG	Very familiar	1	1	13	4	21	
	Moderately familiar	3	1	18	9	32	
	A little familiar	6	5	22	18	26	
	Not very familiar	18	13	21	26	16	
	Not at all familiar	73	80	25	42	5	
Number responding to question		754	396	289	295	19	
Looked online for SG material	Yes	5	3	38	24	53	
	No	95	97	62	76	47	
	Number responding to question		754	396	289	295	19
Found material online	Yes	32	90	42	54	78	
	Only some of it	55	10	55	43	11	
	None	13	0	3	3	11	
	Number responding to question		38	10	106	69	9
Read material online	All of it	11	9	13	7	10	
	Quite a bit of it	18	27	32	22	40	
	Some of it	53	45	42	56	50	
	A little of it	13	18	13	15	0	
	None of it	5	0	0	0	0	
	Number responding to question		38	11	107	68	10
Discuss SG	Frequently	2	1	11	1	11	
	Occasionally	3	2	23	8	47	
	Rarely	10	7	29	21	26	
	Never	85	91	37	70	16	
	Number responding to question		756	395	288	296	19
Know who UPC members are	Most or all of them	1	1	5	2	5	
	Some of them	9	6	48	29	74	
	None of them	90	93	47	69	21	
	Number responding to question		755	395	289	296	19
UPC communication effectiveness	Very effectively	1	1	1	2	6	
	Moderately effectively	16	12	23	21	50	
	Not very effectively	40	41	52	48	28	
	Not at all effectively	43	46	24	29	17	
	Number responding to question		737	369	273	278	18
Accessibility of SG docs	Very accessible	1	1	6	7	5	
	Moderately accessible	6	4	28	12	37	
	Not very accessible	4	3	17	9	26	

	Not at all accessible	3	1	5	1	5
	Don't know	86	92	45	71	26
	Number responding to question	754	391	285	295	19
Aware of policy decisions	No, none	79	87	47	67	32
	Yes, one or two	16	7	34	20	32
	Yes, a few	5	6	14	13	21
	Yes, many	0	1	5	0	16
	Number responding to question	751	393	287	295	19
Understand what should be funneled through UPC	Very clear	1	0	3	1	17
	Moderately clear	6	3	19	10	39
	Not very clear	24	17	37	26	22
	Not clear at all	70	80	41	63	22
	Number responding to question	750	393	289	296	18
Functioning of SG on your primary campus	Very well	1	1	1	1	0
	Moderately well	5	3	9	6	42
	Not very well	4	1	20	5	5
	Not well at all	4	4	21	5	21
	Don't know	87	92	49	82	32
	Number responding to question	755	395	289	296	19
SG encourages participation	To a great extent	1	0	2	3	5
	To some extent	5	5	18	9	42
	Only a little	7	2	28	12	26
	Not at all	10	6	15	9	16
	Don't know	76	87	37	67	11
	Number responding to question	750	396	288	296	19
UPC membership process fair and open	To a great extent	2	0	4	2	0
	To some extent	4	2	11	8	42
	Only a little	4	2	18	8	11
	Not at all	4	2	18	4	16
	Don't know	86	94	48	78	32
	Number responding to question	754	395	289	296	19
Fac/staff in major UPC positions should be compensated	Strongly agree	7	10	17	6	21
	Agree	58	60	49	41	21
	Disagree	26	23	28	37	32
	Strongly disagree	9	6	7	16	26
	Number responding to question	734	381	278	286	19
How positions on UPC should be decided	elected only	28	19	37	17	11
	both elected and appointed	42	45	50	56	79
	appointed only	1	2	2	7	5
	Don't know	29	34	11	20	5
	Number responding to question	753	393	289	296	19
Who should make appointments to UPC	UPC	19	32	37	28	63
	Elected bodies on campus	56	47	44	50	25
	Don't know	23	18	13	13	13
	Other	2	2	6	9	0

	Number responding to question	322	184	149	186	16
SG works effectively with related groups	To a great extent	2	1	2	2	5
	To some extent	5	3	13	7	26
	Only a little	3	1	21	5	16
	Not at all	3	2	9	3	5
	Don't know	86	94	55	83	47
	Number responding to question	748	392	289	294	19
Concerns and interests well represented in SG	To a great extent	2	2	3	2	17
	To some extent	23	16	29	23	56
	Only a little	24	19	34	25	17
	Not at all	51	63	33	49	11
	Number responding to question	700	319	256	244	18
Number of years at Loyola	Less than 3 years	67	70	20	33	21
	3-4 years	29	19	5	9	0
	4-10 years	4	10	16	25	5
	More than 10 years	0	1	60	33	74
	Number responding to question	756	395	288	294	19
Primary campus of work or study	Lake Shore Campus	84	21	55	35	42
	Water Tower Campus	15	62	20	30	32
	Maywood Campus	0	17	24	33	26
	Rome Center	0	0	0	1	0
	Number responding to question	753	391	288	294	19
Gender	Male	31	38	57	29	68
	Female	69	62	43	71	32
	Number responding to question	753	393	284	293	19
Primary race/ethnic identification	White	71	77	87	82	84
	Black	3	5	3	9	0
	Latino/Hispanic	9	4	4	3	0
	Asian, Pacific Islander	11	8	3	5	5
	Other	6	5	4	2	11
	Number responding to question	751	391	274	280	19
Full or part time	Full-time	93	72	87	97	100
	Part-time	7	28	13	3	0
	Number responding to question	753	394	285	291	19
Faculty rank	Instructor	0	0	19	0	6
	Assistant professor	0	0	16	0	0
	Associate professor	0	0	34	0	28
	Full professor	0	0	31	0	67
	Number responding to question	0	0	269	0	18
Tenure track status	Tenured	0	0	54	0	84
	Tenure-track	0	0	11	0	5
	Non-tenure track	0	0	35	0	11
	Number responding to question	0	0	281	0	19

School or division	CAS - Humanities	0	9	29	0	6
	CAS - Natural Sciences	0	2	13	0	13
	CAS - Social Sciences	0	7	13	0	13
	School of Education	0	19	7	0	6
	School of Law	0	16	3	0	0
	School of Social Work	0	13	3	0	6
	Business School	0	14	5	0	6
	Stritch School of Medicine	0	15	23	0	19
	School of Nursing	0	3	4	0	13
	ISP	0	2	1	0	19
	Number responding to question	0	390	267	0	16
Current administrative appointment	None	0	0	91	0	0
	Part time administrator	0	0	8	0	32
	Full time administrator	0	0	1	0	68
	Number responding to question	0	0	280	0	19
Higher administration	President/Provosts*	0	0	0	0	21
	Deans*	0	0	0	0	79
	Chairs	0	0	100	0	0
	Number responding to question	0	0	11	0	19
School or college	CAS	73	0	0	0	0
	School of Education	3	0	0	0	0
	School of Law	0	0	0	0	0
	School of Social Work	2	0	0	0	0
	Business School	16	0	0	0	0
	Stritch School of Medicine	0	0	0	0	0
	School of Nursing	6	0	0	0	0
	ISP	0	0	0	0	0
	Number responding to question	750	0	0	0	0
Degree program	MBA	0	12	0	0	0
	Other master's level	0	34	0	0	0
	Ph.D.	0	20	0	0	0
	Ed. D.	0	3	0	0	0
	M.D.	0	15	0	0	0
	J.D.	0	14	0	0	0
	Other professional	0	3	0	0	0
	Number responding to question	0	393	0	0	0
Position type	Hourly	0	0	0	32	0
	Salaried	0	0	0	43	0
	Manager/supervisor	0	0	0	14	0
	Dept director or above	0	0	0	11	0
	Number responding to question	0	0	0	293	0

* Includes Assistant and Associate positions.

Shared Governance Survey Response Rates, by Status

	<u>Invites</u>	<u>Respondents</u>	<u>Response Rate</u>
Faculty	1,550	307	19.8%
Staff	1,568	292	18.6%
Grad/prof students	5,304	395	7.4%
Undergrad students	8,386	753	9.0%
Total	16,808	1,747	10.4%

Appendix XI: Open-ended responses from electronic survey

[\[print\]](#)

Comment report

Lists all the questions in the survey and displays all the comments made to these questions, if applicable.

Report date: Tuesday, April 18, 2006 1:56 PM
 Start date: Thursday, February 23, 2006 3:26 PM
 Stop date: Wednesday, April 5, 2006 11:59 PM

1. Overall, to what extent are you familiar with Loyola's Shared Governance System, which was established in 2003?
2. Have you ever looked online for material about Loyola's Shared Governance System (e.g., charter, agenda, minutes)?
3. Were you able to find the material you were looking for?
4. Of the material you found, how much of it did you read?
5. How often do you discuss Loyola's Shared Governance System with others within the Loyola community?
6. Do you know who the members of the University Policy Committees are?
7. How effectively would you say the University Policy Committees communicate with the wider university community?
8. How easily accessible are the shared governance documents (e.g., agendas, minutes, policies)?
9. Are you aware of policy decisions that have resulted from University Planning Committees' discussions or actions?
10. How clear is your understanding of which issues should be funneled through the University Policy Committees?
11. How well does the shared governance system function on your campus?
12. To what extent does Loyola's Shared Governance System encourage participation by faculty, staff, and students?

13. To what extent is the process by which people become members of the University Policy Committees fair and open?

14. Do you agree or disagree that faculty and staff who hold major positions on the University Policy Committees should be compensated in some way for their work?

15. Positions on the University Policy Committees should be:

16. Who should make appointments to the University Policy Committees?

Multiple choice other field (Other (please specify))

[Combo of 1 and 2](#)

[Combination of one and two above](#)

[I think senior administrators should consult with key faculty/staff \(dept. chairs, deans, directors, etc.\) who would then nominate appropriate staff/faculty from their areas.](#)

[President](#)

[bothe the first two](#)

[Both choice 1 and 2 in this question](#)

[both top two above](#)

[Don't care](#)

[Combo of the two above.](#)

[A mix of one and two above](#)

[combo of administrators and elected bodies](#)

[a University committee could nominate individuals and students and faculty could vote](#)

[combination of UCC and other elected bodies](#)

[a cordinating committing as listed above with student representation](#)

[elected bodies, deans, chairs and heads of programs, NOT the Provost \(not until we get a faculty friendly provost\)](#)

[chairs know their faculty well; they would be a very good resource for reccommending expertise](#)

[Appointments but the Coordinating Committee with a minority membership from Faculty and Staff Councils and Student Government.](#)

[Both](#)

[undergraduate students not necessarily involved in USG should also be incorporated](#)

[nominations](#)

[a University Coordinating Committee comprised of senior administrators \(including the Provost\)](#)

[both of the above](#)

[Both UCC and elected bodies](#)

[Combination](#)

[Combination of \(a\), \(b\) and department heads](#)

[chairs and deans should have input](#)

[the cardinal](#)

[both a and b should play some part in getting the right person](#)

[Qualified students and staff who actually know what issues are at hand while considering the effects they will have on the greater Loyola community](#)

[USG members themselves](#)

[employees](#)

[A and B](#)

[combination of 1 & 2](#)

[mix of first two choices](#)

[Both of the top choices](#)

[both 1 and 2](#)

[Student Body President and Fr. Garanzini](#)

17. To what extent does the Shared Governance System work effectively with related groups, such as the Faculty Council, the Faculty Senate, the Staff Council, and the Undergraduate Student Government?

18. Which of the following methods of communication about Shared Governance activities would be most effective? Check all that apply.

19. To what extent are your concerns and interests well represented in Loyola's Shared Governance System?

20. Do you have any other comments about Loyola's Shared Governance System?

Free text

[You have constructed a very good questionnaire and it has asked all right questions. I do not feel any need to add anything additional.](#)

[The last I checked, the web page did not provide clear guidelines for how to submit a proposal to the UCC.](#)

[it needs power not just advice, it need to be representative and not appointed by the admin.](#)

[Too many decisions are made by upper administration without consultation or consideration of involved parties. This makes it appear that the university has "shared governance" in name only. There are a significant number of activities that are being revised year after year, when new individuals are put in place. Often the system merely needed to be refined not totally remade. Constant reinvention creates chaos and confusion.](#)

Until I got this email, I didn't know it existed and I've been here for 9 1/2 years

People are busy and generally governance only becomes an issue when you have some crisis (people don't like the way things are working). Few of us will make a big investment in governance at other times. Also, I feel participation in governance should be compensated only to the extent that it involves extraordinary service commitments beyond what is normally expected.

Shared governance is going to be limited as long as senior management operates in an authoritarian model.

Top-down administration has increased in the last few years; it was already excessive even under Fr. Piderit. I have very little confidence that faculty voices are heard at all.

It is not really shared governance. It is guidance for the president and provost.

It it is a travesty to have members appointed through some mysterious process, rather than through elections. In some cases, those on the committee are both judge and jury. The current structure goes against all the recommendations of the AAUP for university governance. This is perhaps the most disturbing aspect of being a faculty at this university.

Very hard to comment on the governance, selection, and operations of something I know nothing about after several years at LUC

As to the above question, since I don't know what is happening with the committee, I feel I can't give an honest answer.

let every in on it!

I don't know the answer to #19.

I have only been here since June, and possibly missed announcements and information.

Poorly publicized. Secretive. No representative of all constituencies.

It seems to me most of the decisions that affect us as staff are made by Father Garanzini without any input from anyone.

I am probaby one of those people who doesn't take advantage of the opportunities to learn about decisions resulting from Shared Governance. But if decisions were made that affect my job/area, I would like to know, and I think the best way to find out would be for our director to share the information with us at staff meetings.

I do not understand why we need Faculty Council and Staff Council if we have shared governance.

Faculty Council should have much more power. There are too many administrators on UPCs; in fact, their presence on some UPCs is a conflict of interest in my opinion. The current system grabbed UPCs from the Faculty Senate model approved by the faculty, and implemented them in a much less transparent way than what was envisioned under the Faculty Senate model, which was deepsixed by the administration. I'm not quite sure what they're afraid of, but I would like to see true shared governance, not the charade of such that is currently in effect at Loyola.

There isn't enough elected representation on the policy committees, they are too administratively driven and top down. It is unclear what should be brought before the committees and what procedure one would take to bring something before a committee.

Those who are low on the totem pole really don't hear much about it and don't seem to be solicited for our opinions much regarding the decisions these people are making.

Does this even exist at the LUMC?

It seems to operate with a small group of people and there does not seem to be a good system of communication.

How were we informed about this system to begin with as I am unfamiliar with it.

Send out info to staff about the SGS, issues, meeting times, ways to be apart of the SGS, etc

The Loyola's Shared Governance System must do better communicating and making everyone inclusive and its information easily accessible.

I'm not sure if I haven't heard about the system because I'm a more recent employee (6 months) or what. Could it be mentioned at a mandatory university orientation for new employees? It sounds very interesting and I would like to know more... Hopefully renewed efforts of explanation/awareness will be seen soon.

I would like to learn more about Loyola's shared Governance System, in terms of what it means and how it applies to individuals on campus. I believe that the whole is no greater than the sum of all it's parts. My boss frequently stated there is no "I" in team. Loyola is a neat place to work and attend school. I want to learn more. Some of the questions I did not answer intentionally, because I really do not know the answer(s).

senior administrators (esp Provost) should not appoint and then sit on these committees, as has happened

To me this is old wine in new bottles, primarily because the administration still holds all the cards. Although UPCs supposedly present their work directly to the President, it must be filtered through and altered by the Provost several times before it gets that far, and even then can be sent back to fit the administration's needs. Thus, as usual, after doing all the grunt work, everything from the faculty is still purely advisory, because the administration knows what's best (regardless of the track record here at Loyola). Frankly, it increasingly seems more like a scam to make faculty think they are making a greater contribution, but the problems that have always existed with the purely advisory roles of Academic Council and Faculty Council have simply been extended to the UPCs, and it is then further complicated by the fact that it is often unclear which Council or UPC should be handling particular issues. Shared governance will never work until the Provost trusts faculty decisions and believes that he might be wrong on some occasions, and that compromises are part of the process. Shared governance?.. same as it ever was.

There was a tendency under the previous Provost for the Fac Aff UPC to be private support group for the Provost. This is very, very wrong. UPCs should be dealing with policy issues ONLY, and should be separate from purely administrative functions. More faculty members on them (and fewer administrators) would be a good idea. Note, too, that some UPCs haven't even MET recently (Research), and that the UCC has only met a few times this academic year. Are there no issues pending????

I served on one of the UPCs and i thought it functioned well. However, I know nothing about other UPCs.

I think university administration has to put more resources and effort in making faculty members familiar with this system if it is more than window dressing.

There must be provision for release time if faculty are to be expected to participate on one of the UPC's. Furthermore, the decisions reached by the UPC's should be cleared by a larger, elected faculty senate. Finally, the decisions by this senate should be binding on the administration. Merely advisory power is non-existent power - a sham that enables the administration to do what it wants under the false facade of so-called popular support.

The shared governance system seems primarily designed to isolate the administration from the faculty. It should be abolished in its current form. The relationship between faculty and administration is poor because of bad faith decision making, open hostility, and active isolationism on the part of the administration. Hopefully replacement of key members will help heal these long term wounds.

It seems to be a good system.

My main concern has long been that the voice of faculty and our Faculty Council and our Academic Council has been muted by the tendency of Provosts, Associate Provosts, Assistant Provosts, and Deans to appoint something like two faculty to a UPC with always three or four administrators already appointed. The system seemed centrally controlled and top-down driven. This is effective for a financial emergency time when quick decisions need to be made but it hammers faculty morale by sending the signal (that has been sent) that faculty really should not play any serious role in setting university or college policy. For example where is the university discussion about the proliferation of new "centers" and the reduction of support for established

interdisciplinary Arts and Sciences programs? We need genuine shared governance and for our President to engage the contributions of faculty and not just the cluster of trusted and narrow circle of Acting, Associate, and Assistant Provosts.

This is the first I have heard of it.

Shared governance has had no input at the Medical Center campus. I appreciate and support this effort at the University level and I know there are Medical Center faculty on the Committees. However, Medical Center issues are not being addressed. The Medical School Senate is ineffective at the governance level. Discussions need to take place to determine how to deal with these issues among medical school faculty. For example, I understand a new Research Building is to be built, but there has been no discussion with faculty about its purpose, what programs will go into it, what is the vision for this building.

When an adjunct faculty member knows more about the shared governance system than full-time faculty you know that the process is at a minimum not being communicated effectively or is not being embraced because of apathy.

I am surprised that I have not heard about this as a current student at the medical school.

As part time faculty I applaud your including all in this survey and urge that inclusion continue. I also urge a role for part-time faculty in future activities.

I think it's a shame that I don't know anything about this, especially when I sat on Staff Council for over 2 years! In #14. you asked if members should be compensated? Why should we say yes, when other groups like Staff Council never get compensated? Plus, what kind of job do these people really do, when we (or I) don't even know about this.

The small decisions are left to the UPCs, with the major decisions predetermined by the administration, using UPC involvement as cover.

I have never heard about Loyola's Shared Governance System prior to this survey.

i am ashamed to admit i have never even heard of Loyola's Shared Governance System until this email. I have been an employee at the Maywood campus for over a year now. I also asked a few co-workers and likewise they did not know about this either. Maybe the idea should be brought up in general orientation or somewhere that is better visible to new employees. i strongly value shared governance systems, but as previously mentioned have not been well informed about they system in place at Loyola. In order for more participation (if that is your goal) there must be more of an awareness of the system in place.

I believe that one problem we have is lack of a clear organizational chart for University and governance structure and lack of clarity of what committee or administrator is responsible for what. Are their two organizational chartsLSC/WT and another one for LUHS? Where do medical and nursing school sit on these charts? What about the graduate school that has students on all three campuses? How do each of the shared governance groups relate to one another? To faculty at each campus? To the two Provosts? How do we determine who gets a representative on each group? Should professional schools have a member on each committee? Does Arts and Sciences speak for undergrads enrolled in professional schools? Does the President/senior administration have ultimate decision making authority so that "shared governance" is really just going through the motions? What about Loyola's Board of Directors? How do faculty provide input to the Board of Directors? Another big concern is how well/not well women are represented among Loyola upper administrators and Board of Directors? What about representation from minorities? I think there are many unanswered questions.....Thanks for doing this survey and seeking faculty input.

I simply know very little about it. I have not been at Loyola for long and know about shared governance only from the issue of Conversations Magazine and from one committee of which I am part. More than specific knowledge, I have picked up a sense that it is a heated issue. I think more open conversation about it (methods like this are appreciated) so that rather than becoming a taboo topic it can be a system that people appreciate implementing and continually reviewing.

It was imposed from above, designed from above, and works to the benefit of those who designed and imposed it. It ignored policy-making bodies within the different colleges, and ignored the faculty vote to establish a Faculty Senate. In short, there's not much shared in Shared Governance.

This is the first I have heard of this Shared Governance System.

It's hard to comment about something that has been invisible up until now.

Not sure this is effective. Bring all committees together to make final decisions.

Having served on a UPC, I came away with the impression that "shared governance" is an oxymoron. Most everything that was approved above the UPC was initiated above the UPC; most everything that was rejected came from the UPC or below.

I found the face to face data gather done by the group so far to be ill structured (I participated in one of the session at a UPC)

The School of Education does not seem well represented.

The answer to questions 14 and 19 is "don't know." E-mails re: this process arrive sporadically, but a significant article in the monthly newsletter to put the whole structure/process together would be a better learning tool. Conversely, a one-time hard copy letter might serve the same purpose. Frankly, it seems that any system-wide umbrella organization intended to serve the individual is pointless: no organization is going to spend its political capital on an individual unless there's a personal relationship involved and even then, the issues of the individual are so diluted at the university level that it's pointless to bring them up because the university will always revert to "policy." Rather than having the university trying to give the appearance of allowing faculty a role in governance, the university should instead empower its individual unit deans to make governance decisions. The only standing policy needed at the university-wide level is that deans of individual schools (or even dept chairs within schools) may allow exceptions to the policies they formulate for their schools/depts, at any time, as long as the reasons for the exception are fully accessible to the affected population (faculty, students, admin, etc) via a mechanism not controlled by those with the authority to grant the exceptions. In other words, low level policy directives applied or excepted in an accountable way... Without low level authority linked to low level responsibility, the very notion of university-wide "shared" governance is simply a fictitious way to mollify the masses.

Most people don't know what it is or how it works.

Some of the UPC's don't even meet (e.g., Research). There is little involvement of faculty at the Medical School, primarily because the issues addressed by the UPC's do not relate to the Medical School.

no

there is no such shared governance system on the medical center campus, it is a dictatorship and always will be

To most of these questions, my answer is "I have no clue", but I have never felt that to be a problem...

As long as the committees remain merely advisory, we have no "shared governance."

I don't see any concern about or representation of part-time instructors. I still see a very top down approach when it comes to important decisions about the core curriculum, e.g., very little to no response about reservations expressed about the new core, especially the reduction of writing courses . Placement of breaks and study days are issues that affect multiple groups within the university, but decisions about them have been made with little input and no good reason. There seem to be too many appointed members to the various committees. I certainly would not have known when committees were meeting, whether meetings were open or not, and how to access committee reports. There certainly have been very few generally broadcast messages. If there are more, then I have not been receiving them. I'm an adjunct professor who has taught at Loyola for nearly 25 years, and I find communication from various sectors of the university to be spotty at best.

I would certainly like to know much more about this.

I did not know that it existed until I got this email and request to complete the survey.

In theory, it's a good idea. I don't think that as it has been implemented at LUC, that it is working or truly representative of the larger body.

I don't really understand why it is necessary except to increase beaurocracy and slow down the process of getting things done.

Shared governance is good in theory, but it needs to take on a practical and meaningful life at Loyola (deeds are greater than words).

Service on a UPC, and other aspects of Shared Governance, needs to be important to university in order for it to be effective. We all have various priorities to juggle, and I would imagine UPC members are no exception. Enabling staff, faculty and students to commit time & energy to shared governance is vital.

Key decisions are actually made outside the system -- in Task Forces or administratively

I believe that we should have a faculty senate instead of faculty council. A senate model assures that representative bodies function in a legislative rather than an avisory capcity. A senate establishes procedures for the shared governance bodies, appoints members to those bodies (if not elected), participates in policies governing salary increases, and plays a key role in the hiring and evaluating of administrators. That said, if we are stuck with the current UPC system, it certainly should be modified. 1. Committees (UPCS) can not be simply advisory in shared governance. The current structure is too centralized. Representation by faculty, staff, students and administrators should be justly distributed and not weighted in favor of administrators (as it is now). 2. Faculty(staff and students) reps on UPS should be ELECTED or at least appointed by Faculty concil. They should NOT be appointed by the administration. 3. Faculty who serve on UPS and other major governing bodies should receive compensation for their work in terms of reduced course loads. 4. Detailed minutes of all meetings of shared governance bodies should be commuicated via email to the entire university community within a week's time and then posted to appropriate webistes. Minutes should not simply list agenda items but should convey a sense of the discussion with key issues of debate highlighted and input invited from faculty, staff and students.

Better cooperation with elected representatives of varied consitutencies is essential.

I wish life at Loyola would give me the time to puruse the documents of the shared governance system as well ss get done all of the other myriad responsibilities that Loyola gives me. Unfortunately, it does not. I thus have to concentrate my efforts on issues that are on my high priority list.

I am not very familiar with the purpose or the accomplishments of Loyola's Shared Governance System, and, based on what I currently know about it, I am not interested in the system. I suggest giving us a convincing reason to care about this and to get involved.

It's hard to comment on something you know practically nothing about. Been here 9 months and know next to nothing about what shared governance is, what it does, and how it effects me if at all!

No

I. Positions: 1. Committees cannot be simply advisory to the senior administration in shared governance. 2. Appointments to committees need to be made by elected faculty and student bodies, such as Faculty Council, not by senior administrators. The appointment of faculty based on "expertise" is not in keeping with best practices. 3. Reports of issues brought to a UPC, the minutes of meetings, and the actions taken need to be reported to faculty regularly in emailed or mailed communications, not just posted on a website. 4. Process is crucial. University committees and administrators should not have the power to change website language or policies and procedures at will. The Faculty Handbook should spell out procedures for changing policies that include dissemination of changes to all faculty and broad consultation. II. Recommendations: 1. Incorporate most if not all UPCs as standing committees of Faculty Council, e.g. Faculty Affairs, Academic Affairs, Research, and even the UCC. Expand the faculty and student representation on each of these committees. 2. Make the Academic Affairs UPC a full-fledged university curriculum committee. 3. Create an Academic Council for the Rome Center Campus, which should be fully integrated into the governance structure of the university. 4. Make Faculty Council a full-fledged faculty senate, with legislative authority, not just an advisory role. A Faculty Senate would appoint members of university committees, and establish procedures for those committees. It would also participate in the hiring and evaluation of administrators. The Academic VP would attend all meetings, as an ex officio member. The American Association of Higher Education's National Network of Faculty Senates recommends the following necessities for effective faculty senates: a. permanent office space, files, archives b. annual budget c. secretarial assistance d. adjusted workload for officers e. regular meetings with the university president f. consulted on creation of all non-

senate committees, especially those that impact faculty working conditions g. by-laws that specify where senate decisions are normally determinative, co-determinative, or advisory To assure broad participation among faculty, reasonable workload concessions and increased recognition for faculty service in the Senate should be instituted. 5. Assure student participation in UPCs. 6. Faculty and student representatives should be ex officio members of the Board of Trustees and attend all meetings.

I wonder if shared governance within the Schools is congruent with the Shared Governance System of the University? If faculty within the Schools do not feel that shared governance is operational at the school level, why should they see the University Shared System as one that works?

Faculty governance that is not 1) elected and 2) legislative is a sham.

Not knowledgeable enough to respond.

A faculty senate should replace the current system. Faculty should be elected and not compensated; it should be part of their service work. If members of the University committees are compensated they become biased toward the people paying their checks -- upper administration.

"It is as a tale told by an idiot, full of sound and fury, signifying nothing."

To what extent does the Shared Governance System work effectively with related groups? The key word here is effectively. In my experience, the UPCs have been very consistent in soliciting input from Faculty Council and other groups with the goal of making the governance truly shared. However, in some cases, the input is different from different groups, or comes after the UPC considers its work to be done and moves on to the next item or in particular, administrators disagree with a requested policy change. The representative bodies need to understand that timely input is essential, and that not all requested changes will be made to policies under consideration. Another point I would like to make is that the styles of various administrators has been different, with some being more legalistic than others. This plays into the policies that UPCs shape. To be fair to the UPCs, it seems that the president should set the style and communicate that style to the UPCs to follow so that the policies worked on for literally years in some cases do not end up back on the agenda of the UPC for stylistic, not just substantive, differences. To work on a policy for so long only to have it rejected more than once is extremely frustrating to the UPC members.

I am sure that communication could be improved. And perhaps the mechanism for selecting the members could be adjusted. But please do not dismantle the basic concept of Shared Governance: namely UPCs that have a clear focus, comprised of members who come from the various sectors of the university (faculty, staff, students, administrators) but who do NOT represent their "constituency, but rather bring their "lens" to a shared commitment to do what is best for all of us. I think that approach is brilliant. It should be communicated more clearly.

Don't know much at all about it...who it's for, what it is doing...who is involved...is this something for administrators and VP's or something for the workers on the floors.

I have never heard of this program before.

No. Just learned about it for the first time via this survey.

I don't know much about it. I get so many emails a day that I only skim the ones that don't directly relate to me. The emails about the Shared Governance System are long and I don't take the time to read it and figure out how it applies to me (as a law student). What would be helpful would be a short summary about what it is and the types of decisions it makes (no more than 3-4 sentences).

What is it? What does it have to do with the practical life of Law Students?

I realize I don't know as much about it as I might. I have taken in a few bits and pieces, but have not become articulate about the whole structure and how it operates.

Questions 3 and 4 are deleted from my survey.

I didn't even know about it until I received the e-mail for this survey I'm sorry to say. Because of this, I have no idea.

I have never even heard of this.

the what?

My main concern is why prior to this email I have not heard anything about the Shared Governance System

I don't think it's very effective at informing people about things, because I didn't even know it existed.

I'm just starting my 2nd quarter as an ODL student. I work full-time so the only time I'm on campus is for class and those are in the evening.

From an outsider's view (as the students are actually outsiders in this), the UPCs seem like impenetrable bureaucracy. The students appointed (I assume) to the UPCs are...who? Are they responsible for telling us what's going on or for representing the student body? Shouldn't we know who they are if that is the case?

Sounds like something that the students should know about, and by that, I mean students that aren't just in U. Ministry or USG

as a graduate student, I am not at all familiar with the system

this is the first time i've even heard about it

I have never even heard of this.

none

no

I haven't had much exposure to this system so I would like its existence to be more open.

I was not aware Loyola had a Shared Governance System. To be fair, I am in my first year of law school at Loyola and probably am not representative of students who have been attending Loyola for a longer period of time.

I never heard about it until this survey came to my email box. That is not surprising, since Loyola is very disorganized and not effective in doing much more than drawing up mission statements and goals.

As a member of the Graduate Student Advisory Committee it remains a mystery to me who is responding to our concerns and if they are responding what administrative bodies are involved in doing so. How is the Graduate student body represented in the Shared Governance System?

How can students become more involved?

I really know nothing about it.

I didn't even know it existed.

Does whoever is involved in strategic planning listen to students or faculty at all?

I didnt even know loyola had a shared governance system. i still dont really know anything about it they should explain the whole thing to students.

Never heard of it before, don't even know if it applies to the School of Social Work...

I don't know what this is!!!!

If I'd heard of it before now, my responses would be more helpful.

I've never heard of this program prior to this email

I have no idea what it is or why we have it.

No clue what it is.

Information should be included in graduate student orientation materials if you want us to know about it

I must say I am not very well educated or aware of Loyola's Shared Governance System. In fact, I've never heard of it and I am a third year student at Loyola. Thanks. Good luck with your research.

.

This is the first I have ever heard of it.

I am a mere certificate student, and I have no idea how Loyola works.

no, i've never even heard of this program.

I've never heard of it

I've never heard of it before.

I've never even heard of this before I got the e-mail to take a survey on it

No

I had never even heard of it before this e-mail! I'm still not quite sure what it is.

What is it?

It strikes me that some of the questions in this survey mentioned the Undergraduate Student Government, but what about the corresponding student bodies in the graduate and professional schools? For instance, as president of the Student Bar Association, I have not once been approached to seek law students' input on a Shared Governance initiative. Similarly, while the Student Relations UPC has a spot for one graduate student, how is this student chosen? Is he or she elected? I have asked around the law school, and no one here has heard of our ever having been asked for input, and I am not aware of any law student who has served on that committee. Are the professional schools explicitly excluded from the Shared Governance system, despite the huge tuition revenues they produce? Please contact me at zziliak@luc.edu with your thoughts on this topic. Thank you!

I've never heard of this before, and that's a little disappointing because I'm very involved with campus life.

none

There are SO many changes that can and should be made at Loyola. Honestly, communication is a great starting point to begin.

What the hell is it?

Wish I knew more about it

This is the first I've heard of it.

I just heard of Loyola's Shared Governance System as a result of this email and survey I received.

I personally have no idea what the Loyola Shared Governance System is. I had no idea it existed. MAYbe if you advertised what this was, maybe students will understand what it does a lot better.

no

No idea what it is!!! Not good!!

i wish i knew more about this governance system. it sounds effective, but if i don't know anything about it, i

can't help you very much with your feedback survey. please find a better way of advertising or making this information available to your student body. thank you

I have no idea what it is and wouldn't know where to go to get information.

Loyola talked about the Shared Government when I was first here, but it is not stressed and I would really like it if there could be emails updating students on whats going on and how to participate in the decision making process of certain aspects the university is considering

I honestly don't know what the Shared Governance System is at all.

I am a part time student and only on campus for classes. It would be nice to have a liason that handles issues such as student aid, ERP, and class registration since I also work full time.

I know little about the organization.

I am aware of the Faculty Senate, and a few other like bodies. I am not aware of how they interrelate, who is on them, what the hierarchy is, etc. I have found from learning about the external review process that at the very least, the Graduate School has serious issues trying to figure out what the 'chain of command' is. Thus things seem not to get done. I have no idea if they fall under the LSGS or not. In general, most of this survey is asking me to evaluate what I essentially have no knowledge of, and so can hardly answer honestly or well if the option "I don't know" is not available to me.

We get regular reports on Faculty Council meetings from our representative. This is the most effective way of keeping the faculty informed. Also, our representative takes seriously messages and concerns communicated to him, even if this is done by one individual faculty member. An individual knows that he or she can get through to the person who is representing him or her. I suggest that the Shared Governance System use this as a model. Also, I have the impression that the current provost has no interest whatsoever in faculty concerns, that he in fact has adapted an adversarial stance in relation to faculty concerns. Until this attitude is changed, preferably by having a new provost in place, Shared Governance should be free from provost control in any form, and should have the power to override his negative, obstructive stance.

i have no idea what loyolas shared fovernance system is or what it does.

I don't really know what it is, but I am interested in learning more information

I consider myself well-informed about most things "Loyolan" - the fact that this seems to have slipped under my radar tells me this is NOT working.

i ghave no idea what this is

I don't know anything about it. Didn't know it existed until I received this survey.

It seems to be working reasonably well, but the role of the Faculty Council needs to be worked out. This should be a substantial role. An issue with faculty governance is the need to secure greater faculty input. Many faculty members are only interested in shared governance in times of crisis. Others are cynical about it, that is, they assert that the administration will do whatever it wants in any event. This is not true. But it is frequently used as a pretext not to participate in shared governance. On the other hand, many faculty have numerous commitments, in the case of younger faculty especially child care, and they simply do not have time to participate.

Fuck the System

Yes

ive never heard about it til now

I have never heard of this.

This is my first year at Loyola and I do not yet know much about it.

none

weekly e-mail? are you crazy? maybe monthly might not get auto-deleted, but weekly? are you crazy? and don't waste \$\$ or paper on a printed version.

Information on it should be more readily available.

I feel little is known about it and the different aspects about how it effects students and other peoples that are affiliated with the university. I feel that more student and faculty involvement is impairative for there to be a greater understanding and betteroverall student happiness towards the decisions made about our campus.

The Judiciary functions at Loyola are demeaning and archaic.

Never heard of it. That might be a problem.

I'd like to know more and be more included in the governance system. It needs more public awareness.

I never heard of "Shared Governance System" until I got this email. Maybe grad students should be better educated about this?

never heard of them - don't know who they are or what they do

I don't know what issues the system covers so I don't know if it covers my interests or concerns.

It is a vague system that I am only slightly aware of. Not sure if it is functioning or just not communicating

As near as I can tell, the governance system is a mirror of the organizational structure of the university. It reinforces a system that is geared to operate within the policy boundaries already established. However, what about issues that fall outside the boundaries of existing policies? For example, if current policies thwart efforts to increase retention, which committee should take the lead? Is it a student issue, staff issue, faculty issue, academic issue, finance issue, strategic planning issue? It is most likely all of them. The need to have cross functional discussion and solutions is difficult within the current structure and that difficulty is replicated in the committee structure. Perhaps the committees should be organized around core business functions: sales, operations, finance. Sales includes admissions, research grant writing, development, alumni relations, advising (sell students on coming back each year)-any function that brings money in. The role of the sales committee in retention would be to develop better predictors of who is most likely to stay. Admissions should be held accountable not only for the number of students brought in, but also the % that stay. In the operations committee, having cross functional teams of faculty, staff, and students from different areas will break down barriers. Is retention an academic issue or a social issue? Probably both, so both faculty and support staff need to be working together.

Never heard of it before this E-mail

no

I have never heard of it until this survey. I don't know if any medical student is appear of the the governance system.

I want to learn more

I would like to get some sort of measure passed so that I can bring friends to Halas Hall for free, as I am annoyed with telling my friends they have to pay \$10 to get in.

I would like to see faculty bodies such as Faculty Council and the various Academic Councils empowered. We need a real Faculty Senate with a measure of executive authority.

I remember getting emails about it but my feeling was, hey, I'm only going to be here a few more years (I'm a student) so this doesn't really apply to me. So i didn't really look into it. I guess it would be a good idea to show us graduate students how it's relevant to us.

I know nothing about it whatsoever.

A wonderful idea, which should be kept alive and refined to be more effective and better known.

All advisory board and council heads should be trained on what the new govern. charter means and exactly how to proceed with certain situations. For example, when UMC points out that there is a new policy in place that came from the president's office, but we cannot see it in writing, and no one else has heard of it, then this is a policy that should not be endorsed, and advisory board heads need to know how to be guided on how not to endorse it.

I think the system itself needs to be advertised more. Otherwise, students will not know what the suggested solutions to problems are and what the system is meant to address.

I really am not familiar with it at all. Because of that, I don't see how my life at Loyola is affected by it, if at all.

i have no idea whate this system does

Faculty senate should replace the UPCs. Members should not be compensated. Policies that affect faculty research should not be made by the research office without going through the appropriate committee with appropriate representation by faculty.

The e-mail regarding the first time the LSGS took the time to contact me. If you expect students to care about it, they'll need either a reason to, or personal attention.

I don't even know what it is.

This is the first time i've even heard of it.

If membership is not elected, there is no real sharing of governance.

I have not been at LUC for very many years, so my experience is limited. But my impressions are so far that the system is not very "shared" -- instead that is it more of a top down approach.

i don't even know what it is

I do not know what kinds of issues are brought before the Shared Governance System and I personally have been unaware of any impact in my school.

cohort student

I've never heard of Loyola's Shared Governance System until now.

Department meetings scheduled after 5 pm conflict with my need to pick up my son at daycare; thus I'm unable to attend and be informed.

Ultimately, the upper administration will do what they want despite this "perceived" shared system.

I have never heard of Loyola's Shared Governance System before

No.

I have no idea what Loyola's Shared Governance System is and what they do on campus.

I have no clue what this is about

don't know enough about it to comment intelligently.

none

i have no idea what Loyola's Shared Governance System is. It isn;t very effective if I've been living here for about seven months and never heard about it.

The Carthage campus is not even on your list.

if this involves letting the school actually control our own goddamned rooms instead of getting dicked around

by the University, then I'm in favor of it.

I do not know anything about this system and have never even heard the name of it until now.

The sense one has is that the University Administration has not wanted to have full and open disclosure. Administration has impeded the formation of the Faculty Senate

I don't know what Loyola's Shared Governance System is.

My general impression is that the committees only work on things they are assigned to work on by the administration and that the administration mainly pays lip service to policy ideas that don't match what the administration wants in the first place.

I know that the administration at Loyola is out of touch with the student population, as evidenced by several instances, but most recently, the housing crisis. If this Shared Governance program has been in place since 2003, there has been little change in policies as far as representation of the current student body, from an outsider's perspective. I am a student in the Nursing School and have had many communication issues with the administration within the nursing school. I'm frustrated and would prefer to take my credits and transfer to Rush University, a credible nursing school, to get my degree. At the rate this entire university is further declining in its already compromised reputation, I am embarrassed to be getting my degree from here.

COMMUNICATION UP AND DOWN THE CHAIN OF COMMAND IS IMPORTANT. IN FACT, THE NORTH CENTRAL REPORT MENTIONED THIS TOPIC AND NOTED THAT, IN SOME UNITS, SUCH COMMUNICATION IS ACTIVELY DISCOURAGED. THIS CERTAINLY IS THE CASE IN THE COLLEGE OF ARTS AND SCIENCES. UNLESS THE SHARED GOVERNANCE SYSTEM DEVELOPS A WAY TO DEAL WITH THIS PROBLEM IN THE LARGEST LAKESIDE ACADEMIC UNIT, THE SYSTEM IS NOT WORTH THE WEBSITE SPACE IT OCCUPIES.

Much confusion exists, as well as lack of connection between faculty and the system - system being a very strange word for an episodic event making entity in which many major policy issues are decided independently.

none

I don't know enough about it to comment

What are they doing for students with disabilities? I'm about ready to change colleges since I cannot get the help I need in the classroom for the symptoms of my cancer.

Why? The President and the administration will what they want regardless of what any "Shared Governance" advises. Like why is there only one staff person on the Staff committee and it is appointed by someone from the Personnel office?

nope

no

I'm not sure what Loyola's Shared Governance System is.

As a graduate student, I am unaware for this system.

Sorry - This is about the second time I have even heard of it. Materials on the website were very interesting; seems like a good plan, but don't really see its effectiveness. See decisions made all the time on the top level with little input from those closest to the actual service process. Maybe I just missed all of the publicity about the Shared Governance System or don't know enough of the people involved in it, but I generally read all Loyola e-mail and at least scan other materials, so I suspect that I am not in the minority.

I've never heard of it before.

I never knew we had one

I don't even know what it is or what it does.

I've never heard of this!

what is Loyola's shared governance system?

no

I am a new faculty, and that is the reason why I am not familiar with it.

I don't really know much about it so I can't really say anything about it except they should be more present in student's lives.

Nothing about shared governance, however the law school must be improved for the amount of tuition that is paid. The computers in the library on the fifth floor are from the 80's it looks bad to prospective students someone just needs to purchase new monitors so the school does not look so outdated. Additionally, there needs to be a sign on the front of the building that actually says School of Law. Finally, the website is very outdated and makes the law school appear low budget and outdated. There needs to be a new website similar to the undergraduates. Fixing these few small things would make the law school appear significantly better.

I experience Loyola as a very patriarchial system. I do not feel that administration listens to staff issues.

no

I pretty much know nothing about it.

As an Adjunct Professor, I feel left out completely. I'm not included in departmental meetings or in anything else. The pay I receive for my work is below minimum wage when divided by the hours I invest per course. I feel used and exploited. I have no idea why I would even be asked to do this survey. I am thankful for the opportunity to teach at Loyola, but the University should be ashamed of its Adjunct policy and should work diligently to amend it radically over the next few years. Given the present state of the academy, the Adjunct position should be used to aid young academics in getting a permanent post. But it seems rather to be simply a way for the University to make lots of money by putting highly qualified individuals in large core classes while paying them nearly nothing (\$2200/course) for their prodigious labors. I earned more teaching as a Graduate Assistant than I do as an Adjunct Prof. Furthermore, the University should bear in mind the scandalous effect that this situation has on undergraduates. Having discussed this with a lawyer friend, I have become persuaded that legal action can and indeed should be taken against the University for this kind of exploitation.

I have no idea what it is and have never heard of it

what is it?

The student selection for committee membership is comprised of administration appointees who are known to be banal and mindless. By keeping student participation to a few yes-men, the students have only a nominal representation on these committees. If the university feels the need to include students, they should at the very least take faculty/staff nominations from a variety of sources and conduct interviews to find independent, unbiased and energetic students.

It is hard to believe in shared governance when so much happens top down, for example CORE change. I have met few faculty who wanted to revise the CORE.

Only that my position at LUC is so tenuous yet demanding that I have not taken the time to acquaint myself with the Shared Governance System.

I have not heard of it, but it sounds interesting. Maybe it should be better advertised.

What is Loyola shared governance? Is student government included in it???

I've never heard anything about it and have no clue what it is

n/a

I have never heard aout this program.

The design of the system is good, though Faculty Council and Staff Council need to be better incorporated. How well is will work in coming up with significant, viable policies remains to be seen.

I have been so frustrated with shared governance at Loyola that I have tended to ignore it and concentrate on teaching, research, and community service.

I've only been at Loyola since July 2005. I'm still trying to get the policies/procedures of my department straight, much less University-wide shared governance. I regret that I couldn't be of more help.

I have no idea what this program is. I have never heard anything about it.

what is Loyola's Shared Governance system?

What Shared Governance System?

What is it?

This is an awful lot of survey for something I've heard very little about until I began this very survey.

I really have no idea what Loyola's Shared Governance System is, thus my answers are probably skewed based on this lack of knowledge.

Before this survey I had never heard of it... maybe there should be more visible information on it?

what is it there is still no explanation of what it does and who exactly runs this

What is it?

I have never heard about Loyola's Shared Governance System, therefore they need to do more to reach everyday students like myself.

A) I have no idea what the shared governance system is B) Now that you mentioned it includes USG, and based on the name, plus these questions, I'm learning for the first time C) You have a lot of great resources/tools to make people feel like there is a community here, this looks like a good way to do it... look at evoke, they have their name all around campus and all I have figured out about it is they have a lot of money. You guys have a lot easier time explaining it, but you never advertise. D) Tell evoke that... I figured out it is grant based, so it doesn't look like it costs ME anything, but I hate seeing money wasted

never heard of it

I'm not so sure what exactly is Loyola's Shared Governance System, and I think information of it ought to be put out there even more than this year (both Fall and Spring semesters).

Sorry, didn't know we had one; but will look it up to find out something about it.

i have no idea what it is

I am not as informed as I should be

FUCK OFF

Have no clue what this is or how it affects me...

no

none

What is it?

I have no idea what it is or what it does or is supposed to do. Sorry.

Re: Question 18, how to communicate effectively about shared governance, I think there are many students like me who are saturated when it comes to e-mail, so anything that looks like it is for the general student body (like "shared governance") and not directly relevant to me (from my friends, professors or interest groups), will immediately be deleted. I think a large bulletin board in a visible location (like Nina's Cafe or in the lobby to 25 E. Pearson), with a title and a two-sentence explanation followed by a more detailed description, would serve the purpose of communication much more effectively than mass a mass e-mail. Good luck.

I could not comment on some areas because I am relatively new to the University and do not know much about the Shared Governance System at all. I will look into more though as a result of this survey.

As for what I've seen and heard the shared governance system at Loyola does not work as intended.

As a doctoral student, I don't know anything about Loyola's Shared Governance System. All members should be ELECTED not appointed, though

Im not sure I even know what it is. The name sounds familiar though.

I believe the problem with the system is that faculty have little interest in it because they have little at stake. Elections don't make the system effective. What makes faculty and staff involved is to actually have some decision-making authority. Everything at Loyola has always been "recommendatory" which means we are never really stake holders. The only way to have joint governance is to have joint decision-making, then faculty and staff will be more involved and take these committees more seriously. To accomplish this, administrators have to trust that faculty will make good decisions. After all, we've had plenty of years of administrators making horrendous decisions (that we are still paying for) so why not give us a shot?

No

i have never heard of it.

#19 should have a Don't Know option. Otherwise, I am unaware of the system, so I cannot comment.

i dont really know what that is. Honestly.

I do not know much about it

I don't know anything about it.

This is my second quarter at Loyola, and I have not heard anything about the Shared Governance System.

Maybe it is good that we don't know much. I am not aware of any major problems caused by the system. That probably means that it is functioning smoothly

Never heard of the LSGS? What is it? Why are we funding this system again?

It seems that the people involved try hard to disseminate information about the process, and decisions made, but I rarely find/take the time to read all of the info. available. Therefore, I am not well qualified to answer questions on the subject. I trust most of our upper management and the faculty and staff members who are involved to make good decisions. I don't have the time to evaluate their "performance".

I have no idea what this is. I have only heard about it from the email survey.

Faculty concerns are often ignored and I see little sign that they will be considered here.

Do something. Have a debate, organize something that the students can see. Your club sucks ass, because there is no concrete results. You should do what your parents did. Get a job sir.

no

I find it alarming that the email notification for this survey is the only information I have received since 2003

regarding the existence of LUC's Shared Governance System.

System is not understood at all. It must be connected to representation bodies such as the Faculty Council.

Loyola's Governance System sucks

The main problem with the UPC's is that they are only advisory. If the administration does not like the advice it simply ignores it.

What is Loyola's Shared Governance System? I have been at Loyola for 4 years, I am very active on campus, and I have never heard of it. This just shows the lack of communication within Loyola, between the students, faculty, and administration.

What is Loyola's Shared Governance System? I have been at Loyola for 4 years and never heard of it. This just shows the lack of communication between Loyola's faculty and administration and the students.

How do I obtain concise information?

no

I would really encourage a more representative method of electing or appointing students to the University Policy Committees. Specifically, I feel that students elected by the undergraduate student body to USG (Unified Student Government) should sit on all of the UPCs.

It doesn't seem to have much of a presence on campus. Other than this e-mail I have only received one other e-mail regarding the SGS and I was under the impression it was something new.

System seems ineffective

The process of policy adoption is highly frustrating--I am under the suspicion that the students share little of the governance

I have no idea what this is.

They should investigate how employees are being treated by their departments and Human Resources combined.

I have been very involved at this university for the past four years and I have not idea what the Shared Governance System is.

The problem does not seem to be in the individual communications, but rather in the nature of the system and the hierarchy of the university. As long as committees, and staff and faculty organizations such as Faculty Council and Staff Council, are entitled to offer recommendations only, there is no shared governance. Faculty Council needs to become the Faculty Senate, which enables faculty to actually have an investment with concomittant responsibilities in the governance of the university. Also, the UPC, although some are tremendously hard working and responsive to initiatives that are presented to them, others, one in particular, did not even meet last year. As far as I'm aware, there is no faculty recourse for this type of lapse in responsibility. Also, many faculty have time to access email that concerns university business from home, not while they are teaching, responding to students, going to meetings, etc., while on campus. Many of the web sites cannot be accessed from home, therefore, information may go unseen, and may seem inaccessible to faculty. In addition, some chairs and deans may not be in the habit of distributing information about how the university functions to their faculties, which I think is a problem. Although, I think I probably understand that they are very busy and that it makes no sense to open a 'can of worms' if you think that type of information may create more problems than solutions.

I know nothing about it and therefor am not qualified to say much on the topic

no

I have a slight idea about what this is, but only because I'm trying to make sense of this questions.

n/a

Loyola needs a better World Wide Web platform, one that is more sophisticated in its design, and more functional. Once in this new platform is in place, the Loyola intranet could have a Shared Governance portal for everyone to access.

I have never heard of it

no

What is it? What do you do? I understand that you are important, but I and other transfer students like me have seen no effort made to help us to understand this (or, really, any other) aspect of the university.

no

In my 4 years here, I've never heard of it.

Virtually all my knowledge of the shared governance systems comes from participation on Faculty Council rather than through general communication. I should mention that Paul Jay was effective in keeping us informed of governance issues through e-mail communications. The actual process of communicating how and when a particular policy issue is funnelled to a UPC by the UCC, and the subsequent resolution, has never been transparent.

What is the point

I have never heard or read "Loyola's Shared Governance System" before.

n/a

the main page for loyola university website of luc.edu is a common place to find helpful items, is it there?

no

The Shared Governance System seems much more beauracritic than necessary. Committees are notoriously poor vehicles for providing vision and leadership.

I don't think that medical students are at all aware of what is going on in the university as a whole.

no

I am not familiar with this system.

This has not had much "press" at the Medical Center,consequently I know very little about it.

no

I am part-time faculty, make zero money, have zero opportunity to receive recognition for my work, and often wonder if I am represented at all in such governance.

Unfortunately I'm not familiar with SGS but I will look for more information because of this survey

Need to be experienced at teh department levels as well as university wide.

We have a shared governance system? Looking back over the past few years, it appears to me that EVERY major decision, even about academics (Whether and how we revise the Core; the closing of the Science Library) is made by presidential fiat with limited in-put by his kitchen cabinet. Shared governance indeed!

No

Senior management dominates with little input from mid level employees who run the university

I did not know that we had one. Maybe it just has not been an issue during the time I have been here. Mostly, I just feel that whatever the university does no matter how much I like/dislike it, it will be done and I

just have to live with it.

No

Never heard of it until I received this email asking me to take a survey about it.

Shared governance is just a front at the moment. The administration just does what it wants, and we have to live with it.

Unless it is elected it will not be seen as really shared.

This survey should explain some of the decisions the Shared Governance System has made. That way, I could give at least some credit to them if appropriate.

I know nothing about it. I don't believe I have ever heard of it. I have a general idea, but that's it. Thanks!

I don't really have a clue about the system.

what is the shared governance system?

Representation is a serious issue. when faculty from three schools are not represented on any UPC, this is a serious issue. Most of what the UPCs deal with should be in the form of a policy ready for up or out consideration. The UPCs neither embody the expertise nor the temper to devise complex policies themselves. Certain committees that were abolished on the assumption that the UPCs can do this should be reinstated, such as the university benefits committee. Faculty and staff are unaware of the many ways, for example, in which the health insurance scheme at Loyola has been revised to impose costs on employees - first \$1000 of prescription coverage, for example.

no

I'm an adjunct faculty member, so I'm only beginning to become familiar with Loyola's administrative aspects.

I think this system needs to be publicized more so people know what its all about and what they talk about and what the current issues are. It is hard to find this info even if you want. I think it should be readily available and broadcast to everyone.

I honestly did not know we even had this organization.

As a part-time faculty member, I have not been provided with any information about Loyola's Shared Governance. Most likely, it's not relevant to me.

Since I obviously did not know its existence... that says something about its advertising.

I have no idea what this really is about but I am involved on campus. Boost the efforts on communicating this with students, both at LSC and WTC

I can't have comments because I don't know what it is or that it existed.

It its anything like the administration's handling of the recent Ann Coulter affair its nothing more than a failure.

It is difficult to have shared governance at the university level when it is nonexistent at the local level.

I wish that all the activities of the student government were sent in a periodical email. This way everyone will be more familiar with teh system, especially students who do not live on campus and rarely have the time to participate in meetings.

none

I heard a mention of it once. Seemed sme people were annoyed about the student end of it. Not the actions exactly, but how the people got there. I haven't run across much at all about it. Perhaps this is because I commute for an hour and a half a day and leave from campus as soon as I can to make it home in daylight, but I haven't seen much at all.

I have no idea what a shared governance system is?!

I honestly have no idea what the Loyola's Shared Governance System is or does. Sorry.

I have no idea what Loyola's Shared Governance System is.

I wish they made it more well known...I don't think I have ever heard the phrase the last three years.

Itis not always apparent where or who decisions do come from or should come from and there is a lack of transparency that makes a small number of folks "insiders" and the rest of the folks "outsiders".

It does not appear to me that senior administrators are at all committed to the principle or the reality of shared governance. A great deal of lip service is paid to it, but the minute an administrator wants a decision made (1) quickly, and (2) his or her way, governance ceases to be shared and takes on the character of administrative fiat. There then begins a long process by means of which faculty first (a) discover that a unilateral, nonconsultative decision has been made, (b) protest, (c) are dismissed by the administration, (d) protest again, this time to Faculty Council, UPC's, the AAUP, and anyone else they can interest, (e) get a meeting with an administrator, at which they are told that their concerns have been heard, (f) wait 6 months, during which time nothing is done to address their concerns or modify the decision, (g) protest again, (h) get told a committee is being appointed to address the issue, (i) protest that the committee should be elected or made up of elected Faculty Council members, (j) etc. etc. etc. ...

I would like to know more but it seems difficult to sort out. I also try to keep up with faculty council and with departmental work, teaching, research etc.. it's a lot.

I think a lot of bad decisions have been made. It seems as if the university cares more about money and renovating than the needs of current students.

Does it even exists?

I would like to know a lot more about it-- this survery reminded me how "clueless" I am in my knowledge of the Shared Governance System.

None

Not all departments are represented. That limits communication.

I am new to Loyola as of the Fall of 2005 so I am really unfamiliar with this process as evidenced by my comments.

I know very little about it. It doesn't seem very well-publicized. I'm staff so perhaps that's why I don't know much about it. My perception is that staff opinions count for little at any level in this university. Maybe that's why there's major staff bleed - we've been losing people at the rate of one every two months in our department. Inequity in compensation and poor management have contributed to the flight.

Since I know nothing about it I couldn't really answer some questions, such as should they be compensated, b/c I have no idea what a position entails.

As an adjunct instructor I feel I am outside most lines of communication at the university. It would be agreeable to have better understanding of University workings.

I must admit that I know nothing about the Shard GOvernance System. I am sure that it impacts me in many ways and that the sytem is helping the university in its administrative functions but it still means little to me at this point in time.

no other comments

I WISH THIS SCHOOL WOULD COMMUNICATE MORE EFFECTIVELY ABOUT MANY THINGS. STUDENTS HERE DO NOT EVER REALLY KNOW WHAT IS HAPPENING.

No

I think one of the main problems is lack of knowledge about what they do. Not clear where to send a problem or question. Also, administration should be on, but not leading committees.

There is a principle at work here, i.e. sharing power over decision-making with those most strongly affected by the decisions, which is central to the notions of social justice in the Catholic tradition that this University stands for. Therefore, even if I am only moderately aware of the details since the process began, I heartily support it, and support also this effort to evaluate and improve it. What I personally wish I knew better (and more readily, since I have investigated somewhat) is how I would go about presenting a proposal, i.e. what it should look like to be effective, and to whom it should be presented. Knowing, if I am correct, that everything goes through the one coordinating body does not tell me how to present it to either them or the UPC they would channel it to, and this is more intimidating when, as seems likely, the coordinating body's concerns are likely different from the particular UPC's. Of course it is possible that all the coordinators do is decide which UPC should get a proposal, leaving it to the UPC to decide if it deserves their time or not. But right not, to my understanding, there is every reason to believe that a proposal might not ever get to the intended UPC because it might be screened out as unacceptable by those on top, especially because they are precisely the people in the University with the most long range and strategic responsibilities. But sometimes a proposal needs to get to those with specific expertise BEFORE it gets to those with the most vision and broadest responsibilities, and I do not see that a very likely in the current set up as I understand it.

no.

No

I do not know much at all about this system, but I blame my own ignorance, not the system itself. I think I recall receiving emails about this issue, but honestly didn't really read them.

To be honest, I don't even know what it is.

As a doctoral student at Erikson Institute/Loyola U., I do not feel much a part of Loyola though there are many benefits of which I would like to take advantage. Is there a way that the Shared Governance info could be shared at an orientation for grad students?

I haven't heard of Loyola's Shared Governance System until this email/survey, but I'd definitely like to know more about it.

I have some comments on policies: 8-ride doesn't pick up ppl from Santa Clara Hall, doesn't answer all of the time, Rambler Room does not provide many healthy eating substitutes and needs more variety, the dining hall food is terrible!!!

Very poor dissemination of information

No

what is it?

if I knew anything about it I might

No

I really have no idea what the Shared Governance System is.

I can only assume that the Shared Governance System doesn't take steps to insure that all students are aware of them as I am fairly active on campus, I read the Loyola Magazine and I have never heard of them.

No

I don't have any idea what this is.

???

[I did not know it existed until I received this e-mail.](#)

[I wish I knew more about it.](#)

[Loyola's shared governance system, in my opinion represents student concerns at a very minimal level. Few students know that the shared governance system exists, and to my knowledge, there are no undergraduate students who serve on the shared governance committees. At the least, a student should sit on each of the shared governance system committees, perhaps it would be most effective if various USG members, who are elected by the student body, also serve as representatives on shared governance committees. Also, in terms of disseminating information about the shared governance system, the current website, <http://luc.edu/governance/>, seems poorly organized and not updates frequently.](#)

[I wish I knew more about it. I am both a part-time faculty member, and a student, so I would find this information very helpful. Thank you.](#)

[I'm not aware of what it is exactly](#)

[send me info. about this \[rufian@hotmail.com\]\(mailto:rufian@hotmail.com\)](#)

[I have never heard of it.](#)

[none](#)

[What is it?](#)

[I don't know what it is.](#)

[Educate before requesting a survey.](#)

[The problem with shared governance system is threefold: 1\) faculty are oblivious to the efforts of the UPC's until they are nearly completed policy, at which point they carp about it. This is particularly true of faculty council: 2\) Administration can too easily disregard policies made by the UPC's. Much like the faculty at large, upper administration, comes end near the end of the policy-making process and demands numerous changes which suit their needs. However, unlike faculty if administration doesn't like the created policy they simply ignore the UPC that created it; 3\) To solve both of these problems department heads and program coordinators should receive reports from UPC's and should be responsible for soliciting responses from the departments to be returned to the UPC's, while administrators need to be somewhat accountable when they demur from implementing UPC-created policies.](#)

[I am dissappointed in what i've seen of the USG; especially in regards of a close, personal friend of mines budget proposal fot the Club/USG conflict. I believe that the Club would do better on its own, where they can function appropriately, giving back to the students. i also think that its pathetic that all of the USG reps voted to allow a certain circus of a guest speaker to come to this university and then tried to back-track and complain nearing the months she was coming, even though it was voted upon in november. which by the way, would to compliment the prez on her beautifully disrespectful people skills, i believe the phrase: "Shut the F--- up" was uttered when the security force got hostile and violent with students OH nevermind they werent there to protect us, you know the ones who pay you 30,000 dollars a year. BUT i am ranting now and i apologize](#)

[I don't really know what it is or what it does.](#)

[I know nothing about it but am very interested in finding out.](#)

[i am very aware of it because i was last year's president but i know that people outside of USG are somewhat clueless so my responses reflected that slightly.](#)

[not yet. Need more information](#)

[I would like to know more about this, but have no idea what it is, or where to get information. Is it discussed](#)

[in the new employee orientation?](#)

[Students rule and the administration drools!](#)

[no.](#)

[Are part-time faculty represented at all?](#)

21. Number of years at Loyola

22. Main campus of work or study

23. Gender

24. Primary race/ethnic identification

25. Primary status

26. Study or work status

27. Faculty rank

28. Tenure track status

29. School or division

30. Current administrative appointment

31. Current administrative position

32. School or College

33. Degree program

34. Type of position

Appendix XII: North Central Report Weblink

<http://luc.edu/nca/>