

AAUP Evaluation of Shared Governance

CLA, Willamette University AAUP Advocacy Chapter

The survey was completed by Tues., Dec. 15th, 2015.

In this anonymous survey administered via a Google doc, please rank the following statements on a 1–5 Likert scale: 1= strongly agree; 3= neutral; 5 = strongly disagree; X= don't know. After selecting 1-5 or X, you may add your own comments by selecting, as well, the “other” box.

Modifications: This survey is adapted from national AAUP’s “Evaluation of Shared Governance,” which you can find at <http://www.aaup.org/sites/default/files/files/Evaluation%20of%20Shared%20Governance.pdf> . We have altered the original AAUP survey in two ways. (1) We have changed their questions with yes/no answers (e.g., “Are these structures and processes functioning in an effective manner – yes/no”) to positive statements (“These structures and processes function in an effective manner.”) to be rated on a 1 – 5 Likert scale from strongly agree to strongly disagree. (2) We have added 16 questions to the 26 in the original AAUP survey: (a) We took the five questions in the “President’s Role” section and changed “President” to “Dean” to create a “Dean’s Role” section. (b) We split one compound question into two separate questions. And (c) we created ten new questions (numbers 3, 4, 6, 7, 22, 23, 28, 29, 38, and 42) concerning governance effectiveness, communication, transparency, budgeting, contingent faculty, and administration size.

Survey response details: 61 responses out of 186 CLA faculty members surveyed, for a **32 %** response rate.

For each question we report the average Likert response (1-5) ± the standard deviation of the mean. The number of “X, I don’t know” responses is denoted in parentheses.

For Likert scale survey responses, only 1 and 2 (strongly agree and agree) are considered to be positive responses. Here I consider average results below about 2.5 to be positive, and these ten questions are **highlighted in yellow**. The other 32 questions had average Likert responses ranging from 2.8 to 4.1. I **highlighted in blue** the 19 especially negative responses, with average Likert scores ranging from 3.4 to 4.1.

Rate on 1-5 Likert scale:
1 = strongly agree,
5 = strongly disagree,

I. Climate for Governance

1. The Trustees, the administration, and the faculty model collegiality, respect, tolerance, and civility towards other members of the campus community and each other. 2.9 ± 1.2 (2x)
2. Negotiations and communications among university constituents are open, and are carried out in good faith and in an atmosphere of trust. 3.5 ± 1.2 (2x)
3. Faculty participation in shared institutional governance is effective. 3.4 ± 1.2 (2x)
4. Faculty participation in shared institutional governance is welcomed by the administration. 3.4 ± 1.3 (5x)

II. Institutional Communication

5. Consultation by the administration with faculty leadership allows both time and a mechanism for leadership to consult with their constituents before offering recommendations. 3.6 ± 1.2 (3x)
6. Communication between administration and faculty is robust and effective. 3.9 ± 1.1 (1x)
7. Transparency in decision-making processes is robust & effective. 3.9 ± 1.1 (1x)
8. The faculty as a whole, in addition to faculty representatives, have timely access to information necessary for faculty members to give input into governance processes. 3.5 ± 1.2 (4x)

III. The Board's Role

9. Members of the governing board have appropriate individual qualifications with regard to education and experience. 2.9 ± 1.2 (28x)
10. Board members inform themselves on governance issues by keeping up with the literature, and participating in training opportunities and meetings of the Association of Governing Boards or the AAUP. 3.8 ± 1.3 (42x)
11. The governing board is *overly* involved in the day-to-day operations of the institution. 3.8 ± 1.0 (16x)
12. The governing board respects and supports the faculty's traditional role in institutional governance. 2.9 ± 1.1 (21x)

Rate on 1-5 Likert scale:
1 = strongly agree,
5 = strongly disagree,

IV. The President's Role

13. The President has adequate academic credentials to serve as the chief academic officer of the institution. 1.6 ± 0.9 (2x)
14. The President has adequate administrative credentials to serve as the chief academic officer of the institution. 2.2 ± 1.2 (5x)
15. The President rarely overturns faculty decisions and recommendations in areas in which the faculty has primary responsibility (e.g., curriculum; decisions on tenure/promotion/student discipline). 2.4 ± 1.3 (7x)
16. The President seeks meaningful faculty input on those issues (such as budgeting) in which the faculty has an appropriate interest, but not primary responsibility. 3.1 ± 1.3 (6x)
17. The President effectively advocates and abides by the principles of shared governance to the governing board of the institution. 3.4 ± 1.3 (26x)

V. The Dean's Role

18. The Dean has adequate academic credentials to serve as the chief academic officer of the institution. 2.1 ± 1.2 (2x)
19. The Dean has adequate administrative credentials to serve as the chief academic officer of the institution. 2.2 ± 1.1 (3x)
20. The Dean rarely overturns faculty decisions and recommendations in areas in which the faculty has primary responsibility (e.g., curriculum, tenure/promotion decisions). 3.2 ± 1.3 (8x)
21. The Dean seeks meaningful faculty input on those issues (such as budgeting, administrative structure) in which the faculty has an appropriate interest. 3.7 ± 1.3 (5x)
22. The Dean serves effectively as a conduit for information, and as an advocate for the well-being of all elements of the college/school under his/her charge (e.g., faculty, staff, students). 4.1 ± 1.0 (4x)
23. In the budgeting process, the Dean adequately considers faculty concerns and departmental academic concerns. 3.6 ± 1.2 (9x)
24. The Dean effectively advocates and abides by the principles of shared governance. 3.6 ± 1.3 (6x)

Rate on 1-5 Likert scale:
 1= strongly agree,
 5= strongly disagree,
 X= don't know

VI. The Faculty's Role

25. The faculty is afforded by the administration and the governing board an appropriate degree of autonomy with regard to its areas of responsibility. 2.8 ± 1.3 (3x)
26. The faculty appropriately exercises its capacity for both adverse and positive decisions in faculty personnel matters. 2.6 ± 1.3 (5x)
27. Resources for faculty development, reward structures, and workloads adequately support the development of faculty expertise in areas of faculty primacy. 2.9 ± 1.1 (2x)
28. Resources (e.g., funding and facilities) are provided to adequately support departments and programs. 3.4 ± 1.1 (2x)
29. The interests of *contingent* faculty are effectively and consistently represented. 3.9 ± 1.0 (5x)

VII. Joint Decision-Making

30. The institution recognizes joint responsibility for decision-making in the area of long range planning. 3.3 ± 1.1 (4x)
31. The institution recognizes joint responsibility for decision-making regarding existing or prospective physical resources and infrastructure. 3.3 ± 1.0 (7x)
32. The institution recognizes joint responsibility for decision-making in the area of budgeting. 3.4 ± 1.1 (6x)
33. The institution recognizes joint responsibility for decision-making in the selection of a new President. 3.0 ± 1.1 (11x)
34. The institution recognizes joint responsibility for decision-making in staff selection and promotion and the granting of tenure. 2.2 ± 1.1 (6x)
35. The structures and processes that allow for faculty collaboration are clearly defined in the governance documents. 3.1 ± 0.9 (15x)
36. The structures and processes that allow for faculty collaboration are functioning in an effective manner. 3.4 ± 1.0 (5x)

Rate on 1-5 Likert scale:
1= strongly agree,
5= strongly disagree,
X= don't know

VIII. Structural Arrangements for Governance

37. An institution-wide governance body meets on a regular basis. 2.8 ± 1.4 (14x)

38. The regular meeting of the CLA faculty governance body, i.e., the monthly meeting of all CLA faculty, allows for effective discussion and decision-making. 3.6 ± 1.2 (2x)

39. Faculty determine how their own representatives are selected. 2.3 ± 1.0 (4x)

40. For joint committees on which the faculty is represented, representation appropriately reflects the degree of the faculty's stake in the issue or area the committee is charged with addressing. 3.0 ± 1.1 (3x)

41. The faculty as a whole is afforded an opportunity to meet and comment on "short-listed" academic administrative candidates before hiring decisions are made. 3.1 ± 1.3 (6x)

42. The number of administrative positions is appropriate relative to the number of faculty and students. (If you disagree, please select the "other" box as well, and state whether the number of administrators is too high or too low. 3.4 ± 1.3 (7x)