

REPORT ON THE SHARED GOVERNANCE SURVEY

June 4, 2013

During Spring semester, the Senate committee on General University Policy conducted a survey of shared governance practices at the department and college levels on campus.

The survey was composed of ten questions and asked respondents to assess the issues at both the college and the department levels (see Appendix A).

The results were scored by average across a five-point Likert scale (see Appendix B). There were about 300 responses on most of the questions (Question 4 had a lower response because many responded "I don't know").

We specifically chose not to ask respondents to identify their units, although some did do so. This means that even where there might be evidence of shared governance concerns, further inquiry would be needed to identify whether these issues are real and where they are occurring. This survey was not designed to answer those questions.

The overall results are far from scientific, but were not intended to be. They indicate some broad information that should be of use to the Senate Executive Committee and the Seventh Senate Review Commission, once it is formed.

We divide this report into two sections: evidence from the Likert scale ratings, and evidence from the written comments.

Likert scale ratings

The first item of note was the number of "I don't knows" and/or items left blank. In the written comments there were statements that, given more opportunities to say "I don't know" across the questions, the numbers might have been even higher. This suggests that many faculty do not know about governance policies and practices in their department or, more commonly, in their colleges – and this is among those who did choose to respond to the survey!

Among those who did respond, the overall sense was that shared governance processes were generally being followed at the department and college levels. However, where there were concerns these were often expressed in stark terms.

In general, ratings for all items were lower at the college than at the department level. This may indicate greater concerns about governance at that level, or may indicate less knowledge about governance at that level, or both.

We note that the averages were lowest for two questions: 5. "How transparent and fair are the processes for distributing faculty workload, development opportunities, and salary?" and 7. "How often does the unit EO engage faculty representatives in discussions on budgeting?" Clearly these are two areas in which statutory requirements are quite explicit, and they need to be followed.

The college scores were also relatively low for questions: 2. "How often does the unit executive officer allow faculty an opportunity to provide advice on matters affecting the entire unit?" 6. "How actively has your unit executive officer engaged the faculty in joint planning exercises for

the unit?” and 9. “How well understood are the structures and processes for shared decision-making in unit governance documents (e.g., bylaws)?”

Written comments

The written comments have been sorted into four categories (see Appendix C). They have not been edited or modified in any other way.

1. Highlighted concerns and comments. These items have been highlighted because they go most directly to potential problems in shared governance at the department and college levels. Some of the comments are rather vague, others quite specific. But a few of them indicate potentially serious deviations from campus and university rules, if true. We recommend developing a process to identify where these issues are happening and, if true, what needs to be done about them.

2. Other concerns and comments. These have been separated out not because they are necessarily less serious, but because they suggest a broader range of concerns, some of which may fall outside the Senate’s purview.

We note that several comments concern the role, or lack of role, by non-tenure track and clinical faculty, AP’s, staff, and/or students in department or college governance. These tend to be matters of local control and vary across units. Is this something the Senate wants to intervene in?

We also note that there seem to be wide disparities in the processes and transparency of procedures for electing representatives to the Senate. Does the Senate want to develop a document of election “best practices” and distribute them to the units? Should there be a more formal process of reviewing and identifying senators who consistently fail to attend meetings?

There were several questions about how units that are organized in different ways, such as Schools, or units with Directors, might fall within shared governance processes.

3. Comments on the survey. A few respondents had questions or concerns about the survey itself.

4. Comments on campus and university governance. A few respondents questioned whether the survey should have also focused on matters of campus and university governance and not only issues at the department and college levels. While that was not the purpose of this survey, those are reasonable questions to ask. We did not ask them here because some data had been gathered on the Senate’s shared governance performance by the Sixth Senate Review Commission, done a few years ago, as well as the Campus Climate Survey administered just one year ago. The Senate has access to evidence through its own experiences, and via its liaisons with the University Senates Conference, about how governance is working at the campus and university levels, whereas it has no direct access to information about governance at the department and college levels. So it seemed appropriate to do a survey on that. Nevertheless, if there are significant faculty concerns about campus and university governance, it is important for the Senate to be made aware of them.

APPENDIX A

Senate Executive Committee Evaluation of Shared Governance Practices in Departments and Colleges

The 1966 AAUP Statement on Government of Colleges and Universities, developed in concert with the American Council on Education (ACE) and the Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges (AGB), states that “The variety and complexity of the tasks performed by institutions of higher education produce an inescapable interdependence among governing board, administration, faculty, students, and others. The relationship calls for adequate communication among these components, and full opportunity for appropriate joint planning and effort.” (<http://www.aaup.org/report/1966-statement-government-colleges-and-universities>)

The Senate of the University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign is committed to fostering the conditions that make such joint decision-making effective. The broad policies and principles providing for these conditions are laid out in the University Statutes and General Rules (<http://www.bot.uillinois.edu/statutes>; <http://www.bot.uillinois.edu/general-rules>).

However, these processes exist not only at the campus and university levels. They are also implemented – and for most faculty most directly experienced – at the department and college levels. Therefore, the Senate is conducting a general survey of shared governance processes within departments and colleges. These questions are loosely adapted from a similar survey developed by the AAUP.

This survey is confidential: your identity and that of your department and college are protected.

If survey results indicate that further, more detailed inquiry is justified, we recommend that the Senate Executive Committee work with the office of the Provost to develop a follow-up process that would identify particular units and outline steps for improvement where needed.

QUESTIONS (rated on a five-point Likert scale). Separate rankings for department (D) and college (C):

1. Shared governance depends on collegiality, respect, and civility between faculty and administrators. Rank how well your unit demonstrates these values.	<table style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="width: 20%;"></td> <td style="width: 20%; text-align: center;">Not well</td> <td style="width: 20%;"></td> <td style="width: 20%;"></td> <td style="width: 20%; text-align: center;">Very</td> <td style="width: 20%;"></td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td style="text-align: center;">well</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>D:</td> <td style="text-align: center;">1</td> <td style="text-align: center;">2</td> <td style="text-align: center;">3</td> <td style="text-align: center;">4</td> <td style="text-align: center;">5</td> </tr> <tr> <td>C:</td> <td style="text-align: center;">1</td> <td style="text-align: center;">2</td> <td style="text-align: center;">3</td> <td style="text-align: center;">4</td> <td style="text-align: center;">5</td> </tr> </table>		Not well			Very			well					D:	1	2	3	4	5	C:	1	2	3	4	5
	Not well			Very																					
	well																								
D:	1	2	3	4	5																				
C:	1	2	3	4	5																				
2. In general, how often does the unit executive officer allow faculty an opportunity to provide advice on matters affecting the entire unit?	<table style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="width: 20%;"></td> <td style="width: 20%; text-align: center;">Rarely</td> <td style="width: 20%;"></td> <td style="width: 20%;"></td> <td style="width: 20%; text-align: center;">Almost</td> <td style="width: 20%;"></td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td style="text-align: center;">always</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>D:</td> <td style="text-align: center;">1</td> <td style="text-align: center;">2</td> <td style="text-align: center;">3</td> <td style="text-align: center;">4</td> <td style="text-align: center;">5</td> </tr> <tr> <td>C:</td> <td style="text-align: center;">1</td> <td style="text-align: center;">2</td> <td style="text-align: center;">3</td> <td style="text-align: center;">4</td> <td style="text-align: center;">5</td> </tr> </table>		Rarely			Almost			always					D:	1	2	3	4	5	C:	1	2	3	4	5
	Rarely			Almost																					
	always																								
D:	1	2	3	4	5																				
C:	1	2	3	4	5																				
3. When the faculty forwards its advice on areas in which it has primary responsibility, such as curriculum, how often does the unit executive officer	<table style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="width: 20%;"></td> <td style="width: 20%; text-align: center;">Rarely</td> <td style="width: 20%;"></td> <td style="width: 20%;"></td> <td style="width: 20%; text-align: center;">Almost</td> <td style="width: 20%;"></td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td style="text-align: center;">always</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>D:</td> <td style="text-align: center;">1</td> <td style="text-align: center;">2</td> <td style="text-align: center;">3</td> <td style="text-align: center;">4</td> <td style="text-align: center;">5</td> </tr> </table>		Rarely			Almost			always					D:	1	2	3	4	5						
	Rarely			Almost																					
	always																								
D:	1	2	3	4	5																				

take such advice into consideration in decision making?	C: 1 2 3 4 5
4. According to the University Statutes, the unit executive officer should meet with the elected unit advisory committee/executive committee at least once a year. How often does the advisory or executive committee meet in your unit?	<p>Less than once/yr Monthly</p> <p>D: 1 2 3 4 5</p> <p>C: 1 2 3 4 5</p> <p>I don't know X</p>
5. How transparent and fair are the processes for distributing faculty workload, development opportunities, and salary?	<p>Not at all Very</p> <p>D: 1 2 3 4 5</p> <p>C: 1 2 3 4 5</p>
6. How actively has your unit executive officer engaged the faculty in joint planning exercises for the unit?	<p>Not at all Very</p> <p>actively</p> <p>D: 1 2 3 4 5</p> <p>C: 1 2 3 4 5</p>
7. According to the University Statutes, one function of the elected advisory or executive committee is to review the unit budget with the executive officer. How often does the unit executive officer engage faculty representatives in discussions on budgeting?	<p>Rarely Very often</p> <p>D: 1 2 3 4 5</p> <p>C: 1 2 3 4 5</p>
8. When the faculty forwards its advice regarding faculty hiring and promotion, how often does the unit executive officer act in accordance with that advice?	<p>Rarely Almost</p> <p>always</p> <p>D: 1 2 3 4 5</p> <p>C: 1 2 3 4 5</p>
9. How well understood are the structures and processes for shared decision-making in unit governance documents (e.g., bylaws)?	<p>Not at all Open and</p> <p>clear</p> <p>D: 1 2 3 4 5</p> <p>C: 1 2 3 4 5</p>
10. Shared governance depends on faculty representation to unit and campus bodies through democratic elections. Does your unit engage in transparent and fair practices in such elections?	<p>Rarely Almost</p> <p>always</p> <p>D: 1 2 3 4 5</p> <p>C: 1 2 3 4 5</p>

OTHER COMMENTS?

APPENDIX B

Question	No in Sample	Average	Dev	Standard
Q1D	305	3.750819672		1.445243521
Q1C	303	3.534653465		1.326781931
Q2D	302	3.715231788		1.40423901
Q2C	299	3.053511706		1.335323809
Q3D	298	3.94295302		1.373319841
Q3C	287	3.428571429		1.374589852
Q4D	213	4.197183099		1.23280342
Q4C	130	4.407692308		1.042896513
Q5D	303	3.125412541		1.406296923
Q5C	290	2.817241379		1.30425536
Q6D	299	3.555183946		1.406910162
Q6C	286	3.06993007		1.301695235
Q7D	291	2.821305842		1.424754038
Q7C	272	2.632352941		1.335647142
Q8D	291	4.23024055		1.171796112
Q8C	273	3.853479853		1.258144448
Q9D	299	3.411371237		1.402817683
Q9C	287	3.135888502		1.332651268
Q10D	301	4.245847176		1.219726167
Q10C	281	4.078291815		1.220054226

APPENDIX C

1. Highlighted concerns and comments

The biggest problem with Executive and Advisory committees is that they rarely poll the faculty about issues, don't publicise when they meet and don't report to the faculty what they are doing.

We have a college that is run four years in row by a leader that came on board without a search. This damages the reputation of the University and the College.

There are particular problems with lack of communication with faculty regarding the hiring, promotion, and responsibilities of administrative staff at the departmental level.

My unit does NOT have an executive advisory committee. The Director assumes the role of dictator.

My unit has an interim head that we did not choose. Where is the shared governance when the faculty's wishes are not heeded?

Lately College-level decisions regarding hiring from searches have gone against departmental search committee and departmental governance committee recommendations. The dept feels that the college administration is not well informed on our needs and is acting on flawed information/judgment.

The top down or 'head' system in most departments in my my college means decisions are 'pre-made' and only ratified by departmental faculty. Having worked in more democratic organizations, I much prefer them. Also, and very important, top down budgeting cuts faculty out of much educational policy. More attention to centralization and its effects would be useful in your survey.

My department's advisory committee currently only meets to discuss student appeals for cheating. It is not asked for advise on any other matters. The dean of the college renewed the appointment of the head for another 5 years without a performance review. Only after faculty protests a performance review was carried out, but had no impact. The A&P committee is appointed by the department head without any faculty input. For many years the department head appointed two biological cousins, his best friends, to the A&P committee. Consequently these 3 people had an over powering influence in the department, which led to bullying and an unfair distribution of departmental resources (salary raises, space, promotions, hires, nominations for awards). The distribution of departmental resources is supposed to be merit based, but in practice it is governed by nepotism and corruption. When the dean was made aware of the issue, he ignored the problem. The faculty has very little influence on the selection of new department heads: (1) The dean appoints the hiring committee with no faculty input. (2) Faculty comments about the candidates are generally not kept in confidence which puts the faculty at risk of retaliation. (3) There is no faculty vote on the candidates or the ranking.

The director under whom I work has no respect for procedure, ignores bylaws, and fails to respond to criticism. The director's indifference to 'shared governance' is well known among faculty, but she has the backing of higher administrative powers. Why, I cannot fathom.

There is no concept of shared governance in my unit. The EO acts as an independent entity who makes all decisions. These include annual salary decisions, promotion and tenure decisions, and annual reviews of pre-tenure faculty. Financial matters, including spending endowment monies reserved for specific purposes, are also at the sole discretion of the EO. I believe that this situation not only flies in the face of the extremely important concept of shared governance, but places the University at considerable risk for legal action and adverse media coverage.

Shared governance in our unit is non-existent.

Our unit is run in a hierarchical manner, and shared governance is present in form only.

shared govr has collapsed in my college

Our department head does not engage the faculty in decisions and follow the Departmental bylaws.

If 'never' were a category for the department head meeting with the advisory committee or asking for input on the budget, I would have selected this category. The head is contemptuous of many faculty and flagrantly violates the by-laws. As far as I know, the administration of the college has been unresponsive to faculty complaints about the head.

I have never worked at an institution with so little transparency in departmental matters, nor such a complete lack of faculty involvement in important decisions facing a department.

Our department head has gone so far as to erase all of the documents in our Curriculum Committee Dropbox folder because she disagreed with our recommendations. The head has created a culture of fear and division in our department, while telling the college administration that she is creating a culture of consensus.

I am frustrated and demoralized.

2. Other concerns and comments

My department's lack of elections is largely due to the need to arm-twist individuals to serve at all. When there's only one candidate, elections are a rubber stamp. Service is undervalued because there is no way to monetize its impact.

In my unit non-tenure track research faculty are active in faculty governance, voting etc., seems strange. Thank you for doing this. I hope it helps. The executive committee of my department meets with the executive officer at least once a week, sometimes twice a week or more.

I feel that the college administration has been particularly unfair to people with the least power (i.e. visiting lecturers, adjuncts, and lecturers). Salaries have been cut with almost no notice to these people, etc.

Faculty efforts raise every cent of indirect costs that is eventually distributed to college and department. At a minimum, the use of these ICR funds should be explained by the dean and department head in sufficient detail so that faculty are aware of how these funds are used.

Our executive committee meets *weekly*, rather than monthly.

NTT faculty are excluded from voting at the departmental level. In my department non-tenure track faculty were not allowed to attend faculty meetings until recently. No information is provided upon joining about these processes or procedures. There is therefore no shared government to speak of.

Much of the 'real' work seems to be done by EOs and their appointed committees (executive committees), and not by faculty elected committees (advisory committees). In addition, faculty committees are in practice chaired and run by administrators. There seems to be very poor understanding of faculty governance and shared responsibilities of faculty/administrators in my unit and no history of socializing faculty into these important roles. In short, faculty seem to be brought in at the end of the decision making process, or for decisions that have little impact (e.g., last year the Department Head and Dean moved an NTT staff member to a tenure track appointment without any discussion among faculty).

One structural problem with the institution is the way in which the only thing that is really incentivized is applying for jobs elsewhere. Indeed, I was actively encouraged by the head of my unit to apply for other jobs for the expressed purpose of extorting more resources out of the college. I can think of only one instance in which I've managed to get salary equity issues addressed or resources that did not involve making some kind of threat. As near as I can tell, teaching large service classes, getting external grants, and publishing in quality journals don't matter much at all. What this all means is that I can't plan to contribute in the long term to strengthening the University or sustaining excellence. I have every indication that effort and accomplishment to this effect would go unrecognized and unrewarded. I always have to have one eye on the door to get anything done. Retention is awfully expensive. Expensive enough that I imagine that we'd all be better off if the administration did two things. In the first case, most of the applications to other jobs seem to be motivated by salary compression. Ensuring that salaries of senior people stay above recently hired people will cut the number of retentions down quite a bit. In the second place, changing the incentive system by having a higher bar for retention (there is always someone younger, hungrier, smarter, and cheaper out there) and putting some sincere and widely advertised effort into solving problems of equity and rewarding good should help to change attitudes quite a bit. What's good for the career at Illinois is bad for the institution and bad for the soul. I'd like to look toward the long term, but my unit head's requests to go out on the job market coupled with nearly every other interaction I've had with the University has led me to believe that this will be penalized. I'd like to be rewarded for loyalty and honest hard work. It would be wonderful for everyone if administration can help make that happen.

The University should develop an election template. Among other things, it should randomize candidate names, to control for order effects. At present this effect is very pronounced in our College, as there are often long lists of names, always alphabetical. This is a trivial computing problem, and amelioration of this would be a great service to the University.

I am a non-tenure-track employee and am not consulted on anything. Not policy, not workload, budget, anything. We are ghosts in our department, even though we teach the bulk of the classes. It is demoralizing.

Growing divide between those teaching and those researching.

Shared governance includes faculty and staff. When does the faculty reach out to the staff on management of the department?

We have excellent shared governance processes in my college. We also are publicly recognized as excellent in our teaching, research and service. So why on earth is the University trying to coerce us to merge with other units? Is it really because our small size makes the org chart look untidy?

More of these questions should have had 'don't know' options. Only more senior tenure-track faculty have good visibility into processes involving the college, budget decisions etc. I had to do some guessing. On a different note, all levels above the dept are really poor at making it clear whether non-tenure-track (e.g. research) faculty are or aren't supposed to participate. This can be very hard to track down, and embarrassing if the answer is that we're not. Email does get sent to everyone when it's aimed only at tenure-track folks. So could everyone PLEASE address the email itself to the specific target group of faculty, rather than hoping we can guess whether we're supposed to consider ourselves part of 'colleagues' or 'faculty members' on this particular occasion?

We have an interim head, from outside the unit this year and next. We need a permanent Head who can be an advocate for the department's interests in the College and University and also administer in an open and transparent way. Our salary equities at the professor's level are enormous (\$26,000) largely because the previous head signed off on retention packages with huge salaries. This had bred resentment and discontent.

We rarely receive information on the state of the college or dept. budget or future outlook. We have a lot of department ICR and do not know how it is used. Not sure why the lack of transparency exists.

Sometimes when I did not give the highest possible ranking, that was ok with me. Not all these processes are equally amenable to open consultation. I have nevertheless been disappointed in the lack of shared governance regarding the university's confrontational approach to unions.

As a non-tenure-track faculty I have to answer at the far left of the scale for all of these questions, as I have absolutely zero opportunities for interaction with any administrative unit, ever. In no way does 'shared governance' characterize any part of my interactions with the university.

On occasions when faculty are not consulted, it is usually because decisions involve expertise on things like budgeting that most faculty don't know about, and that most faculty don't want to be bothered with.

When I served on the College Executive Committee, it met twice per month (biweekly) with the Dean. When I served on the Department's Advisory Committee, it met at least monthly with the Head. I assume that these practices continue.

My colleagues treat our unit head badly & do not act fairly and openly.

Much of the consultation of faculty at the College level takes place in the Executive Committee. Since I have never served on the Executive Committee, I have to rely on second hand information to answer some questions. This makes me think we should emphasize the role of Ex Comm members as true representatives of their areas, which would entail some reporting back to units or areas.

My department has done plenty of self-study and other reports for the college over the past ten years -- indeed, an inordinate amount of time has been spent on these reports, but they all seem to disappear into the ether and then the next year or two years later a different dean wants another report on the same topic. We have spent hundreds of hours of time producing documentation for various initiatives and then when it comes time for decision making, it seems like these reports are disregarded. So it seems like two things are in order on the college level: consultation without over bureaucratization. When all our research time goes to service, something is wrong.

As an emeritus professor, I know far less about the governance process especially at the College level that I did before retiring even though I remain in the Senate

Our Department has always been strong on transparency and shared governance. It is more difficult to involve all faculty at the college level, so we must rely on our Department Head to represent us.

Our Faculty Senate and leaders, our system of shared governance, and our institution are fantastic. They are some of the key reasons on why I have stayed here for so long.

dept head is a micro manager. Dept is strongly influence in certain discipline areas by faculty cliques which exclude some faculty members

Effective administrators understand the value of shared governance and faculty input. Effective faculty members understand their role in the shared governance process and work through that process to impact administrative outcomes. Conversely, administrators that do not understand shared governance typically do not remain as our administrators for very long. Faculty that do not understand their role in shared governance need to invest more time in gaining that understanding.

You can see from the replies that there is a HUGE disconnect between administration at the college level and administration as well as faculty at the departmental level. Repeatedly faculty have been requested to provide 'meaningful' input and have devoted large amounts of time and effort to providing that input only to have it ignored, modified or dismissed because it didn't match the foregone conclusion and commitments already made by the college administration. It is irritating, frustrating and disillusioning to work with the college administration on issues of shared governance. This particular faculty member frankly is disgusted with the whole process.

Faculty are more connected with dept than with the college, so my perception is that our dept head listens to the faculty. I am less clear how the dean interacts with dept heads.

Topics of crucial importance are actually more likely to be poorly or inappropriately handled in my College.

adjunct faculty are denied any meaningful voice in university governance

Thank you for doing this survey. I am more hopeful about the campus level than my local units.

More needs to be done to include students in the shared governance process! A survey would be a nice start...

My answers are biased by the fact that I am a non-tenure track faculty member. I know that our tenured and tenure-track faculty have more input and decision making, but wonder why this is so, given their lack of concern for the overall 'educational mission'. I've been in this department longer than many of the tenured and tenure track faculty, and am the one that fulfills a 3 & 3 teaching load, publishes text books, does community service and outreach activities, and am a senator representing faculty making 3x my salary. It's not that I am underpaid, I do not believe I am, nor is pay the basis of my bias. Surrounding me are faculty too busy doing their research looking for the next University to jump to when a higher offer is made to them. I know this is a Tier I research University, but unless it wants to close it's Undergraduate, Professional, and Masters Degree educational programs, maybe it should reconsider it's approach to 'shared governance'. For a person in my position, shared only means doing the work many others are 'too busy' to do, because they're 'too busy' making a reputation for themselves rather than the Department or the College, much less the University of Illinois. Just a thought.

I am not a professor. None of these questions made sense to me. I am an academic professional. APs are excluded from all these 'collegial' mechanisms, despite the fact that we perform the same duties as faculty. By the way I am also retired.

I've been employed by several universities, and this one has the most shared, most open, most transparent governance of any of them. There are always little things to tweak but there are no major problems with the system. If it works, don't fix it.

Certainly an erosion of these concepts over the last 25 years, but still reasonably sound in my Department and College.

Faculty have more input in governance on this campus than others I've been on.

there are a few who believe they know best for the rest

In my opinion, problems and unreasonable perceptions regarding shared governance almost always (but not always e.g. Hogan) originate from the faculty side. LOTS of 1) huge egos and a belief that if they don't agree with a decision it HAS to be wrong, even if they are in the minority opinion and 2) perceptions that anything originating from UA is 'evil'.

As a non-tenure track faculty member it is very clear in my program and department that I am not respected. Tenured faculty members have no interest in hearing the ideas of adjunct faculty who oftentimes are the most involved members of the department in terms of student contact. This is an unwise approach to the workplace, and if the university is interested in serving and understanding students and their educational needs better, the university and its departments would benefit from integrating non-tenure track faculty into the governance of the university. There are a few positions on committees that non-tenure track faculty are invited to participate on as elected members, however, very often the participation of these members is not in a voting capacity and adjunct representation is much smaller in comparison to tenured representation. In my department non-tenured and non-tenure track faculty are banned from faculty meetings. I think that is a fairly straightforward message about respect and collegiality. Additionally, morale is so low amongst the non-tenure track faculty that we often don't communicate much between ourselves. There are many examples of how this part of the university workforce is disenfranchised. I am not even aware of many of the topics listed on this survey due to this disenfranchisement (in particular this would indicate lack of transparency). I

am not saying these things merely to complain about the university. I believe there is opportunity here to actually improve the university and the services we provide to students and our community. The governance structure here, quite frankly, is extremely outdated and relies on rank rather than communication and willingful participation.

I am a junior faculty member. I feel that my college is an excellent place for me right now, and I have been very happy with how involved I, and especially senior faculty, have been involved in helping shape the direction of the College.

Completely shared governance is, in my opinion, a concept supported by underperforming or momentarily disgruntled members of the faculty. I prefer excellence over perfect democracy.

A major issue to be addressed is the increased discrepancy between resources available in humanistic and arts fields and the much greater resources available in scientific and technical disciplines. There are inadequate mechanisms for recognizing outstanding contributions from faculty in humanistic and arts-related fields.

Shared governance clearly works at this university. The recent ousting of our president is the best example, but there are many others as well. There is really no need to make massive changes to this process. Large changes, for example through the formation of a faculty union, would result in a wholesale exodus of many of the most talented professors (including many of my colleagues) from UIUC.

This survey follows a common pattern at UI: it conceives of 'shared governance' solely according to an arrangement in which one UEO 'solicits feedback' (or equivalent euphemism) and then hands down decisions. I'm not sure how to answer your questions usefully, because I reject this model of shared governance. Given the senate's objections to various actions by the president and BOT two years ago, I'm pretty sure that most of the senate does, too. I'd suggest it would be to our benefit to rethink our definitions of shared governance. While I'm not set on faculty unionization, I have yet to hear a better model proposed.

3. Comments related to the survey

this survey was very helpful as it pointed out some required shared governance elements that I was not aware of and will seek to abide by—

I have very little idea about how any of these things work, to be honest, which is why I left a lot of questions blank.

Some of these questions should have had a don't know. It is difficult to comment on the frequency or fairness of a procedure when we are not directly involved. Hiring is very open; but other aspects of decision-making are not. So we don't know if it happens rarely or happens frequently, but behind closed doors.

I am in a small department that, with 2 others, forms a 'School'. I have answered this with respect to the School - where i see serious problems - rather than for my department (which is a clear example of shared governance at its best; our head is fantastic!) because it is the School that makes decisions on hiring, curriculum, etc. Since the dean reappointed the School's director, i am not hopeful for change.

My answers reflect the actions of the Department Head who left in Dec, 2012, after 10 yr in the position. We have an interim Dept Head about which I know little

Unable to make a fair assessment of many elements at the college level for this survey because I have limited contact/knowledge

I tried to answer the previous questions reflecting my general impressions.

I honestly don't know about a lot of these issues. That's probably not a good thing. :\

I am a low level, first year contract faculty member. My responses were sometimes based on general perception more than hard knowledge.

Goal to be fair in responding. Each response has at least one caveat though. For example, administration includes more than chief executive officer. Another example, access to development opportunities appears to be inequitable. A third, campus committee appointments, not all are elected. For those that are done through elections, these are fair. The appointments process does not appear to be clear or fair.

This survey assumes one is in a multi-department college/school. So, one questions how aware the survey developers are of the multiple organizational structures in place on our campus.

This survey was difficult, since often I, as an adjunct teacher am not included in most of these processes. The range of answers rarely reflected my experience.

Sometimes quite difficult to answer questions about 'unit' and 'college' in same manner, or on same scale, because the two entities are quite different in form and function. My 'college' answers should therefore be taken with a grain of salt.

You entire questionnaire assumes that I know how things work for 'faculty'. I am an lecturer. As such, I am occasionally listed as 'faculty', but generally not included in any decision process, nor am I informed of any rules or procedures, as I have no voice. Had your questionnaire asked questions like 'are *you* involved' or 'are *you* aware' (as opposed to 'is the faculty...'), then most of my answers would have been 'no' or 'almost never'.

Several of the college level survey questions were left blank because I am not familiar with how the college functions in these respects.

This survey was remarkably biased and it wouldn't pass any sort of test as a valid survey for a refereed journal.

I had no choice but to leave many of the responses blank for 'college' because there was no choice for saying 'I don't know.'

Our unit is neither a department nor a college. We are a school. Because this choice was not an option, I answered questions on the department level.

Frequency of meeting and seeking advice does not necessarily reflect the extent to which advice is considered for decision making.

4. Comments on campus and university governance

The relationship between campus admin and faculty should be explored.

My primary/overwhelming concern on this issue is true, fully-transparent shared governance between UIUC faculty and UIUC administration and UIUC trustees. I have been here nearly 3 decades, and increasingly over this time period, it appears that the interaction between faculty-{administration+trustees} is becoming increasingly dysfunctional, and seriously so, IMO.

Shared governance at the University of Illinois is the worst I've seen after 35 years in higher education. Faculty have almost no say in the running or operation of the university apart from the immediate content of their courses and research. The U of I runs a very top-heavy, top-down type of governing system that deliberately disengages the faculty from meaningful participation and decision-making. And it has led to very low morale and very high turnover. Contempt is the only word to describe how my colleagues and I feel toward a distant and arrogant university administration.

In my view, the problems with regard to transparency consistency, and due regard for core values of the campus do not reside at the department or the college level, but in Swanlund.

This university seems to be a top-down institution.

I wish you asked us the same questions about the campus administration and the Senate, which are highly non-transparent in their behavior, and often act in their own self-interest, rather than that of the common good.

If I were given the chance to rate upper level administration such as the Provost/Chancellor with shared faculty governance my scores would have been almost never across the board. We have a significant problem at the U of I. Shared governance is breaking down.

My concerns about the weakness and limitations of shared governance are almost entirely about levels beyond my college: provost, chancellor, university system, trustees. The higher one goes, the less faculty are equal partners (and the less transparency there is about decision making).

Recent problems at U. of Illinois is largely at levels above the College; that is at the State, University system and the campus levels. This survey is a waste of time as it does not touch on the basic cause of problems.

First, I'm very happy to see the Senate taking up and beginning to evaluate issues and some of the details of shared governance. Please do more to flesh out, evaluate, and improve the picture. Toward that end, this study focuses entirely on relationships between faculty and their departments or colleges. It completely ignores a) inter-unit relationships (e.g., college-college) and b) relationships between University administration (provost-level bodies, chancellor-level bodies, university-level bodies). The study also assumes that issues of shared governance are hierarchical issues - that is, issues of openness and engagement 'up' and 'down' in relationships of information, power and control. Much if not most of actual governance and negotiation activities in the University (and many other organizations) occur in other, more 'network-like' relationships, that may be formal and/or informal, (semi-)permanent/organizationally stabilized and/or opportunistic. Finally, the survey focuses principally on codified and sanctioned

mechanisms and processes of governance, and consequently will not surface information about processes that impact and shape governance, and are (intentionally or not) secretive, sub-rosa, or out of view. To be sure the survey contains some questions that get at whether (but not how) some limited kinds of formal information and decision processes are open/transparent or not. But it misses entirely any information on ad-hoc, strategic, historical/cultural, and/or opportunistic processes that a) heavily impact the structures and outcomes of shared governance broadly construed, and b) are often invisible. So, in my view, the survey is going to miss many many occasions in which shared governance is both enhanced and working well at UIUC, and occasions in which it is falling very - and some times catastrophically - short. So, again, I applaud your efforts, but please build a more complete and detailed picture of the actuality of shared governance at the U of I.

This survey mystifies me. I started out taking it in good faith, but ultimately decided not to fill it out. One would assume by this survey that the only governance on campus occurs at the unit level. Where are questions about the senate's relationship to administration? Where are questions about the effects of provost level decisions on units, and the relationships between higher administration and faculty? What on earth does shared governance mean in the context of this survey? It's so limited that I think the results will be useless.

Shared governance is generally excellent at both the department and the college level and quite poor at the campus level. The campus as a whole is run from the top, down, while faculty have considerable input especially at the department level.

While I appreciate the efforts here, none of these questions go to addressing the relationship between the Provost and the College, for instance. For example, how might we discern whether people felt that there had been open communication & shared governance with regard to the closure of the Institute of Aviation?

First: our department head meets WEEKLY with the elected advisory committee. I know this is the case with many other departments, but this was not an option in this survey. Second: why did you only survey shared governance at the department and college level? From my perspective, the real problems are higher up.

All of these questions focus only on the levels of department and college. The most serious problems with shared governance have involved higher levels of administration at the campus and system levels. My sense is that whatever the findings of this survey the answers would be quite different if the wider context of shared governance were considered. Why not redo these questions or related ones in relation to the offices of the provost, chancellor, and president or the campus and the system?

This survey is OK as far as it goes, but the range of questions is incredibly limited. On numerous issues that are fundamental to the direction and operation of this university, the faculty are simply never consulted. We are permitted to run our little villages by ourselves, but we are not allowed anywhere near the levers of real power in the institution.

Shared governance works extremely well in my department and college. I am more concerned about what happens at the campus level. The Senate itself has a difficult problem attracting leading scholars on campus to participate. This is in part because the Senate is so large as to be inefficient in its operations, and in part because leading scholars have too many demands on their time to put up with the inefficiency. Thus, most won't agree to run, and those who are

elected seldom attend. As a result, the Senate is at risk of being 'captured' by narrow interest groups (such as the CFA) who have an ideological agenda and who do not represent the views of the majority.

The focus of this survey is essentially misguided. Under present circumstances, the profoundly important issues pertaining to shared governance have to do with the central administration's size and orientation in relation to the faculty as a whole. When the Senate leadership manages to identify this as a significant issue, perhaps by crafting a different survey to elicit information from individual faculty members about the performance of the central administration, then I will be happy to fill it out.

I look forward to a subsequent survey that covers shared governance between units and between each unit and upper levels of campus administration.

The survey should have included university and campus level shared governance. These areas are where there had been continued problems with shared governance that are structural and cultural (not dependent on who the administrators are).

Why is this survey only focused on department and college level governance? There may be problems at these levels, and finding them out will be useful. But this survey tells you nothing about faculty views of administrative bloat above the department and college level and the tendency of decisions to be made at those level without transparent or sufficient consultation with faculty governance. Also, the choices about executive committee consultation on this survey are insufficient. Those of us fortunate enough to be in very democratic departments have executive committees that meet far more often than monthly. If this, rather than a system of autocratic heads, were the departmental management model endorsed by the administration at large there would be far more transparency and shared governance.