

**REPORT OF THE TASK FORCE ON SHARED GOVERNANCE SYSTEM
EVALUATION**

APRIL 2006

LOYOLA UNIVERSITY CHICAGO

Report of the Task Force on Shared Governance System Evaluation

April 2006

Task Force Members

Linda Heath, Ph.D., Professor of Psychology, and Co-Chair
Frederick Wezeman, Ph.D. Professor, Orthopaedic Surgery and Rehabilitation, and
Associate Dean, Graduate School, and Co-Chair

Martin B. Berg, Ph.D., Associate Professor, Department of Biology
Laura Bityou, President, Unified Student Government
Jamie Caldwell, Director of Research Services, Loyola University Medical Center
Michael Kabbaz, Ph.D. Candidate in Higher Education
Edward Neafsey, Ph.D., Professor of Cell Biology, Neurobiology and Anatomy
Peter J. Schraeder, Ph.D., Professor of Political Science
Kelly Shannon, University Marketing and Communications Chief
David Yellen, J.D., Professor of Law and Dean, School of Law

BACKGROUND

The Provisional Shared Governance Charter, created in February 2003, intended to promote Loyola as a university community that "engages in continual discernment of the best and most appropriate (governance) policies and actions" that foster its mission. The formation and improvement of University committees and councils to effect broad participation in governance was to be guided by the following governing principles: a) a foundation of trust, b) a sense of ownership (joint effort), c) responsible, expertise-based participation in governance, d) subsidiarity, and e) transparency of operation and communication (Appendix I). The structure of the Shared Governance System includes oversight by the University Coordinating Committee (UCC) of seven individual University Policy Committees (UPCs) in the areas of Academic Affairs, Faculty Affairs, Staff Affairs, Student Affairs, Strategic Planning, Budget and Finance, and Research.

TASK FORCE CHARGE

The first policy committees were constituted in June, 2003, and most began functioning in the fall of that year. After two full years in operation and with the expiration of the provisional period during which the new governance system was tested, the President and the University Coordinating Committee (UCC) created the Task Force on Shared Governance System Evaluation (SGTF) (Appendix II) to conduct a University-wide developmental review during AY 2005-06, with a final report due to President Michael Garanzini, S.J., in April 2006. The SGTF was charged with conducting a developmental review aimed at answering the following three questions:

- 1) What is the knowledge base of the Shared Governance System at Loyola?
- 2) What has been the effectiveness of the Shared Governance System to date?
- 3) What has been the level of participation in shared governance during the provisional period?

To these, the SGTF added a fourth question:

- 4) What improvements could be made to the Shared Governance System at Loyola?

PROCESS

To answer these questions, the SGTF conducted a University-wide listening process involving committees and individuals from the various campuses involving schools and colleges, councils, affinity groups, student and staff groups, departments, administrators, students and staff. (See Appendices III and IV for a full list of groups consulted and minutes from SGTF meetings, respectively.) Major groups we consulted include:

- Academic Council
- American Association of University Professors
- Council of Graduate School Programs
- Dean's Council
- Executive Faculty Group, LUMC
- Faculty Council
- Faculty Senate, LUMC
- Graduate Student Council, LUMC
- Medical Council, LUMC
- President's Cabinet
- Staff Council, Lakeside campuses and LUMC
- Unified Student Government
- University Policy Committees
- University Coordinating Committee

In addition to one-on-one and group sessions, the Task Force designed and implemented an electronic survey sent to all University GroupWise mailbox addresses followed by a summation of the data by the Office of Institutional Research prior to Task Force review. (See Appendix VIII for the electronic survey weblink, Appendix IX for general frequencies from the electronic survey, Appendix X for survey frequencies by LUC group, and Appendix XI for all open-ended responses on the survey.)

The electronic survey was completed by 10.4 percent or roughly 1 in 10 members of the Loyola community (i.e., 1,747 persons out of a total university invite list of 16,808). The response rates varied when broken down into four major categories: faculty, staff, graduate/professional students, and undergraduate students. Faculty and staff responded at the highest levels (19.8

percent and 18.6 percent, respectively, or roughly 1 of every 5 members), perhaps indicative of their greater, long-term investment in Loyola's Shared Governance structure. Student response rates ranged from 7.4 percent of graduate/professional students to 9.0 percent of undergraduate students.

The SGTF has uncovered concerns that need to be addressed; despite its many strengths, the Provisional Shared Governance System has significant weaknesses that require immediate attention. In the following sections of this report the SGTF details the categories that collectively represent the areas of concern drawn from all of the interviews and electronic survey data analyses. Each area of recommendation is briefly introduced to provide a context for the issue, followed by specific recommendations. The major categories into which the recommendations fall are Knowledge and Communication, Composition, and Compensation/Support.

FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

I. Knowledge and Communication

The University community expressed major concerns that the System is neither well-known nor well-understood, is ineffectively communicated, is lacking in connectivity to existing advisory and governance groups, and is without full endorsement by many, if not most, faculty, students, and staff.

Three types of communication emerged as important concerns during our listening sessions:

- Communication about Shared Governance with the LUC community.
- Communication between and among various aspects of the Shared Governance System.
- Communication between the Shared Governance System and various affinity groups.

Additionally, a clear need for enhanced education through better means of communication about Shared Governance emerged from the listening sessions.

Clearly, there is a communication gap between the Shared Governance System and the LUC community. Listening sessions revealed that the vast majority of respondents are largely unaware of the role, scope, and processes of our Shared Governance System. Further, survey results revealed that even among the 10.4% of the LUC community who chose to respond to the survey on Shared Governance, 79% report being "not at all familiar" or "not very familiar" with the Shared Governance System.

This lack of knowledge is not driven just by student responses. To illustrate, 46% of faculty and 68% of staff report being "not very" or "not at all familiar" with our Shared Governance System. Administrators, however, are under the impression that the Shared Governance System is working better than the rest of the survey respondents. For example, 56% of administrators who responded say the UCC communicates "moderately" or "very effectively"—more than twice the percentage endorsing those responses from any other group of survey respondents. Similarly,

47% of the administrators who responded to the survey reported that the system of governance encourages participation by faculty, staff, and students "to a great extent" or "to some extent," more than double the percentages reported in those categories by faculty, staff, and students.

Although structures are in place for news about shared governance to be shared with the LUC community (e.g., website, notices in *Inside Loyola* print and electronic publications, and *Inside the System*), these structures are not functioning adequately for even the most proactive information seekers within the LUC community. When asked how effectively the UPCs communicate with the wider University community, 82% of the respondents said either "not very effectively" or "not at all effectively" (the percentages for faculty and staff were 76% and 77%, respectively). Furthermore, 86% of survey respondents overall (62% of faculty and 76% of staff who responded) reported that they had never checked the website for information about Shared Governance, and, of those who had looked on the website, almost half did not find all the information they sought. More respondents reported that the use of broadcast email would be a more effective means of communicating about Shared Governance than any of the other options listed on the survey.

Recommendations:

- Annual summary reports of Shared Governance actions and issues under consideration need to be distributed to the entire University community via broadcast email.
- The Shared Governance website needs to be redesigned and re-positioned so it is easier to access.
- A key issue under consideration by a UPC should be displayed on the web portal, in a box titled "Shared Governance Update" or something similar, with the UPC chair's email address listed for more information or to submit comments.
- Shared Governance reports should be distributed to deans, chairs and department heads, and affinity groups for possible inclusion on agendas for department, division, and unit meetings.
- Judicious use of broadcast emails, clearly marked Shared Governance Update, needs to be implemented.
- Open fora should be held on each campus following the publication of the annual Shared Governance Update for comments and questions from the LUC community, having been widely advertised and placed on the University's master calendar.
- Shared Governance issues should be highlighted through other institutional channels (e.g., State of University Address, *Inside Loyola*, Dean's Convocations).
- Shared Governance units should be more proactive in communications with the *Phoenix* editorial staff.

A second type of communication concern that emerged from the listening sessions involves the communication within our Shared Governance System—between the UCC and the UPCs, among UPCs, and from the UCC and UPCs to the President. The following recommendations address this concern:

- All requests for policy proposals or reviews should be forwarded to a UPC for study.

- The UCC should facilitate communication among the UPCs by scheduling frequent meetings of the chairs of the UPCs in order for information to flow between UPCs.
- The UCC should determine, in consultation with the UPCs, if policy issues should a) go to one UPC only, with another UPC serving in an advisory capacity, b) go to multiple UPCs concurrently for independent analysis, or c) go to an ad hoc combined-UPC structure when issues cross UPC boundaries.
- The UCC should consider an annual summit meeting of all members of the UPCs and the UCC for information sharing.

A third area of concern that emerged from the listening sessions is the communication between the Shared Governance System and affinity groups, particularly the major elected groups that cross campuses (i.e., Faculty Council, Faculty Senate, Staff Council, Unified Student Government). The following recommendations emerged from this area:

- The UCC should work with major elected affinity groups to develop a formal means of information sharing and collaboration. (See Table 1 for a listing of presumed special relationships between specific UPCs and major elected affinity groups). At the bare minimum, anytime a UPC is provided an issue to discuss, the relevant elected affinity group should be informed as soon as possible. During deliberations, UPCs should also continuously update the relevant elected affinity groups on the progress of those deliberations.
- The UCC should immediately inform major groups of recommendations that have been forwarded to the President in order to allow those groups the opportunity to provide input to the President prior to his decision.

ILLUSTRATIVE RELATIONSHIPS TO BE SOLIDIFIED BETWEEN UPCs AND AFFINITY GROUPS

UPC	ILLUSTRATIVE AFFINITY GROUPS
Academic Affairs	Faculty Council Faculty Senate LUMC Executive Faculty Group at LUMC Medical Council, LUMC AAUP
Budget and Finance	Staff Council
Faculty Affairs	Faculty Council Faculty Senate LUMC Executive Faculty Group at LUMC AAUP
Research	Faculty Council Faculty Senate LUMC Executive Faculty Group at LUMC AAUP
Staff Affairs	Staff Council LUC Staff Council LUMC
Strategic Planning	
Student Affairs	Unified Student Government at Lakeside campuses Graduate Student Council, LUC, LUMC

The final area that emerged from our listening sessions in regard to communication involves basic education about Loyola's Shared Governance System. Even though the Charter and a great amount of detail about the System are posted on the website, many people express bafflement about how the System operates. Although the above recommendations will help inform the LUC community about the Shared Governance System, the following recommendations address education in particular:

- A section concerning the Shared Governance System should be included in all orientation sessions for new staff and faculty, as well as in training sessions for student leaders.
- A brochure that succinctly outlines the Shared Governance System should be developed for wide distribution to the LUC community.

II. Composition

A major theme repeated often during the listening sessions and revealed by the survey data was that there is a lack of understanding of and/or support for the manner in which membership in the UPCs is currently determined. Of the respondents, 79% percent overall, 48% of faculty, and 78% of staff reported that they do not know if the system of appointment to UPCs is fair and open. Indeed, only 6% of undergraduates, 2% of graduate/professional students, 15% of faculty, and 10% of staff replied that the process of placing members on the UPCs was "to some extent" or "to a great extent" fair and open. Further, 79% of respondents overall (and 47% of faculty and 69% of staff) do not know the identity of a single member of any UPC.

UCC membership is currently determined through a mix of elections (three seats, representing the chairs of Faculty Council and Staff Council as well as a Maywood faculty member) and appointment. Thus the mixture of appointment and election to membership in place for the UCC is a starting point for consideration of a revision in the mode of membership on the UPCs. There was recognition of the fact that the Provisional Shared Governance System in its original design, including appointment of all members, was important after the change in senior administration and the period of institutional recovery. This approach, however, does not fully align with the necessary principles of Shared Governance as outlined in the Charter.

More transparent methods of UPC membership selection would increase trust, a key component of this system of Shared Governance. Feelings were expressed that the UPCs should be composed of more than appointed members. The listening sessions and the survey data point directly to the opinion that a mixture of appointment and election should determine membership on these committees. Furthermore, the input suggests that UPCs should include those students, staff, or faculty who represent affinity groups and possess the certain expertise necessary to resource UPC functions. Equally important was the observation that leadership of the UPCs should not be by members of the administration but by election from within the individual UPC.

The current seven UPCs are integral components of the Provisional Shared Governance System. Each UPC has well-defined areas of responsibility and collectively they represent a broad spectrum of activities across the University.

Recommendations:

- The current seven UPCs should continue as representative committees for the purpose of effective shared governance.

Currently the membership of the seven UPCs is by appointment. With reference to the recent North Central Higher Learning Commission's Report on LUC (Appendix XII) and the five stated principles underlying the current Shared Governance System at LUC, appointment-only membership on these bodies formalizes a more centralized governance approach. Creation of a more balanced system of governance could be accomplished by the following:

- Membership of UPCs should be by both appointment and election.
- UPC membership should be determined by each of the following: 1) one portion should be elected by constituent group members (e.g. faculty electing faculty members, students electing student members, etc.), 2) a second portion should be appointed by the Executive Committees of major elected affinity groups 1), and 3) a third portion should be appointed by the UCC, with this portion not to exceed a majority of the UPC membership.
- Elections and appointments to the UPCs should be undertaken after wide publicity calls for expressed interest.

Because leadership is crucial to the proper functioning of the UPC and should be free of undue influence or conflict of interest, the Task Force makes the following recommendation:

- The UPC should elect the chair from the appointed and elected UPC membership with consideration given to the level of knowledge and credentials for effective leadership of the UPC. Administrators should not serve as UPC chairs.

Because the student body represents the life of the university and through its governance structure should have representation on the UCC, the Task Force recommends the following:

- The USG-elected president should serve as a member of the UCC.

The critical concerns for the representative elected membership on UPCs extend to the issue of informing the entire university of the ways in which members are chosen. The openness of a process of election extends to the importance of educating the entire university about the role of the Shared Governance System in policy making and the rationale for elected members.

- The process of nomination and election should be supported by appropriate and effective communication across the University.

III. Compensation/ Support

Recommendations under this heading fall into two general categories: support for activities necessary to improve Shared Governance (e.g., website support, clerical support, and budget) and compensation for the major participants in the Shared Governance System.

Resources are necessary in order to fulfill the knowledge and information recommendations. Also, chairs of UPCs reported that the amount of work that their departmental assistants had to do preparing materials for the UPC meetings was burdensome. Similarly, the copying costs for materials for some UPCs are substantial and carried by the home department or unit of the UPC chair.

Recommendations:

- A webmaster should be appointed for the Shared Governance System, with duties to include a) re-designing the site to make it more user-friendly and easily located and b) monitoring the posting of minutes and other actions of the UPCs to make sure such information is available in a timely fashion.
- UPC chairs should be provided with administrative support to handle the clerical and other support needs of the UPC.

Major contributions to Shared Governance should be considered as an additional factor in workload determination.

- Faculty and staff who hold *significant, central* roles in the LUC Shared Governance System should have either a) compensation (in the form of a stipend or comp time) to compensate for hours beyond normal workload demands or b) release from other tasks in their job description to allow a reasonable amount of time during normal working hours to be devoted to Shared Governance activities.
- Work on Shared Governance should be a recognized part of the annual evaluations of faculty and staff, appropriately weighted to reflect the person's role and time commitment to Shared Governance. This recommendation also applies to support staff discussed above (e.g., webmaster, administrative assistance).
- Students (undergraduate, graduate, professional) who contribute significant time to Shared Governance activities should be recognized in some way (plaque, certificate, award) for their participation.

IV. Implementation

Care should be taken to ensure that changes to the Shared Governance System are made thoughtfully, transparently, and smoothly.

Recommendations:

- A working group should be appointed to develop methods to implement changes to the Shared Governance System (e.g., methods of election to UPCs, should that change be adopted).
- The Shared Governance Charter should be revised to reflect changes to the system, and the revised Charter should be made widely available to the LUC community.
- Another electronic survey should be conducted in three years to see if changes to the Shared Governance System are successful at remedying concerns about the current system.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The SGTF is extremely grateful to the many individuals who participated in this effort. The thoughtful, positive, and developmentally-gearred commentaries received by the SGTF once again indicate the spirit of enthusiasm that infuses the University and provides direction for the future. We particularly thank Dr. Richard Hurst and Dr. Kristin Espinosa from the Office of Institutional Research for their contributions to the electronic survey.

Appendices

Appendix I: Shared Governance System description from LUC website

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

Appendix III: Listening Session Groups

Appendix IV: SGTF Meeting Minutes

Appendix V: Shared Governance Committee Policy Discussions 04-05

Appendix VI: Motions regarding Shared Governance by affinity groups

Appendix VII: Overview of electronic survey topics

Appendix VIII: Electronic Survey Web-link

Appendix IX: Overall frequencies from electronic survey data

Appendix X: Frequencies from electronic survey data by LUC group

Appendix XI: Open-ended responses from electronic survey

Appendix XII: North Central Report Web-link